

Carley Adding Adding

February 3, 1983

SECY-83-50

ADJUDICA DRY ISSUE

For:

From:

(NEGATIVE CONSENT) Sheldon L. Trubatch Acting Assistant General Counsel

Subject:

REPORT ON ALAB-712 (PUGET SOUND POWER AND LIGHT COMPANY, ET AL.) 50-522,523 A

Facility:

Petitions

Review

Purpose:

For Review:

Time Expires:

Skagit/Hanford Nuclear Power Project, Units 1 and 2

None expected

March 13, 1983

To inform the Commission of a minor Appeal Board decision [that, in the General Counsel's opinion

Discussion:

In ALAB-712, the Appeal Board summarily dismissed as unauthorized under the Commission's Rules of Practice intervenor Confederated Tribes and Bands of Yakima Indian Nation's appeal of the rejection of some parts of its contentions. Because other of intervenor's contentions were accepted as litigable, the Licensing Board's rejection of some contentions did not deny intervenor party status and, thus, did not create the necessary predicate for interlocutory review. See Puget Sound Power and Light Company, Et Al. (Skagit/Hanford Nuclear Power Project,

Information in this record was deleted in accordance with the Freedom of information Act, exemptions _ FOIA 92-436

CONTACT: X-3224

9404010072 930608 PDR FOIA GILINSK92-436 PDR

EX.5

FX 5

Units 1 and 2) ALAB-683, 16 NRC (July 27, 1982).

Sheldon L. Trubatch Acting Assistant General Counsel

Attachment: ALAB-712

SECY NOTE: In the absence of instructions to the contrary, SECY will notify OGC on Friday, February 18, 1983 that the Commission, by negative consent, assents to the action proposed in this paper.

DISTRIBUTION: Commissioners OGC OPE OIA SECY

A.ini .

5X.5

Release

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING APPEAL BOARD

Administrative Judges:

Stephen F. Eilperin, Chairman Christine N. Kohl Dr. Reginald L. Gotchy

In the Matter of

PUGET SOUND POWER AND LIGHT COMPANY,) Docket Nos. 50-522

(Skagit/Hanford Nuclear Power Project, Units 1 and 2)

50-523

James B. Hovis, Yakima, Washington, for intervenor Confederated Tribes and Bands of the Yakima Indian

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

February 1, 1983 (ALAB-712)

The Confederated Tribes and Bands of the Yakima Indian Nation, an intervenor in this construction permit proceeding, seeks to appeal the Licensing Board's rejection of part or all of four of its contentions; other of its contentions were accepted as litigable. See Memorandum and Order Restating Admitted Contentions (Jan. 18, 1983) (unpublished). As we did just six months ago with regard to another intervenor's similar appeal in this very proceeding, we summarily dismiss the appeal on the ground that it is unauthorized by the Commission's Rules of Practice. See ALAB-683, 16 NRC (July 27, 1982). We repeat again what

we said there and on numerous other occasions:

Those Rules do not permit a person to take an interlocutory appeal from an order entered on his intervention petition unless that order has the effect of denying the petition in its entirety. 10 CFR 2.714a; Culf States Utilities Company (River Bend Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-329, 3 NRC 607, 610 (1976), and cases there cited.

Texas Utilities Generating Co. (Comanche Peak Steam Electric Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-599, 12 NRC 1, 2 (1980), quoting from Houston Lighting and Power Co. (Allens Creek Nuclear Generating Station, Unit 1), ALAB-585, 11 NRC 469, 470, and ALAB-586, 11 NRC 472, 473 (1980). */

The appeal is dismissed.

It is so ORDERED.

. . . .

FOR THE APPEAL BOARD

C. Jean Shoemaker Secretary to the

Appeal Board

*/ As noted in ALAB-599, 12 NRC at 2 n.1, an intervenor in the Yakima Indian Nation's position must await the rendition of the Licensing Board's initial decision. If dissatisfied with that decision, it may then appeal under 10 CFR § 2.762(a). One of the matters that can be raised on such an appeal is whether the Licensing Board erred in rejecting or rewording one or more of the appellant's contentions.

Release

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING APPEAL BOARD

Administrative Judges:

·. ·. ·

Stephen F. Eilperin, Chairman Christine N. Kohl Dr. Reginald L. Gotchy

In the Matter of		
PUGET SOUND POWER AND LIGHT COMPANY,	Docket No	s. 50-522 50-523
(Skagit/Hanford Nuclear Power) Project, Units 1 and 2)		

James B. Hovis, Yakima, Washington, for intervenor Confederated Tribes and Bands of the Yakima Indian Nation.

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

February 1, 1983

(ALAB-712)

The Confederated Tribes and Bands of the Yakima Indian Nation, an intervenor in this construction permit proceeding, seeks to appeal the Licensing Board's rejection of part or all of four of its contentions; other of its contentions were accepted as litigable. See Memorandum and Order Restating Admitted Contentions (Jan. 18, 1983) (unpublished). As we did just six months ago with regard to another intervenor's similar appeal in this very proceeding, we summarily dismiss the appeal on the ground that it is unauthorized by the Commission's Rules of Practice. See ALAB-683, 16 NRC (July 27, 1982). We repeat again what we said there and on numerous other occasions:

Those Rules do not permit a person to take an interlocutory appeal from an order entered on his intervention petition unless that order has th effect of denying the petition in its entirety. 10 CFR 2.714a; Gulf States Utilities Company (River Bend Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-329, 3 NRC 607, 610 (1976), and cases there cited.

Texas Utilities Generating Co. (Comanche Peak Steam Electric Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-599, 12 NRC 1, 2 (1980), quoting from Houston Lighting and Power Co. (Allens Creek Nuclear Generating Station, Unit 1), ALAB-585, 11 NRC 469, 470, and ALAB-586, 11 NRC 472, 473 (1980). -/

The appeal is dismissed.

It is so ORDERED.

a (. . . .

FOR THE APPEAL BOARD

C. Jean Shoemaker Secretary to the Appeal Board

*/ As noted in ALAB-599, 12 NRC at 2 n.1, an intervenor in the Yakima Indian Nation's position must await the rendition of the Licensing Board's initial decision. If dissatisfied with that decision, it may then appeal under 10 CFR § 2.762(a). One of the matters that can be raised on such an appeal is whether the Licensing Board erred in rejecting or rewording one or more of the appellant's contentions.