UNITED STATES OF AMERICA ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

BEFORE THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD

POOR ORIGINAL

In the Matter of

THE TOLEDO EDISON COMPANY and
THE CLEVELAND ELECTRIC ILLUMINATING
COMPANY
(Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station,
Unit 1)

THE CLEVELAND SLECTRIC ILLUMINATING COMPANY, ET AL. (Perry Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2)

AEC Dkt. Nos. 50-348A 50-440A 50-441A

STAFF'S ANSWER IN OPPOSITION TO APPLICANTS' MOTION FOR SUMMARY DISPOSITION OF AUGUST 8, 1974

Pursuant to 10 CFR §2.749 of the Commission's Rules of Practice, Staff hereby opposes applicants' motion for summary disposition in the above captioned proceeding.

In their motion for summary disposition, applicants contend that

American Municipal Power-Ohio, Inc.'s (AMP-Chio) nexus argument is factually
incorrect and as a result of this failure to allege a proper nexus AMP-Chio's
intervention in this proceeding should be withdrawn. 1/ In setting forth its

In order to refute this nexus argument by AMP-Ohio, applicants now come forward with an affidavit by Dalwyn R. Davidson (Vice President - Engineering of CEI) which asserts that the construction of the Perry units will not hinder CEI's ability to wheel 30 megawatts of PASNY power.

I/ In its petitions to intervene, AMP-Ohio had alleged that a refusal by Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company (CEI) to wheel 30 megawatts of PASNY power for AMP-Ohio on behalf of the City of Cleveland constituted a situation inconsistent with the antitrust laws insofar as it relates to the licensing of the Perry nuclear units. To establish a nexus between this refusal by CEI and the activities under the license, AMP-Ohio had contended, among other things, that the operation of the Perry nuclear units may impair CEI's ability to wheel PASNY power due to a possible overload on CEI's transmission lines.

POOR
ORIGINAL

opposition to AMP-Ohio's intervention, applicants also contend that CEI's alleged refusal to wheel PASNY power for AMP-Ohio is not a proper matter for the Board to consider in this proceeding. 2/

Staff agrees that if there is no factual dispute concerning the ability of CEI to wheel 50 megawatts of PASNY power after construction of the Perry nuclear facilities, then the impairment issue raised by AMP-Ohio may be disposed of by summary disposition. 3/ However, the Staff believes that CEI's alleged refusal to wheel power will remain an issue whether or not AMP-Ohio's specific nexus argument is correct. In this regard, since the interrogatories in applicants' discovery requests have directed the parties to describe their contentions and proof for their various nexus arguments, applicants will be supplied this necessary information after discovery is completed. In the meantime, however, it would be premature to summarily dispose of the issue raised by AMP-Chio.

^{2/} In their August 15, 1974 cover letter to the Board applicants contend that, "It is Applicants' position that this alleged denial of access now to AMP-Ohio has no connection whatsoever with the future Perry nuclear facilities, or with any activities under the licenses requested in the captioned dockets, and therefore, it is not a proper matter for the Licensing Board to consider in the present antitrust hearing."

^{3/} Rule 56(c) Fed Rules Civ Proc permits any party to a civil action to move for a summary judgement upon a claim, counterclaim, or cross claim as to which there is no genuine issue of material fact and upon which the moving party is entitled to prevail as a matter of law.

The principles governing summary judgement in Federal practice are appropriate for use in determining motions for summary disposition under 10 CFR 2.749. Alabama Power Company (Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant Units 1 and 2), ALAB-182, RAI-74-3, 210, 217 (March 7, 1974).

Applicants' Motion is especially inappropriate at this time in view of the Board's recognition that third party wheeling of power from outside the service areas of the applicants is a relevant issue in this proceeding. Item (5) at page 11 of the Board's Prehearing Conference Order #2 of July 25, 1974 includes as a matter in controversy, "...whether applicants have, or could use their ability to preclude other electric entities within the CCCT from obtaining sources of bulk power from other electric entities outside the CCCT." 4/

The Staff believes that AMP-Ohio has an interest in this proceeding.

By refusing to wheel for AMP-Ohio, applicants through the use of their dominant position can effectively restrict a potential competitor.

Applicants' dominance and misuse of its dominant position, if established, represents the type of "situation" that may be considered in a Section 105(c) proceeding.

^{4/} It is significant that Applicant cites the Louisiana Power & Light (LP&L) case, Dkt. No. 50-382A, in support of its present motion for summary disposition -- however, in the LP&L proceeding, the LP&L Board also adopted third party wheeling as a matter in controversy.

Conclusion

For the above stated reasons, Staff recommends that the Board deny the applicants' motion for summary disposition.

Respectfully submitted,

Benjamin H. Vogler

Assistant Antitrust Counsel for AEC Regulatory Staff

Lee Scott Dewey

Counsel for AEC Regulatory Staff &

Dated at Bethesda, Maryland this 10th day of October 1974.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

ORIGINAL

BEFORE THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING

In the Matter of

THE TOLEDO EDISON COMPANY and THE CLEVELAND ELECTRIC ILLUMINATING) AEC Docket No. 50-346A COMPANY (Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station)

THE CLEVELAND ELECTRIC ILLUMINATING COMPANY, ET AL. (Perry Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2)

AEC Docket Nos. 50-440A 50-441A

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that copies of STAFF'S ANSWER IN OPPOSITION TO APPLICANTS' MOTION FOR SUMMARY DISPOSITION OF AUGUST 8, 1974, dated October 10, 1974, in the captioned matter, have been served upon the following by deposit in the United States mail, first class or air mail, this 10th day of October 1974:

John B. Farmakides, Esq., Chairman Atomic Safety and Licensing Board U. S. Atomic Energy Commission Washington, D. C. 20545

John H. Brebbia, Esq. Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Alston, Miller & Gaines 1776 K Street, N. W. Washington, D. C. 20006

Dr. George R. Hall Atomic Safety and Licensing Board U. S. Atomic Energy Commission Washington, D. C. 20545

Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel U. S. Atomic Energy Commission Washington, D. C. 20545

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

Docketing and Service Section Office of the Secretary U. S. Atomic Energy Commission Washington, D. C. 20545

Joseph J. Saunders, Esq. Steven Charno, Esq. Antitrust Division Department of Justice Washington, D. C. 20530

Reuben Goldberg, Esq. David C. Hjelmfelt, Esq. 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue, N. W. Washington, D. C. 20006

Frank R. Clokey, Esq. Special Assistant Attorney General Room 219, Towne House Apartments Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17105

Herbert R. Whiting, Director Robert D. Hart, Esq. Department of Law 1201 Lakeside Averus Cleveland, Ohio 4-114

John C. Engle, President AMP-0, Inc. Municipal Building 20 High Street Hamilton, Ohio 45012

George B. Crosby Director of Utilities Piqua, Ohio 45350

Donald H. Hauser, Esq. Managing Attorney The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company 55 Public Square Cleveland, Chio 44101

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

John R. White, Esq. Executive Vice President Ohio Edison Company 47 North Main Street Akron, Ohio 44308

Thomas J. Munsch, Esq. General Attorney Duquesne Light Company 435 Sixth Avenue Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15219

Wallace L. Duncan, Esq. Jon T. Brown, Esq. Duncan, Brown, Weinberg & Palmer 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue, N. W. Washington, D. C. 20006

David McNeil Olds Reed, Smith, Shaw & McClay Union Trust Building Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15230 Dwight C. Pettay, Jr.
Assistant Attorney Ceneral
Chief, Antitrust Section
30 East Broad Street, 15th Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43215

George Chuplis
Commissioner of Light & Power
City of Cleveland
1201 Lakeside Avenue
Cleveland, Ohio 44114

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

Christopher R. Schraff, Esq. Assistant Attorney General Environmental Law Section 361 East Broad Street, 8th Floor Columbus, Ohio 43215

Mr. Raymond Kudukis, Director of Public Utilities City of Cleveland 1201 Lakeside Avenue Cleveland, Ohio 44114

Gerald Charnoff, Esq.
Brad Reynolds, Esq.
Shaw, Pittman, Potts & Trowbridge
910-17th Street, N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20006

Benjamin H. Vogler
Assistant Antitrust Counsel
for AEC Regulatory Staff

POOR ORIGINAL DISTRIBUTION:
REG Central Files
(Public Document Room)
(Local Public Document Room)
A. Braitman, L:OAI (2)
ASLB
J. Rutberg (3)
B. Vogler
ASLAB (5)
OGC Formal Files (2)
OGC Reading File
OGC Cmtn File
Solicitor, GC
H. K. Shapar
T. Engelhardt

POOR ORIGINAL