

DOCKETED  
USNRC

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

BEFORE THE COMMISSION

82 AGO 19 A11:36  
OFFICE OF SECRETARY  
DOCKETING & SERVICE  
BRANCH

In the Matter of )  
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY ) Docket Nos. 50-275 O.L.  
(Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power ) 50-323 O.L.  
Plant, Units 1 and 2 )  
)

JOINT INTERVENORS'  
REQUEST FOR HEARING

Pursuant to § 189(a) of the Atomic Energy Act, 42 U.S.C. § 2239(a), the SAN LUIS OBISPO MOTHERS FOR PEACE, SCENIC SHORELINE PRESERVATION CONFERENCE, INC., ECOLOGY ACTION CLUB, SANDRA SILVER, GORDON SILVER, ELIZABETH APFELBERG, and JOHN J. FORSTER ("Joint Intervenors") hereby request a hearing with respect to the August 3, 1982 application of Pacific Gas and Electric Company ("PGandE") for an amendment to the Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant ("Diablo Canyon") Facility Operating License No. DPR-76.<sup>1/</sup> In essence, PGandE seeks by the proposed amendment to renew the low power operating license granted by the Nuclear

<sup>1/</sup> This written request formalizes the oral request for hearing communicated by telephone on August 11 by Joint Intervenors' counsel to the office of Edson Case (acting on behalf of the Director of Nuclear Reactor Regulation) and to Donald Hassell and Lawrence Chandler, NRC Staff counsel. Such request was confirmed that same day by letter to Mr. Hassell (attached hereto as Exhibit A).

Regulatory Commission ("Commission") on September 21, 1981.<sup>2/</sup> Less than two months thereafter, on November 19, 1981, the Commission suspended the license in light of design and construction errors discovered at the facility which, the Commission acknowledged, "had [they] been known to the Commission on or prior to September 22, 1981, Facility License No. DPR-76 would not have been issued."<sup>3/</sup> The suspension is still in effect.

The Joint Intervenors oppose the proposed license amendment and are, therefore, requesting an adjudicatory hearing to contest PG&E's entitlement to, and the appropriateness of, the proposed amendment. In so doing, they are not appealing to the Commission's discretion, but are asserting their statutory right to a hearing prior to disposition of the application by the Commission. This right is guaranteed by § 189(a) of the Atomic Energy Act, as amended which provides, in pertinent part, as follows:

In any proceeding under this chapter, for the granting, suspending, revoking, or amending of any license. . . , the Commission shall grant a hearing

---

<sup>2/</sup> Pacific Gas and Electric Company's ("PG&E") proposed license amendment is attached hereto as Exhibit B. A described in the application, at 1, the "proposed change is to amend condition 2.K. of the license to change the expiration date of the license from one year from the date of issuance to two years from the date of issuance."

<sup>3/</sup> CLI-81-30, at 3.

upon the request of any person whose interest may be affected by the proceeding, and shall admit any such person as a party to such proceeding. \* \* \*<sup>4</sup>

Section 189(a) has repeatedly been held to make mandatory an adjudicatory hearing prior to the issuance, revocation, suspension, or amendment of an operating license once such a hearing has been requested by an interested person. Brooks v. U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, 476 F.2d 924, 926 (D.C.Cir. 1973) (per curiam); Westinghouse Electric Corp. v. U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, 598 F.2d 759, 772-773 (3d Cir. 1979); Sholly v. U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, 651 F.780 (D.C.Cir. 1980) (per curiam), cert. granted, \_\_\_ U.S. \_\_\_, 10 S.Ct. 3004 (1981). The legislative history of this section indicates that "it was Congress' intent to lessen the mandatory hearing requirement only when there was no request for a hearing." Brooks v. U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, 476 F.2d at 927.

The Joint Intervenors have been parties to this proceeding for almost a decade and, as such, they are unquestionably persons "whose interest may be affected by the proceeding. . . ." 42 U.S.C. § 2239(a). They have requested hearing with respect to a proposed license amendment having clear safety significance -- e.g., renewal of a nuclear facility operating license -- and they have done so in a timely fashion. Accordingly, their request must be granted.

---

<sup>4</sup>/ 42 U.S.C. § 2239(a); see also 10 C.F.R. §§ 2.104, 2.105, 50.91.

PGandE's assertion in its application that the proposed amendment is "administrative in nature" and has "no safety or environmental significance" is a flagrant mischaracterization of the amendment's effect. In fact, PGandE is seeking to double the effective term of a suspended license which the Commission has explicitly acknowledged would not have been granted in the first place had the errors disclosed through last November been revealed prior to its issuance.<sup>5/</sup> Since that time, over 200 additional serious design and construction errors at the plant have been revealed, and even the auditor selected by PGandE to review its quality assurance/quality control program has concluded that the program was deficient in "policy, procedures, and implementation."<sup>6/</sup> Within the past month, the NRC Staff issued a detailed Brookhaven National Laboratory report which establishes significant flaws in the fundamental design basis for Diablo Canyon, flaws so pervasive that PGandE has conceded that reverification of the entire seismic design of the facility is necessary.<sup>7/</sup>

---

<sup>5/</sup> Indeed, in an October 9, 1981 meeting with PGandE, NRR Director Denton observed that the low power license would not have been issued had the design errors then discovered been known to the Staff prior to issuance of the license. Meeting Transcript, at 117 (October 9, 1981).

<sup>6/</sup> Quality Assurance Review and Audit Report, Phase I (March 8, 1982).

<sup>7/</sup> Independent Seismic Analysis of the Diablo Canyon Unit 1 Containment Annulus Structure and Selected Piping Systems (July 1, 1982); Meeting Transcript (August 6, 1982).

In light of such a record, PGandE's proposed license amendment is far more than a mere administrative detail. On the contrary, it is an unprecedented attempt to obtain renewal of a license which PGandE never should have received in the first instance, for a facility designed and constructed in violation of the Commission's basic safety regulations, and in complete disregard of a continuing series of revelations which unquestionably undermine the reasonable assurance of safety and regulatory compliance which is the mandatory prerequisite to licensing of a nuclear facility. See 42 U.S.C. § 2233(d); 10 C.F.R. §§ 50.40, 50.57(a). Thus, the proposed amendment can be considered "administrative" and without "safety or environmental significance" only by ignoring the basic Commission standards promulgated to assure that public safety and the environment will be protected. Under such circumstances, the opportunity to challenge the proposed amendment through an adjudicatory hearing is critical.

Even were the proposed amendment not a matter of safety significance, however, the law is well settled that the hearing right guaranteed by § 189(a) applies nonetheless. First established in Brooks v. U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, supra, this principle was recently reaffirmed by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit in Sholly v. U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, supra, where the court held unlawful the NRC policy of making immediately effective license amendments without holding a hearing, even though petitioners request one, whenever the NRC finds that the amendment involves "no

significant hazards consideration."<sup>8/</sup> Citing Brooks, the court concluded that the doctrine of stare decisis compelled the conclusion that a determination of "no significant hazards consideration" did not obviate the hearing right and, moreover, that the legislative history of § 189(a) left no ambiguity as to this result. The court explained the law as follows:

[W]e are confident that Brooks was properly decided and that it dictates the construction that must be attached to the last sentence of section 189(a). Because the NRC's finding of "no significant hazards consideration" did not entitle the Commission to dispense with a requested hearing prior to issuance of the [license amendment], we hold that its failure to provide a hearing violated section 189(a) of the Atomic Energy Act.<sup>9/</sup>

The Joint Intervenors are entitled to an adjudicatory hearing prior to a decision by the Commission regarding PGandE's August 3rd application for an amendment to the Diablo Canyon low power operating license. Under the circumstances of this proceeding, renewal of the suspended low power license would make a mockery of the Commission's licensing standards.

For the reasons stated above and consistent with the terms of § 189(a) of the Atomic Energy Act, the Joint Intervenors respectfully request that an adjudicatory hearing be held with respect to PGandE's license amendment

---

<sup>8/</sup> At issue was an amendment to the operating license for Unit 2 of the Three Mile Island Nuclear Power Plant authorizing the venting of hydrogen gas from the containment building into the atmosphere as part of the decontamination process.

<sup>9/</sup> 651 F.2d at 789.

application and, specifically, that such application be  
(1) referred to the responsible NRC adjudicatory panel;  
(2) set for prehearing conference to establish a schedule  
for hearing on the application; and (3) noticed in the  
Federal Register for hearing no less than 30 days after  
the date of publication.

DATED: August 17, 1982

Respectfully submitted,

JOEL R. REYNOLDS, ESQ.  
JOHN R. PHILLIPS, ESQ.  
Center for Law in the Public  
Interest  
10951 West Pico Boulevard  
Los Angeles, California 90064

DAVID S. FLEISCHAKER, ESQ.  
P.O. Box 1178  
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73101

By Joel Reynolds  
JOEL R. REYNOLDS  
Attorneys for Joint  
Intervenors  
SAN LUIS OBISPO MOTHERS FOR  
PEACE  
SCENIC SHORELINE PRESERVATION  
CONFERENCE, INC.  
ECOLOGY ACTION CLUB  
SANDRA SILVER  
GORDON SILVER  
ELIZABETH APFELBERG  
JOHN J. FORSTER

## BOARD OF TRUSTEES

JAMES H. ADLER	OWEN OLPIN
REGINALD ALLEYNE	JUDY ORTTUNG
BAYARD F. BERMAN	VICTOR H. PALMIERI
HOWARD L. BERMAN	BOB PAYSON
PHILLIP S. BERRY	JOHN R. PHILLIPS
GEOFFREY COWAN	WILLIAM PRESS
MARGOT E. FEUER	BRENT H. RUSHFORTH
DAVID FIELD	MICHAEL H. SHAPIRO
ROBERT A. GREENFIELD	STANLEY K. SHEINBAUM
CARLYLE W. HALL, JR.	MARION SICILIANO
ELIZABETH M. HOROWITZ	ALAN STAMM
ALVIN S. KAUFER	STEWART L. UDALL
MICHAEL R. KLEIN	DONALD M. HESSLING
WESLEY MARX	FRANCIS M. WHEAT
GLADYS MEADE	WERNER WOLFEN

CENTER FOR LAW  
IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST

10951 WEST PICO BOULEVARD  
THIRD FLOOR  
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90064  
TELEPHONE: (213) 470-3000

August 11, 1982

DOCKETED  
USNRC

LEGAL STAFF

MOOTHY B. FLYNN

LUCAS GUTTENTAG

CARLYLE W. HALL, JR.

JOHN R. PHILLIPS

JOEL REYNOLDS

REDIE WILLIAMSON

REED WILLIAMSON

MARSHA H. KWALWASS

VISITING FELLOWS

MICHAEL S. GENDLER

ERIC HAVIAN

BRUCE WILLIAMSON

'82 AGO 19 AM 1:36  
OFFICE OF SECRETARY  
DOCKETING & SERVICE  
BRANCH

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE

BY EXPRESS MAIL

Donald F. Hassell, Esq.  
Office of the Executive  
Legal Director  
BETH 042  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20555

Re: In the Matter of Pacific Gas and Electric  
Company (Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant,  
Units 1 and 2), Nos. 50-275 O.L. and 50-323  
O.L.

Dear Mr. Hassell:

This letter is to confirm our telephone conversation of this morning in which I requested, on behalf of the Joint Intervenors to the above-entitled proceeding, a hearing with respect to the August 3, 1982 application of Pacific Gas and Electric Company for an amendment to the Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant Facility Operating License No. DPR-76. This request is based on § 189(a) of the Atomic Energy Act, as amended.

The Joint Intervenors oppose the proposed amendment. As I mentioned, we received notice of the amendment application only yesterday (see attached letter), and, in order to ensure the timeliness of our hearing request, it has been made by telephone to you and to the office of Edson Case, acting on behalf of Harold Denton, Director of the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation. A formal written request for hearing will be submitted within the next ten days.

Very truly yours,

Joel Reynolds  
Counsel to the Joint  
Intervenors

JR:av

cc: Diablo Canyon Service List

**COPY**

August 3, 1982

Mr. Harold R. Denton, Director  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC 20555

Re: Docket No. 50-275, OL-DPR-76  
Diablo Canyon Unit 1  
License Amendment Request 82-05  
Extension of Term of Facility License

Dear Mr. Denton:

Enclosed are three (3) signed and thirty-seven (37) conformed copies of an application for an amendment to Facility Operating License No. DPR-76.

Pursuant to 10 CFR 170.22, PG&E has reviewed the proposed changes and determined that a Class II amendment fee is applicable as the amendment is administrative in nature and has no safety or environmental significance. Enclosed is a check in the amount of \$1,200 in payment of the required Class II amendment fee.

Kindly acknowledge receipt of this material on the enclosed copy of this letter and return it in the enclosed addressed envelope.

Very truly yours,

Philip A. Crane, Jr.

Enclosures

bcc w/encl: Service List

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

In the Matter of	)	
	)	
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY	)	Docket No. 50-275
	)	
(Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power	)	Facility Operating
	)	
Plant, Unit No. 1)	)	License No. DPR-76
	)	

As provided in 10 CFR 50.90, Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) hereby proposes to amend its Diablo Canyon Power Plant (DCPP) Facility Operating License DPR-76 (License).

The proposed change is to amend Condition 2.K. of the License to change the expiration date of the License from one year from the date of issuance to two years from the date of issuance.

On September 22, 1981 the NRC issued Facility Operating License DPR-76 for a term of one year. This License authorized operation of the Diablo Canyon Power Plant, Unit 1 at up to five percent of rated power. On November 19, 1981, the Commission suspended portions of the license (CLI-81-30) pending completion of an Independent Design Verification Program (IDVP). It is anticipated that the work associated with the IDVP will extend beyond the present expiration date of the license.

The proposed change is administrative in nature, and has no safety or environmental significance.

Subscribed to in San Francisco, California, this 3rd  
day of August, 1982.

Respectfully submitted,

Pacific Gas and Electric Company

By /s/ J. O. Schuyler  
J. O. Schuyler  
Vice President  
Nuclear Power Generation

Subscribed and sworn to before me  
this 3rd day of August, 1982.

/s/ Nancy J. Lemaster

Nancy J. Lemaster, Notary Public in  
and for the City and County of  
San Francisco, State of California

My Commission expires April 14, 1986.

Robert Ohlbach  
Philip A. Crane, Jr.  
Richard F. Locke

Attorneys for Pacific Gas  
and Electric Company

By /s/ Philip A. Crane, Jr.  
Philip A. Crane, Jr.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

'82 AGO 19 AM 1:36

BEFORE THE COMMISSIONOFFICE OF SECRETARY  
DOCKETING & SERVICE  
BRANCH

In the Matter of )  
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY ) Docket Nos. 50-275 O.L.  
                                       )                               50-323 O.L.  
(Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power )  
Plant, Units 1 and 2 )  
                                       )

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this 17th day of August, 1982, I have served copies of the foregoing JOINT INTERVENORS' REQUEST FOR HEARING, mailing them through the U.S. mails, first class, postage prepaid.

Nunzio Palladino,  
Chairman  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory  
Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20555

James Asselstine,  
Commissioner  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory  
Commissioner  
Washington, D.C. 20555

Victor Gilinsky,  
Commissioner  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory  
Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20555

John Ahearn, Commissioner  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory  
Commissioner  
Washington, D.C. 20555

Thomas Roberts,  
Commissioner  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory  
Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20555

Samuel J. Chilk,  
Secretary  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory  
Commissioner  
Washington, D.C. 20555

Mr. Harold Denton  
Director of Nuclear  
Reactor Regulation  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory  
Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20555

Leonard Bickwit, Esq.  
Office of General Counsel  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory  
Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20555

Thomas S. Moore, Chairman  
Atomic Safety & Licensing  
Appeal Board  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory  
Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20555

Dr. W. Reed Johnson  
Atomic Safety & Licensing  
Appeal Board  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory  
Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20555

Dr. John H. Buck  
Atomic Safety & Licensing  
Appeal Board  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory  
Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20555

Admin. Judge John F. Wolf,  
Chairman  
Atomic Safety & Licensing  
Board  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory  
Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20555

Glenn O. Bright  
Atomic Safety & Licensing  
Board  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory  
Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20555

Dr. Jerry R. Kline  
Atomic Safety & Licensing  
Board  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory  
Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20555

Docket & Service Branch  
Office of the Secretary  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory  
Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20555

Bradley Jones, Esq.  
Donald F. Hassell, Esq.  
Lawrence Chandler, Esq.  
Office of the Executive Legal  
Director - BETH 042  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory  
Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20555

Herbert Brown, Esq.  
Lawrence Coe Lanpher, Esq.  
Alan Dynner, Esq.  
Hill, Christopher &  
Phillips  
1900 M. Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20036

Byron Georgiou, Esq.  
Legal Affairs Secretary to  
The Governor  
State Capitol Building  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Janice E. Kerr, Esq.  
Lawrence Q. Garcia, Esq.  
J. Calvin Simpton, Esq.  
California Public Utilities  
Commission  
5246 State Building  
350 McAllister Street  
San Francisco, CA 94102

Mr. Fredrick Eissler  
Scenic Shoreline Preservation  
Conference, inc.  
4623 More Mesa Drive  
Santa Barbara, CA 93105

Malcolm H. Furbush, Esq.  
Vice President & General  
Counsel  
Philip A. Crane, Esq.  
Pacific Gas & Electric Company  
Post Office Box 7442  
San Francisco, CA 94106

David S. Fleischaker  
Post Office Box 1178  
Oklahoma City, OK 73101

MHB Technical Associates  
1723 Hamilton Avenue  
Suite K  
San Jose, CA 95725

Arthur C. Gehr, Esq.  
Snell & Wilmer  
3100 Valley Center  
Phoenix, AZ 85073

Virginia and Gordon Bruno  
Pecho Ranch  
Post Office Box 6289  
Los Osos, CA 93402

Sandra and Gordon Silver  
1760 Alisal Street  
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401

Bruce Norton, Esq.  
3216 N. Third Street  
Suite 202  
Phoenix, AZ 85012

Nancy Culver  
192 Luneta  
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401

Carl Neiburger  
Telegram Tribune  
Post Office Box 112  
San Luis Obispo, CA 93402

Amanda Varone  
AMANDA VARONA