

LAW OFFICES
GOLDBERG, FIELDMAN & LETHAM, P. C.
1100 FIFTEENTH STREET, N. W.
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20005

REUBEN GOLDBERG
ARNOLD FIELDMAN
GLENN W. LETHAM
CHANNING D. STROTHER, JR.
JOSHUA L. MENTER
KENNETH M. ALBERT
OF COUNSEL
DAVID C. HJELMFELT

May 23, 1988

TELEPHONE
(202) 463-8300

TELECOPIER
(202) 463-8309

Cecil O. Thomas
Chief, Policy Development and
Technical Support Branch
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Mail Stop 12E4
One White Flint North
11555 Rockville Pike
Rockville, Maryland 20852

Re: Cleveland Electric Illuminating Co., et al.
Docket Nos. 50-440A, et al.

Dear Mr. Thomas:

On February 19, 1988, the City of Cleveland, Ohio submitted an answer in opposition to the September 18, 1987 application filed by Ohio Edison Company in which Edison asks the Commission to suspend the antitrust license conditions in the operating license issued in Docket Nos. 50-440A, et al., for the Perry Nuclear Power Plant. Cleveland recently discovered that the table of contents and table of appendices prepared by it were inadvertently omitted from its answer. Enclosed are the omitted pages.

Very truly yours,

Kenneth M. Albert

Kenneth M. Albert
Attorney for
City of Cleveland, Ohio

KMA/jat

cc: all parties (w/encl.)

2999
1/1

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. PREAMBLE.....	2
II. BACKGROUND.....	5
A. THE CONSTRUCTION PERMIT PROCEEDING.....	5
1. The applications.....	5
2. The Licensing Board decision.....	7
3. The Appeal Board decision.....	14
a. The Applicants' anticompetitive activities.....	15
b. The nexus between the proposed nuclear plants and the anticompetitive situation.....	18
c. The antitrust license conditions.....	20
d. Subsequent review.....	21
B. THE OPERATING LICENSE PROCEEDING.....	22
III. THE NRC DOES NOT HAVE JURISDICTION TO GRANT EDISON'S APPLICATION.....	24
A. THE NRC HAS RECOGNIZED THAT THE 1970 AMENDMENTS PRECLUDE IT FROM MODIFYING ANTITRUST CONDITIONS SUBSEQUENT TO ISSUANCE OF AN OPERATING LICENSE.....	25
1. <u>South Texas</u>	26
2. <u>Florida Power</u>	35
3. <u>South Texas</u> and <u>Florida Power</u> indicate that the NRC does not have the statutory authority to grant the relief sought by Edison.....	39

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

	<u>Page</u>
B. NRC PRECEDENT REGARDING ANTITRUST REVIEW IN CONNECTION WITH CHANGES IN THE NATURE OF A PLANT'S OPERATIONS OR OWNERSHIP IS INAPPLICABLE HERE.....	45
C. THE DICTA IN THE APPEAL BOARD DECISION IN THIS PROCEEDING DOES NOT AND CANNOT SUPPORT POST-OPERATING LICENSE ANTITRUST REVIEW.....	48
IV. THE RELIEF SOUGHT BY EDISON IS BARRED BY <u>RES JUDICATA</u> OR, ALTERNATIVELY, COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL.....	53
A. <u>RES JUDICATA</u> AND COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL AND THEIR APPLICABILITY TO NRC PROCEEDINGS.....	54
B. APPLICATION OF <u>RES JUDICATA</u> AND COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL IN NRC PROCEEDINGS.....	55
C. APPLICABILITY OF <u>RES JUDICATA</u> TO EDISON'S APPLICATION.....	59
1. <u>Res judicata</u> is the applicable preclusion doctrine here.....	60
2. <u>Res judicata</u> bars the arguments made by Edison.....	63
a. Edison already made its arguments here during the construction permit proceeding.....	63
b. The events cited by Edison could have been raised during the operating licensing proceeding.....	66
i. Increased cost of nuclear power.....	66

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

	<u>Page</u>
- New statutory require- ments.....	67
- Regulatory changes.....	68
- Adverse economic condi- tions.....	69
- Overall costs of Perry Unit 1.....	71
ii. The reduction of the CAPCO nuclear program.....	75
iii. Termination of the CAPCO pool.....	77
3. Alternatively, collateral estoppel is applicable and bars Edison's arguments.....	79
V. THE RELIEF SOUGHT BY EDISON IS BARRED BY LACHES.....	82
VI. THE EVENTS CITED BY EDISON DO NOT UNDERMINE THE LEGAL OR FACTUAL BASIS FOR IMPOSITION OF ANTITRUST LICENSE CONDITIONS.....	87
A. THE 1970 AMENDMENTS WERE BASED ON FACTORS OTHER THAN THE ANTI- CIPATEL COST OF NUCLEAR POWER.....	89
B. NRC PRECEDENT REFLECTS THE NRC'S RECOGNITION THAT FACTORS OTHER THAN THE COST OF NUCLEAR POWER CAN BE THE BASIS FOR IMPOSITION OF ANTITRUST LICENSE CONDITIONS.....	99
C. THE EVENTS CITED BY EDISON DO NOT UNDERMINE THE CONCERNS UNDER- LYING THE NRC'S DECISION TO IMPOSE THE ANTITRUST LICENSE CONDITIONS.....	110
VII. CONCLUSION.....	117

TABLE OF APPENDICES

- A. The Toledo Edison Company, et al (Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1, et al.), Docket Nos. 50-440A, et al., "Order Modifying Antitrust License Condition No. 3 of Davis-Besse Unit 1, License No. NPF-3 and Perry Units 1 and 2, CPPR-148, CPPR-149" (June 25, 1979) (cited on p. 50 of this answer)
- B. Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, Investigation Into The Perry Nuclear Power Station, Case No. 85-521-EL-COI, "Comprehensive Assessments Of The Perry Nuclear Power Plant", prepared for the Commission by Touche Ross, The Nielson Wurster Group and Chapman & Associates, p. I-7 (Aug. 1986) (cited on p. 67)
- C. Cleveland Electric Illuminating Co. News Release, "Perry Budget Revised" (March 23, 1983) (cited on p. 69)
- D. CAPCO News Release (Jan. 23, 1980) (cited on p. 70)
- E. Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, "In the Matter of the Application of The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company for Authority to Amend and Increase Certain of Its Filed Schedules Fixing Rates and Charges for Electric Service", Case No. 86-2025-EL-AIR (Dec. 16, 1987) (cited on p. 73)
- F. Prizinsky, "Avon Lake capacity cut as CEI retires generator", Cleveland Business, p. 3 (Jan. 4, 1988) (cited on p. 74)
- G. Ohio Edison Co., Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) Form 10-K for 1978, pp. 37-38 (cited on p. 75)
- H. Ohio Edison Co., SEC Form 10-K for 1984, p. 11 (cited on p. 75)
- I. "Cost Estimate Revised For Cleveland Electric's Perry-1", Nucleonics Week, p. 7 (Sept. 20, 1984) (cited on p. 75)
- J. List of delays announced during construction of CAPCO nuclear plants (cited on p. 76)
- K. Prehearing Antitrust Review of Nuclear Powerplants, Hearings Before The Joint Comm. on Atomic Energy, Part 1, 91st Cong., 1st Sess. 310 (testimony of Philip Sporn) (cited on p. 93)

TABLE OF APPENDICES (continued)

- L. Centerior Energy Corp., "Long-Term Forecast Report -- Electric -- Submitted To The Public Utilities Commission Of Ohio, Forecast And Power Sitting Division (May 15, 1987)" (cited on p. 115)
- M. Cleveland Electric Illuminating Co., 1986 Annual Report (Form 1) filed with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC), p. 216 (cited on p. 115)
- N. Ohio Edison Co., Response to NRC Regulatory Guide 9.3, item C (May 12, 1981) (cited on p. 115)
- O. Ohio Edison Co., 1986 Annual Report (Form 1) filed with FERC, p. 422 (cited on p. 115)
- P. Ohio Edison Co., 1985 Form 10-K, pp. 4-7 (cited in App. J)