UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

BEFORE THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD

In the Matter of	)	
	)	
DUKE POWER COMPANY, et al.	)	Docket Nos. 50-413
	)	50-414
(Catawba Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2)	)	

APPLICANTS' REPORT TO THE BOARD ON CHARLOTTE-MECKLENBURG ENVIRONMENTAL COALITION ("COALITION") CONTENTIONS

On December 30, 1981, Applicants' informed the Board that, as a result of discussions with the Coalition they had no objection to the admission of the contentions advanced by the Coalition in its December 9, 1981 pleading. 1/ The Staff in its pleading of December 30, 1981 opposed the Coalition's contentions. At the January 12, 1982 prehearing conference the Staff indicated that it might reconsider its position. See, i.e., Tr. 36. As a result of recent discussions between the Staff, Applicants' and the Coalition, it is Applicants' understanding that an agreement has been reached with respect to Contention 1. The Staff has not agreed that Contentions 2, 3 or 4 are proper contentions; Applicants' do.

1/ Applicants' noted a minor clarification to the Coalition's Contention 3(a) which clarification was acceptable to the Coalition. See Tr. 30.

DS03
S
1/1

To assist the Board, Applicants' are attaching a copy of the contentions of the Coalition.

Respectfully submitted,

J. Michael McGarry, III
DEBEVOISE & LIBERMAN
1200 Seventeenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 857-9833

William L. Porter
Albert V. Carr, Jr.
Ellen T. Ruff
DUKE POWER COMPANY
P.O. Box 33189
Charlotte, North Carolina 28242

Attorneys for Duke Power
Company, et al.

February 19, 1982

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

BEFORE THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD

In the Matter of	)	
	)	
DUKE POWER COMPANY, et al.	)	Docket Nos. 50-413
	)	50-414
(Catawba Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2)	)	

CONTENTIONS OF THE CHARLOTTE-MECKLENBURG ENVIRONMENTAL COALITION

1. The Applicant's Environmental Report (ER) does not adequately project the radioactive emissions, both liquid and gaseous, which will result from normal operation of the Catawba Nuclear Station (Catawba) in the following respects:

(a) The projections set out in the Catawba ER are understated in that they do not reflect the fact that during the operating life of a LWR such releases will become progressively greater.

(b) The projections set out in the Catawba ER are based on assumptions which lack proper scientific foundation in that there are wide divergences between such projections for the McGuire Nuclear Station (as shown in the ER and FES for the McGuire operating license) and Catawba (as shown in the Catawba ER), notwithstanding the fact that the Catawba

reactors and the McGuire reactors are essentially similar in design.

Due to these inadequate projections, the cost/benefit balance does not support operation of the Catawba Nuclear Station.

2. The projections of radioactive emissions set out in the ER for normal operation of Catawba fail to take into account the actual accidental releases of radionuclides which have occurred at operating nuclear power plants with the United States.

3. The Applicants' ER does not adequately project the concentrations of radionuclides which will occur in the Catawba River from normal operation of Catawba, and releases of the nature specified in Contention 2, in the following respects:

(a) The models and methods used in the ER underestimate the resulting concentration of radionuclides in that they project an erroneous and overly optimistic dilution effect in the discharge canal and in the lake. We contend that the only suitable and realistic model is one that, in respect to any particular radionuclide, calculates the resulting concentration by dividing the, e.g., annual projected release into the total annual amount of water leaving the lake. The steady-state completely mixed model used in the ER results

in a lower figure for the concentration than that yielded by the methodology described in the preceding sentence.

(b) The calculated concentrations of radionuclides in the Catawba River downstream of Catawba from liquid releases fail to take into account the cumulative impact of radionuclides released to the Catawba River from McGuire Nuclear Station during normal operation of both the McGuire and Catawba Nuclear Stations. Such cumulative impact should be taken into account in calculating concentrations of radionuclides in water drawn from the Catawba River by communities downstream from Catawba.

(c) The calculated concentrations of radionuclides, particularly tritium, drawn from the Catawba River upstream of Catawba into the water supply of the City of Charlotte does not take into account the fact that gaseous releases from normal operation of Catawba will be carried up to 50 miles from Catawba and will be brought back into the Catawba River watershed through rainfall.

Due to these inadequate projections, the cost/benefit balance does not support operation of the Catawba Nuclear Station.

4. The ER inadequately assesses the long-range genetic and somatic health effects of routine releases of radioactivity within applicable NRC guidelines during normal operation, and releases of the nature specified in Contention 2, of the Catawba Nuclear Station, in that it fails to take into account recent work which shows the long-term genetic and somatic health effects of such releases to be damaging to adults and extremely hazardous to the human embryo and fetus.