UNITED STATES OF AMERICA NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

BEFORE THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD

In the Matter of

PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY OF Docket Nos. 50-443 OL NEW HAMPSHIRE, et al.

(Seabrook Station, Units 1 and 2)

ANSWER AND OBJECTIONS OF THE NRC STAFF
TO "THE HAMPTON BEACH AREA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE'S INTERROGATORIES AND REQUEST FOR
PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS TO THE . . . STAFF AND APPLICANT

By a document dated January 17, 1983, the Hampton Beach Area Chamber of Commerce of New Hampshire, formerly the Coastal Chamber of Commerce, after having ignored the interrogatories and document requests propounded to it by the Staff and Applicant respectively, 1/2 has now propounded an identical set of interrogatories to the Staff and Applicant. The problem of course, is that the Board ruled orally in a Conference Call of December 22, 1982, 2/2 that discovery had closed (i.e., the last discovery requests had to be filed) on January 7, 1983. The January 7, 1983 date represented an approximate three week extension for discovery, afforded by the Licensing

DESIGNATED ORIGINAL

Certified By_

0507

8302080039 830204 PDR ADOCK 05000443 C PDR

Appropriate motions have been filed by the Staff and Applicant with regard to this aspect of "HBALL's" "participation" in this proceeding.

^{2/} Confirmed in writing by a "Memorandum and Order" of January 17, 1983.

Board pursuant to requests by certain parties (not including HBCCNH), for an extension of the discovery period. Prior to this extension, the last date for filing discovery requests had previously been December 13, 1982.3/

On January 17, 1983, HBCCNH, without explanation for its lateness, has filed twenty-one interrogatories directed to the Staff and Applicant.

Interrogatories IA-D are virtually identical 4/ and in essence state that

The HBACCNH, at the direction of the Licensing Board Memorandum and Order September 13, 1982 to coordinate efforts with the State of New Hampshire, submits all the Interrogtories which the State has submitted to date for Contention NH-20. The HBACCNH reserves the right to amend or submit additional interrogatories if desired or if new evidence arises.

B. HBACCNH Contention 5. On-Site Protective Measures

The HBACCNH submits all interrogatories which the State of New Hampshire has submitted to date for Contention NH-21. The HBACCNH reserves the right to amend or submit additional interrogatories if desired or if new evidence arises.

C. HBACCNH Contention 7. Radioactive Monitoring

The HBACCNH submits all interrogatories which the State of New Hampshire has submitted to date for Contention NH-9. The HBACCNH reserves the right to amend or submit additional interrogatories if desired or if new evidence arises.

D. HBACCNH Contention 8. Control Room Design

The HBACCNH, at the direction of the Licensing Board Memorandum and Order September 13, 1982 to join with the State of New Hampshire on NH-10, submits all interrogatories which the State has submitted to date for NH-20. The HBACCNH reserves the right to amend or submit additional interrogatories if desired or if new evidence arises."

^{3/ &}quot;Memorandum and Order," September 15, 1982.

^{4/ &}quot;I. Interrogatories

A. HBACCNH Contention 4. Accident Classification and Notification.

HBCCNH "submits all interrogatories which the State of New Hampshire has submitted to date" on the particular contention. The Staff has already responded to New Hampshire's discovery requests but will include, as an attachment hereto to its response to HBCCNH the following documents:

NRC Staff Response To First Set Of Interrogatories And Request For Production Of Documents Of The State Of New Hampshire (November 30, 1982)

NRC Staff Response To . . . New Hampshire's Second Set of Interrogatories . . .

NRC Staff Response To New Hampshire's Third Set Of Interrogatories

Secondly, CCCNH has propounded twenty-one interrogatories to the Staff and Applicant. Those interrogatories are attached hereto as an Appendix. The Staff objects to these interrogatories for the following reasons. First, the interrogatories and document requests have been filed beyond the close of the Board-extended discovery period. The interrogatories are particularly late inasmuch as HBCCNH failed to participate in the discovery period allotted by the Board, and declined to answer interrogatories and document requests propounded by other parties although directed to do so. 5/ Second, the interrogatories and document requests violate 10 C.F.R. § 2.740(b)(1) of the Commission's Rules of Practice in that the attempted discovery does not relate to admitted contentions. 10 C.F.R. § 2.740(b)(1) expressly provides,

In a proceeding on an application for . . . an operating license . . ., discovery . . . shall relate only to those matters in controversy which have been identified by the

^{5/} This point is developed in greater detail in "Motion Of The NRC Staff To Compel Answers To Interrogatories By Coastal Chamber Of Commerce Of New Fampshire Or In The Alternative, Motion To Dismiss CCCNH Contentions 4, 5, And 7." (February 4, 1983).

. . . presiding officer in the prehearing order entered at the conclusion of . . . [the 2.751a] that prehearing conference.

Indeed, the subject matter of these interrogatories, the "Effects Operating (sic) the Seabrook Station in the Local Economy," relate to no admitted contention but rather, most closely relate to the <u>rejected</u> SAPL-3 contention, concerning the alleged negative impact of the closure of Seabrook on the economic well-being of the local tourist area. 6/

Third, controlling Commission precedent regarding discovery against the Staff has been clearly set forth in <u>Pennsylvania Power and Light Company</u> (Susquehanna Steam Electric Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-613, 12 NRC 317, 323. (footnote omitted):

Discovery again the Staff is on a different footing. With limited exceptions, Commission regulations make staff documents that are relevant to licensing proceedings routinely available in the NRC Public Document Room. 10 C.F.R. 2.790(a). The comtemplation [sic] is that these "should reasonably disclose the basis for the Staff's position," thereby reducing any need for formal discovery. Reflective of that policy, the Rules of Practice limit documentary discovery against the Staff to items not reasonably obtainable from other sources, 10 C.F.R. 2.744; require a showing of "exceptional circumstances" to depose Staff personnel, 10 C.F.R. 2.720(h) and 2.740a(j); and allow interrogatories addressed to the Staff only "where the information is necessary to a proper decision in the case and not obtainable elsewhere." See 10 C.F.R. 2.720(h)(2)(ii). In addition, the licensing board's advance permission is needed to depose Staff members or to require the Staff to answer written interrogatories. Ibid.

Therefore, the Staff also objects to these interrogatories and document requests in that HBCCNH has violated 10 C.F.R. § (h)(2)(ii), since it has not demonstrated that the answers to its questions are necessary to a

^{6/} See "Memorandum and Order" p. 95 (September 13, 1982).

proper decision in this proceeding. Since the subject matter of the interrogatories does not relate to admitted contentions it will be difficult, if not impossible for HBCCNH to demonstrate that the answers are necessary or essential to a proper decision.

Respectfully submitted,

Roy P. Lessy

Counsel for NRC Staff

Dated at Bethesda, Maryland this 4th day of February, 1983 Section 5.8.3 Effects Operating the Seabrook Station on the Local Economy Please state the complete citation for Bykoski, L. M., et al, listed in section 5.8.3 and 5.14. What is the ASLB case name and number? Please identify the government officals and business people interviewed 2. at each of the 10 locations indicated in Table 5.3 (Section 5.8.3) for each year: 1976, 1978 and 1981. What criteria or standards did the Staff use to evaluate negative or 3. positive impacts on the local economies in the Bykoski study. What is the Staff's position as to the relevancy of the Bykoski study 4. to the Seabrook area? Please state the reasons for the Staff's position. Please identify those Staff members conducting the Bykoski study. Please identify those Staff members preparing Section 5.8.3 and 6.

including the Bykoski study.

- Has the Staff conducted a similar interview at the Seabrook location? 7. If so, please state the date(s) of the interviews, locations and names, and addresses and occupations of the interviewees.
- Section 5.8.3, page 5-15, last paragraph states: "In addition to the Staff's study, research was undertaken to estimate tourist avoidance in the vicinity of offshore floating nuclear power plants." NUREG 0-39 provides the basis of the research. Please list all off-shore floating nuclear power plants studied in NUREG 0394 and citations to relevant NUGEG - 0394 sections.
- Explain the reasons why the Staff chose to include the NUREG 0394 9. research in Section 5.8.3.
- 10. Explain the relevance of offshore floating nuclear power plants to the proposed Seabrook Units.
- 11. Please provide the following data concerning the offshore floating nuclear power plants studied in NUREG 0394 and relied on in Section 5.8.3 including but not limited to: type of plant, operational capacity, distance from beach, permanent and seasonal population figures, and distance to nearest population center.
- 12. Please list the names, addresses of "those interviewed" at the beaches studied in NUREG 0394. Please include the date and location of the interview.
- 13. Please identify the Staff who conducted the interviews.
- 14. Please list or provide a separate copy of the questions posed to the interviewees.
- 15. Please explain the criteria or standards which the Staff used to evaluate beach-user avoidance.

- 16. Please explain how "avoidance potential" is determined (Section 5.8.3, page 5-16, last paragraph).
- 17. Explain the reasons why the staff applied the avoidance potential to the encremental increase in potential beach users overtime? Please provide the data used and calculations.
- 18. Explain the reasons why the Staff chose to apply the calculations above to the beaches of Seabrook.
- 19. Please provide all data collected and calculations made concerning the beach-user avoidance at Seabrook.
- 20. Please explain the reasons why the Staff chose to rely on the Hecock study cited in Section 5.8.3, pages 5-17, and in Section 5.14 on pages 5-77. Please produce, pursuant to 10 CFR 2.741 the Hecock and McConnell studies relevant to the conclusion in Section 5.8.3.
- 21. Please cite all sections of the Hecock/McConnell studies which address behavior patterns or beach use relative to nuclear power plants.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Beverly Hollingsworth, do hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing Hampton Beach Chamber of Commerce Interrogatories and Request for Production of Documents to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission Staff has been mailed this ______, by first class mail, postage prepaid, to:

Helen F. Hoyt, Chm.
Administrative Judge
Atomic Safety and Licensing
Board Panel
U.S. NRC
Washington, D.C. 20555

Dr. Jerry Harbor
Administrative Judge
Atomic Safety and Licensing
Board Panel
U.S. NRC
Washington, D.C. 20555

Robert A. Backus, Esquire 116 Lowell Street P. O. Box 516 Manchester, N.H. Obs.05

Phillip Ahrens, Esquire Assistant Attorney General State House, Station #6 Augusta, Maine U4333 Dr. Emmeth A. Luebke
Administrative Judge
Atomic Safety and Licensing
Board Panel
U.S. NRC
Washington, D.C. 20555

On Ann Shotwell, Asst. AG Office of the Attorney General One Ashburton Place, 19th Floor Boston, MA 02108

William S. Jordan, II, Esquire Ellyn R. Weiss, Esquire Harmon and Weiss 1725 I Street, N.W. Suite 506 Washington, D.C. 20006

Edward J. McDermott, Esquire Sanders and McDermott 408 Lafayette Road Hampton, N.H. 03842

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 "ANSWER AND OBJECTIONS OF THE NRC STAFF TO 'THE HAMPTON BEACH AREA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE'S INTERROGATORIES AND REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS TO THE . . . STAFF AND APPLICANT'" 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 4th day of February, 1983:

Helen Hoyt, Esq., Chairman*
Administrative Judge
Atomic Safety and Licensing Poard
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

Beverly Hollingworth 7 A Street Hampton Beach, NH 03842

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

Edward F. Meany Town of Rye, New Hampshire 155 Washington Road Rye, NH 03870 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

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

Sandra Gavutis Town of Kensington, New Hampshire RFD 1 East Kingston, NH 03827

Roberta C. Pevear Town of Hampton Falls, New Hampshire Drinkwater Road Hampton Falls, NH 03844 Robert A. Backus, Esq. 116 Lowell Street P.O. Box 516 Manchester, NH 03105

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

David R. Lewis*
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board
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

Docketing and Service Section*
Office of the Secretary
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

John B. Tanzer Town of Hampton, New Hampshire 5 Morningside Drive Hampton, NH 03842

Letty Hett Town of Brentwood RFD Dalton Road Brentwood, NH 03833

Roy P. Lessy

Deputy Assistant Chief Hearing Counsel