Docket Nos. 50-275
and 50-323

JAN 23 1974

APPLICANT: PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY (PG&E)

FACILITY: DIABLO CANYON UNITS 1 AND 2

SUMMARY OF MEETING HELD WITH POTENTIAL DIABLO CANYON INTERVENORS IN SAN LUIS OBISPO, CALIFORNIA

A meeting with potential intervenors on the Diablo Canyon operating license application was held December 18, 1973 at the Veterans Memorial Building in San Luis Obispo. The purpose of the meeting was to allow the potential intervenors to communicate directly to the staff their concerns regarding the application by PG&E to operate Units 1 and 2 of the Diablo Canyon Nuclear Plant.

The notice of opportunity for hearing on this application expired on November 19, 1973; as of this date, four petitions to intervene and one request for a limited appearance had been received. These petitions were submitted by the following groups and/or individuals:

1. Scenic Shoreline Preservation Conference, Inc. of Santa Barbara, California;

2. Elizabeth E. Apfelberg and Sandra A. Silver, both as individuals and as representatives of the San Luis Obispo Mothers for Peach;

3. John J. Forster and Lonnie Valentine, both as individuals and as representatives of the Ecology Action Club of California Polytechnic State University in San Luis Obispo;

4. People of the State of California and the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California;

5. Bruce Patrovsky, representing the Sierra Club (Limited Appearance).

Of the five listed above, only Scenic Shoreline was not represented at the meeting. The staff was represented by the Licensing and Environmental Project Managers, the Light Water Reactors Branch Chief in whose branch the safety review is being conducted, and the Office of General Counsel attorney assigned to this case. A complete list of attendees is given in Enclosure No. 1.

OFFICE ▶						
SURNAME ▶						
DATE ▶						

[illegible]

The LPM opened the meeting by discussing the purpose of the meeting, and indicating that the staff was here to consider and understand the concerns of the potential intervenors in order to attempt to incorporate these concerns into our review process. The structure of the Regulatory Organization was discussed briefly, and the mechanics and procedures of the actual review process were outlined. The EPM summarized the status of the environmental review to date.

At this point representatives of the potential intervenors asked several questions regarding the form and substance of their petitions to intervene. The petitions of groups 1, 2, and 3 listed previously had recently been denied by the Board (see Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Order dated December 14, 1973), but these groups were allowed an additional 30 days to submit amended petitions. Most of the questions concerned the statement of particularity and interest in the petions, and were addressed by Mr. Chandler of OGC. The mechanics of prehearing conferences and hearings were also discussed at this time.

Before discussing specific contentions that had been expressed in the petitions, several miscellaneous items or concerns were raised by the potential intervenors:

1. Availability of Regulations in the Local Document Room

   They would like to see a complete set of the applicable parts of the Code of Federal Regulations in the local public document room. The LPM indicated that the Regulations were not routinely sent to the local PDR, but that we would provide copies of the appropriate parts upon request.

2. Inspection of Diablo Canyon Facilities

   Several persons indicated the desire to tour the Diablo Canyon plant. The staff replied that this matter should be addressed directly to PG&E. Mr. Chandler of OGC added that parties to a hearing often inspect the plant as a group with the Hearing Board.

3. Receiving of Nuclear Fuel

   They would like to be informed when initial fuel shipments will be received at the site.

4. Interim Operating License(s)

   The potential intervenors were concerned that PG&E could obtain an interim low-power operating license before all safety concerns had been addressed. The concern was that this would give them a "foot in the door" toward obtaining a full power license. There was considerable discussion as to whether specific contentions in the petitions had to apply to fractional as well as full power operation.

OFFICE ▶					
SURNAME ▶					
DATE ▶					

5. Generic Safety Issues

Several persons expressed their opinions that it was improper for the AEC to treat certain safety concerns, e.g., ECCS criteria, in a generic rulemaking hearing, and not allow them as contentions on specific plants. The staff replied that it was the Commission's position that the concentration of expertise from all sides, i.e., AEC, vendors, intervenors, in a single hearing provided for the most in-depth and complete discussion of the issues at hand.

6. Offshore Faults

Serious concerns were expressed regarding the faulting near Diablo Canyon that was discovered during recent offshore geologic mapping performed by USGS. A request was made that the USGS report be made available to everyone as soon as it is published.

7. Accelerations at Site due to Potential Earthquakes

A general concern expressed was that the analytical models in the codes used to calculate acceleration at the site are not up to date, and that acceleration factors could be achieved that are greater than those specified by PG&E for the safe shutdown earthquake.

8. Prehearing Conferences and Hearings

The potential intervenors indicated a strong preference that all prehearing conferences and the hearing should be held in San Luis Obispo. The staff replied that this would depend upon the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board, but that this would most likely be the case.

The remainder of the meeting was devoted to discussion of specific contentions raised in the petitions of Apfelberg and Silver (Mothers for Peace), and Forster & Valentine (Ecology Action Club of Cal. Poly.). A summary of the more significant items discussed is given below:

1. Lack of Specific Evacuation Plans for the Town of San Luis Obispo

Regarding this item, the staff indicated that PG&E has made arrangements with the County Sheriff's Office to coordinate any evacuation of the town that is required. This information is stated in Chapter 13 of the FSAR.

OFFICE ▶						
SURNAME ▶						
DATE ▶						

2. Loss of Coolant Accident (LOCA)

Opinions were expressed that a LOCA could initiate a chain of events which would result in releases of large amounts of radioactivity to the surroundings. Also, it was felt that fuel densification is not clearly understood, and that this phenomenon has not been properly related to the current ECCS criteria.

3. Environmental Impact of a Class 9 Accident

The potential intervenors felt strongly that the staff or PG&E should perform this type of analysis. The staff replied that we do not require this type of analysis because the probability of such an accident occurring is so small that the environmental risk is extremely low (see Federal Register, Volume 36, page 22,852 - December 1, 1971).

4. Deficiencies in Final Environmental Statement

The staff's Final Environmental Statement on Diablo Canyon Units 1 and 2 was cited as being deficient in the following areas:

a. The Diablo Canyon Plant as a growth inducing factor was not properly addressed;

b. Biological effects of low level radiation were not sufficiently studied; they questioned whether the plant would meet proposed Appendix I;

c. Effects of thermal pollution were not properly studied;

d. Alternative energy sources have not been examined in sufficient detail.

5. Price-Anderson Act

Concerns were expressed regarding the fact that this legislation will expire in 1977; the question was also raised as to whether the act would provide sufficient indemnification in the event of a serious nuclear accident.

6. Transportation of Nuclear Fuel

Several persons expressed concern about the possible adverse effects on San Luis Obispo County of the transportation of nuclear fuel through the County.

OFFICE ▶						
SURNAME ▶						
DATE ▶						

[illegible]

7. Industrial Security

The discussion centered on non-accidental risks to which the plant may be subjected; the increase in terrorist activities around the world was viewed as a real threat to safe operation of the plant.

8. Storage and Disposal of Nuclear Wastes

Several persons raised questions about the temporary storage of wastes at the plant site as well as the long term storage and disposal at some permanent site. They do not feel that this problem has been sufficiently solved to allow the generation of additional nuclear wastes.

9. Nuclear Plant Reliability

A recent Wall Street Journal article was quoted as questioning the reliability of nuclear plants.

10. Independent Monitoring of Plant Activities

Once plant startup has occurred, the potential intervenors would like to see someone independent of PG&E in residence at the plant to verify that all abnormal occurrences and releases of radiation are fully disclosed. A suggestion was made that someone from the San Luis Obispo Public Health Department could fill this position.

11. Population Density Requirements for Plant Siting

Several persons felt that the AEC, by allowing the plant to be located in a fairly remote area, was willing to sacrifice a few people in the event of a serious plant accident. The staff stressed that siting criteria from a population standpoint were related to being able to evacuate the areas near the plant as quickly as possible if this should be required.

The meeting ended about 7:00 p.m., with all items of concern to the intervenors having been covered. The discussions were frank and informal, with both potential intervenors and staff in agreement that the meeting had been worthwhile. The staff agreed to contact Mr. Eissler, president of the Scenic Shoreline organization, to discuss the possibility of a similar meeting with representatives of this group at a later date.

Thomas J. Hirons
Light Water Reactors Group 1-3
Directorate of Licensing

OFFICE ▶	L:LWR 1-3	L:EP				
SURNAME ▶	x7415 TJHirons:esp	RCushman				
DATE ▶	1/23/74	1/23/74				

JAN 23 1974

Enclosure:
Attendance List

ccc w/encl:
AEC PDR
Local PDR
RP Assistant Directors
RP Branch Chiefs
S. Varga
R. W. Klecker
J. M. Hendrie
TR Assistant Directors
TR Branch Chiefs
R. Cushman
L. Chandler, OGC
RO (3)
V. H. Wilson
Meeting Attendees from REG
R. Fraley, ACRS (16)

DISTRIBUTION:
Docket (2)
RP Reading
LWR 1-3 Reading

OFFICE ▶						
SURNAME ▶						
DATE ▶						

ENCLOSURE NO. 1

ATTENDANCE LIST

POTENTIAL INTERVENORS

San Luis Obispo Mothers for Peace

Elizabeth E. Apfelberg
Sandra A. Silver

Ecology Action Club - Cal. Poly.

John J. Forster
Lonnie Valentine

State of California - Public Utilities Commission

Andrew J. Skaff

Sierra Club

Bruce Patrovsky

AEC - STAFF

Lawrence J. Chandler (Office of General Counsel)
Robert A. Cushman (Environmental Project Manager)
Karl R. Goller (Branch Chief, LWR Group 1-3)
Thomas J. Hirons (Licensing Project Manager)

AEC - SAN FRANCISCO OPERATIONS OFFICE

Hank Bowden (Public Information Representative)

INTERESTED CITIZENS

Mabel Barnes
Freddie Raye
Gordon Silver
Saundra Trice