UNITED STATES OF AMERICA NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING APPEAL BOARD

Alan S. Rosenthal, Chairman Michael C. Farrar, Member Richard S. Salzman, Member

In the Matter of THE TOLEDO EDISON COMPANY, et al. (Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1)

Docket No. 50-346A

Messrs. Gerald Charnoff and Wm. Bradford Reynolds, Washington, D. C., for the applicants, The Toledo Edison Company, et al.

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

November 5, 1975

(ALAB - 297)

Yesterday, the applicants filed a motion with the Licensing Board seeking an affirmative determination that Unit 1 of the Davis-Besse facility may be licensed for operation prior to the completion of this on-going antitrust proceeding. ___ In the alternative, the Licensing

^{1/} Construction of this plant has been allowed to continue, notwithstanding the pendency of an antitrust review, pursuant to the "grandfather" clause in the antitrust provisions of the Atomic Energy Act. Section 105c(8), 42 U.S.C. 2135(c)(8). The question which the applicants wish to have resolved is whether operation is similarly "grandfathered" should the plant be ready before the antitrust proceeding has been completed (according to the applicants, a contingency not unlikely to materialize).

Board was asked to certify promptly the question to us for decision.

Simultaneously with the filing of that motion, the applicants moved before us for an immediate direction to the Licensing Board to certify the question. The provisions of 10 CFR 2.718(i), as well as our decision in Public Service Co. of New Hampshire (Seabrook Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-271, NRCI-75/5 478 (May 21, 1975), were invoked. Section 2.718(i) expressly authorizes the Commission, and thus this Board as its delegate, to direct certification of a question raised in a proceeding still pending before a licensing board. In ALAB-271, we expressly held that a party to the proceeding is entitled to request us to exercise that authority. NRCI-75/5 at 482-83. See also our prior memorandum and order in this case, ALAB-290, NRCI-75/9 (September 19, 1975); Seabrook, Supra, ALAB-295, NRCI-75/10 (Oqtober 28, 1975). 2/

Although there thus can be no doubt respecting our power to grant the relief sought of us by the applicants, we nonetheless believe it would be inappropriate to direct certification at this time. There may well be merit to

^{2/} In asking for a certification direction, applicants also referred to 10 CFR 2.785(d). That section is concerned, however, with the certification of duestions by an appeal board to the Commission. It is, therefore, inapposite here.

the applicants' insistence that the question which they have raised is worthy of definitive resolution at an early date; indeed by its very nature the question obviously must be decided at an interlocutory stage of the antitrust proceeding or not at all. But it has not been satisfactorily explained to us why we must step in before the Licensing Board has passed upon the question (after having first obtained the views of the other litigants).

As observed in <u>Seabrook</u>, ALAB-271, <u>supra</u>, "if at all, the need to reach down for an issue is more likely to surface after, and not before, the Licensing Board has itself spoken on the issue." NRCI-75/5 at 482. That observation fully applies here. For one thing, upon its own examination of the question the Licensing Board may decide it in the applicants' favor; if this should come to pass, the applicants will no longer require our intervention (although, to be sure, some other party to the proceeding might then wish us to invoke our certification jurisdiction). And should the Licensing Board instead reject the applicants' position that completion of the antitrust review is not an absolute condition precedent to the issuance of an operating license for the Davis-Besse facility, we would have the

benefit of that Board's reasoning in making our own determination (1) whether there is sufficient warrant for our stepping into the controversy; and (2) if so, what answer should be given by us to the question.

In short, as a general rule we will not avail ourselves of our Section 2.718(i) certification authority unless and until the Licensing Board has been afforded at least a reasonable opportunity to decide itself the question sought to be certified. An exception to that rule will be made only in the most compelling circumstances (such as the presence of an emergency situation giving rise to a manifest need for an almost immediate final determination of the question). Perceiving the existence of no such circumstances in the present case, we deny the certification request as premature. It may, of course, be later renewed in the event that the Licensing Board (1) rules against the applicants on the merits of the question raised by their motion now pending before that Board; and (2) then declines to refer that ruling to us under 10 CFR 2.730(f). In this connection, we assume that the Licensing Board will render its ruling as soon as practicable following its receipt of the responses of the other parties to the applicants' motion.

Motion to direct certification <u>denied</u> without prejudice to its renewal in accordance with the terms of this order.

It is so ORDERED.

FOR THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING APPEAL BOARD

Margaret E. Du Flo Secretary to the Appeal Board

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

In the Matter of		
THE TOLEDO EDISON COMPANY, ET AL.) CLEVELAND ELECTRIC ILLUMINATING) COMPANY	Docket No.(s)	50-346A 50-440A 50-441A
(Davis-Besse Nuclear Power) Station, Unit No. 1; Perry) Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1&2))		

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I have this day served the foregoing document(s) upon each person designated on the official service list compiled by the Office of the Secretary of the Commission in this proceeding in accordance with the requirements of Section 2.712 of 10 CFR Part 2 - Rules of Practice, of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Rules and Regulations.

Dated at Washington, D.C. this

6 4 day of 1 2 1975.

Office of the Secretary of the Commission

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Docket No.(s)	50-346A
	50-440A 50-441A
	50-500A 50-501A
	Docket No.(s)

SERVICE LIST

Pouglas Rigler, Esq., Chairman Foley, Lardner, Hollabaugh & Jacobs 815 Connecticut Avenue, N. W. Washington, D. C. 20006

Ivan W. Smith, Esq.
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D. C. 20555

John M. Frysiak, Esq. Atomic Safety and Licensing Board U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, D. C. 20555

Alan S. Rosenthal, Esq., Chairman Atomic Safety and Licensing Appeal Board

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

Mr. Michael C. Farrar Atomic Safety and Licensing Appeal Board

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

Richard R. Salzman, Esq.

Atomic Safety and Licensing Appeal
Board

Nuclear Regulatory Commission

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

Joseph Rutberg, Esq.
Antitrust Counsel
Counsel for NRC Staff
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D. C. 20555

Office of Antitrust & Indemnity Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, D. C. 20555

Benjamin H. Vogler, Esq.
Roy P. Lessy, Jr., Esq.
Antitrust Counsel
Counsel for NRC Staff
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D. C. 20555

Donald H. Hauser, Esq.
Victor F. Greenslade, Jr., Esq.
Cleveland Electric Illuminating
Company
P. O. Box 5000
Cleveland, Ohio 44101

Joseph J. Saunders, Esq., Chief Public Counsel and Legislative Section Antitrust Pivision U. S. Department of Justice Washington, D. C. 20530

Gerald Charnoff, Esq. Shaw, Pitt an, Potts, Trowbridge and Madden 910 -17th Street, N. W. Washington, D. C. 20006

Lee C. Howley, Esq., Vice President Honorable Deborah P. Highsmith and General Counsel Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company P. O. Box 5000 Cleveland, Ohio 44101

David C. Hjelmfelt, Esq. Michael Oldak, Esq. 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue, N. W. Washington, D. C. 20006

Reuben Goldberg, Esq. Arnold Fieldman, Esq. 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue, N. W. Washington, D. C. 20006

Steven M. Charno, Esq. Melvin G. Berger, Esq. Antitrust Division U. S. Department of Justice Washington, D. C. 20530

Honorable Thomas E. Kauper Assistant Attorney General Antitrust Division U. S. Department of Justice Washington, D. C. 20530

John C. Engle, President AMP-O, Inc. Municipal Building 20 High Street Hamilton, Ohi 45012

Honorable Richard M. Firestone Assistant Attorney General Antitrust Section 30 East Broad Street, 15th Floor Columbus, Ohio 43215

Honorable William J. Brown Attorney General State of Ohio Columbus, Ohio 43215

Honorable Edward A. Matto Assistant Attorney General Chief, Antitrust Section 30 East Broad Street, 15th Floor Columbus, Ohio 43215

Assistant Attorney General Antitrust Section 30 East Broad Street, 15th Floor Columbus, Ohio 43215

Honorable Christopher R. Schraff Assistant Attorney General Environmental Law Section 351 East Broad Street Columbus, Ohio 43215

Duncan, Brown, Weinberg & Palmer 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue, N W. Washington, D. C. 20006

John Lansdale, Jr., Esq. Cox, Langford & Brown 21 Dupont Circle. N. W. Washington, D. C. 20036

Leslie Henry, Esq. W. Snyder, Esq. Fuller, Henry, Hodge & Snyder 300 Madison Avenue Toledo, Ohio 43604

Mr. George B. Crosby Director of Utilities Piqua, Ohio 45350

William M. Lewis, Jr. W. M. Lewis & Associates P. O. Box 1383 Portsmouth, Ohio 45662

Robert D. Hart, Esq. Assistant Law Director City Hall Cleveland, Ohio 44114

Anthony G. Aiuvalasit, Jr., Esq. Antitrust Division Department of Justice P. O. Box 7513 Washington, D. C. 20044

Susan B. Cyphert, Esq.
Antitrust Division
Department of Justice,
727 New Federal Building
2140 East Ninth Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44199

David M. Olds, Esq. Reed, Smith, Shaw and McClay P. O. Box 2009 Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15230

Thomas A. Kayuha, Esq. 47 North Main Street Akron, Ohio 44308

Perry Public Library 3753 Main Street Perry, Ohio 44081

Director Ida Rupp Public Library 301 Madison Street Port Clinton, Ohio 43452 Joseph A. Rieser, Jr., Esq. Lee A. Rau, Esq. Reed, Smith, Shaw & McClay Madison Building, Suite 404 Washington, D. C. 20005

Terence H. Benbow, Esq.
A. Edward Grashof, Esq.
Winthrop, Stimson, Putnam
and Roberts
40 Wall Street
New York, New York 10005

Ruth G. Bell, Esq.
Janet R. Urban, Esq.
Antitrust Division
Department of Justice
Washington, D. C. 20530