

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

DOCKETED
USNRC

BEFORE THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD

In the Matter of)

84 APR 16 10:54

GEORGIA POWER COMPANY)
et al.)

Docket Nos. 50-424 and 50-425

(Vogtle Electric Generating Plant,)
Units 1 and 2))

SUPPLEMENT TO PETITION FOR LEAVE TO INTERVENE AND REQUEST FOR HEARING
Campaign for a Prosperous Georgia

Pursuant to an Order dated March 9, 1984 of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board in the above-captioned proceeding, Campaign for a Prosperous Georgia hereby submits the supplement to its Request for Hearing and Petition for Leave to Intervene filed January 27, 1984. The contentions which Campaign for a Prosperous Georgia seeks to have admitted in this proceeding are as follows:

CPG 1

There is no reasonable assurance that Plant Vogtle will be "substantially completed, on a timely basis" as required by 10 CFR part 2, Appendix A, Section VIII(b)(1).

Numerous nuclear power plants throughout the United States have been cancelled as a result of declining growth, increasing construction and financing costs, and availability of alternatives. All these factors appear in Georgia. (See CPG Contentions 2, 3 and 4.)

In addition to the three factors outlined above and described in detail in the following contentions, the partners in this project face financing difficulties that may well prevent the completion of construction. These difficulties have not been addressed by the Applicant.

The Georgia Public Service Commission has recently ruled that a complete review of Georgia Power's construction program will be required before any further

8404170480 840411
PDR ADOCK 05000424
PDR 1

7503

financing will be allowed. This ruling preceded by less than three weeks an announced bond issuance totalling \$150 million and came in a proceeding in which Georgia Power requested permission to obtain \$750 million for construction-related expenditures. Failure to obtain the financing--a likelihood if the PSC follows through on its commitment to review the prudence of the construction program (see CPG Contentions 2, 3 and 4)--will likely result in significant delay and/or cancellation of one or both of the Vogtle facilities.

Should the PSC reverse its determination that the construction program of Georgia Power must be reviewed, Campaign for a Prosperous Georgia plans to file suit to require the PSC to complete such a review before allowing the financing; Georgia law requires that the PSC approve the "purpose" for which any financing is to be used before such financing is pursued.

Georgia Power itself has implicitly acknowledged that it is in financial trouble. In the current financing proceeding, the Company requested a sinking fund provision to protect potential investors. According to the Company witness (under cross-examination by Campaign for a Prosperous Georgia), the last time the Company used such a provision was 1975, a time when the Company nearly went bankrupt and required two emergency rate increases to remain solvent.

Additionally, Georgia Power is defendant in a suit in Fulton Superior Court, Fulton County, Georgia, for collecting allegedly illegally high rates since October 1, 1983. (Civil Action D-6943) Should Georgia Power lose that suit, it would be required to lower its rates and to refund millions of dollars collected since October. Rates could not be increased unless and until the Company could demonstrate the need for such higher rates following full hearings by the Public Service Commission; this could take up to six months following preparation and filing of the rate increase application, which itself could take several months.

There is no reasonable assurance that the production capacity of Plant Vogtle will be needed, as required by NEPA (42 USC 4331-4335) and by NRC regs (10 CFR 50.42) and other laws, rules and regulations.

Originally issued a construction permit for Plant Vogtle in 1974, Georgia Power anticipated annual growth in electricity sales in excess of 10%. Annual electricity sales growth by Georgia Power in its territory has declined steadily. In no year since the construction permit was originally issued has growth in electricity sales matched the average on which the Nuclear Regulatory Commission predicated the construction permit, let alone the average which Georgia Power forecast. In fact, never has the growth exceeded 6%, the average growth since Georgia Power applied for a construction permit in 1973 has been less than 2%, and the average annual growth in the last six years has been less than 1% (Georgia Power Company Financial and Statistical Review 1973-1983).

During the Atomic Energy Commission hearings on the construction permit application by Georgia Power (April 16, 1974 transcript), Georgia Power executive Bob Scherer told the Commission, "I believe there are still important economies of scale to be gained in the future, particularly in nuclear generation." Scherer added, "...the demand for electricity is relatively price inelastic." Of course, history has proven him wrong on both counts--as other witnesses at the time warned. The decline in growth described above can be directly attributed to a price increase of more than 250% from 1972 through 1982.

Consequently, Scherer also erred in his forecasts of peak demand. He projected that in 1980, peak demand would be 16,728 megawatts while in fact it was 11,154 megawatts; he predicted a 1981 peak of 18,528 MW and the actual peak was 11,514 MW; he predicted a 1982 peak demand of 20,528 MW while the actual peak was 10,683 MW; and he predicted a 1983 peak demand of 22,728 MW while the actual peak demand was only 12,257 MW. These lowered peaks occurred despite the absence of any serious actions on the part of Georgia Power to control peak demand.

Georgia Power's load factor has steadily declined in the past decade, from 59.7% in 1973 to just 51.9% in 1983. This reflects a tremendous peak relative to base load, precisely the kind of demand curve that requires cutbacks on baseload plant construction and increased use of ways to control the peak (such as radio load control).

Georgia Power is already greatly overbuilt. A 1978 Congressional report stated "Georgia Power Company rated first (in annual cost to consumers of excess generating capacity) with overcharges of \$39 million." (Nuclear Power Costs, US House Committee on Government Operations, 1978) Since that time, the overcapacity problem has become even worse in Georgia as several more coal and hydroelectric plants have begun operation while growth has not been commensurate with this new capacity. In fact, territorial kilowatt-hour sales have increased at a rate of less than 1% per year despite some of the most severe weather conditions ever recorded in Georgia.

In addition to Plant Vogtle, Georgia Power is constructing nine other generating units, including Plant Scherer Unit 3 (818 megawatts), Plant Scherer Unit 4 (818 megawatts), Bartletts Ferry Units 5 and 6 (108 megawatts), Goat Rock Units 7 and 8 (67 megawatts) and Rocky Mountain Units 1, 2 and 3 (847.8 megawatts) (Georgia Power Company Annual Report 1983). Thus, the Company's overcapacity problem will be compounded if and when Plant Vogtle comes on line, particularly in view of the increased use of alternative energy sources including conservation.

Even if additional capacity were needed, Plant Vogtle would not be the best way to provide it. Expert testimony before the PSC has stated that it may be more prudent economically to invest in alternatives (particularly conservation and solar energy) than to operate Plant Vogtle even if the plant is completed. Clearly, conservation and solar energy are less injurious to the physical and human environment than Plant Vogtle would be.

The Georgia Public Service Commission has also questioned whether Plant Vogtle will be needed. In Georgia Power's most recent rate case, the Commission reversed

its previous practice and disallowed Plant Vogtle's nuclear fuel from the rate base, stating in its final order dated January 17, 1984, "Of course, at the present time, Plant Vogtle is not operational and it is not expected that it will produce electricity for several more years, if at all...It is the Commission's position, as it has made clear from previous orders, that to be included in rate base an investment must be used and useful to the retail ratepayer, if not immediately, at least in the reasonably near future. In the context of the nuclear fuel purchased for Plant Vogtle, since the plant itself is not yet in operation, it is obvious that the nuclear fuel purchased by the Company for use in that plant is not currently used or useful to the retail ratepayer, and cannot be for some time, if at all." (emphasis added) (Ga. PSC Docket No. 3397-U, Order on Reconsideration, January 17, 1984, pp. 3-4) It is important to note that in past cases, the PSC allowed the Vogtle fuel to be included in rate base although the plant was further from operation than in 3397-U, demonstrating that a key concern to the PSC is whether the plant will ever be "useful" as well as whether it will ever be "used."

A solar water heating system could be installed on every household in Georgia at less cost than the remaining cost of the Vogtle Nuclear Plant. Said water heaters would provide more energy, would provide more jobs and would have far less negative environmental impact than completion and operation of Plant Vogtle. Furthermore, conservation measures will provide even greater return on the investment than solar water heating. Yet, Georgia Power does not address these issues.

Clearly, as conditions relating to economics, electric consumption patterns, and availability of alternative energy sources have changed since the construction permit was issued for Plant Vogtle, Applicant must make a full assessment of the current and future need for the plant, as required by the National Environmental Policy Act and NRC regulations. Applicant has not assessed the need for the

facility.

CPG 3

There is no reasonable assurance that Georgia Power Company and co-owners will have the financial ability to safely operate Plant Vogtle for the period of the license or to permanently shut down the facility and maintain it in a safe condition, as required by 10 CFR 50.40(b), and other applicable laws, rules and regulations.

As described in the previous contention (CPG-2), it is clear that Plant Vogtle is not needed. As even Georgia Power acknowledges, the Georgia Public Service Commission ("the PSC") must ascertain prudence of Georgia Power investments before allowing them to be included in the rate base. If a facility is imprudent or is not used and useful for ratepayers, the PSC should refuse to allow it to be charged to the ratepayers.

In determining the prudence of rate base items in a rate proceeding, if the PSC determines that an overcapacity exists--that certain capacity is not useful for retail ratepayers--then the PSC will not allow Georgia Power to include in rate base the most expensive (and therefore least prudent) portion of new capacity representing the percentage of overcapacity needed to bring the Company down to a level commensurate with safe reserve margins. Plant Vogtle is by far the most expensive capacity under construction. In fact, Plant Vogtle, according to Georgia Power, will cost \$6.6 billion to construct (including financing during construction) while all production plants in operation at the end of 1983 combined cost only \$2.9 billion (Georgia Power Company Financial and Statistical Review 1973-1983). The fact that Georgia Power has sold all electrical capacity in the four Scherer coal-fired units through 1992 (Georgia Public Service Commission Docket #3397-U), and that the electricity from the Scherer coal plants will be substantially cheaper than that from the Vogtle nuclear units, increases the likelihood that the PSC will conclude that Georgia Power acted imprudently in constructing the Vogtle nuclear units.

In addition, the PSC may look at the prudence of alternative investments, such as conservation and alternative energy. Expert testimony before the PSC in a previous proceeding has stated that it may be more prudent economically to invest in alternatives (particularly conservation and solar energy) than to operate Plant Vogtle even if the plant is completed. This increases the likelihood that the PSC will exclude Plant Vogtle from the rate base.

As mentioned in CPG-2, considerable evidence from the PSC itself suggests that the PSC will exclude Plant Vogtle from the rate base. Until Georgia Power's most recent rate hike request, the PSC had allowed the Company to include nuclear fuel for Plant Vogtle in the rate base. In the most recent rate case (Docket #3397-U), expert testimony indicated that the financial problems facing Georgia Power were a direct result of overconstruction of power plants. Subsequently, the Commission, in its final order dated January 17, 1984, ruled, "Of course, at the present time, Plant Vogtle is not operational and it is not expected that it will produce electricity for several more years, if at all...It is the Commission's position, as it has made clear from previous orders, that to be included in rate base an investment must be used and useful to the retail ratepayer, if not immediately, at least in the reasonably near future. In the context of the nuclear fuel purchased for Plant Vogtle, since the plant itself is not yet in operation, it is obvious that the nuclear fuel purchased by the Company for use in that plant is not currently used or useful to the retail ratepayer, and cannot be for some time, if at all. As a consequence, the Commission finds as a matter of fact that the nuclear fuel purchased by the Company for use in Plant Vogtle should be excluded from rate base." (emphasis added) (Ga. PSC Docket No. 3397-U, Order on Reconsideration, January 17, 1984, pp. 3-4) It is important to note that in past cases, the PSC allowed the Vogtle fuel to be included in rate base although the plant was further from operation than in 3397-U, demonstrating that a key concern to the PSC is whether the plant will ever be "useful" as well as "used."

Petitioner contends that PSC will disallow Plant Vogtle as not used or useful even if said plant is completed and Georgia Power attempts to place it in the rate base.

Another potential financial burden which the Company has failed to address is the impact of changes in federal income tax accounting being considered by Financial Accounting Standards Board and the U.S. Congress. These changes could remove or reduce tax incentives for unneeded construction, particularly in cases where conservation and other renewable energy has not been aggressively promoted. According to Georgia Power, its total accumulated deferred income taxes (net) at the end of 1983 totalled over \$800 million (Georgia Power Company Financial and Statistical Review 1973-1983); hundreds of millions of dollars more in investment tax credits might be "flowed through" to consumers by the regulators if the changes being considered are implemented.

Georgia Power will be unable to safely operate the facility and will be unable to safely shut down and maintain the facility in the face of these self-inflicted financial situations.

Furthermore, partners in the project will be unable to financially offset Georgia Power's inability to safely operate the plant. Indeed, it may be difficult for the partners to finance their shares of the facility. The financial burden faced by the other partners--Oglethorpe Power Corporation (and its thirty-nine member electric membership corporations), Municipal Electric Authority of Georgia (and its forty-seven members) and the City of Dalton--far exceeds their entire assets. Recent efforts by the Reagan Administration to remove financial guarantees for electric cooperatives will, if successful, have substantial impact on OPC's ability to finance its share of the facilities. The Washington Public Power Supply System's municipal members defaulted on their share of that five-unit nuclear project, and the cities in Georgia may face a similar situation. MEAG has estimated

that its share of Plant Vogtle will cost approximately \$2.3 billion; this compares with the entire general bonded indebtedness of all its members of less than \$128 million, less than one-seventeenth their share of Plant Vogtle (Official Statement, \$300,000,000, Municipal Electric Authority of Georgia, General Power Revenue Bonds, 1984A Series, Dated March 1, 1984).

CPG 4

The applicant has not reasonably explored alternatives to the plant as required by NEPA (42 USC 4332(c)) and NRC (10 CFR 40.42(a)) and other laws, rules and regulations.

Plant Vogtle is the most expensive construction project in Georgia history and will cost more than all currently operating power plants combined. Alternatives including conservation may cost less than running costs alone for Plant Vogtle, according to expert testimony presented before the Georgia Public Service Commission.

A solar water heating system could be installed on every household in Georgia at less cost than the remaining cost of the Vogtle Nuclear Plant. Said water heaters would provide more energy, would provide more jobs and would have far less negative environmental impact than completion and operation of Plant Vogtle. Conservation measures will provide even greater return on the investment than solar water heating. Yet, Georgia Power does not address these issues.

Clearly, alternatives to the operation of Plant Vogtle would mitigate environmental damage, and therefore the NRC would be in violation of the National Environmental Policy Act if it granted an operating license before reviewing alternatives to the operation of the Vogtle Nuclear Plant.

CPG 5

The applicant has not properly assessed the geology of the site and has not properly considered the geology of the site in the engineering design of the project, especially in light of new data made available by the U.S. Geological Survey. This violates NRC rules on seismic standards described in 10 CFR Part 100, Appendix A, and other applicable laws, rules and regulations.

The U.S. Geological Survey has postulated the existence of the Millett earthquake fault seven miles from the Vogtle reactor site. (U.S. Geological Survey Open File Report 82-156) Petitioner disputes applicant's claim that the fault is not capable.

Further, USGS has pointed out to NRC that "after several years of intensive study in the Charleston region, no geologic structure or feature can be identified unequivocally as the source of the 1886 Charleston earthquake." (letter from James F. Devine, Assistant Director for Engineering Geology, USGS, to Robert E. Jackson, Chief, Geosciences Branch, Division of Engineering, NRC, dated November 16, 1982)

The Charleston earthquake was the second worst recorded in American history and was more intense than the San Francisco earthquake. USGS in 1887 said of the Charleston Earthquake, the "area within which motion was sufficient to attract...attention would be somewhat more than that circumscribed by a circle of a thousand miles radius. Six hundred miles from the origins, the long swaying motion was felt and was often sufficient to produce seasickness (nausea)." USGS reported that the earthquake was felt in the Adirondacks; Ontario, Canada; Michigan; Milwaukee and Green Bay, Wisconsin; and even Cuba. In eastern Kentucky and southeastern Ohio, "chimneys and bricks were shaken down." USGS went on to say, "In all of the large towns within two hundred miles of Charleston, more or less damage was suffered...dams were broken (on the Savannah River and near Barnwell)...At Augusta, 110 miles distant from the epicentrum, the damage to buildings was considerable...(For example) at the Arsenal, the commanding officer's residence was so badly cracked and shattered as to necessitate practical reconstruction...In Atlanta, 250 miles distant, there was no worse injury than falling chimneys and some slight cracks in the wall, but the houses were instantly abandoned in great alarm and confusion by their occupants, and many preferred passing the night in the streets to re-entering their dwellings."

The situation in Charleston itself was, of course, even worse. The words of an eyewitness survivor are particularly relevant to this proceeding:

...It was upon such a scene of calm and silence that that shock of the great earthquake fell, with the suddenness of a thunderbolt launched from the starlit skies; with the might of ten thousand thunderbolts falling together; with a force so far surpassing all other forces known to men that no similtude can truly be found for it. The firm foundation upon which every home had been built in unquestioning faith in its stability for all time was giving way...For a few moments all the inhabitants of the city stood together in the presence of death, in its most terrible form...

(Within one minute) Every home in the city had been broken or shattered--and beneath the ruins lay the lifeless or bruised and bleeding bodies of men, women and children, who had been stricken down in the midst of such security as may be felt by him who reads these lines at any remote distance of time or space."

Even if Applicant is correct that the Millett earthquake fault is not capable--a premise Petitioner disputes--the area is of a similar geology to Charleston and therefore poses a risk of a devastating earthquake, perhaps as high as XII on the Mercalli scale.

Petitioner maintains that Georgia Power has not adequately designed Plant Vogtle for such seismic events as are reasonably expected to occur there.

CPG 6

The applicant cannot guarantee the safe operation of the reactor for the life of the plant due to unresolved questions of thermal shock effects on irradiated reactor vessels as required by 10 CFR 50 Appendices A, G, and H and other applicable laws, rules, and regulations.

Thermal shock and the effects of operator response, neutron irradiation, and pressure vessel steel impurities remains an unresolved scientific question. Pressurized water reactors are susceptible to cracking of the reactor vessel due to severe drops in vessel temperature under high internal pressure. Neutron irradiation of the reactor vessel, especially at the midline, weakens the vessel and raises the reference temperature at a rate dependent on the impurities in the steel and welds and the rate of neutron irradiation. Studies by the Oak Ridge National Laboratories showed that conditions created during a routine transient at Rancho Seco reactor near Sacramento, CA might be enough to cause cracks in older irradiated pressure

vessels. Further analysis and model simulations showed that whether pressure vessel ruptures would or would not occur in a Rancho Seco type transient depended on the operator response. If the model assumed correct operator response then the simulations indicated the pressure vessel would not rupture during the life of the reactor. Conversely, if the model assumed incorrect operator response, the reactor vessel would be subject to rupture within 3 or 4 years of start-up. Thus, protection from reactor vessel rupture seems to depend totally on operator response and not on redundant safety features built into the plant (Marshall 1981, 1982).

The reactor vessel for Plant Vogtle contains 0.10-0.12% copper and 0.012 to 0.020% phosphorous (FSAR sec 5.3.1.1) but no discussion is undertaken by the applicant as to the effects of these levels of impurities on accelerated brittleness and increased reference temperature for the pressure vessel. The applicant also does not consider the effect of varied fuel rod geometrics on pressure vessel embrittlement. In general, the applicant has not considered the long term safety hazards posed by the problems of thermalshock combined with the effects of vessel material impurities, embrittlement due to irradiation, and the confounding effect of operation error.

In addition to not addressing the safety factors outlined above, the applicant does not address the economic costs of possible solutions to the problems associated with thermal shock. The applicant states that "no special design features...prohibit the in situ annealing of the reactor vessel" (FSAR sec. 5.3.3.1) but do not consider the costs of this process. If annealing is necessary after plant start-up, a shutdown of two years may be necessary (Marshall 1981). The applicant also neglects to mention the economic cost of changes in fuel rod geometry which might be necessary to decrease irradiation of the reactor vessel.

CPG 7

Applicant has not adequately addressed the value of the groundwater below the

plant site and fails to provide adequate assurance that the groundwater will not be contaminated as required by 10 CFR 51.20 (a), (b) & (c), 10 CFR 50.34(a)(1) and 10 CFR 100.10(c)(3).

The groundwater underlying the Vogtle Plant is a valuable resource whose protection has not been (and cannot be) assured by the Georgia Power Company.

Approximately 300 feet below the surface is the Tuscaloosa Aquifer, a permeable sand formation which contains large volumes of excellent quality water. This aquifer is an important regional aquifer which supplies water to many cities and communities across central Georgia and much of the South Carolina coastal plain. In eastern central Georgia, the Tuscaloosa Aquifer is the major source of water for many communities. In Richmond County just north of Plant Vogtle, eighteen Tuscaloosa wells provide water for 15,000 people. In Girard, which is approximately five miles from the plant, and McBean, only thirteen miles away, the Tuscaloosa provides drinking water for most of the community residents.

The Tuscaloosa Aquifer is not the only valuable groundwater resource underlying the plant site. At a depth of approximately 200 feet below surface and a thickness of approximately 100 feet, the sand member of the Lisbon Formation also represents a valuable groundwater resource for the area. Cooling system make-up water wells for the plant which penetrate and are open to both the Lisbon Sand Formation and the Tuscaloosa Aquifer can provide as much as two thousand gallons per minute of excellent quality groundwater. This groundwater is not only important as an existing source of drinking water but it is important to future development which is likely to occur along the Savannah River corridor.

Directly below the surface at the Vogtle Plant is the water table aquifer. While this aquifer is not as areally or vertically extensive as the Tuscaloosa or Lisbon Sand Formations, it is used extensively in Burke County as a source of drinking water for numerous domestic supply wells, as a small scale agricultural supply and for some commercial establishments. To these individuals, farmers and businesspeople, loss of this source of water through contamination from Plant Vogtle

could endanger health and cause economic hardship.

In the case of a release of radionuclides to the ground at Plant Vogtle, the water table aquifer would be the first and the most seriously impacted owing to its close proximity to the surface. In the area of Plant Vogtle, soils are permeable and virtually no runoff of rainwater occurs. Any release of radionuclide contaminated water would seep immediately into the ground and eventually reach the water table aquifer. The sandy nature of the soils and the aquifer material would offer little retention of radionuclides. The radionuclides would migrate with the groundwater and contaminate larger portions of the aquifer.

A significant contamination incident could result in contamination migrating vertically downward from the water table aquifer into the deeper Lisbon Sand Formation and the Tuscaloosa Aquifer. While a clay separating the water table from the deeper aquifers may provide some protection for the deeper aquifers, the 50 feet of hydraulic head on the water table aquifer acts as a vertical force on the groundwater, pushing it through fractures or more permeable sections of the clay. It is known that just south of the plant site, this clay changes into a limestone, becoming part of a major regional water supply aquifer, the Principal Artesian Aquifer.

The Georgia Power Company's record of groundwater protection is not encouraging as demonstrated by events at the Hatch Nuclear Plant. Groundwater underlying Plant Hatch has been contaminated with tritium from a source or sources never fully identified.

CPG 8

Applicant has failed to enforce a quality assurance program in the construction of Plant Vogtle that provides adequately for the safe functioning of diverse structures, systems and components, as required by 10 CFR 50 Appendix B.

The success of a quality assurance program is ultimately tied to the generation of adequate confidence concerning the correct functioning of critical nuclear power

plant systems and components.

Repeated violations of NRC regulations by Applicant in the construction methods applied to pipe-fitting and welds must be interpreted as undermining confidence in the capability of coolant and containment systems to perform their essential tasks.

Although potential deficiencies involving welds in containment liner penetrations had been raised as an issue at least as early as April 29, 1981 (I & E file #X7BG03-M18), problems involving the appropriate inspection of welds have occurred at least as recently as September 1983.

Violation Notification has been issued in several instances related to implementing the required test procedures. As indicated in IR 50-424/83-15 Appendix A, the applicant's construction sheet for examination of reactor coolant pressure boundary welds did not specify the penetrant examination test required by NRC. Such a failure, not simply in the execution of a prescribed test, but the omission of the test from the required procedure, certainly reduces the confidence in the correct functioning of a vital reactor safety system.

Failure to assure that non-destructive testing is conducted consistent with applicable codes led to another violation as reported in IR-50-424 and 50-425. In this instance grit-blasting of the closure head weld cladding of Plant Vogtle Unit 1 (IE X7B610) was performed after liquid penetrant examination of the component. This represented not only a departure from the standard procedure of performing the examination on the component in its finished condition but an unintended method of degrading a critical steam system component after its final installation and inspection. This is much more than a flaw in an isolated procedure; it is a basic failure in established quality assurance methodology.

Any adequate quality assurance program must take into account a broad range of "planned and systematic actions necessary" to establish confidence in the system in question. Any quality assurance program predicated exclusively on the

implementation of dictated procedures without regard to the exercise of critical judgement and standards of professional practice must be considered woefully inadequate. In an examination of welding activities involving steel structures and supports in both Units 1 and 2 of Plant Vogtle, the applicant was cited for failure to include the heat-affected zone (HAZ) of the weld in acceptance radiographs (IR 52 50-424 Appendix A Report Details). In response to the notice of violation, the applicant defended its procedure by replying that the Code "gives no requirement for including the heat-affected zone in the area of interest" (X7B610). This response, which erroneously equates methods of quality assurance with simple compliance to written procedures, was so unacceptable to the NRC that it was directly criticized by Richard C. Lewis even though the violation itself had been withdrawn. In his words,

"Interpretations of the code by 'Code Experts' make your response appear to set aside engineering reason when you consider that, based on failure analysis experience, the technical world realizes that the heat affected zone of a weld is the most critical area of the weldment."

In a related matter on November 18, 1982, welding on sections of the containment dome of Unit 2 was conducted during a "very light misty rain." The welding and site QA supervisors felt that the conditions were suitable for welding since the surfaces of the pieces involved were not completely covered with moisture (425/82-29-02). The inspector, more concerned with the quality of the weld than with the "General Welding Procedure Specification for Shielded Metal Arce Processes," prevailed upon the two to stop the work for the day.

The applicant's disposition to prefer restrictive implementation of prescribed procedures to the more circumspect methods of professional practice does not contribute to confidence in the proper functioning of a completed and operating Plant Vogtle.

In addition to these procedural aspects of quality assurance, there are other questions involving the applicant's "controlling the quality of the ...component or

system to predetermined requirements." In the case of quality control the repeated discovery of inadequacies and defects in the performance of an essential safety subsystem would generate a cause for concern. Furthermore, at some point in time, good quality control practice mandates the abandonment of a suspect manufactured article in favor of a more reliable alternative.

The standby steam generators selected by the applicant for use as an emergency backup power system and manufactured by Transamerica Deloal have been riddled with problems. The applicant was notified of such problems as early as December 1981. That defect involved the governor lube oil cooler assembly and, according to Transamerica Deloal, "could result in engine non-availability." The applicant itself reported a starting air valve assembly problem (X7B603-M29) that also "could result in engine non-availability." Likewise problems with piston skirts, reported in October 1982, in the applicant's own analysis (X7B603-M36) could, postulating a common mode failure, "cause the failure of both engines, resulting in a loss of power to both trains of the emergency core cooling system and most of the emergency safety features equipment."

In a report of a defect in the engine mounted electrical cables submitted to the NRC in September 1983, TD also noted a potential engine performance deterioration.

The applicant's responsibility for quality control extends beyond collection of individual defect notification and corresponding remedial action. By failing to make a general assessment of the suitability of the TD diesel generator system for such an extremely important emergency function, the applicant has brought its own quality control capabilities into question, undermining confidence in the safe functioning of its operating plant in direct contradiction to NRC QA requirements.

The number of past and continuing failures of the Georgia Power/Bechtel QA/QC program represents a pattern which indicates an undue risk to the health and safety of the public. Violations involving activities at times resulted from failure to

provide documented procedures. (For example, Report No. 50-424, 50-425/83-04 regarding concrete QC problems)

The severity of Quality Assurance performance at Plant Vogtle forced a meeting conducted 22 August 1983 at Georgia Power headquarters on the subject of Subcontractor Quality Assurance Performance Allegation by Pullman Power Products quality control personnel about pipe support installation and piping installation as well as job intimidation of quality control workers. Allegations had been made by a Walsh Company boilermaker that improper welding and work practice had occurred. Twenty-three concerns which dealt with twelve separate items were discussed. Defects were found during the reinspection of Pullman Power Products manufactured piping spool pieces. (Letter from James P. O'Reilly to Georgia Power, 28 September 1983, Subject: Summary of Meeting--Docket Nos. 50-424 and 50-425, Vogtle 1 and 2)

Procurement failures continue after numerous I-& E Bulletins from past QA/QC inaction. (for example, I & E Bulletin 83-06 "Nonconforming Materials Supplied by Tube-Line Corporation Facilities at Long Island City New York, Houston Texas, and Carol Stream Illinois;" Westinghouse NLF Printed Circuit Cards GN-275, dated 11/3/83 and GN-298, dated 12/27/83; Westinghouse DS-416 Reactor Trip Breakers GN-235, dated June 13, 1983; Westinghouse NSSS Protection System, Relay cards, GN 244 dated July 20, 1983; AKR-30 and AKR-50 Electrically Operated Low Power Circuit Breakers; Westinghouse 3" Gate Valve Closure Problem; Westinghouse 4" Gate Valve Closure Problem; Reliance Electric--Cable Terminations; Brown Boveri Electric Inc. 7.5 HK and 15 HK circuit breakers; and American Delaval backup diesel generators)

Repeated questions have been raised about changes in the Vogtle QAP in addition to the earlier described letter from Richard Lewis of NRC to Applicant. For example, there are questions about the completeness of the Vogtle QAP. (Memorandum from James G. Partlow to Assigned Reviewers, 29 November 1983, Subject: Determination of Acceptability of List of VEGP items under QA Program Questions)

About Field Change Notices; Request for additional information, letter dated 20 September 1983 from Luster L. Kintner to Doug E. Dutton)

Another threat to the quality assurance, quality control and safety and health of the public is the drug and alcohol use which has been documented and continues to take place on the construction site. The breakdown of the QAP results in situations such as that described in Preliminary Notification of Event of Unusual Occurrence PNO-11-82-115, Subject: Arrest of Contractor Employees on Drug Charges Involving Drug Sales and Use, including marijuana, cocaine and valium.

Other allegations from a former employee pertain to improper QA testing of backfill materials and falsification of backfill QC test results. Four allegations made by a former employee pertain to inadequate concrete QC testing and falsification of concrete QC test records. Two allegations were subsequently partially substantiated.

Four violations were also described in the Systematic Assessment of Licensee Performance Board Assessment July 1, 1981 through October 31, 1983. Valve mispositioning has resulted in a \$40,000 civil penalty. Testing procedures have identified discrepancies involving cadwell operators. Protection of equipment procedures have been neglected. Failure to establish adequate radiography procedures and welding procedures places the integrity of the entire plant in doubt.

The complete failure of the QA/QC program at Vogtle mirrors similar situations at the Zimmer Nuclear Plant and the Byron Nuclear Plant. Plant integrity cannot be assured at Plant Vogtle in view of the large number of violations and inadequacies found to date.

CPG 9

The applicant has failed to submit adequate discussion of novel design features in its preliminary and final safety analysis reports as required by 10 CFR 50.34.

NRC regulations require that Applicant must include "a summary description and discussion of the facility with special attention to design and operating

characteristics, unusual or novel design features, and principal safety considerations" in its PSAR (emphasis added).

A final safety analysis report (10 CFR 50.34(b)) must contain "a description and analysis of the structures, systems and components of the facility, with emphasis upon the performance requirements, the bases with technical justification therefor, upon which such requirements have been established and the evaluations required to show that safety functions will be accomplished. The description shall be sufficient to permit understanding of the system designs and their relationship to safety evaluations." (emphasis added)

Despite these specific regulatory requirements the applicant has proceeded with the implementation of a novel design without providing information adequate for the minimum evaluation of its safety implications.

For example, in a letter directed to Harold Denton dated October 25, 1983, the applicant proposed to eliminate the need to postulate longitudinal and circumferential pipe breaks in the reactor coolant system primary loop in the design of VEGP. As a modification of an existing design requirement this cannot be considered as anything but novel. Unfortunately, even the minimum information required to understand and assess the safety impact of such a departure from standard design has been eradicated from the Westinghouse Electric Corporation report which provides the impetus for the design decision.

In "Technical Bases for Eliminating Large Primary Loop Pipe Ruptures As the Structural Design Basis for Alvin W. Vogtle Units 1 and 2," an analysis is generated from pipe-loading and fracture-mechanics models. The details of the models have been withheld based upon a claim of propriety by Westinghouse. The sanitization of the report is so severe that even the figures presenting the comparison of the predictions of these models with experimental results have been removed.

It is impossible for anyone to evaluate or understand the impact of such an innovation on the safe functioning of the applicant's operating system.

Models of engineering systems have no intrinsic validity. The utility of the model is only realized in the comparison of its predictions with a body of empirical data. Without such a comparison a model is no more than a method of generating a desired result.

Furthermore, the claim that the results of a model betray a proprietary interest is hard to accept. It is difficult to reconstruct a model of even minor complexity from a handful of numbers. Oddly enough, if one could deduce the form of the model from a small set of predictions the model would probably be so trivial as to have no proprietary value.

The failure by Westinghouse to provide adequate substantiation of its approach and the applicant's insistence on using the resulting claims as a basis for a major departure in the design of a critical safety system is an unacceptable breach of the regulatory code.

CPG 10

Applicant has not shown that safety-related electrical and mechanical equipment and components will be environmentally qualified at the onset of operations and throughout the life of the plant as required by General Design Criteria 1, 2 and 4 of 10 CFR 50, Appendix A and other applicable NRC rules.

The concept of environmental qualification, i.e. that safety systems must be able to survive and perform their functions under accident conditions, is "fundamental to NRC regulation of nuclear power reactors." UCS Petition for Emergency and Remedial Action, CLI-78-6, 7 NRC 400, 408 (1978); CLI-80-21, 11 NRC 707, 710 (1980). Safety is the "first, last and permanent consideration" and can lead to the shutdown of noncomplying plants. Power Reactor Development Corp. v. International Union of Electrical Radio and Machine Workers, 367 U.S. 396, 402 (1961).

Applicant has not demonstrated that its present safety systems testing methods, VEGP FSAR Table 3.11.B.1-1, Figures 3.11.B.1-1, 3.11.B.2, are adequate to ensure

effective operation under emergency conditions. For example, in investigating accelerated aging of materials, Sandia Laboratory has found that many materials experience greater damage from lower as opposed to raised dose rates when the total integrated dose is the same. Proceeding International Meeting on Light Water Reactor Severe Accident Evaluation, August 1983, TS-3.1; Industrial Research and Development, June 1982 at 55-56. Particularly sensitive are polymers which are found in cable insulation and jackets, seals, rings and gaskets at VEGP. Current methods of testing have used high levels of radiation or only reported the integrated dose (VEGP FSAR, Table 3.11.B.1-1) and therefore underestimate the effects of the total dose. NUREG/CR-2157, "Occurance and Implications of Radiation Dose-Rate Effects for Material Aging Studies," June 18, 1981. The effects of synergisms, involving the combined effects of radiation, heat and in some experiments oxygen concentration, were also studied at Sandia. The greatest amount of degradation was found upon exposure to heat followed by exposure to radiation (significantly affected by oxygen during a LOCA simulation). NUREG/CR-2156, "Radiation-Thermal Degradation of PE and PVC: Mechanism of Synergisms and Dose-Rate Effects," June 1981.

Sandia has also identified other interesting "anomalies." In tests of EPR cable material, multiconductor configuration performed "substantially worse" than single conductor configurations. Sandia concluded that qualification testing employing only single conductors as test specimens may not be representative of multiconductor performance. Testing of terminal blocks by prior industry standards (function before and after accidents) is not adequate. Instead, applicant must show equipment can function during accident conditions. Simulation of these conditions led to instrument reading errors on high resistance instruments of 15-90%, which were not conservative. This could have led real operators to think that there was adequate subcooling when in fact the degree of subcooling was significantly less. UCS Petition for Emergency and Remedial Action, Supplemental, February 7, 1984.

The results of these reports have not been applied to environmental qualification testing performed and referenced by Applicant to demonstrate compliance of safety-related equipment and components with applicable standards.

Several pieces of equipment specified in VEGP FSAR Table 3.11.N.1-1 as being environmentally qualified may in fact be unqualified. For example, on August 31, 1983, NRC issued a Board notification transmitting a summary of a staff investigation into Franklin Research Center tests on solenoid valves. Over half the valves failed in tests simulating normal and accident conditions. BN 83-128.

Several valves manufactured by ASCO failed early after exposure to 340 degrees F., i.e., they had little or no time to perform their safety function before failing. Over one year earlier ASCO's own testing had shown poor performance of these valves, and had reported this to the EQB. The EQB memo from R. Vollmer to D. Eisenhut (included in BN83-128A) stated the staff "continues to approve" the qualification of valves on the basis of 1978 tests. The applicable standard in 1978 was IEEE 382-1980. The EQB concluded that the early failure of the ASCO solenoid valves makes them unacceptable for use in safety systems and suggested that licensees and applicants be prohibited from using the valves in any application where conditions could be more severe than those reported in the qualification test report. VEGP FSAR Table 3.11.N.1-1 shows the use of twenty-three separate ASCO solenoid valves. The function of some of the valves is not listed and in no case is the qualification reference listed.

Also shown as qualified are forty-three (43) separate motor operators manufactured by Limitorque. The company's own testing, see IE Notice 81-29, EEQN No. 1 (September 24, 1981), had shown motor failure on initiation of steam spray accident profile. An update, IN 82-52, simply noted that "this is an ongoing problem." Westinghouse performed further tests and concluded that "the present motor design will not successfully pass Westinghouse specified test parameters."

The NRC staff has only confirmed that they will pass IEEE 323-1971, a standard explicitly rejected by the Commission in CLI-80-21 as virtually useless.

A critical safety component in LOCA is the post LOCA hydrogen recombiner. One common type of unit manufactured by Rockwell International has recently been shown to have a large number of defective parts. EEQN No. 14 in IN 83-72 (10/28/83). For example, ITT pressure transducers failed typical IEEE 323 environmental qualification testing, i.e., they would not withstand radiation doses of 1×10^7 rad and showed gradual drifting of readings after 1×10^4 rads. Inspection of VEGP FSAR 6.2.5 gives no indication of the manufacturer of the hydrogen recombiner. FSAR 6.2.5.1.1.A states:

All materials used in the recombiners are selected to be compatible with the environmental conditions inside the reactor containment during normal operation or during accident conditions.

However, no specifics can be found. FSAR 6.2.5.4.1 briefly summarizes testing on the hydrogen recombiners in the Westinghouse development program. The effect of radiation was not tested. A hydrogen recombiner containing unqualified transducers was shipped to E.I. Hatch 2.

The applicant has not satisfied 10 CFR 50.48 which requires a showing that safety equipment is capable of surviving a fire in order to shut the plant down. Since the NRC has no testing program to establish that the necessary safety equipment is qualified to withstand the fire environment, there is no assurance that the applicant's equipment can withstand such conditions as high humidity, high temperature, spray, corrosive gas, smoke, all of these probably combined with radiation. Commission meeting of January 6, 1984, Tr. at 36; UCS Petition for Emergency and Remedial Action, Supplemental, February 7, 1984 at 27-29. Without this assurance, Plant Vogtle should not be allowed to operate.

Applicant has not determined that suitable seismic qualifications of safety related equipment have been used in selecting equipment for VEGP. The design criteria and methods for seismic qualification of equipment in nuclear plants have

undergone significant change. Consequently, the margins of safety provided in existing equipment to resist seismically induced loads may vary considerably and must be reassessed. NRC "Unresolved Safety Issues Summary," August 20, 1982.

At the Commission meeting of January 6, 1984, Sandia Laboratories reported numerous "shortcomings" in qualifications methodologies used to test safety equipment. For example, compounded effects (related to the order in which several conditions are tested) can be very important and produce nonconservative results (under testing). A broad range of generally accepted methods was also questioned which included:

- Can gamma radiation adequately simulate the effects of beta radiation?
- Is it necessary to include oxygen in LOCA simulation chambers?
- Under what circumstances is the Arrhenius methodology for accelerated thermal aging valid?
- Are mechanical stresses significant in aging of electrical equipment (cables, seals)?
- Are the procedures of IEEE standards for qualifying specific type of electrical equipment adequate?

These criticisms and questions about current environmental qualification method raise fundamental doubts about the applicant's ability to employ only environmentally qualified equipment in all required applications.

Applicant has not accurately defined the parameters of an accident which would affect the operability of safety-related equipment. Furthermore, Applicant has underestimated the period of time safety-related equipment will be required to operate. S. H. Hanauer, NRC, perceived this issue as a problem shortly following the accident at Three Mile Island Unit 2:

"I think that as a result of the TMI accident we have to rethink:

1. Environmental Qualifications Envelope
2. Things which may have to be qualified

Changes in my thinking include:

1. Core damage is credible
2. Long-term plant operation is essential, initiation isn't enough
3. LOCA and SLB may not give an envelope that includes TMI experience."

—Note from S. H. Hanauer
NRC Assistant Director for Plant Systems
Division of Systems Safety
April 6, 1979

Such thinking was reiterated by Robert Pollard, Nuclear Safety Engineer of the Union of Concerned Scientists:

I think it is clear that what is needed is essentially a reassessment of the environmental qualifications of safety related equipment in light of lessons learned from the accident."

—Special Prehearing Conference, TMI-1 Restart Hearing,
Docket No. 50-289, November 8, 1979, TR at 236.

CPG 11

Applicant has not considered generic defects in the Westinghouse PWR constitute an undue risk to public health and safety.

Westinghouse PWR steam generator tubes have shown evidence of corrosion-induced wastage, cracking, reduction in tube diameter, degradation due to bubble collapse water hammer and vibration-induced fatigue cracks. Of primary concern is the capability of degraded tubes to maintain their integrity during normal operation and under accident conditions. NRC "Unresolved Safety Issues Summary" August 20, 1982.

The applicant has not considered the possibility of pressure vessel failure, and no protection is provided against reactor vessel failure in the design of the nuclear facility. However, as plants accumulate service time, neutron irradiation reduces the material fracture toughness and initial safety margins. Results from reactor vessel surveillance programs indicate that up to twenty (20) operating PWRs will have materials with only marginal toughness after comparatively short periods of operation. NRC "Unresolved Safety Issues Summary," August 20, 1982.

The applicant has not considered nor is sufficient technical information currently available to deal with a steam generator tube rupture (SGTR) accident as occurred in a Westinghouse Plant at the Borselle Nuclear Power Station. NRC BN 83-151. The TMI-2 accident convinced Westinghouse to change the ECCS actuation logic by eliminating the low pressurizer level trip, and this was implemented by licensees

with Westinghouse plants. However, the recent SGTR accident at Borssele actuated the ECCS which was believed to produce "undesirable attendant problems, such as RCP trip and containment isolation, which would make accident management more difficult." Memo from D. J. Mattson, Director DSI, NRC to D. Eighenhut, Director Division of Licensing, NRC, September 26, 1983. As stated in the above-described memo the NRC staff feels a revision of the ECCS logic to the pre-TMI accident configuration "has the potential to improve the management of SGTR events." However, the staff did not conclude whether this "revision would have an overall net increase or decrease in plant risk."

CPG 12

The applicant has not properly assessed the amount of salt and hydrochloric acid release from the cooling towers and the extent of consequent adverse agricultural and environmental damage in the area of Plant Vogtle.

The VEGP FSAR 5.5.1.1 estimates an approximate salt drift of 305 pounds per acre per year (see CPSER 5.3.2) within a one mile radius of the cooling towers, assuming a two-unit operation. Naturally this amount would decrease at greater distances. No mention was made of hydrochloric acid releases, although this point was brought up by NRC staff at the Construction Permit Hearing (personal communication from N. Herring). Hydrochloric acid would be expected to be emitted from these towers, since chlorine is injected directly into the circulating water system, with a maximum system design chlorine rate of 10,000 lb/day. Thus there is the potential for the release of thousands of pounds per day of hydrochloric acid which is not addressed in the FES-CP or OLSEG (see section 3.6.4.2) and could pose a serious environmental problem. In the VEGP-OLSER-Q-E290.3 the rate of salt drift emission of 305 lb/acre/year is admitted to be presently considered in the range of potential damage to vegetation.

CPG 13

Petitioner contends that Applicant's proposed emergency plan fails to ensure

that protective measures can and will be taken in the event of a radiological mishap at Plant Vogtle, as required by 10 CFR 50.33, 50.47, 50.54 and Appendix E to Part 50.

Applicant's Emergency Plan states that the Burke County Civil Defense Director will coordinate emergency operations at the local level. The plan fails, however, to note that Burke County has no full-time emergency manager or office. The County lacks a hot-line system tie-in to the State Emergency Management Office. The Acting Director of Emergency Management of Richmond County, Pam Smith, states that she occasionally has difficulty contacting emergency personnel in Burke County due to the lack of a full-time emergency planner. (Conversation between Dr. Judy Gordon and Ms. Pam Smith, April 4, 1984) Therefore Applicant fails to show that provisions exist for prompt communications among principal response organizations and that each principle response organization has the staff to respond and to augment its initial response on a continuous basis as required by 10 CFR 50.47 (b) (1) and (6).

Similarly, the Plan specifies that the Burke County Sheriff's Office will provide traffic control, law enforcement and aid in the event of an emergency. Yet the Applicant fails to show how the limited staff of 28 deputies and one sheriff will be able to effectively handle such a task in light of the hysteria conditions likely to prevail in an evacuation atmosphere.

The Plan states that the Burke County Hospital Ambulance Service will provide ambulance service in an emergency situation, yet the Service maintains only three ambulances. The Burke County Hospital, which the Plan says will handle the treatment of both radiation-contaminated and noncontaminated injuries, has a bed capacity of only 52. Such facilities are unlikely to be sufficient to service a large number of injured in the event of a fairly serious radiological accident or of an accident external to the plant which results in injury to the plant, such as an earthquake or a nuclear attack, where non-plant related injuries will also be rampant. Applicant does not address the fact that in light of its close proximity to Plant Vogtle, the Burke County Hospital might be ordered to evacuate in the event

of a radiation-related accident. Applicant thus fails to show that adequate emergency facilities and equipment to support the emergency response are provided and maintained as required by 10 CFR 50.47 (b)(8).

Applicant fails to show that initial notification of the public within the plume exposure pathway Emergency Planning Zone (EPZ) within about 15 minutes will be possible, as required by 50 CFR App E (IV)(D)(3). Applicant has not shown that the local civil defense offices responsible for notification have the necessary equipment, training and manpower to activate a prompt notification system. Though Applicant lists a number of warning devices that might be implemented such as autos and boats equipped with sirens or loudspeakers, door-to-door contact in remote areas and aircraft equipped with sirens to be used in remote areas, it provides no assurance that such equipment is available to local governments or that personnel will be available to operate this equipment. An adequate county-wide siren warning system which Ms. Smith sees as a top priority in the event of Vogtle operation, would require installation of a minimum of 200 sirens at \$5,000 each, totalling \$1,000,000. The County has lacked the funds to install such a system in the past. (Supra)

In the event of an accident serious enough to require evacuation of all of Richmond County, including the city of Augusta, within 26 miles of the plant, Ms. Smith estimates it would take three days to move out the 145,000 citizens affected. Such a task is not addressed in the Emergency Plan though Applicant should be prepared for the displacement of a significant number of the population outside the EPZ due to predictable public response to a limited evacuation. For example, during the accident at Three Mile Island-2, over 30% of the people living within a fifteen mile radius of the plant evacuated though only a precautionary warning to pregnant women and small children within a five mile radius of the plant had been issued. The possibility for a similar mass exodus is not addressed in the Emergency Plan. The evacuation procedures in neither Burke nor Richmond Counties have been tested.

Yet, exercises are required to evaluate "major portions of emergency response capabilities" and to identify deficiencies "as a result of exercise or drills", by 10 CFR 50.47 (b) (14). The NRC staff has concluded that a successful full-scale exercise is "at the core" of the finding of adequate protection for the public. SECY-82-185, "Final Amendment to 10 CFR Part 50 and the Appendix E: Modifications to Emergency Preparedness Regulations Relating to Low Power Operations", May 3, 1982.

The Government Accounting Office has concluded that:

Testing emergency procedures with offsite participation would improve State and local emergency preparedness...The types of deficiencies identified during these [NRC-licensed facilities] drills included:

- inadequate communication between the various agencies participating in the drill, authority for coordinating and implementing emergency measures, and
- inadequate offsite radiological monitoring procedures.

We believe it is better to identify problems in an emergency drill rather than wait until the actual event occurs. Also, by holding nuclear emergency drills, NRC-licensed power plants and local emergency service agencies have been able to resolve some of the problems that were identified.

GAO Report to Congress, "Areas Around Nuclear Facilities Should be Better Prepared for Radiological Emergencies", EMS 78 110, March 30, 1979.

The Applicant fails to explain why the plume exposure pathway EPZ for Vogtle has been set at 5 miles rather than the 10 mile radius recommended in 10 CFR 50.33(y). In light of the severe Pasquille type A weather conditions prevalent in the area, the plume pathway should be wider as opposed to more narrow than generally required. Based on the sensitivity of children (in utero through preschool particularly) the plume exposure pathway Emergency Planning Zone should be larger for pregnant women and children. The Three Mile Island-2 accident caused a statistically significant rise in the rate of infant mortality within 10 miles of the plant. "Management of Radiological Emergencies," Gordon McCleod, M.D., Text of lecture, May 2, 1980. McCleod, formerly Secretary of Health for the state of Pennsylvania, has said:

Any radiological emergency plan and response in Pennsylvania must not overlook population density for at least 20 miles around existing or proposed nuclear reactors.

Applicant has not shown, pursuant to 10 CFR Part 50 Appendix E, IV D.2 and 50.47(b)(6)&(7) that adequate education and notification procedures will be followed during normal plant operation and in the event of an accident at WNP-3. These requirements include "basic emergency planning information", "general information as to the nature and effects of radiation", "signs or other measures...helpful if an accident occurs." 10 CFR Appendix E, IV, D.2. Applicant should be required to utilize such methods as billing or home distribution of public information brochures to supplement emergency information included in phone books as not all residents can be expected to have phones. Provisions for emergency evacuation education of illiterate adults must also be taken.

Applicant's plan states that possible evacuation routes for persons leaving the reactor site are New River Road and Ebenezer Church Road and evacuation will primarily take place in individually owned autos. Applicant cannot claim adequacy of this evacuation plan until it identifies the number of autos to be moved, estimate of evacuation time, and under what conditions company-owned vehicles will be made available for evacuation purposes.

Applicant claims that the Department of Energy (Savannah River Plant Operations Office, Aiken, South Carolina) will provide radiological assistance (advice and emergency action essential for the control of immediate hazards to health and safety) in the event of an emergency at Vogtle. It fails to address the possibility that an emergency situation (for example, an earthquake) which threatens the safe operation of Vogtle might also endanger operations at Savannah River Plant. In this event, not only would Department of Energy officials be prevented from providing aid to Vogtle, other federal, state and local assistance resources would be divided between the two sites. Applicant does not address the impacts of simultaneous evacuation from both plants, or overload of medical facilities and emergency vehicles in the event of injury to persons by the operation of both plants.

Applicant states that estimates of predictions of atmospheric effluent transport and diffusion during and immediately following radioactive releases are based upon the constant mean wind model. Rather applicant should prepare estimates encompassing a variety of wind and weather conditions.

In light of the afore-mentioned facts, Applicant has failed to show that in the event of an accident at Vogtle, adequate notification, communication, education, evacuation, and relocation can take place for permanent, transient, and special populations within the Emergency Planning Zone.

April 11, 1984

Respectfully submitted,

Laurie Fowler

Laurie Fowler for:

Legal Environmental Assistance Foundation
1102 Healey Bldg./57 Forsyth St. NW
Atlanta, GA 30303
404-688-3299

Attorney for Petitioner
Campaign for a Prosperous Georgia

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

BEFORE THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD

DOCKETED
USNRC

In the Matter of)

GEORGIA POWER CO., et al.)

(Vogtle Electric Generating Plant,
Units 1 and 2))

84 APR 16 10:55
Docket Nos. 50-424 and 50-425

OFFICE OF SECRETARY
DOCKETING & SERVICE
BRANCH

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

This is to certify that copies of the foregoing Supplement to Petition for Leave to Intervene and Request for Hearing were served by deposit with the Federal Express agent in the City of Atlanta or by hand delivery this eleventh day of April, 1984, to all parties in this proceeding.

Laurie Fowler
Laurie Fowler for:

Legal Environments Assistance Foundation
1102 Healey Bldg./57 Forsyth St. NW
Atlanta, GA 30303
404-688-3299

Attorney for Petitioner
Campaign for a Prosperous Georgia

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

BEFORE THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD

| | | |
|------------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|
| In the Matter of |) | |
| |) | |
| GEORGIA POWER CO., <u>et al.</u> |) | Docket Nos. 50-424 and 50-425 |
| |) | |
| (Vogtle Electric Generating Plant, |) | |
| Units 1 and 2) |) | |

SERVICE LIST

Morton B. Margulies, Chairman
Atomic Safety & Licensing Board
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

Dr. Oscar H. Paris
Atomic Safety & Licensing Board
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

Mr. Gustave A. Linenberger
Atomic Safety & Licensing Board
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

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

Douglas C. Teper
1253 Lenox Circle
Atlanta, Georgia 30306

Jeanne Shorthouse
507 Atlanta Avenue
Atlanta, Georgia 30315

James E. Joiner
Sumner C. Rosenberg
Troutman, Sanders, Lockerman & Ashmore
127 Peachtree Street, N.E.
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

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

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

Bernard M. Bordenick, esq.
Office of the Executive Legal
Director
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

Carol A. Stangler
425 Euclid Terrace
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

Dan Feig
1130 Alta Avenue
Atlanta, Georgia 30307

George F. Trowbridge
Ernest L. Blake, Jr.
David R. Lewis
Shaw, Pittman, Potts & Trowbridge
1800 M Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Ruble A. Thomas
Southern Company Services, Inc.
P. O. Box 2625
Birmingham, Alabama 35202