

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
BEFORE THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD

| | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|--------------------|
| In The Matter of Puget Sound |) | |
| Power and Light, et al. |) | |
| Amended Application for Construction |) | Docket Nos. |
| Permits and Facility Licenses, |) | STN 50-522, 50-523 |
| SKAGIT/HANFORD NUCLEAR PROJECT |) | |

COLUMBIA RIVER INTER-TRIBAL FISH COMMISSION'S
MOTION FOR ADMISSION OF SECOND SUPPLEMENT TO PETITION TO INTERVENE


On May 5, 1982, Petitioner Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission (CRITFC) filed its Petition to Intervene in the above-captioned proceeding together with a Supplement to Petition to Intervene. On May 19, 1982, applicant, Puget Sound Power and Light Company, filed its Response in Opposition to Untimely Petition to Intervene objecting to the timeliness of the CRITFC petition and to the specificity and basis for petitioner's contention but concluding that CRITFC's Petition to Intervene satisfied the standing requirements of commission regulations 10 C.F.R. 2.714(a)(2). On June 14, 1982, the NRC staff served its Response to Untimely Petition to Intervene by CRITFC and the Yakima Indian Nation. The NRC staff concluded that Petitioner, CRITFC, satisfied the standing requirements and that the balance of the five factors set out in 10 C.F.R. 2.714(a)(1) weighed in favor of CRITFC being permitted to Intervene in this proceeding. The NRC staff, however, objected to certain contentions.

In light of the objections specified by the NRC staff and the applicant, and certain recent changes in the commission's regulatory scheme, Petitioner, CRITFC,

has prepared a Second Supplement to Petition to Intervene, which amends the original supplement in certain respects, while retaining contentions 1,2, and 3 essentially unchanged. Pursuant to commission regulation 10 C.F.R. 2.714(a) (3) Petitioner, CRITFC, hereby moves the Board to admit its amended contentions and bases, as set forth in its Second Supplement, and to reject the objections raised by applicants and staff to CRITFC contentions.

In support of this motion, CRITFC has filed a memorandum justifying the amendments contained in its Second Supplement, pursuant to 10 C.F.R. 2.714 (a). In addition, the Memorandum discusses CRITFC position on its consolidation with other parties.

Respectfully Submitted,


S. Timothy Wapato

Dated this 16th day of July, 1982.