

NEW PUBLIC DOCUMENT

LEGAL NUMBER
ELECTRIC & UTIL. FAC. 50-596, 597

STATE OF NEW YORK
BOARD ON
ELECTRIC GENERATION SITING AND THE ENVIRONMENT

At a session of the New York State Board on Electric Generation Siting and the Environment for the New Haven/Stuyvesant Generating Facility held in the City of Albany on October 12, 1979.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

Charles A. Zielinski, Chairman,
Public Service Commission

Peter Lanahan, Alternate for Robert F. Flacke, Commissioner, Department of Environmental Conservation

James L. Larocca, Commissioner, State Energy Office

Dr. William E. Seymour, Alternate for William D. Hassett, Commissioner, Department of Commerce

Fred Bartle, Ad Hoc Member



CASE 80008 - Application of the New York State Electric & Gas Corporation and the Long Island Lighting Company for a certificate of environmental compatibility and public need - New Haven/Stuyvesant.

ORDER DISMISSING APPLICATION

(Issued October 12, 1979)

BACKGROUND

On November 22, 1978, New York State Electric & Gas Corporation (NYSE&G) and Long Island Lighting Company (LILCO) filed an application for a certificate of environmental compatibility and public need to construct two 1250 megawatt

1381 064

G 7911210095

nuclear fueled electric generating facilities in New Haven, Oswego County, or, alternatively, in Stuyvesant, Columbia County. The application was docketed by the Chairman of the Public Service Commission and hearing procedures prescribed by Article VIII were commenced.^{1/} At a prehearing conference held on March 27, 1979, Ecology Action of Oswego moved to dismiss the application on the grounds that it was premature and legally insufficient. The motion was denied by the hearing examiners on April 13, 1979. Ecology Action then filed an interlocutory appeal of that ruling to the Public Service Commission^{2/} and, on July 10, 1979, the Commission certified the appeal to us with a recommendation^{3/} that Ecology Action's motion to dismiss be granted.

NYSE&G and LILCO have filed several briefs opposing Ecology Action's motion and the Public Service Commission's recommendation. The Department of Environmental Conservation has also submitted a letter suggesting that the proceeding on NYSE&G's and LILCO's application be "suspended" pending Siting Board action on other Article VIII applications. Responses to applicants' arguments were submitted by the staff of the Department of Public Service, the Attorney General, Ecology Action, and Safe Energy for New Haven. Statements supporting the Commission's recommendation were received from the Village of Mexico, the Town of Kinderhook, the Columbia County Farm Bureau, Columbia County, the Town of Stuyvesant, and Concerned Citizens for Safe Energy, Inc.

1/1972 Session Laws, Chap. 385.

2/Interlocutory appeals are governed by Section 70.8 of the Rules of Procedure. 16 NYCRR § 70.8.

3/Case 80008 - Application of the New York State Electric & Gas Corporation and the Long Island Lighting Company for a certificate of environmental compatibility and public need - New Haven/Stuyvesant, Order Certifying Appeal and Recommending Dismissal of Application, issued July 10, 1979.

1381 065

SUMMARY OF MOTION TO DISMISS
AND COMMISSION'S RECOMMENDATION

Ecology Action's motion is based on the theory that an Article VIII application is premature and legally insufficient unless the ownership and ultimate use of a proposed generating facility are reasonably certain. Ecology Action claims that despite NYSE&G's and LILCO's announced intention in the application to share the cost and output of the proposed facilities, the statements of applicants' planners in Case 80003, Jamesport^{1/} demonstrate that ownership has not been determined.

The Public Service Commission agreed with Ecology Action that an Article VIII application should be dismissed when probable ownership has not been demonstrated. With respect to that question, the Commission found that even the applicants themselves were uncertain about who would own the facilities, and whether other utilities would purchase shares in the plants. The Commission further found unpersuasive applicants' claim that statewide need would result in other utilities coming forward to participate in New Haven/Stuyvesant since 6000 megawatts of generating capacity to serve statewide needs are currently under consideration in the Article VIII process and the members of the New York Power Pool, including NYSE&G and LILCO, believe that capacity should be built before the capacity proposed in this case.

DISCUSSION

Applicants claim that the Commission's recommendation is based on a misunderstanding of Article VIII and a misinterpretation of the record. They assert that probable

^{1/}Case 80003, testimony of Madsen and Rider, filed February 23, 1979, p. 5.

ownership can "evolve" during the course of an Article VIII proceeding, in which issues relevant to need are litigated, and that there is no particular barrier under Article VIII to processing an application where ownership is not reasonably certain. Similarly, applicants renew their claim, without additional support, that continuing with this application would be desirable because of the statewide need for the New Haven/Stuyvesant units. In any event, according to NYSE&G and LILCO, the testimony of their system planners in Case 80003, Jamesport, which was relied on by both Ecology Action and the Commission, only reflects the possibility that ownership arrangements may change during the course of an Article VIII proceeding. Thus, contrary to the Commission's conclusion, they contend that the issue of ownership of the New Haven/Stuyvesant facilities is not "permeated with doubt."

We agree with the recommendation of the Public Service Commission. It would be wasteful to proceed with lengthy and costly proceedings on a proposed generating facility whose ownership and use are subject to substantial uncertainty at the very outset of the hearings. Applicants concede that ownership is relevant but would have us proceed with substantial uncertainty about it from the outset. We believe this would be unfair to the other parties in the case and inconsistent with the spirit of Article VIII. The statute contemplates a public examination and exploration of significant aspects of an application. This cannot be accomplished when there is substantial uncertainty about ownership at the outset of hearings.

1381 067

Furthermore, applicants have made no credible showing of statewide need for the facilities, and have not disputed the Public Service Commission's conclusion that ownership of the New Haven/Stuyvesant units will not be known until other pending Article VIII cases are decided. Ownership cannot be inferred from either the current or probable future demand of any particular company or companies in the state. Moreover, no other utility has expressed interest in sharing ownership of the proposed facility even in the face of the Public Service Commission's opinion recommending dismissal because of uncertain ownership.

This brings us to applicants' final argument. They contend that no reliable evidence has been introduced in this proceeding calling into question their announced intention to share equally in the construction of the New Haven/Stuyvesant unit. This argument misses the mark. The plain facts are that probable ownership has been called into question by statements from applicants themselves. In these circumstances, it is the applicants' responsibility to remove the uncertainty by confirming their present commitment to own and operate the proposed facility if it is licensed. The applicants have had many opportunities to do this and, instead, have failed to do so, claiming that the parties must show that the companies do not intend to own the facilities. Their continued failure to respond directly to the Ecology Action motion and the Public Service Commission's recommendation with a clear affirmation of present intent simply confirms our conclusion that the probable ownership and utilization of the proposed facilities are too uncertain to proceed with the case.

1381 068