

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

In the Matter of
NIAGARA MOHAWK POWER CORPORATION
(Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station,
Unit 1)

Docket No. 50-20

REVISED ORDER FOR MODIFICATION OF LICENSE

I.

The Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation (licensee) is the holder of Facility Operating License No. DPR-63 which authorizes the operation of the Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station, Unit 1 at power levels up to 1850 megawatts thermal (rated power). The facility consists of a boiling water reactor located at the licensee's site in Oswego County, New York.

II.

On November 4, 1977, the Union of Concerned Scientists (UCS) filed with the Commission a "Petition for Emergency and Remedial Relief." The petition sought action in two areas: fire protection for electrical cables, and environmental qualification of electrical components. By Memorandum and Order dated April 13, 1978 (7 NRC 400), the Commission denied certain aspects of the petition and, with respect to other aspects, ordered the NRC staff to take several related actions. UCS filed a Petition for Reconsideration on May 2, 1978. By Memorandum and Order, dated May 23, 1980, the Commission reaffirmed its April 13, 1978 decision

regarding the possible shutdown of operating reactors. However, the Commission's May 23, 1980 decision directed licensees and the NRC staff to undertake certain actions.

With respect to environmental qualification of safety-related electrical equipment, the Commission determined that the provisions of the two staff documents - the Division of Operating Reactors "Guidelines for Evaluating Environmental Qualification of Class 1E Electrical Equipment in Operating Reactors" (DOR Guidelines) and NUREG-0588, "Interim Staff Position on Environmental Qualification of Safety-Related Electrical Equipment," December 1979 "form the requirements which licensees and applicants must meet in order to satisfy those aspects of 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix A General Design Criterion (GDC-4), which relate to environmental qualification of safety-related electrical equipment." The Commission directed, for replacement parts in operating plants, "unless there are sound reasons to the contrary, the 1974 standard in NUREG-0588 will apply." The Commission also directed the staff to complete its review of the information sought from licensees by Bulletin 79-01B¹ and to complete its review of environmental qualification of safety-related electrical equipment in all operating plants, including the publication of Safety Evaluation Reports, by February 1, 1981. The Commission

¹ Bulletin 79-01B was not sent to licensees for plants under review as part of the staff's Systematic Evaluation Program. The information sought by Bulletin 79-01B was requested from these licensees by a series of letters and meetings during the months of February and March, 1980.

imposed a deadline that, "by no later than June 30, 1982 all safety-related electrical equipment in all operating plants shall be qualified to the DOR Guidelines or NUREG-0588." The Commission requested the staff to, "keep the Commission and the public apprised of any further findings of incomplete environmental qualification of safety-related electrical equipment, along with corrective actions taken or planned," and requested the staff to provide bi-monthly progress reports to the Commission.

The Commission further directed the staff to add certain documentation requirements to each license after the specific requirements were approved by the Commission. The Commission also pointed out that the various deadlines imposed in its Order, "do not excuse a licensee from the obligation to modify or replace inadequate equipment promptly."

III.

The information developed during this proceeding emphasizes the importance of adequate documentation, the prompt completion of the review of environmental qualification of safety-related electrical equipment, and the prompt completion of any plant modification needed to assure conformance with the DOR Guidelines or NUREG-0588. A significant aspect of this review is the timely submittal of environmental qualification information by the operating plant licensees to enable the staff to complete its review in accordance with the Commission's Order. The staff has a program presently underway to reevaluate, using the DOR Guidelines and NUREG-0588, the qualifications of safety-related electrical equipment exposed

to environments that may exist following postulated accidents. These accidents are Loss of Coolant Accident and Main Steam Line Break inside containment, and High Energy Line Breaks inside and outside containment.

In this connection the licensee was requested by I&E Bulletin 79-01B of January 14, 1980 to provide a detailed review of the environmental qualification of Class 1E electrical equipment. This review was to include all equipment required to function under postulated accident conditions, both inside and outside the primary containment, and recognize all conditions specified in the bulletin. Evidence of qualification together with methods and justification, was requested.

Clarification was provided by supplemental information, briefings, and in some cases, meetings with the licensee. Timely completion of the staff's review of environmental qualification of electrical equipment and timely completion of needed modifications by the licensee is required to provide continuing reasonable assurance of public health and safety. Such completion is dependent on the prompt receipt of a complete response by the licensee to the staff's requests for information. However, the licensee's response, to date, is incomplete.

Therefore, I have concluded that the public health, safety, and interest require that a firm schedule for the timely submission of all the information previously requested by the staff should be established by Order effective immediately.

IV.

Accordingly, pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and the Commission's regulations in 10 CFR Parts 2 and 50, IT IS ORDERED THAT EFFECTIVE IMMEDIATELY Facility Operating License No. DPR-63 is hereby amended to add the following provisions:


"Information which fully and completely responds to the staff's request as specified in I & E Bulletin 79-01B, shall be submitted to the Director, Region I, Office of Inspection and Enforcement, by the licensee not later than November 1, 1980."

An earlier response is encouraged to facilitate staff review and issuance of the safety evaluation report. The licensee or any person whose interest may be affected by this Order may request a hearing within 20 days of the date of publication of this Revised Order in the Federal Register. Any request for a hearing will not stay the effective date of this Order. Any request for a hearing shall be addressed to the Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D. C. 20555. A copy of the request should also be sent to the Executive Legal Director, U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D. C. 20555, and to Eugene B. Thomas, Jr., Esquire, LeBoeuf, Lamb, Leiby & MacRae, 1333 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W., Suite 1100, Washington, D. C. 20036, attorney for the licensee.

If a hearing is held concerning this Order, the issue to be considered at the hearing shall be whether the license should be modified to require submission of information as set forth in Section IV. of the Order.

Operating of the facility on terms consistent with this Order is not stayed by the pendency of any proceedings on the Order. This Order revises, in its entirety, the Order issued August 29, 1980, and published in the Federal Register September 11, 1980, (45 FR 60085).

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION


Darrell G. Eysenhut, Director
Division of Licensing

Effective Date: September 19, 1980
Bethesda, Maryland

22 January 1979

1/22/79

Honorable Joseph M. Hendrie
Chairman
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

50-220

Dear Chairman Hendrie,

Safe
Energy
Coalition
of
New
York
State

P.O. Box 2029, Albany, N.Y. 12220

I am writing in regard to the imminent construction of the first phase of a radwaste incinerator by the Niagara-Mohawk Power Corp at Nine Mile Point, N.Y.

As you are probably aware, the proposed facility has never been tested with radioactive materials. Public concern over the possible escape of low-level radiation from the facility are being compounded by a lack of public hearings, an environmental impact statement, and a process for licensing such a facility that allows for the expression and consideration of adversary opinion.


We do not believe that a radwaste incinerator should be built now at Nine Mile Point. We believe that construction of the building in which the incinerator would be housed at this time is premature. The company expects to break ground in February, 1979.

In view of the recent action of the Commission which has called into question the evaluations of the Rasmussen Study, we believe the Commission should allow no project to progress, especially one as experimental in nature as the Niagara-Mohawk incinerator.

We call upon you, Chairman Hendrie, to halt the radwaste incinerator project at Nine Mile Point by withdrawing Niagara-Mohawk's permit to begin construction in February, until such time as public concerns are satisfied.

Sincerely yours,

Richard Hermans
Richard Hermans, chairpsn.





DOCKET NUMBER
PROD. & UTIL. FAC. - 220

Box 94
Oswego, New York 13126
December 29, 1978

Thomas Ippolito
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC

Dear Mr. Ippolito:

We want to comment on Niagara Mohawk Power Corp.'s plan to install a new radioactive waste solidification and handling system at Nine Mile Unit 1, as outlined in the company's letter to you on November 30, 1978. We strongly disagree with Niagara Mohawk's conclusion that the new system does not involve an unreviewed safety question and will have no significant environmental impact.

Further, this new system is intimately connected to Niagara Mohawk's plan to install a radioactive waste incinerator at this plant. As we understand it, the incinerator would be housed in the building that the company now proposes to construct. The Commission staff is now reviewing the radwaste incinerator proposal. It seems to us that Niagara Mohawk's latest application is merely a ploy to allow the incinerator project to begin before Commission approval. In any case, it doesn't make sense to consider the new building alone.

For instance, it may be true that the present system breaks down often (as Niagara Mohawk admits) and the resulting maintenance increases worker exposure. But in that case, it might be wiser to replace the present equipment with more reliable components of the same sort — not with remote barrel grab mechanisms, overhead cranes and tv cameras. This very sophisticated equipment is necessary only to handle the intensely radioactive ash from the proposed radwaste incinerator. This is the kind of problem that makes it difficult to separate the incinerator from the building.

One special problem is posed by construction of the new building next to the present waste storage building. In its annual environmental reports, Niagara Mohawk has mentioned several times that radiation levels in the vicinity of the radwaste building are unusually high. In view of this, the company should be required to estimate the maximum radiation doses that will be received by construction workers on this job.

Niagara Mohawk's description of the new system is vague and offers no justification for its claims that the system will reduce worker exposure and provide superior performance and reliability. What facts, either from design specifics or actual experience, can the company provide to prove its assertion that the new system will work better than the old? What will be the consequences of a breakdown of the remote handling equipment or a leak in the decant tanks? What kind of maintenance will be required? None of these questions are even addressed in the November 30 letter.

The company says there is no potential for a new "type" of accident because the total radwaste input hasn't changed. One could say the same

thing about applications to enlarge the capacity of spent fuel pools at reactors. The total waste input is the same; the only difference is that there is more of it at one time in one place. Here, Niagara Mohawk wants to build a new waste building that is about twice as large as the old one, with a vastly increased storage capacity. Is this so different from an application to store more spent fuel? Surely no one is claiming that low level waste is a benign substance. The logical result of Niagara Mohawk's reasoning is that an unlimited amount of low level waste can be handled and stored at Nine Mile Point as long as it all comes from Unit 1.

The environmental aspects of this proposal are treated even more cavalierly than the safety questions. Niagara Mohawk offers nothing more than the bald statement that there won't be a significant impact. What will the radiation levels be within the new building? It is reasonable to assume the levels will be high in an area with limited access. Will ventilation of the building increase radiation emissions from the Unit 1 site? How much additional liquid waste will come from the decant tanks? How much additional solid waste will be created -- the equipment and related components, and the building itself? What will be done with the old radwaste building?

What is the cost of this new system? Can it be justified if there is no incinerator? Can it be justified at all?

The problem of low level waste has been blissfully ignored by the industry and the Commission in the past. Yet it is precisely this kind of radioactive waste that has escaped into the environment from disposal areas. The Commission must stop allowing reactor operators to keep treating low level waste like ordinary garbage instead of radioactive material.

We ask that the Niagara Mohawk radwaste handling proposal be considered along with the radwaste incinerator application, not separately. We reiterate the request we made in connection with the incinerator plan: for hearings with opportunity for public intervention, and a full environmental impact statement.

Sincerely,

Sue Reinert


Sue Reinert

Ecology Action of Oswego

Copies to: Joseph Hendrie, Sen. Patrick Moynihan, Sen. Jacob Javits, Assemblyman John Zagame, James Larocca, Herbert VanSchaack (Chairman, Oswego County Legislature), James Best (Oswego County Legislature Nuclear Facilities Committee), Thomas Cochran (Natural Resources Defense Council), David Berick (Environmental Policy Center), Jim Cubie (Union of Concerned Scientists), Lorna Salzman (Friends of the Earth), Marvin Resnikoff (Sierra Club), Richard Hermans (Safe Energy Coalition of New York State).

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

BEFORE THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD



In the Matter of
NIAGRA MOHAWK POWER CORPORATION
(Nine Mile Point, Unit 1)

Docket No. 50-220


NRC Staff Response to New
York's Interested State Petition

On November 7, 1978, the Commission published a notice of opportunity for hearing concerning a proposed amendment to Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation's (licensee) Facility Operating License No. DPR-63. [43 Fed. Reg. 51883.] The proposed amendment would authorize the licensee to increase its spent fuel storage capacity from 1984 fuel assemblies to 3009 fuel assemblies. The New York State Energy Office (State) filed a petition on December 4, 1978 requesting leave to participate as an interested state pursuant to 10 CFR 2.715(c) in the event hearings are held on the licensee's application. The State specifically did not request a hearing.

Absent a request by a person whose interest may be affected by the proposed action there will be no on-the-record proceedings on this matter.

In the event a request which satisfies the requirements of the Commission's regulations is received and a hearing is noticed, the NRC Staff has no objection to the admission of the State pursuant to 10 CFR 2.715(c).

Respectfully Submitted,


A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "William J. Olmstead". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned above the printed name and title.

William J. Olmstead
Counsel for the NRC Staff

Dated at Bethesda, Maryland
this 21st day of December 1978

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

BEFORE THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD



In the Matter of)

NIAGRA MOHAWK POWER CORPORATION)

(Nine Mile Point, Unit 1))

Docket No. 50-220

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that copies of "NRC STAFF RESPONSE TO NEW YORK'S INTERESTED STATE PETITION", dated December 21, 1978, in the above-captioned proceeding, have been served on the following, by deposit in the United States mail, first class, or, as indicated by an asterisk through deposit in the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's internal mail system, this 21st day of December, 1978:

William A. Shapiro
Counsel
New York State Energy Office
Agency Building 2
Empire State Plaza
Albany, New York 12223

Eugene B. Thomas, Jr., Esq.
LeBoef, Lamb, Leiby & MacRae
1752 N Street, N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

Secretary of the Commission
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D. C. 20555

Chairman, Atomic Safety and
Licensing Appeal Board
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D. C. 20555

Chairman, Atomic Safety and
Licensing Board Panel
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D. C. 20555

Docketing and Service Section
Office of the Secretary
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D. C. 20555

William J. Olmstead

William J. Olmstead
Counsel for NRC Staff

Reg Cont

12/21/78

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

BEFORE THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD

In the Matter of)	
NIAGRA MOHAWK POWER CORPORATION)	Docket No. 50-220
(Nine Mile Point, Unit 1))	

NRC Staff Response to New
York's Interested State Petition

On November 7, 1978, the Commission published a notice of opportunity for hearing concerning a proposed amendment to Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation's (licensee) Facility Operating License No. DPR-63. [43 Fed. Reg. 51883.] The proposed amendment would authorize the licensee to increase its spent fuel storage capacity from 1984 fuel assemblies to 3009 fuel assemblies. The New York State Energy Office (State) filed a petition on December 4, 1978 requesting leave to participate as an interested state pursuant to 10 CFR 2.715(c) in the event hearings are held on the licensee's application. The State specifically did not request a hearing.

Absent a request by a person whose interest may be affected by the proposed action there will be no on-the-record proceedings on this matter.



1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9


10

11

12

In the event a request which satisfies the requirements of the Commission's regulations is received and a hearing is noticed, the NRC Staff has no objection to the admission of the State pursuant to 10 CFR 2.715(c).

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "William J. Olmstead". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned above the printed name and title.

William J. Olmstead
Counsel for the NRC Staff

Dated at Bethesda, Maryland
this 21st day of December 1978



BEFORE THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD

Docket No. 50-220

William J. Olmstead
William J. Olmstead
Counsel for NRC Staff




JOHN R. ZAGAME
ASSEMBLYMAN - 117th DISTRICT
ROOM 325, LEGISLATIVE OFFICE BLDG.
ALBANY, N. Y. 12248
(518) 472-6320

THE 24 LY
STATE 042 YORK

DISTRICT OFFICE:
34 E. BRIDGE STREET
OSWEGO, N. Y. 13126
(315) 343-4130

12/12/78



December 12, 1978

Joseph M. Hendrie, Chairman
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
1717 H Street
Washington, D. C. 20555

Dear Mr. Hendrie:

The Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation has applied to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for a permit to construct and operate a low-level waste reduction system at the Nine Mile I Nuclear Station in Oswego, New York.

Since that time the Oswego County Legislature has gone on record by resolution requesting full NRC hearings on this proposed system. I wish to add my strong support to this request.

Several factors lead me to my position:

1. The hearing process will provide additional information on the safety of this system by allowing interested parties access to proprietary information within guidelines designed to protect against disclosure of this information to competitors of the Radwaste system developer.
2. My own study and observations have led me to conclude that this system should be tested on a full-scale operational basis in a less populated area before it is installed in Oswego County. This point would be developed further during full NRC hearings.
3. The decision-making process for such new ancillary nuclear technologies should be as protective of the public as possible. To assure this protection, it is advisable to provide a mechanism for intelligent public input at the local level rather than relegating the decision to Washington alone.

I urge you to take these considerations into account in your decision on the question of NRC hearings. The people of Oswego County deserve the maximum opportunity afforded under federal law to take an active part in the decision-making process, based on adequate disclosure and discussion of the many issues surrounding this proposed plant.

Sincerely,

John R. Zagame

JRZ/gw

Reg. Cent.

November 6, 1978

11/6/78

Frank R. Church, Clerk
Town of Scriba
Scriba Municipal Building
R.D. #2, Creamery Road
Box 76
Oswego, New York 13126

In the Matter of
NIAGARA MOHAWK POWER CORPORATION
(Nine Mile Point, Unit No. 1)
Docket No. 50-220

Dear Mr. Church:

The Resolution passed at a regular meeting of the Town Board of the Town of Scriba, New York on October 18, 1978, a copy of which you forwarded to Harold R. Denton has been referred to me for reply. The subject of the Resolution is the Niagara Mohawk Corporation request for NRC approval of a proposed Radwaste Reduction System installation at the Nine Mile Point Unit 1 facility.

The Resolution requests that NRC publish a notice of opportunity for hearing in the Federal Register. It also authorized the Scriba Town Planning Board to intervene on behalf of the town "in public hearings." The matters raised in the Resolution are under consideration and I will apprise you of any decisions in that regard at the time they are made. In the interim, please do not hesitate to contact me at 301-492-8674 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,


Bernard M. Bordenick
Counsel for NRC Staff

DISTRIBUTION
Formal Files
BMBordenick
JTourtellotte
Wolmstead
WPaton
Shapar/Engelhardt/Scinto
PPolk
BGrimes
VStello
NRC Central
PDR/LPDR

cc: Robert Deyle, Oswego County, N.Y.
Jay Dunkleberger, N.Y. State Energy Office
Robert Vessels, N.Y. State Public Service Commission
Thomas Cashman and Paul Merges
N.Y. State Department of Environmental Conservation
Robert Ryan, NRC
Thomas Elsasser, NRC Region 1

VERBAL CONC FROM WU

OFFICE	OELD BMB	OELD			
SURNAME	BMBordenick:djtp	JRTourtellotte			
DATE	11/2/78	11/ /78			



DOCKET NUMBER 50-220-
PROD & UTIL REC.

At a Regular Meeting of the Town Board of the Town of Scriba, held at the Town Office Building, Creamery Road, Scriba, New York, on October 18, 1978.

WHEREAS, Niagara Mohawk has proposed construction of a radioactive waste volume reduction incinerator at Nine Mile Point, Unit One, and

WHEREAS, considerable public concern has been registered, including a petition signed by 2,321 persons.

NOW, on motion of Justice Leo Dillenbeck,
seconded by Councilman Kenneth Martin, be it

RESOLVED, that the Town Board of the Town of Scriba requests that the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission place a notice in the Federal Register of Niagara Mohawk's application to install a radioactive waste volume reduction incinerator at Nine Mile Point, Unit One, to facilitate holding of a public hearing on the application, and be it further

RESOLVED, that this Town Board authorizes the Scriba Town Planning Board to intervene as party-at-interest on behalf of the Town in public hearings on the proposed incinerator, and be it further

RESOLVED, that copies of this Resolution be directed to Harold R. Denton, Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission; Joseph M. Hendrie, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission; Jay Dunkleberger, N.Y. State Energy Office; Robert Vessels, N.Y. State Public Service Commission; and Thomas Cashman and Paul Merges, N.Y. State Department of Environmental Conservation.

ROLL CALL

(Aye) (Nay)
(Aye) (Nay)
(Aye) (Nay)
(Aye) (Nay)
(Aye) (Nay)

Robert Parker
Leo Dillenbeck
Kenneth Martin
Vernard Baxter
Norma Canale

Supervisor
Justice
Councilman
Councilman
Councilwoman

Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc.

917 15TH STREET, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

202 737-5000

Western Office

2345 YALE STREET
PALO ALTO, CALIF. 94306
415 327-1080

October 25, 1978

New York Office


122 EAST 42ND STREET
NEW YORK, N.Y. 10017
212 949-0049

SECRET NUMBER
50-220-

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

Attn: Secretary of the Commission

Dear Sir,



Please provide me with any technical information you have describing the health and safety consequences of operating the low level waste incinerator planned for installation at Nine Mile Point Unit No. 1 in New York.

Have you, or do you intend to prepare an environmental assessment of this technology? If not, why not? If so, please send me a copy when it becomes available.

Given the public concern over the installation of this incinerator, an environmental impact statement, or at least an environmental assessment would appear appropriate.


Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Thomas B. Cochran".

Thomas B. Cochran

TBC/ps





10/12/78

50-220

RESOLUTION NO. 207

OCTOBER 12, 1978

RESOLUTION RELATIVE TO THE NIAGARA MOHAWK
PROPOSED RADIOACTIVE WASTE VOLUME INCINERATOR

BY LEGISLATOR JAMES BEST:

WHEREAS, NIAGARA MOHAWK HAS PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION OF A
RADIOACTIVE WASTE VOLUME REDUCTION INCINERATOR AT NINE MILE POINT
UNIT ONE: AND

WHEREAS, CONSIDERABLE PUBLIC CONCERN HAS BEEN REGISTERED,
INCLUDING A PETITION SIGNED BY 2,321 PERSONS.

NOW ON RECOMMENDATION OF THE PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT
COMMITTEE OF THIS BODY, BE IT

RESOLVED, THAT THE OSWEGO COUNTY LEGISLATURE REQUESTS
THAT THE UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION PLACE A NOTICE
IN THE FEDERAL REGISTER OF NIAGARA MOHAWK'S APPLICATION TO INSTALL
A RADIOACTIVE WASTE VOLUME REDUCTION INCINERATOR AT NINE MILE POINT
UNIT ONE TO FACILITATE HOLDING OF A PUBLIC HEARING ON THE APPLICATION;
AND FURTHERMORE BE IT

RESOLVED, THAT THIS COUNTY LEGISLATURE AUTHORIZES THE
COUNTY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE'S REPRESENTATIVE TO
INTERVENE AS PARTY-AT-INTEREST ON BEHALF OF THE COUNTY IN PUBLIC
HEARINGS ON THE PROPOSED INCINERATOR; AND FURTHERMORE BE IT

RESOLVED, THAT COPIES OF THIS RESOLUTION BE DIRECTED
TO HAROLD R. DENTON, DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION,
U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION; JOSEPH M. HENDRIE, U.S. NUCLEAR
REGULATORY COMMISSION; JAY DUNKLEBERGER, N.Y. STATE ENERGY OFFICE;
ROBERT VESSELS, N.Y. STATE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION; AND THOMAS
CASHMAN AND PAUL MERGES, N.Y. STATE DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL
CONSERVATION.

ROLL CALL

AYES 882.72 NAYS -0- ABSENT 73.01

PASS. 53.24

STATE OF NEW YORK
COUNTY OF OSWEGO

OFFICE OF THE CLERK OF THE
COUNTY LEGISLATURE

SS:

This is to certify that I, the undersigned clerk of the County Legislature of the said County of Oswego, have
compared the foregoing copy of resolution with the original resolution now on file in this office, and which
was adopted by the County Legislature of said County of Oswego, on the 12th day of October
19 78, and that the same is a correct and true transcript of such original resolution and the whole thereof.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and the official seal of said County Legislature this 12th
day of October, 19 78.

Witnessed by clerk. 10/20

Ralph W. Schmidt
CLERK OF THE COUNTY LEGISLATURE OF THE COUNTY OF OSWEGO

