



UNITED STATES  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

October 20, 1999

Docket

William T. Miller, Esq.  
Randolph Lee Elliott, Esq.  
Miller, Balis & O'Neil  
1140 Nineteenth Street, N.W.  
Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20036-6600

Dear Messrs. Miller and Elliott:

Re: Kansas Gas and Electric Company, et al. (Wolf Creek Generating Station, Unit 1),  
Docket No. 50-482-LT

In response to the directive in CLI-99-19 that the parties address the disposition of the Wolf Creek antitrust license conditions in view of the anticipated transfer of the operating license for Wolf Creek to Westar Energy, Inc., on July 6, 1999, the Applicants for the transfer, Kansas Gas and Electric Company (KGE) and Kansas City Power and Light Company (KCPL), and you, on behalf of Kansas Electric Power Cooperative, Inc. (KEPCo), submitted the respective proposals. The Commission has referred those proposals to me for appropriate action.

In summary, Applicants propose, as their transfer application proposed, that the existing antitrust license conditions be retained and, with no substantive changes but after administratively substituting Westar for KGE and KCP&L, be made applicable to Westar as the new licensee. On the basis of KEPCo's belief that there would be adverse and anticompetitive effects of the proposed merger on it, KEPCo proposes that the existing antitrust license conditions be substantively amended to address its perceived problems with a simple substitution of Westar for KGE and KCPL in the conditions. For the reasons explained below, after consultation with the Commission, I must deny KEPCo's request for substantive revision of the antitrust license conditions to address its asserted antitrust concerns about the proposed license transfer.

First, as was made clear in CLI-99-19, after careful and thorough analysis of its antitrust authority, the Commission concluded that it lacks statutory authority to undertake an antitrust review of post-operating license transfer applications (or, if it had authority, would not perform as a matter of policy). KEPCo's proposal to enhance existing license conditions based on asserted antitrust problems with the proposed transfer, problems that are disputed by Applicants, could be evaluated only after a review of the alleged antitrust problems and a resolution of the differences between Applicants and KEPCo. This is precisely the antitrust review the Commission decided not to perform. Thus KEPCo's proposal is tantamount to its original request to have the Commission conduct an antitrust review of the proposed transfer and, accordingly, is inconsistent with the Commission's decision in CLI-99-19.

Second, it is far from clear that KEPCo is correct in its assertion that the application of the antitrust license conditions to the new licensee will result in draconian antitrust problems for KEPCo. The Applicants July 6<sup>th</sup> submission on its face commits the new licensee, Westar, to compliance with the antitrust conditions verbatim throughout Westar's service area. In

94-188

DFOI

FOR ADOCK

William T. Miller, Esq.  
 Randolph Lee Elliott, Esq.

- 2 - October 20, 1999

particular, with respect to KEPCo's concern about the differences in the two current sets of license conditions as they apply to KGE and KCP&L, Applicants commit Westar "to abide by whichever conditions were more restrictive to Westar and more favorable to KEPCo." Applicants' July 6<sup>th</sup> letter at 1. With respect to KEPCO's assertion that "it is far from clear what would be 'the more restrictive set of conditions for any given circumstances,'" KEPCo's July 6<sup>th</sup> letter at 6, Applicants state that "in any given circumstance, KEPCo could choose whether to rely upon the duties imposed on Westar either by the more specific KGE conditions or by the more general KCP&L conditions," Applicants' July 6<sup>th</sup> letter at 2. In this and other respects, it appears that Applicants are willing to give KEPCo the benefit, at KEPCo's choice, of both sets of conditions applicable verbatim to the new licensee, Westar.

Two additional points warrant emphasis. First, as stated above, and for the reasons in CLI-99-19, the Commission has decided that it has no authority to conduct the kind of antitrust review (or, if it had authority, would not perform as a matter of policy) that KEPCo would have us undertake now in connection with the proposed license transfer. Accordingly, even if the staff is wrong that the Applicants proposal to substitute Westar as the new licensee in the Wolf Creek license conditions is the appropriate disposition and addresses KEPCo's antitrust concerns with the transfer, consistent with CLI-99-19, the staff cannot embark on a course to determine what new or different conditions might be warranted. Second, if future events prove KEPCo's antitrust concerns valid, then KEPCo has a number of options available to it to have those antitrust issues resolved (see, e.g., Atomic Energy Acts § 105a, b), including, if appropriate, seeking NRC enforcement of the transferred license conditions against Westar.

For these reasons, if the Applicants' proposed transfer is approved by the Commission, the existing antitrust license conditions will be administratively amended to substitute Westar as the licensee to which all antitrust license conditions apply.

Sincerely,  
 ORIGINAL SIGNED BY R. ZIMMERMAN FOR  
 Samuel J. Collins, Director  
 Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-482

cc: See next page

DISTRIBUTION:

Docket File	SRichards
PUBLIC	OPA
PDIV-2 Reading	ACRS
KBrockman, RIV	WJohnson, RIV
OGC, 15B18	JGoldberg, OGC
KHart, SECY	CCarpenter
NRR Mail Room	

\* SRM dated 10/01/99 for SECY-99-220 dated 08/30/99 approved letter

DOCUMENT NAME: G:\WOLFCREEK\SECY-99-220-Letter.WPD

TO RECEIVE A COPY OF THIS DOCUMENT, INDICATE IN THE BOX: "C" = COPY WITHOUT ENCLOSURES "E" = COPY WITH ENCLOSURES "N"

OFFICE	PM/PDIV-2	C	LA/PDIV-2	C	OGC	SC/PDIV-2
NAME	JDonohew:sp		EPeyton		SECY-99-220*	SDembek
DATE	10/15/99		10/15/99		08/30/99	10/15/99
OFFICE	D/PDIV-2	C	D/DLPM		ADPT	D/NRR
NAME	SRichards		JZwolinski*		BSheron*	SCollins
DATE	10/15/99		08/30/99		08/30/99	10/19/99

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

William T. Miller, Esq.  
Randolph Lee Elliott, Esq.

- 3 -

cc:

Jay Silberg, Esq.  
Shaw, Pittman, Potts & Trowbridge  
2300 N Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20037

Vice President & Chief Operating Officer  
Wolf Creek Nuclear Operating Corporation  
P. O. Box 411  
Burlington, Kansas 66839

Regional Administrator, Region IV  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
611 Ryan Plaza Drive, Suite 1000  
Arlington, Texas 76011

Superintendent Licensing  
Wolf Creek Nuclear Operating Corporation  
P.O. Box 411  
Burlington, Kansas 66839

Senior Resident Inspector  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
P. O. Box 311  
Burlington, Kansas 66839

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Resident Inspectors Office  
8201 NRC Road  
Steedman, Missouri 65077-1032

Chief Engineer  
Utilities Division  
Kansas Corporation Commission  
1500 SW Arrowhead Road  
Topeka, Kansas 66604-4027

Mr. Otto L. Maynard  
President and Chief Executive Officer  
Wolf Creek Nuclear Operating Corporation  
Post Office Box 411  
Burlington, KA 66839

Office of the Governor  
State of Kansas  
Topeka, Kansas 66612

Attorney General  
Judicial Center  
301 S.W. 10th  
2nd Floor  
Topeka, Kansas 66612

County Clerk  
Coffey County Courthouse  
Burlington, Kansas 66839

Vick L. Cooper, Chief  
Radiation Control Program  
Kansas Department of Health  
and Environment  
Bureau of Air and Radiation  
Forbes Field Building 283  
Topeka, Kansas 66620