NRC PUBLIC DOCUMENT ROOM

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

### BEFORE THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD

In the Matter of

ARIZONA PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY, ET AL.

Docket Nos. STN 50-592 STN 50-593

(Palo Verde Nuclear Generating Station, Units 4 and 5)

#### STATEMENT OF ISSUES

The California Energy Resources Conservation and Development Commission ("California Energy Commission") submits this Statement of Issues, as an interested state in the pending hearings to be held before the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission pertaining to the Arizona Public Service Company, et al., application for construction permits for the Palo Verde Nuclear Generating Station Units 4 and 5. This statement is submitted pursuant to the assigned Atomic Safety and Licensing Board's Order dated March 6, 1979, directing the California Energy Commission to file a statement of issues indicating with reasonable specificity, the subject matters on which it desires to participate.

As an "interested state", not a party, the California Energy Commission is encitled to a reasonable opportunity to participate in the hearings and advise the Commission without taking a posi-

349 201 7907190479

tion on any of the issues. (10 CFR § 2.715(c).) Accordingly, the California Energy Commission's Statement of Issues has been framed with sufficient detail and preciseness to define concrete issues, pursuant to the ASLB's March 6, 1979, Order, but does not set forth any specific position of the Califoria Energy Commission with respect to any of the issues in this proceeding. Rather, the California Energy Commission's statement raises those issues which neither the Applicants nor the NRC staff have thus far adequately addressed. Of particular concern is the failure to assess fully the need for and alternatives to Palo Verde Units 4 and 5 for the California participants. Since the Applicants retain the burden of demonstrating that the matters raised by the California Energy Commission are adequately addressed and have been satisfactorily resolved prior to Board action on the permit, the California Energy Commission anticipates that additional information will be presented in these areas by the Applicant, subject to cross-examination by participants in the proceeding. In addition, the California Energy Commission may provide testimony in a number of areas of interest during this proceeding.

The California Energy Commission has successfully used statements of issues similar to this filing in its own licensing proceedings. These issue statements have provided adequate notice to all parties of the issues in dispute without unduly restricting the parties in presenting their case. If the Applicant, NRC Staff or any other party has questions about this filing, the California Energy Commission counsel would be happy to discuss the matter informally and attempt to resolve any differences without the need for ASLB intervention.

-2-

## California Energy Commission Statement of Issues

What forecast of capacity and energy demand through
1995 should be used in this proceeding to determine the need
for each California participant for Palo Verde Units 4 & 5?

 To what extent do California's mandatory building and appliance conservation standards (Pub. Res. Code § 25402;
Cal. Admin. Code §§ 1400, <u>et seq</u>.) reduce the need of each California participant for Palo Verde Units 4 & 5?

3. To what extent do federal, state, and local programs and incentives to promote the use of solar energy (e.g., tax credits and low interest loans) reduce the need of each California participant for Palo Verde Units 4 & 5?

4. To what extent does California's mandatory load management program (Pub. Res. Code § 25403.5) reduce the need of California participants in Palo Verde Units 4 & 5?

5. To what extent do other feasible and cost effective conservation activities reduce the need of each California participant for Palo Verde Units 4 & 5?

6. What electrical energy resources are needed by each California participants to meet forecasted energy needs through 1995?

7. What capacity resources are needed by each California participant to meet forecasted capacity needs through 1995?

E. Are Palo Verde Units 4 & 5 necessary to meet the forecasted energy and capacity needs of the California participants?

9. Do the California participants need at least a 15% reserve margin to ensure reliable supplies of electricity?

-3-

10. What electric generating facilities are reasonably likely to be available to each California participant by the time Palo Verde Units 4 & 5 are planned to come on line?

11. If Palo Verde Units 4 & 5 are not needed to meet forecasted demand, would operation of Palo Verde Units 4 & 5 reduce oil and natural gas use in each of the California participants' systems?

12. What benefits, if any, would necessarily result from any such reduction in oil and gas use?

13. Is construction of the proposed project the most cost effective and environmentally benign method of producing these benefits from reduced oil use?

14. Are there any other benefits, other than reduced oil use, which justify participation in Palo Verde Units 4 & 5 by California utilities, if it is not needed to meet projected capacity and energy requirements?

15. Are there alternate fuels, such as methanol, biomass derived from fuel, shale oil, and oil from tar sands, which are reasonably likely to be available in the 1990's for use in California's oil-fire' power plants whose use would be a better method to displace existing oil use than Palo Verde Units 4 \$5?

16. To what extent can increased power pooling among California utilities reduce the need for Palo Verde Units 4 & 5?

17. To the extent increased power pooling can reduce the need for Palo Verde Units 4 & 5, is it a better option (i.e., more economical, reliable, and environmentally sound) than the proposed facilities?

-4-

18. To what extent can cogeneration reduce the need for Palo Verde Units 4 & 5?

19. To the extent cogeneration can reduce the need for Palo Verde Units 4 & 5, is it a better option (i.e., more economical, reliable, and environmentally sound) than the proposed facilities?

20. To what extent can geothermal electric generation reduce the need for Palo Verde Units 4 & 5?

21. To the extent geothermal electric generation can reduce the need for Palo Verde Units 4 & 5, is it a better option (i.e., more economical, reliable, and environ solally sound) than the proposed facilities?

22. To what extent can repowering of Silvergate for San Diego Gas & Electric reduce the need for Palo Verde Units 4 & 5?

23. To the extent repowering of Silvergate for San Diego Gas & Electric can reduce the need for Palo Verde Units 4 & 5, is it a better option (i.e., more economical, reliable, and environmentally sound) than the proposed facilities?

24. To what extent can power purchases from Mexico reduce the need for Palo Verde Units 4 & 5?

25. To the extent power purchases from Mexico can reduce the need for Palo Verde Units 4 & 5, is it a better option (i.e., more economical, reliable, and environmentally sound) than the proposed facilities?

26. To what extent can a coal-fired power plant reduce the need for Palo Verde Units 4 & 5?

-5-

27. To the extent a coal-fired power plant can reduce the need for Palo Verde Units 4 & 5, is it a better option (i.e., more economical, reliable, and environmentally sound) than the proposed facilities?

28. Does the NRC health impact analysis for a coal alternative to Palo Verde Units 4 & 5 accurately account for the following:

 a. Health impacts from a facility sited in a remote, unpopulated area in California.

b. Health impacts from a facility complying with Clean Air Act New Source Review requirements, including attainment of ambient air quality standards by 1992.

c. Health impacts from a facility using scrubbers, electrostatic percipators or baghouses, and selective catalytic reduction to reduce  $SO_X$ ,  $NO_X$ , TSP, and hydrocarbon emissions.

29. What are the comparative financial risks to California participants of Palo Verde Units 4 & 5 and a coal-fired alternative?

30. What is the comparative energy consumption in constructing and fueling Palo Verde Units 4 & 5 and a coal-fired alternative?

31. What cost estimates (capital, fuel, operations, maintenance, etc.) for Palo Verde Units 4 & 5 should be used in this proceeding?

32. What cost estimates (capital, fuel, operations, maintenance, etc.) of a coal-fired alternative should be used in this proceeding?

-6-

33. Except as already provided in NRC Rules (Table S-3 and S-4), what is a reasonable assessment of the health and safety risk and impacts from the proposed facility, including its complete fuel cycle for comparison with alternatives?

34. Do the Applicants' capital cost estimates include a reserve for possible required design changes in nuclear facilities as a result of studies of the Three Mile Island Unit II accident?

35. To what extent will Applicants' estimated capital costs be increased as a result of the Three Mile Island Unit II accident?

36 Have the Applicants reasonably estimated the costs of spent fuel storage and disposal for Palo Verde Units 4 & 5?

37. Have the Applicants reasonably estimated the costs of decommissioning Palo Verde Units 4 & 5?

38. What are the economic and reliability consequences to the California participants if no off-site storage of Palo Verde Units 4 & 5 spent fuel is available when needed?

39. Do the California participants have an adequate and acceptable method of financing decommissioning costs?

40. Is there a sufficiently assured uranium supply at a reasonable cost, taking into account mining, milling, enrichment, and fabrication, for Palo Verde Units 4 & 5?

41. Are the Applicants' estimates of Palo Verde Units 4 & 5 plant reliability (annual capacity factor) reasonable given recent nuclear power plant operating fa :ilities?

42. Would the California participants be able to provide reliable service in the event of a simultaneous outage of all five Palo Verde units?

-7-

43. What is the financial obligation of California participants in the event of a nuclear accident at Palo Verde Units 4 & 5?

44. What is the financial obligation of the California utilities for Arizona Public Services' activities?

45. What impacts would delays in operation of Palo Verde Units 4 & 5 have on California participants' ability to finance the project and provide reliable electrical service?

46. What is the ability of the California participants to attract adequate and acceptable financing given the events at Three Mile Island Unit II?

Dated: June 20, 1979. Respectfully submitted,

MARK J. URBAN Deputy General Counsel

DIAN M. GRUENEICH Legal Counsel

Attorneys for the California Energy Commission

-8-

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

# BEFORE THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD

In the Matter of:	)	
ARIZONA PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY, <u>sc</u> al.	) Docket Nos.	STN-50-592 STN-50-5°3
(Palo Verde Nuclear Generating Station, Units 4 and 5).		

#### CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that copies of the foregoing California Energy Commission Statement of Issues have been mailed, postage prepaid, or hand delivered this June 20, 1979 to the following:

Robert M. Lazo, Esq., Chairman Atomic Safety and Licensing Board U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, D.C. 20555

Victor Gilinsky Commissioner U.S. Nucles Regulatory Commission Washington, D.C. 20555

Dr. Quentii J. Stober Research Associate Professor Fisheries Research Institute University of Washington 400 Northeast 15th Avenue Seattle, Washington 98195

George Campbell, Chairman Maricopa County Board of Supervisors 111 South Third Avenue Phoenix, Arizona 85004

Michael M. Grant, Esq. Assistant Attorney General 200 State Capitol 1700 West Washington Phoenix, Arizona 85007 James D. Woodburn, Chief Engineer Public Service Department P.O. Box 631 Burbank, CA 91503

Samuel Gorlick City Attorney P.O. Box 6459 Burbank, CA 91510

James L. Mulloy, Chief Electrical Engineer & Assistant Manager Edward C. Farrell, Chief Assistant City Attorney for Water and Power P.O. Box 111 Los Angeles, CA 90051

R.E. York Senior Vice President El Paso Electric Company P.O. Box 982 El Paso, Texas 79999

David N. Barry III, Esq. James A. Beoletto, Esq. Southern California Edison Company P.O. Box 800 Rosemead, CA 91770

Byron L. Miller Assistant Vice President Nevada Power Company P.O. Box 230 Las Vegas, Nevada 89151

Gary E. Craythorn, Engineer City of Glendale 119 North Glendale Avenue Glendale, CA 91206

Ronald V. Stassi, Engineer City of Pasadena 100 North Garfield Avenue Pasadena, CA 91109

Everett C. Ross Public Utilities Director City of Riverside 3900 Main Street Riverside, CA 92501

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

Docketing and Service Section U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, D.C. 20555

Tom Diamond, Esq. 1208 First City National Bank Building El Paso, Texas 79901

Gordon W. Hoyt Utilities Director City of Anaheim P.O. Box 3222 Anaheim, CA 92803 Jack E. Thomas Vice President San Diego Gas & Electric Co. P.O. Box 1831 San Diego, CA 92112

Arthur C. Gehr, Esq. Snell & Willmer 3100 Valley Center Phoenix, Arizona 85073

Janice E. Kerr J. Calvin Simpson, Esq. Vincent V. MacKenzie, Esq. California Public Utilities Commission 5066 State Building San Francisco, CA 94102

Mr. Larry Bard P.O. Box 793 Tempe, Arizona 85281

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

Dr. Stanley L. Dollins Assistant Director Energy Programs (OEPAD) Office of the Governor 1700 West Washington Executive Tower - Room 507 Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Stephen M. Sohinki Counsel for NRC Staff U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, D.C. 20555

Kathryn Burkett Dickson, Esq. Mark J. Urban, Esq. Counsel for the California Energy Commission 1111 Howe Avenue, Suite 610 Sacramento, CA 95825

349 210