ORIGINAL

OCT -1 P3:58

DOCKETED September 30, 1998USNRC

°98

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

BEFORE THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD,

)

))

In the Matter of Duke Energy Corporation (Oconee Nuclear Station, Units 1, 2, and 3)

Docket Nos. 50-269/270/287 LR

RESPONSE OF DUKE ENERGY CORPORATION TO THE REQUEST FOR ENLARGEMENT OF TIME OF THE CHATTOOGA RIVER WATERSHED COALITION AND MESSRS. NORMAN "BUZZ" WILLIAMS, WILLIAM "BUTCH" CLAY, AND W.S. LESAN

I. INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to the September 18, 1998 Memorandum and Order of the NRC Atomic Safety and Licensing Board in this proceeding (hereafter "Prehearing Order") and 10 CFR §2.730(c), Duke Energy Corporation ("Duke"), licensee in the above-captioned matter, hereby responds to the September 27, 1998 filing of the Chattooga River Watershed Coalition and Messrs. Norman "Buzz" Williams, William "Butch" Clay, and W.S. Lesan (collectively, the "Petitioners").^V The Petitioners' filing requests a thirty-day enlargement of time, until approximately October 27, 1998, in which to submit an amended petition to intervene in this license renewal proceeding. For the reasons discussed below, Duke opposes Petitioners' request.

 $^{^{1/}}$ Counsel for Duke did not receive a copy of Petitioners' filing until September 29, 1998.

II. BACKGROUND

Duke filed an application to renew the operating licenses for its Oconee Nuclear Station, Units 1, 2, and 3 (NRC license numbers DPR-38, DPR-47, and DPR-55), on July 6, 1998. The NRC published in the *Federal Register* a Notice of Receipt of Duke's application on July 14, 1998. 63 Fed. Reg. 37, 909 (1998). On August 11, 1998, the Commission published in the *Federal Register* its Notice of Acceptance for Docketing of the Application and Notice of Opportunity for a Hearing Regarding Renewal of Licenses Nos. DPR-38, DPR-47, and DPR-55 for an Additional 20-Year Period (63 Fed. Reg. 42885) (1998).

On September 8, 1998, Petitioners submitted a letter seeking leave to intervene in the Oconee Nuclear Station license renewal proceeding. On September 15, 1998, the Commission issued an Order designating an Atomic Safety and Licensing Board (hereafter "Licensing Board") for this proceeding and prescribing detailed scheduling and policy guidance for the conduct of any hearing. See CLI-98-17, 48 NRC ___ (Sept. 15, 1998). The Commission's schedule calls for decisions on intervention petitions and proposed contentions within 30 days of the Commission's Order. Shortly thereafter, on September 18, 1998, the Licensing Board issued its Prehearing and Order setting forth its directives and expectations regarding the conduct of this proceeding. See ASLBP No. 98-752-02-LR, 48 NRC __ (Sept. 18, 1998). Citing its intention to conduct this proceeding as expeditiously as possible with fairness to all participants, the Licensing Board established a schedule for amended intervention petitions, including proposed contentions, and responses, consistent with the Commission's schedule expectations.

III. DISCUSSION

Duke opposes the Petitioners' extension request. The Licensing Board's schedule provided ample time for amended petitions to intervene and is consistent with the Commission's clear expectations. Moreover, in its September 18, 1998 Prehearing Order, the Licensing Board set a standard for granting requests for extensions of time, reiterating the Commission's guidance on the conduct of adjudicatory proceedings, as established in CLI-98-17. Among other things, such a motion is to demonstrate "unavoidable and extreme circumstances" that support permitting the extension. Prehearing Order, slip op. at 8. Petitioners have utterly failed to show such cause for an enlargement of time.

As pointed out by the NRC Staff in its opposition to the extension request, Petitioners have had, effectively, since mid-July to consider their basis for intervention in this proceeding, to identify the issues that they would seek to litigate, and to obtain counsel to represent them in this proceeding. It is simply inadequate to suggest at this late date that the need to find counsel would constitute "unavoidable and extreme circumstances" justifying the extension. This is particularly true given that (1) the requested delay would significantly hamper the ability of the Licensing Board to meet the schedule expectations established by the Commission for this proceeding, and (2) the lack of counsel at this time would not preclude Petitioners from establishing their standing to intervene and from identifying proposed contentions. For better or worse, NRC proceedings are formal proceedings that require a commitment from all who would participate. Fairness and judicial economy dictate that the Licensing Board establish this expectation from the outset of this proceeding.

IV. CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, the Petitioners' request for an enlargement of time in which to amend their petition for leave to intervene fails to satisfy applicable Commission standards, and should be denied.

Respectfully submitted,

avidt r. Kepkc

David A. Repka Anne W. Cottingham

WINSTON & STRAWN 1400 L Street, NW Washington, D.C. 20005-3502 202/371-5726 or 202/371-5724

Paul R. NewtonDUKE ENERGY CORPORATION422 South Church StreetP.O. Box 1244Charlotte, North Carolina 28202

ATTORNEYS FOR DUKE ENERGY CORPORATION

Dated in Washington, D.C. This 30th day of September, 1998

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

BEFORE THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD ⁹⁸ DCT -1 P 3:58

In the Matter of

DUKE ENERGY CORPORATION

Docket Nos. 50-269/270/287-LR

(Oconee Nuclear Station, Units 1, 2 and 3)

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that copies of the foregoing "Response of Duke Energy Corporation To The Request For Enlargement Of Time Of The Chattooga River Watershed Coalition And Messrs. Norman "Buzz" Williams, William "Butch" Clay, And W.S. Lesan" in the above captioned proceeding have been served upon the following by electronic mail as noted, with conforming copies and additional service deposited in United States Mail, first class, this 30th day of September 1998.

Office of Commission Appellate Adjudication U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission One White Flint North 11555 Rockville Pike Rockville, MD 20852-2738

Administrative Judge Richard F. Cole Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Two White Flint North, 3rd Floor 11545 Rockville Pike Rockville, MD 20852-2738 (E-mail copy to rfc1@nrc.gov) Chief Administrative Judge B. Paul Cotter, Jr., Chairman Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Two White Flint North, 3rd Floor 11545 Rockville Pike Rockville, MD 20852-2738 (E-mail copy to bpc1@nrc.gov)

Administrative Judge Peter S. Lam Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Two White Flint North, 3rd Floor 11545 Rockville Pike Rockville, MD 20852-2738 (E-mail copy to psl@nrc.gov)

DOCKETED USNRC

OFFIC RU ADJU Marian L. Zobler Robert M. Weisman Office of the General Counsel U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission One White Flint North 11555 Rockville Pike Rockville, MD 20852-2738 (E-mail copies to mlz@nrc.gov and rmw@nrc.gov)

W.S. Lesan P.O. Box 66 Long Creek, SC 29658

Adjudicatory File Atomic Safety & Licensing Board Panel U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Two White Flint North 11545 Rockville Pike Rockville, MD 20852-2738 Norman "Buzz" Williams 190 Mountain Cove Rd. Mountain Rest, SC 29664

William "Butch" Clay P.O. Box 53 Long Creek, SC 29658

Chattooga River Watershed Coalition P. O. Box 2006 Clayton, GA 30525 (E-mail copy to <u>crwc@acme-brain.com</u>)

Office of the Secretary U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission One White Flint North 11555 Rockville Pike Rockville, MD 20852-2738 Attn: Rulemakings and Adjudications (original & 2 copies) (E-mail copy to hearingdocket@nrc.gov)

David A. Repka \ Winston & Strawn Counsel for Duke Energy Corporation