UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD

Before Administrative Judges:
John H Frye, III, Chairman
Dr. Martin J. Steindler
Dr. Robert L. Holton

In the Matter of COMMONWEALTH EDISON COMPANY (Dresden Nuclear Power Station, Unit No. 1)	Docket No. 50-10-OLA July 12, 1982

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER
(Ruling on Amended Petition)

This matter concerns a request by Licensee to chemically decontaminate the interior surfaces of Dresden Unit 1's primary coolant system. This request has been pending for some time.

On September 28, 1981, the Commission issued a Memorandum and Order (CLI-82-25, 14 NRC 616) in response to requests for hearing in this matter filed by Citizens for a Better Environment, Prairie Alliance, Illinois Safe Energy Alliance, Kay Drey, Bridget Rorem, and Marilyn Shineflug. This Memorandum and Order directed that an Atomic Safety and Licensing Board be appointed to rule on the requests and laid down certain guidelines pertinent to the requests and any hearing which might result from them.

Pursuant to the Commission's Order, this Board was established. Pursuant to this Board's Order, amended petitions were filed and responses received from Licensee and Staff.

While the Board had this matter under consideration, on March 29, 1982, Licensee informed the Board that, while it definitely plans to go forward with chemical decontamination of Dresden Unit 1, it appeared that it could not do so prior to June 1, 1983, and did not expect to do so before 1984. Consequently we requested Petitioners' comments on the impact of this information on their petition and contentions in general and in particular on those portions of proposed Contention A which address the potential problem of an extended lay up of the reactor between decontamination and return to service.

Petitioners responded to this request, albeit two-weeks late, and at the same time submitted a "Second Amended Petition and Initial Contentions." This Amended Petition is specifically authorized by 10 CFR § 2.714(a)(3). Licensee and Staff have responded to both documents on the merits. We treat the Second Amended Petition (hereinafter Petition) as superceding the Amended Petition and confine our ruling to it as amplified by the Petitioners' response to the Licensee's deferral of decontamination.

Before considering the amended petition, it is important to note that the license amendment sought by Licensee has been issued. In its Memorandum and Order, the Commission stated ". . . if the Director [of Nuclear Reactor Regulation] determines that the proposed licensing modifications present 'no significant hazards consideration,' then the decontamination may be initiated prior to the conclusion of any hearing," (14 NRC at 623). On December 18, 1981, the Director made that determination and issued Amendment No. 35 authorizing the decontamination, along with a Safety Evaluation Report covering the amendment.

Standing

In its September Memorandum and Order, the Commission required each petitioner to separately establish standing to participate. In their Petition, Petitioners have addressed this issue separately for each Petitioner, and have addressed some of the objections of Licnesee and Staff on this point.

The organizations petitioning do so as representatives of their members residing near the Dresden Station. Citizens for a Better Environment (CBE) petitions on behalf of two of its members, Kevin Greene and Bridget Rorem, who reside 25 and 15 miles, respectively, from the station. Prairie Alliance (PA) petitions on behalf of one of its members, the same Bridget Rorem. Both members have furnished the necessary authorization to these organizations. The Illinois Safe Energy Alliance, a coalition of 19 affiliate organizations with over 300 members, petitions on behalf of those members residing near the station. However, no such members are identified and no authorizations furnished. Thus the Alliance has not complied with the requirements laid down in Houston Lighting and Power Company (Allens Creek Nuclear Generating Station, Unit 1) ALAB-535, 9 NRC 377 (1979).

Additionally, CBE seeks to intervene on behalf of its members who may be affected by possible decontamination of other reactors in the future, and

Kay Drey supports her standing on the ground that she may be adversely affected by decontamination of other nuclear stations. These allegations raise matters outside the scope of this proceeding and consequently cannot furnish a basis for standing. Cf. Consolidated Edison Company of New York, Inc. (Indian Point, Units 1, 2 & 3) ALAB-304, 3 NRC 1 (1976). We agree with the Staff that purely academic interests are not encompassed by 10 CFR § 2.714(a). These concerns must await a future case affecting a specific interest of these petitioners. They are, of course, also free at any time to raise general concerns under 10 CFR § 2.802.

Marilyn Shineflug seeks to support her standing on her status as a citizen of Illinois. She furnishes no information with respect to her residence or other activities in the vicinity of the Dresden station, asserting merely that her own, her family's and her descendants' health, safety and property will be adversely affected by any negative environmental impact resulting from the decontamination. These allegations are insufficient to support standing. As noted in the discussion of ISEA's petition, acceptance of such allegations in support of standing would run counter to the rationale of Allens Creek, supra.

Bridget Rorem, however, has clearly satisfied 10 CFR § 2.714(a) by alleging that she resides within 15 miles of the Dresden station and that her own, her family's and her descendants' health, safety, and property will be adversely affected by any negative environmental impact of the decontamination. Her standing, as well as that of Kevin Greene, support the representational standing of CBE and PA.

Contentions

Proposed Contention A asserts:

A. There has not been an adequate evaluation of the impact of the proposed decontamination if Dresden 1 is to be restarted in 1986 or later.

1. It has not been demonstrated that the extended period between decontamination and startup will not increase the likelihood of increased corrosion of bolts and valves in the core support system or of metal in the vessel clad or any creviced areas or pockets.

2. There has been no demonstration that the final inspection criteria of the materials in the reactor coolant pressure boundary will be adequate to insure the safe resumption of operation.

3. It has not been demonstrated that the extended lay up after decontamination will not exacerbate any stresses or cracks already existing and/or induced by the decontamination.

4. There has been no demonstration that the decontamination will neither induce nor increase the likelihood of stresses or cracks developing in materials embrittled by more than 15 years of exposure to radiation; evaluations of potential embrittlement problems has [sic] been ordered by the NRC for other reactors.

5. There has been no demonstration that any alternatives to decontamination are not preferable to the proposed method in light of the decrease in the remaining years of operation if the unit is not restarted until 1986 (the operating permit expires in 1996).
6. There has been no demonstration that the cost of other actions and modifications necessary for restarting the unit will be sufficiently minimal that the total cost for restarting the reactor would be less than the "break even renovation cost" of $105 million (Final EIS p. 8-6).
7. There has been no demonstration that the hazards analysis for the decontamination and post-decontamination review will be adequate for resumption of operation in light of TMI 2 and the current state of knowledge.

In their response to Licensee's deferral of decontamination, Petitioners do little to elaborate on this Contention, which remains unchanged from their original version despite the subsequent issuance of the SER which devotes considerable discussion to the problem posed by an extended lay up between decontamination and restart. The response basically reiterates Petitioner's concern with regard to the lay up period and asserts a concern that too long a period prior to decontamination could also be detrimental.

Licensee opposes Contentions A.1, 2, 3, 6, and 7 on the ground that they raise matters relevant only to operation. Licensee correctly points

out that CLI-81-25 limited this proceeding to matters arising from decontamination.

Additionally, Licensee objects on the following grounds:

A.1 -- No basis is given for the assertion that there will be an extended period between decontamination and restart.

A.2 -- No basis or specificity is furnished for the assertion that the final inspection will not be adequate.

A.3 and A.4 -- No basis is given to support the assertion that stresses or cracks will be induced or exacerbated by an extended lay up after decontamination, or that decontamination itself will induce or exacerbate stresses or cracks, or that stresses or cracks exist. Licensee also objects to the fact that Contention A.3 would require proof of a negative.

A.5 -- No authority exists to consider alternatives absent a determination under NEPA that decontamination will have significant effect on the environment or involves unresolved conflicts concerning uses of available resources. Further, no contention calls for such NEPA determinations.

A.6 -- Economic costs are irrelevant absent a showing that an environmentally preferable alternative exists.

A.7 -- No basis or specificity is given.

Staff basically agrees with the Licensee's specific objections to Contentions A.2 and A.7. Staff views Contentions A.5 and A.6 as attempts to litigate matters considered in the FES (NUREG-0686, October 1980), correctly noting that the Commission in CLI-81-25

excluded these matters from this proceeding. As to Contention A.6, Staff agrees with Licensee that it also improperly seeks to litigate matters related to restart as well as economic matters without the required environmental showing.

Staff differs with Licensee with respect to Contentions A.1, A.3, and A.4. These the Staff views as presenting acceptable subjects for hearing.

These Contentions do identify problem areas which the Staff has pointed out in its December 18 SER. Contentions A.1, 3. and 4. raise in general terms concerns about which a good deal of information was available to Petitioners. For instance, in a letter to NRR dated May 5, 1980, Brookhaven National Laboratory (BNL) commented on a Licensee submittal of March, 1980, and raised concerns regarding an extended lay up period. BNL stated that should an acid residue of the solvent used in decontamination remain in crevices in the presence of such inorganic anions as sulfates, sulfites or chlorides, a possibility would exist for continued crevice corrosion. BNL pointed to the difficulty of removing the residual acid from tight crevices by rinsing. BNL also expressed concern that activated crevices in stressed piping could continue to propagate during a long shut down. BNL recommended a thorough rinsing procedure, coupled with either heating the reactor vessel and piping, or, if heating were not feasible, a neutralizing treatment.

In a letter of September 3, 1980, BNL commented further on the clearing and rinsing procedure and indicated that its concerns had been substantially reduced. Both these letters are available in the local Public Document Room for the facility.

Following submission of these Contentions, the SER for the decontamination was issued. It contains an extensive discussion of the problem posed by a lay up period, and relies on the BNL letters for the conclusion that the proposed rinsing procedure will prevent any corrosion or crack propagation which might otherwise occur following decontamination. Approximately five months later Petitioners filed their Amended Petitions which restated the Contentions without substantive change.

In these circumstances, we believe more is required to state acceptable Contentions. These Contentions do no more than point to the existence of a problem which Licensee and Staff have recognized and have resolved to their own satisfaction. Petitioners assert that there has been an inadequate evaluation of the decontamination, assuming an extended lay up, because that lay up will result in increased corrosion and exacerbation of cracks. They do not address the proposed solution to these identified problems. They do not give notice to the Board or the parties of the respects in which Petitioners regard the proposed solution as inadequate. They do not even say that Petitioners regard the proposed solution inadequate. As they stand, the Contentions simply do not place any facts in issue. They are more conclusions than they are contentions. Because they do not give notice of facts which Petitioners desire to litigate, they fail to be specific enough to satisfy the requirements of 10 CFR § 2.714.

The remaining portions of Contention A are denied for the following reasons:

A.2 -- The term "final inspection criteria" lacks the necessary specificity to advise the Licensee and Staff of the matter sought to be litigated. Additionally, this Contention appears to be aimed at pre-operational, rather than post-decontamination, inspection. As such, it is outside the scope of this proceeding.

A.5 -- The Board agrees with Licensee that, absent an appropriate contention and determination by this Board under NEPA, this Contention need not be considered.

A.6 -- The Board agrees with the Staff's conclusion that this Contention need not be litigated because it relates to matters covered in the FES and is related to restart rather than decontamination.

A.7 -- The Board agrees with the Staff's conclusion that this Contention need not be litigated. The Contention does not indicate what Petitioners seek to litigate and hence is too vague.

Contention B states:

> B. There has not been an adequate evaluation of the impact of the proposed decontamination if Dresden Unit 1 will never be restarted.
>
> 1. It has not been demonstrated that the proposed method of decontamination is the preferable method or if it is necessary based on environmental, health and cost considerations if the reactor is not restarted.

2. It has not been demonstrated that decontamination is unrelated to decommissioning of the reactor.
3. If the decontamination is not related to startup or decommissioning then the applicant has not adequately demonstrated a need for the decontamination and for imposing any potential environmental and health impacts of the decontamination on the public.

Licensee objects to Contention B.1 for the same reasons given in opposition to A.5, i.e., that it requests a consideration of alternatives without a showing under NEPA that such is necessary. Licensee objects to Contention B.2 because it does not state a contention and, in any event, is outside the scope of the proceeding as defined by the Commission. Licensee objects to Contention B.3 because it calls for a justification for the project under NEPA without a showing that NEPA requires this consideration.

Staff objects to Contention B in toto as calling for litigation of matters contained in the Final Environmental Statement, noting correctly that the Commission expressly excluded these matters from the proceeding in CLI-81-25.

In their amended petition, Petitioners have added a reference in this Contention to an article entitled "The Environmental Biogeochemistry of Chelating Agents and Recommendations for the Disposal of Chelated Radioactive Wastes," 2 Nuclear and Chemical Waste Management 183-196 (1981). The article is the work of Jeffrey L. Means and Carl A. Alexander of Battelle Columbus Laboratories. Petitioners do not indicate why the reference is added or what portions of the article they

deem relevant to this Contention. The abstract of the article indicates that, if it is relevant, it is relevant to Contention F, not Contention B.

In these circumstances, the reference does nothing to aid Contention B. While the inclusion of such references in Contentions has the potential to benefit the process by furnishing the details of Petitioners' position, mere reference to an article which on its face appears irrelevant does not accomplish this. At the least, the reference should specify the portions of the material relied on; preferably it should include an explanation of Petitioners' position on the relevance of the referenced material. (See Tennessee Valley Authority (Browns Ferry Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2) LBP-76-10, 3 NRC 209 at 216 [1976].)

The Board believes that before any part of this Contention could be accepted, it would be necessary to find that, under NEPA, the decontamination constituted a major Federal action significantly affecting the human environment. Contention B presupposes the need for a cost-benefit balance and a consideration of alternatives under NEPA. These requirements do not come into play absent finding referred to above. Consequently the Board agrees with Licensee that a prerequisite to this Contention is the successful prosecution of a contention asserting the applicability of NEPA.

Moreover, in light of the Commission's determination not to permit challenges to the FES in this proceeding, coupled with their recognition that ". . . the staff has concluded that the decontamination project will have no significant impact on the human environment . . ." (CLI-81-25, 14 NRC 625), it is difficult to conceive of a situation in which such a contention could be admitted in this proceeding.

Additionally, the Board, like Licensee, is perplexed by the impact of Contention B.2. It appears merely to be a statement, rather than a contention. To the extent that it raises the possibility that Licensee will not restart this reactor, it falls under NEPA and is also governed by the above reasoning.

Contention C states:

> C. There was no adequate demonstration that the choice of decontamination procedure both specifically and as a general alternative was not simply a rationalization as was suggested by the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards on October 8, 1980.

Licensee objects on the grounds that, first, this Contention again raises NEPA considerations in the absence of a finding that NEPA is applicable; second, the Contention is overly vague; and third, the Contention impermissibly challenges the Staff's FES. Staff finds this Contention overly vague, and perhaps constituting, under one possible interpretation, an impermissible challenge to the FES.

The Board agrees that the Contention is too vague to be admitted. To the extent that it seeks a consideration of alternatives, it must be denied for the same reasons as Contention B.

Contention D states:

> D. The proposed decontamination is a novel procedure for a commercial reactor and thus no assurance of safety has been demonstrated.

Licensee and Staff find this Contention overly vague and lacking basis. The Board agrees. The Contention wholly fails to indicate what is sought to be litigated.

Contention E States:

E. Neither the Board nor the public can properly evaluate the impact of the decontamination without more detailed information on the nature of the solvent, NS-1.

Licensee and Staff find this Contention overly vague. While the Board agrees that this Contention is vague, it must be borne in mind that the composition of the solvent, NS-1, is proprietary. Consequently, Petitioners obviously have been hampered in their ability to state an acceptable Contention. Nevertheless, information with regard to the use and properties of the solvent is detailed in the Staff's SER, and has been available in the local public document room in correspondence dating back to 1974. Consequently the Board is of the opinion that Petitioners should have furnished more information with regard to the deficiencies they perceive in the information available and why those deficiencies inhibit a proper evaluation of the decontamination. This contention is denied.

Contention F.1-5 states:

F. The applicant and NRC staff have not properly evaluated the potential impact of the waste generated by the decontamination.

1. There has been no adequate evaluation of the potential for migration of chelated radionuclides, even in a dry environment, from waste temporarily trapped in a polymer matrix.

2. The applicant has not demonstrated that there will not be more migration from the chelated waste than other radioactive waste disposed of in the Beatty or Hanford sites.
3. The applicant has not properly evaluated the potential for migration of chelated radionuclides following the eventual degradation of the polymer matrix which will occur after burial.
4. The applicant has not properly evaluated the environmental advantages to be derived from deactivation of the chelate complex in case of transportation accidents, leaks on site or leakage from the drums either before or after burial.
5. There was inadequate assurance that the disposal sites will be able to accept all the waste from this and/or other decontaminations employing this procedure and still meet the disposal criteria described in the EIS.

Licensee asserts that because none of the individual petitioners or the members of the organizations petitioning reside close to the proposed disposal sites, they have not demonstrated that they will suffer injury from the disposal of the wastes resulting from the decontamination. Licensee believes that consequently their participation

should not extend to the waste disposal issue, citing 10 CFR § 2.714(f), Sierra Club v. Morton, 405 US 727 (1972), and Allied General Nuclear Services (Barnwell Fuel Receiving and Storage Station) ALAB-328, 5 NRC 420 (1976). Staff and Petitioners do not address this proposition.

The Board has found that Bridget Rorem and Kevin Greene have standing to participate in this proceeding based upon their residence close to the reactor, and that based upon the membership of either one or both of these persons, both CBE and Prairie Alliance have standing to participate in this proceeding as representatives of their members. None of these parties, however, has made any showing as to how their respective interests would be affected by the consequences of disposal of the wastes generated by the decontamination.

This Board has found no NRC precedent specifically addressing the question of whether a petitioner who has standing in a proceeding based on residence close to a reactor also has the necessary standing to raise questions relative to the consequences to distant sites of the storage of waste produced during the decontamination of the reactor.

We note that the NRC has allowed consideration of issues relating to uranium mines located considerable distances from nuclear plants applying for licenses (see, e.g., Philadelphia Electric Co. (Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station, Units 2 and 3) ALAB-640, 13 NRC 487 (1981); Pennsylvania Power and Light Co. (Susquehanna Steam Electric Station, Units 1 and 2) LBP-79-6, 9 NRC 191, 297-98 (1979). It does not appear, however, that those cases considered whether the intervenors raising those issues had shown injury from that aspect of operation.

While we entertain some question whether any of the Petitioners have established standing to litigate issues related to the disposal of decontamination wastes at distant sites, this point was never addressed by Staff and Petitioners (although both had the opportunity to do so) and was only minimally briefed by Licensee in its response to the Petitioners Amended Petition. Consequently, we do not decide this point.

Another difficulty presented by Contention F is whether it seeks to litigate the Staff's FES. In CLI-81-25, the Commission stated ". . . that the public interest does not require a hearing on the Final Environmental Statement." (14 NRC at 625.) Neither Staff nor Licensee assert this objection. However, we believe a close question exists with regard to the scope of the Commission's ruling (does it preclude litigation of matters covered in the FES only, or also of attempts to assert that matters should have been covered and were not), and the specifics of this Contention.

With respect to the latter problem, we are confronted with an assertion that "[t]he applicant and NRC Staff have not properly evaluated the potential impact of the waste generated by the decontamination." In five following paragraphs, it is asserted that there has been inadequate evaluation of the potential for migration of chelated radionuclides, no demonstration that these wastes will not

migrate more than other wastes, no proper evaluation of potential migration following degradation of the polymer matrix, inadequate evaluation of the advantages of deactivation of the chelate complex, and inadequate assurance that the disposal sites can handle the wastes and meet the disposal criteria of the FES.

None of this tells the parties or the Board in what specific ways the evaluation has been improper. We are left to speculate with what specific aspects of the evaluation Petitioners quarrel. In what respects has the evaluation of the potential for migration of chelated radionuclides been inadequate? Why should the Licensee demonstrate that its wastes will not migrate more than other wastes? What's wrong with the Licensee's evaluation of the potential for migration of chelated radionuclides following degradation of the polymer matrix, and its evaluation of the advantages of deactivation of the chelate complex? Why is there inadequate assurance that the disposal sites can accept the wastes and meet the disposal criteria, and what specific criteria in the FES are involved? The Contention poses these questions, it does not answer them. We are thus severely handicapped in judging not only whether the Contention improperly places the FES in issue, but, leaving the FES aside, precisely what is sought to be litigated.

Petitioners have an obligation to answer such questions if their contentions are to be accepted for litigation. Section 2.714 of the Commission's regulations requires no less. Before initiating costly

and time-consuming litigation, the Commission is entitled to know what is to be litigated.

The amount of information available to Petitioners and the length of time it has been available make it easy for the Petitioners to have supplied the necessary detail. CLI-81-25 was published September 28, 1981. The FES has been available since October, 1980, and the SER since December, 1981. Additionally, the data evaluated in the SER predates 1975 and has been available in the local public document room. Nonetheless, neither the amended petition of November, 1981, nor the second amended petition of May, 1982, make reference to this material in order to supply the necessary detail. In the second amended petition, reference in Contention F is made to the Petitioners' response to the Licensee's deferral of decontamination. No elaboration is given, and we suspect that in fact Petitioners intended to refer to the article on chelated wastes discussed above. If so, as we indicated, more was required than the bare reference itself.

In these circumstances we must conclude that Petitioners have failed to state this Contention with sufficient specificity to comply with § 2.714.

Contention G asserts:

> G. The EIS is deficient in that it does not adequately evaluate the potential impacts from the proposed decontamination.

Licensee and Staff believe that this Contention seeks to litigate matters discussed in the FES and correctly point out that the Commission precluded this. The Board agrees. The Contention is denied.

Two points raised in Petitioners' response to the Licensee's deferral of decontamination remain to be addressed. In their paragraph numbered '1.' on page 1, Petitioners call into question Licensee's financial qualifications to conduct the decontamination, as well as its "plans or predictions" for future nuclear generating capacity. While we are unsure whether this is meant to be a contention, we note that if so, it improperly seeks to introduce financial qualification and "need for power" issues into the proceeding. As the Staff points out, the Commission's recently promulgated rule: "Elimination of Review of Financial Qualifications of Electric Utilities In Licensing Hearings for Nuclear Power Plants," 47 F.R. 13750, March 31, 1982, removes the issue of financial qualifications from construction permit and operating license proceedings for power reactors. While license amendment proceedings are not specifically included in the rule (the issue typically was not raised in these proceedings), it would be anomolous to take the issue up in this proceeding. The Commission's rationale for eliminating the requirement in construction permit and operating license proceedings is no less applicable to license amendment proceedings.

In Consumers Power Company (Big Rock Point Nuclear Plant) ALAB-636, 13 NRC 312 (1981), the Appeal Board held that it was not necessary to consider the continued plant operation which might be permitted by the grant of a license amendment. We believe this rationale is applicable to the "need for power" issue to the extent Petitioners seek to raise it here.

The second point is Petitioners' request that the Board seek Commission clarification as to the admissibility of questions relating to the return to service of Dresden Unit 1. This is set forth in the paragraph numbered '4' on page 2 of Petitioners' response.

The Commission's intent to exclude restart matters from this proceeding is clearly set forth in CLI-81-25, and Petitioners have not made a showing sufficient to justify the certification of this question to the Commission. Consequently the request is denied.

Because we have found that none of the Contentions advanced by the Petitioners meet the standards of § 2.714, we find it unnecessary to address the question of discretionary intervention. We read the Commission's decision on this matter, Portland General Electric Company, et al. (Pebble Springs Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2) CLI-76-27, 4 NRC 610 (1976), as permitting Boards to admit, on a discretionary basis, petitioners who do not meet the Commission's requirements for standing. We do not believe the Commission intended that a petitioner without a valid contention should be entitled to discretionary intervention, nor do we believe that a petitioner could qualify for discretionary intervention without a contention worthy of exploration in an adjudication.

ORDER

In consideration of the foregoing, it is this day of July, 1982,

ORDERED

1. Petitioner Bridget Rorem has standing to intervene based on her residence;

2. Petitioner Citizens for a Better Environment has standing to intervene as a representative of its members, Kevin Greene and Bridget Rorem;

3. Petitioner Prairie Alliance has standing to intervene as a representative of its member, Bridget Rorem;

4. Petitioners Kay Drey, Marilyn Shineflug, and Illinois Safe Energy Alliance lack standing to intervene; and

5. None of the Contentions advanced by Petitioners satisfy the requirements of 10 CFR § 2.714.

It is further ORDERED that the Petition is hereby DENIED.

Pursuant to 10 CFR § 2.714a, this Order may be appealed to the Atomic Safety and Licensing Appeal Board by the filing of a notice of appeal and accompanying brief within ten days after service of this Order. Any other party may file a brief in support of or opposition to the appeal within ten days after service of the appeal.

Judges Steindler and Holton concur but were unavailable to sign this Memorandum and Order.

FOR THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND
LICENSING BOARD

John H. Frye, III, Chairman
ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE

Bethesda, Maryland
July 12, 1982