

Disbribution:

Docket (50-466 & 50-467)
Docket (50-367)
Docket (50-286) ✓
Docket (50-440 * 50-441)
JAN 8 1975 L Rdg. (M. Groff, Rm. 188)
LWR 1-2 File (3)

LVGossick
EGCase
FSchroeder
AGiambusso
RSBoyd
VMoore
RCDeYoung
DMuller
DEVassallo
WButler
MBaycock
MJOestmann
JOrndoff
MLynuch

L. Manning Muntzing, Director of Regulation

THRU: Edson G. Case, Acting Director of Licensing

STATUS REPORT ON SELECTED LICENSING CASES

Original Signed By
E. G. Case

Enclosed are brief status summaries for the week ending January 4, 1975,
as requested for:

Allens Creek 1 & 2
Bailly 1
Indian Point 3
Perry 1 & 2

We have deleted Bellefonte 1 & 2 because construction permits were issued
on December 24, 1974.

Original signed by
Roger S. Boyd

A. Giambusso, Deputy Director
for Reactor Projects
Directorate of Licensing

Enclosures:
As stated above

8111200075 750108
ADOCK 05000286

1/15/75

| | | | | | | |
|-----------|-------------|-----------|-----------|------------|---------|--|
| OFFICE ➤ | L: LWR 1-2 | AD: LWR 1 | AD: LWR 1 | DD: RD | Act. DL | |
| SURNAME ➤ | WButler/sac | VMoore | RCDeYoung | AGiambusso | EGCase | |
| DATE ➤ | 1/6/75 | 1/6/75 | 1/6/75 | 1/7/75 | 1/8/75 | |

Distribution:

Docket (50-466 & 50-467)
Docket (50-367)
Docket (50-286)
Docket (50-440 * 50-441)
L Rdg. (M. Groff, Rm. 188)
LWR 1-2 File (3)
LVGossick
EGCase
FSchroeder
AGiambusso
DEVassallo
WButler
MBaycock
MJOestmann
JOrndoff
MLynuch
RCDeYoung
DMuller

JAN 8 1975

L. Manning Muntzing, Director of Regulation

THRU: Edson G. Case, Acting Director of Licensing

STATUS REPORT ON SELECTED LICENSING CASES

Original Signed By
E. G. Case

VMoore

Enclosed are brief status summaries for the week ending January 4, 1975,
as requested for:

Allens Creek 1 & 2
Bailly 1
Indian Point 3
Perry 1 & 2

We have deleted Bellefonte 1 & 2 because construction permits were issued
on December 24, 1974.

Original signed by
Roger S. Boyd

A. Giambusso, Deputy Director
for Reactor Projects
Directorate of Licensing

Enclosures:
As stated above

| | | | | | |
|-----------|-------------|-----------|-----------|------------|---------|
| OFFICE > | L: LWR 1-2 | AD: LWR-1 | AD: LWR-1 | DD: RD | Act. DL |
| SURNAME > | WButler/sac | VMoore | RCDeYoung | AGiambusso | EGCase |
| DATE > | 1/6/75 | 1/6/75 | 1/6/75 | 1/7/75 | 1/ /75 |

STATUS REPORT FOR THE WEEK ENDING JANUARY 4, 1975

HOUSTON LIGHTING & POWER COMPANY

ALLENS CREEK NUCLEAR GENERATING STATION, UNITS 1 AND 2

DOCKET NOS. 50-466/467

The applicant met with us on December 30, 1974 to discuss its response to our request for additional information on subsidence, which is scheduled to be submitted on January 3, 1975. Assuming we find this response to be acceptable, we expect to be ready to consider site suitability matters at the close of the environmental hearings (proposed for January 28, 1975) and, in addition, meet the blue book date of February 28, 1975 for the RAD/Safety hearing.

STATUS REPORT FOR THE WEEK ENDING JANUARY 4, 1975

NORTHERN INDIANA PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY

BAILLY GENERATING STATION NUCLEAR - 1

DOCKET NO. 50-367

There has been no significant change in the Bailly licensing status since last week. The history and current status are summarized below.

The staff issued a construction permit for Bailly on May 1, 1974. The Joint Intervenors appealed this decision and the Appeal Board granted a temporary stay on construction which was subsequently vacated. The Joint Intervenors filed motions in the U. S. Court of Appeals, and the Court ordered a temporary stay of construction on October 16, 1974.

Oral arguments were held before the U. S. Court of Appeals on December 11, 1974. The Court did not indicate its schedule for issuing a decision on this case. The temporary stay, ordered by the Court on October 16, 1974, on construction activities related to dewatering will remain in effect until its decision is issued.

Oral arguments before the AEC's Appeal Board on the proposed slurry wall were held on December 16, 1974. The Appeal Board remanded the matter back to the Licensing Board for further hearings. Hearings before the ASLB resumed on January 2, 1975 and is expected to continue into the week of January 6, 1975.

STATUS REPORT FOR WEEK ENDING JANUARY 4, 1975

CONSOLIDATED EDISON COMPANY

INDIAN POINT UNIT 3

DOCKET NO. 50-286

The SER supplement has been completed and is being reviewed by management and OGC.

The issuance of the FES is now estimated for January 31, 1975 as a result of substantial comments by the staff and OGC involving extensive rewrite of the draft FES by the lab.

A summary of the status of major events is as follows:

1. SER Supplement and staff evaluations as needed on other pertinent safety-related issues - Supplement issuance the week of January 6, 1975.
2. FES Issued - January 31, 1975
3. Fuel Loading Date - Con Ed projects - March 15 to April 1, 1975
4. The settlement agreement on environmental matters is currently being circulated for signature and several parties have already signed. A date for beginning the evidentiary hearing has not been established as yet, however, Chairman Jensh has indicated that he would like to commence around mid-February. A meaningful PDD cannot be set until the hearing date is finalized and the issues to be discussed are clearly defined by the ASLB. The staff would support a fuel loading and low power license if necessary not to interfere with plant startup.

(Note to LMM: In response to your comment on last week's report we have implored OGC to get a date established for the hearing and the issues to be discussed clearly defined. RSB)

STATUS REPORT FOR THE WEEK ENDING JANUARY 4, 1975

THE CLEVELAND ELECTRIC ILLUMINATING CO. ET AL

PERRY NUCLEAR POWER PLANT, UNITS 1 & 2

DOCKET NOS. 50-440/441

The staff issued an LWA-1 on October 21, 1974 and the applicants started construction activities that same day. The ACRS considered the Perry application during its meeting in December and reported its conclusions in a letter to the Chairman, dated December 12, 1974. The applicants have requested the staff and the ASLB, in letters dated December 4, 1974, to initiate and schedule proceedings leading to the issuance of an LWA-2 by March 15, 1975. These letters request that testimony relating to the issuance of the LWA-2 be filed by January 20, 1975.

There are two outstanding issues which make the filing of favorable findings by January 20, highly improbable. The applicants proposed a design change in Amendment 22 to the PSAR (received on December 9, 1974), involving the use of a permanent dewatering system. The staff has concluded that the permanent dewatering system and the revision to the structural design criteria proposed in Amendment 22 to the PSAR, is unsatisfactory. The staff has sent two letters to the applicants dated December 23, 1974 and December 30, 1974, indicating the undesirable features of this proposed dewatering system and stating that the necessary detailed review of the proposed design change could involve a substantial licensing delay. We understand the applicants' view to be that, licensing delays notwithstanding, they want to proceed with the modified design

rather than the original design which the staff has found acceptable. The detailed review of this proposed system may also delay the start of the radiological safety hearing.

The staff filed a pleading with the ASLB on December 16, 1974, in response to the applicants' motion for a hearing on their request for an LWA-2. In this pleading, the staff opposes the applicants' motion as being premature in light of the outstanding safety-related issues affecting the work items contained in the LWA-2 request. We are meeting with the top management officials of CEICO on January 10, 1975 to develop early resolutions for these issues.

A letter was sent to the applicants requesting that the matters identified in the ACRS report to the Chairman, be addressed by them by January 10, 1975. Two of these issues in the ACRS letter may require the staff to perform additional work which was not previously planned. The first issue is a recommendation for a more detailed analysis of the post-LOCA containment response. The activities now underway can be accomplished prior to completion of construction, as the ACRS recommended. We may have to convince the ASLB that these activities need not be completed prior to the start of construction. The second issue is a recommendation for reevaluation of what appears (to the ACRS) to be excessive conservatism in our design requirements for the offgas system. While we expect this reevaluation to be completed in about six weeks, we believe its resolution can be deferred to the post-CP period.