## **EDISON ELECTRIC** INSTITUTE The association of electric companies

85 SEP -6 P1:48 (50 FR

1111 19th Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036 Tel. (202) 828-7400

DOCKETING & SERPtember 6, 1985 BRANCH

COLFETED ACKET NUMBER!

BORDES BULL PR-14

The Honorable Samuel J. Chilk Secretary U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, D.C. 20555

Attention: Docketing and Service Branch

Subject: Proposed Rule: Criteria for an

Extraordinary Nuclear Occurence

(50 Fed. Reg. 13978-85, April 9, 1985)

Dear Mr. Chilk:

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission published on April 9, 1985, for comment, a proposed rule consisting of three options for Criteria for an Extraordinary Nuclear Occurence. The Edison Electric Institute has a vital interest in the NRC's Extraordinary Nuclear Occurence (ENO) rulemaking.

The Edison Electric Institute (EEI) is the association of the nation's investor-owned electric companies and its members currently operate 78 nuclear energy units with full power operating licenses and one with a low power license. EEI members will operate 23 additional units now under construction.

On September 6, 1985, the Atomic Industrial Forum (AIF) filed extensive comments on the proposed rule. Representatives of EEI member companies and EEI staff participated with the AIF Committees in preparation of those comments. EEI fully endorses the AIF comments on the proposed rule for Criteria for an ENO. We wish to emphasize, however, two fundamental points made in the AIF comments:

8509120125 850906 PDR PR 140 50FR13978 PDR o ENO Threshold

1/0

As a result of the Commission's difficulty in applying the existing Criteria to the facts about the March 29, 1979 TMI-2 accident (which was determined not to be an ENO), the Commission is proposing to revise the ENO Criteria so as to make them more practicable. EEI does not disagree with the Commission's desire to render these Criteria more practicable. However, it appears that in doing so, the Commission has also proposed to lower the threshold for determining that an ENO

Acknowledged by card SEP, 11 1985

Acknowledged by cardSEP. 1 1 1985 pd

Hon. Samuel J. Chilk September 9, 1985 Page 2

has occurred. Congress desired to establish a level of discharge that is clearly above that which could be expected from normal activities. We respectfully suggest that the Commission has lost sight of the intent of the statutory language; an intent that is reflected in the existing Criteria. EEI recommends that the Commission revisit the threshold question in light of the Congressional intent and use a higher threshold, similar to the existing Criteria, for revising the Criteria.

## o Explanatory Information

The explanatory material contained in the April 9, 1985

Federal Register notice does not explain fully the

Commission's underlying rationale for the proposals. We
suggest that it would be in the best interest of all concerned
for the Commission to publish a more complete explanation of
the policy, technical and legal aspects of the proposal.

In summary, EEI recommends that the Commission reconsider the proposed rule, taking into account the intent of the statutory language and re-propose the rule along with a full explanation of its rationale. EEI, along with the AIF Committees, would be pleased to assist the Commission and its Staff in this endeavor.

We appreciate the opportunity to comment on this proposed rule. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely yours,

John J. Kearney

Senior Vice President

JJK:ski