

11/10/82

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

BEFORE THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD

In the Matter of)
PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY OF)
NEW HAMPSHIRE, et al.)
(Seabrook Station, Units 1 and 2))

Docket Nos. 57-443 OL
50 444 OL

NRC STAFF'S INTERROGATORIES AND REQUESTS FOR DOCUMENT
PRODUCTION TO THE COASTAL CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

NRC Staff hereby requests that the Coastal Chamber of Commerce of New Hampshire (CCCNH), pursuant to 10 C.F.R. §§ 2.740b and 2.741, answer separately and fully, in writing under oath or affirmation, the following interrogatories and produce and permit inspection and copying of the original or best copy of all documents identified in the responses to interrogatories below, and that subsequent to filing answers to these interrogatories and producing documents therein identified, CCCNH file supplemental responses and produce additional documents as required by 10 C.F.R. § 2.740(e).

Where identification of a document is requested, briefly describe the document (e.g., book, letter, memorandum, report) and state the following information as applicable for the particular document: name, title, number, author, date of publication and publisher, addressee, date written or approved, and the name and address of the person(s) having possession of the document.

DESIGNATED ORIGINAL

Certified By _____

[Handwritten signature]
AS07

8211120209 821110
PDR ADOCK 05000443
G PDR

As used in these discovery requests the term "document(s)" includes publications of any format, letters, memoranda, notes, reports, analyses, test results or data, recordings, transcriptions and printed, typed or written materials of every kind.

I. INTERROGATORY I

For each contention listed in the Specific Interrogatories contained herein (CCCNH Hampshire Contentions 4, 5, and 7), state the following information separately for each contention:

Q.I(1) Upon what person or persons do you rely to substantiate in whole or in part the view(s) as stated in this contention?

Q.I(2) Provide the addresses and education and professional qualifications of any person(s) named in response to the above interrogatory.

Q.I(3) Identify any person(s) you may call as a witness or witnesses on this contention.

Q.I(4) Provide summaries of the views, positions, or proposed testimony on this contention of all persons named in response to interrogatories (1) and (3) immediately above that you may present during this proceeding.

Q.I(5) State the specific bases and references to any documents upon which the persons named in Interrogatories 1 and 3 immediately above may rely or reference regarding this contention.

Q.I(6) List all documentary or other materials that you may use during this proceeding to support this contention or refer to during examination of witnesses. The list should be by author, title, date of

publication (if applicable), and publisher (if applicable). In addition to listing such documents, provide a copy of all documents (except for those that are NRC documents or documents provided to the NRC in this proceeding, which need only be listed). If you are uncertain as to whether a document was provided to the NRC, provide that document.

II. CCCNH 4

The Applicant has not adequately demonstrated that it has developed and will be able to implement procedures necessary to assess the impact of an accident, classify it properly, and notify adequately its own personnel, the affected government bodies, and the public, all of which is required under 10 C.F.R. 50.47 and Appendix E, and NUREG-0654.

Q.4(a) List and describe in detail each provision of the Applicant's emergency plan which you believe violates provisions of either 10 C.F.R. 50.47, 10 C.F.R. Part 50, Appendix E, or NUREG-0654.

4(b) State the precise provisions of 10 C.F.R. 50.47 and Appendix E and NUREG-0654 that each of the emergency plan shortcomings listed in the answer to question 4(a) violates and describe how these deficiencies should be corrected.

4(c) Describe in detail how the emergency classification and action scheme outlined in Section 9 of the Applicant's Emergency plan is inadequate and state the steps that New Hampshire believes must be taken for it to satisfy the requirements of 10 C.F.R. 50.47(b)(4) and NUREG-0654, App. 1.

4(d) Provide the basis for your assertion (on page 5 of your June 8, contentions) that the emergency plan's initiating procedures must include the postulated accidents in the FSAR and Emergency Plan.

4(e) On page 5 of the contentions you submitted on June 8, you state: "The Environmental Plan should state the basis for selecting a certain emergency action level." Give the basis or reasons for requiring the Environmental Plan to state the basis for selecting a certain emergency action level.

4(f) Explain in detail your reasons, and bases therefor, for requiring that the responsibilities of the Unit Shift Supervisor and the Shift Superintendent relating to Emergency Implementing Procedure be more clearly delineated and the steps necessary to reach the correct level of delineation.

4(g) State in detail: (1) how the Applicant's Emergency Plan fails to meet the provision for the adequate, continued staffing required by 10 C.F.R. 50.47(b)(2) and NUREG-0654, Table B-1; (2) the bases or explanation for this assertion; and (3) how you believe this alleged deficiency should be corrected.

4(h) State how the Emergency Plan fails to meet the provision of NUREG-0654, Criteria J.7, page 60 and the steps that should be taken to correct this deficiency.

4(i) State in detail: (1) how the notification process outlined in Section 3 of the Applicant's Emergency Plan will involve unnecessary delay in implementing protective actions; (2) the bases or reasons for this assertion, and (3) the corrective steps that you assert should be taken.

4(j) State the bases for asserting that the Emergency Plan fails to provide for prompt notification directly to all off-site authorities and describe how this alleged deficiency should be corrected.

4(k) List and describe in detail the steps that you feel must be taken by the Applicant in order to provide an adequate mechanism for

making protective action recommendations, including the basis for making such recommendations, to the appropriate State and local authorities.

4(l) Provide the bases for the assertion that the emergency plan fails to satisfy the requirements of 10 C.F.R. 50.47(b)(7) and describe how the plan should be corrected in this regard.

4(m) Describe in detail the program that you believe should be adopted to acquaint the news media with the emergency plans and provide the basis therefor.

III. CCCNH 5

The Applicant has failed to demonstrate adequate on-site and off-site protective measures in the event of an emergency in accordance with 10 C.F.R. 50.47(a)(b), 10 C.F.R. 50, App. E, and NUREG-0654.

Q.5(a) List in detail the provisions of the Applicants' Emergency Plan that you contend are inadequate and provide the bases and reasons for these assertions.

5(b) State the steps that you feel must be taken to remedy the alleged deficiencies in the plan.

5(c) Provide the bases and explanation for the assertion that the plan does not meet the requirements of 10 C.F.R. 50.47(b)(12) and describe what you contend must be done to rectify the situation.

5(d) Explain in detail why you believe the FSAR does not sufficiently demonstrate how injured personnel will be treated or the adequacy of medical services that have been arranged, and describe what you contend must be done to correct this alleged deficiency.

5(e) Do you contend that the Applicants have not demonstrated in their Emergency Plan that, in the event of an accident at the Seabrook

facility, they will be able to protect individuals located on-site? If so, provide the bases and explanation for the assertion (including specific references to the Applicants' Plan) and describe the additional measures you contend are required.

5(f) List and explain: (1) any insufficiency of the plan in indicating upon what bases protective action decisions will be made and how protective actions will be implemented; (2) the bases for asserting there is an insufficiency; and (3) the steps that you believe must be taken to correct this insufficiency.

5(g) Do you contend that the plan does not comply with 10 C.F.R. 50.47(b)(10) and NUREG-0654? If so, state the bases and explain the reasons for this assertion and the means by which these provisions may be satisfied.

IV. CCCNH 7

The Seabrook design does not provide an adequate program for monitoring the release of radioactivity to the plant and its environs either under normal operating conditions or in pre- and post-accident circumstances. Thus, the application is not in compliance with general design criteria 63, 64 of Appendix A, 10 C.F.R. Part 50, and the requirements of NUREG-0737 and NUREG-0800.

Q.7(a) Specify in detail: (1) the equipment, components, and procedures of the Seabrook in-plant monitoring system that you allege are not in compliance with GDC Nos. 63 and 64 of 10 C.F.R. Part 50,

Appendix A, or the requirements of NUREG-0737; (2) the precise requirements of GDC 63, GDC 64 and Appendix A that are alleged to have not been met; (3) the reasons for asserting non-compliance for each GDC or Appendix A; and (4) the means by which you believe these alleged deficiencies can be cured.

7(b) Are you alleging that there is a lack of adequate monitoring capacity in terms of the range of monitoring equipment and the location and number of monitoring sites? If so, provide the bases for this assertion and describe what you believe should be done to correct any shortcomings.

7(c) Do you assert that radiation monitoring for radioactivity which may be released due to anticipated operational occurrences at Seabrook is inadequate to protect the public health and safety? If so, state the bases for this assertion and explain how any such shortcomings or inadequacies can be corrected.

7(d) Provide and discuss in detail your bases for asserting that the Applicants will not provide sufficient radiation monitoring capacity in containment spaces which could contain LOCA fluids, effluent discharge paths, and plant environs as required by General Design Criterion 64.


7(e) Are you asserting that the health physics division at the plant is not qualified or properly staffed to perform its function? If so, provide in detail the basis for such assertion. Include in your

response a discussion of the provisions of Regulatory Guide 1.97 assertedly not being met by the Seabrook Applicants.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert G. Perlis
Counsel for NRC Staff



Roy P. Lessy
Deputy Assistant Chief
Hearing Counsel

Dated at Bethesda, Maryland
this

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

BEFORE THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD

In the Matter of)

PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY OF)
NEW HAMPSHIRE, et al.)

(Seabrook Station, Units 1 and 2))

Docket Nos. 50-443 OL
50-444 OL

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that copies of "NRC STAFF'S INTERROGATORIES AND REQUESTS FOR DOCUMENT PRODUCTION TO THE COASTAL CHAMBER OF NEW HAMPSHIRE" in the above-captioned proceeding have been served on the following by deposit in the United States mail, first class, or, as indicated by an asterisk, through deposit in the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's internal mail system, this 10th day of November, 1982:

Helen Hoyt, Esq., Chairman*
Administrative Judge
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board
Panel
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

Dr. Jerry Harbour*
Administrative Judge
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board
Panel
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

Lynn Chong
Bill Corkum
Gary McCool
Box 65
Plymouth, NH 03264

E. Tupper Kinder, Esq.
Assistant Attorney General
Environmental Protection Division
Office of the Attorney General
State House Annex
Concord, NH 03301

Dr. Emmeth A. Luebke*
Administrative Judge
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board
Panel
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

Jo Ann Shotwell, Asst. Attorney
Office of the Attorney General
Environmental Protection Division
One Ashburton Place, 19th Floor
Boston, MA 02108

Beverly Hollingworth
7 A Street
Hampton Beach, NH 03842

Nicholas J. Costello
1st Essex District
Whitehall Road
Amesbury, MA 01913

Robert L. Chiesa, Esq.
Wadleigh, Starr, Peters, Dunn
& Kohls
95 Market Street
Manchester, NH 03101

Robert A. Backus, Esq.
116 Lowell Street
P.O. Box 516
Manchester, NH 03105

Ms. Patti Jacobson
3 Orange Street
Newburyport, MA 01950

Docketing and Service Section*
Office of the Secretary
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

Wilfred L. Sanders, Esq.
Lawrence M. Edelman, Esq.
Sanders and McDermott
408 Lafayette Road
Hampton, NH 03842

Thomas G. Dignan, Jr., Esq.
Ropes & Gray
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110

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

Jane Doughty
Field Director
Seacoast Anti-Pollution League
5 Market Street
Portsmouth, NH 03801

David R. Lewis*
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

William S. Jordan, III, Esq.
Ellyn R. Weiss, Esq.
Harmon & Weiss
1725 I Street, N.W.
Suite 506
Washington, D.C. 20006

Phillip Ahrens, Esq.
Assistant Attorney General
State House Station #6
Augusta, ME 04333


Donald L. Herzberger, MD
Hitchcock Hospital
Hanover, NH 03755

Edward J. McDermott, Esq.
Ann C. Thompson, Esq.
Sanders and McDermott
408 Lafayette Road
Hampton, NH 03842

Sen. Robert L. Preston
State of New Hampshire Senate
Concord, NH 03301

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

Brian P. Cassidy
Regional Counsel
FEMA, Region 1
John W. McCormack Post Office &
Courthouse
Boston, MA 02109



Robert G. Perlis
Counsel for NRC Staff