5 1981 DO SENENT BASU The Honorable Lloyd Bentsen United States Senate PROPOSED RULE IT 912 Fectoral Building 46FR 17216 Austin, Texas 78701 Dear Senator Bentsen: Thank you for your letter dated April 15, 1981 enclosing correspondence from your constituent, Harvey I. Cohn, who is concerned about proposed MRC regulations and legislation designed to reduce delays in the licensing process for nuclear power plants. The diverson of staff resources and rethinking of safety requirements following the accident at Three Mile Island adversely affected licensing activity at the Commission. As a result, we estimate that in 1981 and 1982 approximately a dozen nuclear plants will be completed from 1 to 12 months before a full power license decision can be made. The Commission is concerned about this situation and is proposing a number of actions to correct it. Your constituent mentions several of these proposed changes. Amendments to the Commission's Rules of Practice, 10 CFR Part 2, were published in the Federal Register for comment on March 18, 1981. These amendments, if adopted, should permit more timely conduct of NRC hearings by tightening the time allowed for each part of the process and by providing firmer time management. Public comments received by April 7, 1981 will be considered by the Commission before promulgation of a final rule. Also on March 18, 1981, the Commission submitted proposed legislation to Congress, which would allow it to authorize interim reactor operation for fuel loading and low-power operating and testing before the completion of a hearing. Such interim operation would save at least two months and, where the low power testing revealed a need for repairs or modifications, could save substantially more time. This proposed authority would expire at the end of 1983 thereby assuring that this adjustment to our licensing requirements would be temporary and confined to those plants which have been directly affected by the Commission's post-TMI action. I am enclosing for your information a copy of the proposed changes to Part 2 and of the letter to Congress transmitting the proposed legislation. 4.1.71.2 I hope that this information is helpful in responding to your constituent. Sincerely. signed by E. Fay Carlton Kammerer, Director 8106020 238 Office of Congressional Affairs Enclosure: As stated OFFICE MANAME DATE

LLOYD. BENTSEN

Minited States Senate

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20110

COMMITTEES,
FINANCE
FINANCE
ENVIRONMENT AND FUBLIC WORKS
JOINT ECONOMIC

Genter

April 15, 1981

Mr. Carlton C. Kammerer, Director Office of Congressional Affairs The United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission 1717 H Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20555

Dear Mr. Kammerer:

I recently received the enclosed constituent inquiry, and I would very much appreciate your providing me with any pertinent information you might have regarding the matter.

Your kind assistance is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Enclosure

PLEASE REPLY TO:

912 Federal Building Austin, Texas 78701 ATTN: Wanda Garcia

A. i. i.

4321 Travis Street, Apt. 12 Dallas, Texas 75205 March 24, 1981

MAR 30 1981

Secretary of the Commission U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, D.C. 20555 Attn: Docketing & Service Branch

Dear Sir/Madam:

while to you it may just seem like one more application to stamp, to people on the local level a nuclear power plant is a critical issue both medically and economically. To "streamline" the licensing procedure goes against any right of local citizens being able to choose, a right which is central to a democratic society.

Specifically, preventing Intervenors from engaging in formal discovery with the N.R.C. staff means that facts about the plant can be suppressed by the utility. Obviously the group building the plant has the most information on it, both pro and con, and obviously they will not voluntarily release information detrimental to the granting of a license.

The public has a right to have all the facts brought out before a nuclear power plant is a structed in their midst.

Finally, the granting of any kind of "interim" operating permit while hearings are still going on is totally unacceptable. Why bother to license plants at all if the whole process is just a sham? I personally believe that nuclear power is a big mistake. The licensing process, such as it is, is the only assurance I have that these plants will be built and operated within some safety parameters rather than in just the cheapest manner.

Ostaney l. Coly

Harvey I. Conn