Dichating + Service

RECEIVED

APR 1 3 1982

S MUCHAN SEGULITARY COMMISSION

BECOMENT MANAGEMENT BR

THOC

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

E THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD

In the Matter of ARIZONA PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY, et al.

(Palo Verde Nuclear Generating Station, Units 1, 2 and 3)

Docket Nos. STN 50-528 STN 50-529 STN 50-530

MOTION TO POSTPONE HEARING

The Intervenor moves for an order postponing the hearing set for April 27, 1982, for a period of 30 days on the grounds of newly discovered material evidence. In support of this motion the Intervenor states that she very recently discovered this evidence; that the Applicant and it's Associate, The Salt River Project, have known of the evidence for a long time. That the evidence has been material to the construction and operating license Applicants; and that the very seroius problem raised by this evidence was concealed by the Applicant. The problem suggested by this evidence cannot responsibly be either ignored or belittled by rushing to a hearing before it can be developed in a fair and proper way.

I. THE NEW EVIDENCE

1. The Intevenor has learned that at least fifteen years ago the Salt River Project (SRP) asserted in a lawsuit against the City of Phoenix that sewage effluent from the City's water treatment plant was reclamation project water so that the City was not legally entitled to sell it for use outside the Salt

DS03/1

8204140173 820407 PDR ADDCK 05000528 PDR River Project boundaries. A copy of that lawsuit is attached as Exhibit A. SRP filed a legal brief in this suit explaining why the City could not sell the water. This brief is attached as Exhibit B. SRP later dropped the suit voluntarily.

- 2. On January 22, 1971, the Regional Director of the U.S.
 Bureau of Reclamation wrote a memo to the Commissioner of
 Reclamation on this issue. It discussed the reason why SRP of dropped it's lawsuit against Phoenix and discusses a 1969 agreement regarding the sewage effluent and says that this water is "return flow" and is subject to Bureau of Reclamation control. It says that: "The (Senate Interior) committee clearly states in Senate Report No. 408 that the United States should not abandon its rights to return flows from the Central Arizona

 Project or from any water stored or developed by any Reclamation

 Project." A copy of this memorandum is attached as Exhibit C.
- 3. In a bond prospectus dated March 1, 1980, the SRP stated that the lawyers for the Interior Department were studying the legality of using Salt River Project water for Palo Verde Nuclear Generating Station. A copy of the front page and page 15 of this prospectus are attached as Exhibit D.
- 4. By letter dated Februaary 25, 1980, the Solicitor of the Depprtment of Interior told the Justice Deaprtment about the proposed sale of effluent to the Palo Verde Plant and says flatly that he believes that the United States has priority over this Reclamation Project water. A copy of this letter is attached as Exhibit E.

These documents prove that the Salt River Project and the Interior Department have long known that Phoenix cannot sell effluent to Palo Verde.

The question now is whether the Intervenor should have found out about this matter a long time ago or whether APS and SRP should have disclosed this problem to the Commission a long time ago.

II. The Applicant and Salt River Project know about this matter but they insist that the Board refuse to allow us to take discovery on it. The Staff apparently has failed to make even superficial inquiry with the Interior Department about this problem.

Respectfully Submitted this 7th day of April, 1982,

Patricia Lee Hourihan

Patricia Lee Hourinan 6413 South 26th Street Phoenix, Arizona 85040 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION 82 17 12 PG 95

BEFORE THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD

In the Matter of ARIZONA PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY, et al.

(Palo Verde Nuclear Generating Station, Units 1, 2 and 3)

Docket Nos. STN 50-528 STN 50-529 STN 50-530

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that copies of The Motion to Postpone
Hearing and The Motion for Order Requiring Admission and Production of Documents in Ten Days, submitted by the Intervenor,
have been served on the following individuals by deposit in the
United States mail, properly addressed and with postage prepaid,
this 7th day of April, 1982.

Docketing and Service Section U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, D.C. 20555

Chairman, Maricopa County Board of Supervisors 111 South Third Avenue Phoenix, Arizona 85004

Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel w/enclasses:
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

Robert M. Lazo, Esq.
Chairman, Atomic Safety and Licensing Board
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 29555

Dr. Richard F. Cole Atomic Safety and Licensing Board U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Dr. Dixon Callahan Union Carbide Corporation P.O. Box Y Oak Ridge, TN 37830

w/enclosures Lee Scott Dewey, Esq. Office of the Executive Legal Director U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, D.C. 20555

w/enclosures Arthur C. Gehr, Esq. Charles Bischoff, Esq. Snell & Wilmer 3100 Valley Center Phoenix, Arizona 85073

Rand L. Greenfield Assistant Attorney General P.O. Drawer 1508 Santa Fe, New Mexico 87504-1508

Atomic Safety and Licensing Appeal Board Panel U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, D.C. 20555

Patricia Lee Hourihan