

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING APPEAL BOARD:

Algie A. Wells, Chairman Dr. John H. Buck Dr. Laurence R. Quarles

IN THE MATTER OF

CONSUMERS POWER COMPANY (Midland Plant, Units 1 and 2)

DOCKET NOS. 50-329 50-330

## MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

On September 2, 1971, the Mapleton Intervenors filed a notice of appeal from the August 26, 1971, Order of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board in this proceeding, denying the motion to dismiss application which had been filed by those intervenors. On September 13 and 16, 1971, the applicant and the AEC Regulatory Staff, respectively, filed responses to that notice of appeal, both pointing out that the appeal was interlocutory and urging that it be dismissed on that basis.

Mapleton Intervenors: Nelson Aeschilman, John L. Wentworth, "ilda M. Wentworth, John Liddell, Loretta Liddell, and Wendell H. Marshall.

By way of background, the Mapleton Intervenors, on August 9, 1971, filed with the presiding Atomic Safety and Licensing Board a motion to dismiss the construction permit application. The grounds therefor were that the applicant had "unlawfully caused the procurement, partial manufacture, production and fabrication of the reactor pressure vessel ... without first having obtained a construction permit." The intervenors asserted that these activities constituted a violation of the Atomic Energy Act, and that since a license could be revoked for such a violation, it could also be denied on that basis. The intervenors also claimed that the illegal fabrication of the reactor pressure vessel not only put undue pressure upon the Licensing Board to grant a permit, but in fact "disabled" the Board from rendering decisions upon the fabrication process itself. The motion was supported by the Saginaw intervenors and opposed by the regulatory staff and the applicant . In denying the motion, the Board pointed out that advance procurement of the pressure vessel did not violate the Atomic Energy Act or AEC regulations, and that the argument that such advance procurement would add pressure on the Board to permit construction was simply a new formulation of the argument which had been rejected by the U. S. Supreme Court in PRDC v. International Union, 367 U.S. 396 (1961), and by countless Board decisions since that time.

<sup>2/</sup> Saginaw Intervenors: Saginaw Valley Nuclear Study Group, Citizens
Committee for the Environmental Protection of Michigan, Sierra
Club, United Auto Workers of America, Trout Unlimited, West Michigan
Environmental Action Council, Inc., and University of Michigan
Environmental Law Society.

The Appeal Board has reviewed the filings of the parties on this matter. Since no initial decision has been issued by the Licensing Board in this proceeding, we find that this appeal is interlocutory, within the meaning of 10 CFR Section 2.730(f). Under that section, no interlocutory appeal may be taken to the Commission or to the Appeal Board, which has been designated to act for the Commission in this proceeding. Accordingly, the appeal of Mapleton Intervenors is hereby denied as an interlocutory appeal.

The Commission's rules in 10 CFR Part 2 afford intervenors adequate opportunity in this proceeding for a determination whether the reactor pressure vessel meets Commission requirements for the protection of the public health and safety. This denial is without prejudice to intervenors' later raising, in accordance with the Commission's Rules of Practice, the questions which they seek to have considered.

It is so ORDERED,

By the Atomic Safety and Licensing Appeal Board

William L. Woodard Assistant Executive Secretary

Dated:

choos a plan for oc. oz. 1.30 10-13-71 Mr. arthur W. Murphy, Chairman FEC Haring Board midland, mich. Dear Sir: Unother year has gone by since I last write to you I verging the speeply Power to the construct and operate a nuclear Power Blant in Midland Mich. In my last letter I pointed out The fact that the intervenors were a very small minority and represented by attorneys who make a living by causing delays We in medland can not tolerate further delays - already we have seen plant operations transferred to other weating because of the high cost of power in midland - We have also seen the cost estimates of building the plant nearly clouble while wanting for your decision Gesterday over 10, do people stand up and spoke out for nuclear Pawer now - These are people who recognize The need today - who see their jobs jugard and their homes Threating because of frek of implayment - Midling cannot 8007/60933

wait indefinitely for your decision. We need the muchille lower plant and we ask for your favorable action now I so that our homelife will not be interrupted by unimplayment low power supply and continued pollution of air caused by the use of expensione, duty fossil fuels -I have had the opportunity to visit nuclear Power plants in the south, month, east and west and found them all to aperate in a clean, safe and sound fachion - Please let us have the barne here in Medland. Sincerely yours J. H. Byen.

Mon 18h

## UNITED STATES OF AMERICA ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

In the Matter of

CONSUMERS POWER COMPANY (Midland Plant, Units 1 and 2)

Docket Nos. 50-329 50-330

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

0-18-71

I hereby certify that copies of (1) MEMORANDUM AND ORDER issued by Appeal Board dated October 18, 1971; (2) Letter from J. H. Byers to Mr. Murphy dated October 13, 1971, in the captioned matter have been served on the following by deposit in the United States mail, first class or air mail, this 18th day of October 1971:

Arthur W. Murphy, Esq., Chairman Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Columbia University School of Law 435 West 116th Street, Box 38 New York, New York 10027

Dr. Clark Goodman Professor of Physics University of Houston 3801 Cullen Boulevard Houston, Texas 77004

Dr. David B. Hall Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory P. O. Box 1663 Los Alamos, New Mexico 87544

Dr. Stuart G. Forbes 100 Tennessee Avenue, Apt. 37 Redlands, California 92373

Thomas F. Engelhardt, Esq. David E. Kartalia, Esq. Regulatory Staff Counsel U. S. Atomic Energy Commission Washington, D. C. 20545

Robert Lowenstein, Esq. Jerome E. Sharfman, Esq. Lowenstein and Newman 1100 Connecticut Avenue, N. W. Washington, D. C. 20036 Richard G. Smith, Esq. Smith & Brooker, P. C. 703 Washington Avenue Bay City, Michigan 48706

Harold P. Graves, Esq. John K. Restrick, Esq. Consumers Power Company 212 West Michigan Avenue Jackson, Michigan 49201

Mr. R. C. Youngdahl Senior Vice President Consumers Power Company 212 West Michigan Avenue Jackson, Michigan 49201

Honorable Frank Olds, Chairman Midland County Board of Supervisors 623 St. Charles Street Midland, Michigan 48640

Honorable Jerome Maslowski
Assistant Attorney General, State
of Michigan
Seven Story Office Building
525 West Ottawa
Lansing, Michigan 48913

Honorable Curtis G. Beck Assistant Attorney General State of Michigan Seven Story Office Building Lansing, Michigan 48913

herain

Myron M. Cherry, Esq. 109 North Dearborn Street Suite 1005 Chicago, Illinois 60602

Anthony Z. Roisman, Esq. Berlin, Roisman & Kessler 1910 N Street, N. W. Washington, D. C. 20036

James A. Kendall, Esq. Currie and Kendall 135 North Saginaw Road Midland, Michigan 48640

Dr. Wayne E. North, Chairman Midland Nuclear Power Committee P. O. Box 335 Midland, Michigan 48640

Milton R. Wessel, Esq.
Allen Kezsbom, Esq.
J. Richard Sinclair, Esq.
Kaye, Scholer, Fierman, Hays
and Handler
425 Park Avenue
New York, New York 10022

William A. Groening, Jr., Esq. James N. O'Connor, Esq. The Dow Chemical Company 2030 Dow Center Midland, Michigan 48640

William J. Ginster, Esq. Merrill Building Suite 4 Saginaw, Michigan 48602

Mr. Wendell H. Marshall RFD No. 10, Mapleton Midland, Michigan 48640

Irving Like, Esq. Reilly, Like and Schneider 200 West Main Street Babylon, New York 11702

Office of the Secretary of the Commission

cc: Mr. Murphy
Mr. Engelhardt
Mr. Wells
N. Brown
H. Smith