March 4, 1986

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

'86 MAR -5 P12:18

BRANCH

BEFORE THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD

In the Matter of	
PHILADELPHIA ELECTRIC COMPANY	Docket Nos. 50-352
(Limerick Generating Station,) Unit 1)	

RESPONSE OF NRC STAFF IN SUPPORT OF LICENSEE'S MOTION TO DEFER ANSWERS TO PETITIONER'S PROPOSED CONTENTIONS UNTIL A RULING UPON HIS MOTION FOR LEAVE TO INTERVENE

I. INTRODUCTION

On February 25, 1986, the Philadelphia Electric Company (Licensee) filed the above captioned motion in response to a document filed on February 15, 1986, by R. L. Anthony/Friends of the Earth in the Delaware Valley (collectively "FOE"). The FOE document contains eleven numbered "contentions" concerning amendment number one issued by the NRC staff (Staff) to the Licensee on February 6, 1986. For the reasons set forth below, the NRC staff supports Licensee's motion.

II. BACKGROUND

On December 18, 1985, the Licensee, in a letter to the NRC, requested an amendment to its Limerick Unit 1 operating license. The Licensee requested approval, on a one-time-only basis, for temporarily extending certain surveillance requirements in the Technical Specifications, which must be performed nominally every 18 months and which can only be done when the plant is shutdown. The change would extend the

8603060265 860304 PDR ADOCK 05000352 G PDR

DS07

18 month surveillance interval by fourteen weeks beyond the maximum 25 percent extension allowed by the Technical Specifications. This would permit the Licensee to delay performing this testing until a maintanance and surveillance outage which is scheduled to begin on or before May 26, 1986. The NRC staff after a review of the Licensee's request determined that the condition of the valves in question would not change significantly during the short extension period.

On January 30, 1986, FOE filed a petition to intervene in this matter in connection with the Licensee's request for an amendment. February 5, 1986, FOE filed an amended petition to intervene and request for a hearing. The NRC staff has opposed FOE's petition in a pleading filed before the Licensing Board on February 25, 1986. On February 12, 1986, FOE, after receiving notice of the issuance of Licensee's amendment number one, filed a one page request for a stay before the Commission incorporating by reference its two previous petitions to intervene in this matter. The NRC staff has opposed FOE's request for a stay in a pleading filed on February 27, 1986 before the Commission. February 15, 1986, FOE filed its document containing eleven numbered "contentions" concerning amendment number one to the Limerick license. FOE notes on page one of this document that it proposes to litigate the eleven "contentions" in the hearing it expects to be held on the amendment. In addition, FOE incorporates all of its previous petitions in this matter and concludes with yet another request for a stay. As noted earlier, the Staff has opposed FOE's petitions to intervene and its requests for a stay.

On February 25, 1986, the Licensee filed its motion seeking to Defer answers to FOE's eleven "contentions" until the Licensing Board rules on

its petition to intervene. For the reasons that follow, the NRC staff supports the Licensee's motion.

III. DISCUSSION

Pursuant to 10 C.F.R. § 2.714(b) $\frac{1}{}$ a petitioner may supplement his petition to intervene not later than fifteen days prior to the holding of the special prehearing conference or the first prehearing conference. Thus, the filing of proposed contentions at this juncture in this proceeding while not specifically prohibited by the Commission's rules is not the normal procedure that is followed in the NRC's licensing or amendment proceedings. Generally, Licensing Boards rule upon questions regarding the Petitioner's standing and the timeliness of the petition before reviewing proposed contentions. If the Intervenor is found to have standing and has otherwise complied with 10 C.F.R. § 2.714, then proposed contentions are received prior to the special prehearing

^{1/ 10} C.F.R. § 2.714(b) states:

⁽b) Not later than fifteen (15) days prior to the holding of the special prehearing conference pursuant to § 2.751a, or where no special prehearing conference is held, fifteen (15) days prior to the holding of the first prehearing conference, the petitioner shall file a supplement to his petition to intervene which must include a list of the contentions which petitioner seeks to have litigated in the matter, and the bases for each contention set forth with reasonable specificity. A petitioner who fails to file such a supplement which satisfies the requirements of this paragraph with respect to at least one contention will not be permitted to participate as a party. Additional time for filing the supplement may be granted based upon a balancing of the factors in paragraph (a)(1) of this section.

conference or the first prehearing conference at which time the admissibility of proposed contentions are determined. $\frac{2}{}$

Based upon the foregoing practices and procedures, the Licensee filed its motion to defer answers to FOE's "contentions" until after the Licensing Board rules upon FOE's petition to intervene. In setting forth its reasons in support of the motion, the Licensee states:

Accordingly, Licensee requests the Licensing Board to defer answers to Mr. Anthony's proposed contentions until after it decides Licensee's objections to Mr. Anthony's intervention or the time expires for Mr. Anthony to supplement his petition, whichever is later. Deferral of answers will eliminate the need for the Staff and the Licensee to file any answers at all if the Board finds that Mr. Anthony has not met the requirements for intervention. Even if the Board should grant Mr. Anthony intervenor status, it is pointless to answer Mr. Anthony's contentions until the time for supplementing his petition has expired. Should it become necessary, any delay in answering the proposed contentions would be mini-Especially considering that Mr. Anthony is the only petitioner and that the proceeding is not otherwise required, a brief deferral is well justified. Licensee's Motion to Defer Answers to Petitioner's Proposed Contentions Until a Ruling Upon His Motion For Leave To Intervene, at 4 (February 25, 1986).

The NRC staff agrees with the Licensee's conclusions as expressed above.

As noted earlier herein, the NRC staff has opposed FOE's petitions to intervene and requests for a stay. 3/ Page 3, supra. The Staff's bases for such opposition is predicated on FOE's failure to demonstrate standing. In Staff's view FOE's petitions should be denied for this reason and, if the Licensing Board agrees with the Staff's position, there will be no need to respond to FOE's "contentions."

^{2/} Id.

^{3/} The Licensee has also opposed FOE's petitions to intervene and stay requests.

In the event the Licensing Board determines that FOE's does have standing there should be ample time for Staff to respond to FOE's "contentions" as FOE will be the only intervenor. In Staff's view, until the Licensing Board determines the questions of FOE's standing and sets a prehearing conference schedule deferral of answers to FOE's proposed "contentions" is in the best interests of all the parties.

IV. CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, the NRC staff supports Licensee's motion to defer filing answers to Mr. Anthony's proposed contentions until after it has decided whether Mr. Anthony has standing to participate in this proceeding or until the time for supplementing his petition has expired, which ever is later.

Respectfully submitted,

Benjamin W. Vaghe

Benjamin H. Vogler Counsel for NRC Staff

Dated at Bethesda, Maryland this 4th day of March, 1986

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION'86 MAR -5 P12:19

BEFORE THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD

In the Matter of)

PHILADELPHIA ELECTRIC COMPANY) Docket Nos. 50-352

(Limerick Generating Station,)

Unit 1)

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that copies of "RESPONSE OF NRC STAFF IN SUPPORT OF LICENSEE'S MOTION TO DEFER ANSWERS TO PETITIONER'S PROPOSED CONTENTIONS UNTIL A RULING UPON HIS MOTION FOR LEAVE TO INTERVENE" 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 March, 1986:

Ivan W. Smith, Chairman (2)
Administrative Judge
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555*

Dr. Richard F. Cole Administrative Judge Atomic Safety and Licensing Board U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, D.C. 20555*

Mr. Gustave A. Linenberger, Jr. Administrative Judge Atomic Safety and Licensing Board U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, D.C. 20555*

Mr. Frank R. Romano Air and Water Pollution Patrol 61 Forest Avenue Ambler, PA 19002

Ms. Phyllis Zitzer, President Ms. Maureen Mulligan Limerick Ecology Action 762 Queen Street Pottstown, PA 19464 Mr. Edward G. Bauer, Jr. Vice President & General Counsel Philadelphia Electric Company 2301 Market Street Philadelphia, PA 19101

Troy B. Conner, Jr., Esq. Mark J. Wetterhahn, Esq. Conner and Wetterhahn 1747 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20006

Mr. Marvin I. Lewis 6504 Bradford Terrace Philadelphia, PA 19149

Joseph H. White, III 15 Ardmore Avenue Ardmore, PA 19003

Kathryn S. Lewis, Esq. 1500 Municipal Services Bldg. 15th and JFK Blvd. Philadelphia, PA 19107 Thomas Gerusky, Director Bureau of Radiation Protection Dept. of Environmental Resources 5th Floor, Fulton Bank Building Third and Locust Streets Harrisburg, PA 17120

Director
Pennsylvania Emergency Management
Agency
Basement, Transportation & Safety
Building
Harrisburg, PA 17120

Robert L. Anthony Friends of the Earth of the Delaware Valley 103 Vernon Lane, Box 186 Moylan, PA 19065

Angus R. Love, Esq. Montgomery County Legal Aid 107 East Main Street Norristown, PA 19401

Charles W. Elliott, Esq. Brose & Poswistilo 325 N. 10 Street Easton, PA 18042

David Wersan Consumer Advocate Office of Attorney General 1425 Strawberry Square Harrisburg, PA 17120

Jay Gutierrez Regional Counsel USNRC, Region I 631 Park Avenue King of Prussia, PA 19406

Steven P. Hershey, Esq. Community Legal Services, Inc. 5219 Chestnut Street Philadelphia, PA 19139 Barry M. Hartman Governor's Energy Council P.O. Box 8010 300 N. 2nd Street Harrisburg, PA 17105

Spence W. Perry, Esq.
Associate General Counsel
Federal Emergency Management
Agency, Room 840
500 C Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20472

Robert J. Sugarman, Esq. Sugarman, Denworth & Hellegers 16th Floor Center Plaza 101 North Bread Street Philadelphia, PA 19107

James Wiggins
Senior Resident Inspector
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
P.O. Box 47
Sanatoga, PA 19464

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

Atomic Safety and Licensing Appeal Board Panel (5) 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*

Gregory Minor MHB Technical Associates 1723 Hamilton Avenue San Jose, CA 95125

Timothy R. S. Campbell, Director Department of Emergency Services 14 East Biddle Street West Chester, PA 19380

Benjamin H. Vogier Counsel for NRC Staff

Benjamin H. Vogles