

DISCLAIMER

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States Government. Neither the United States Government nor any agency thereof, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof.

DISCLAIMER

Portions of this document may be illegible in electronic image products. Images are produced from the best available original document.

Foreword

Digests and indexes for issuances of the Commission (CLI), the Atomic Safety and Licensing Appeal Panel (ALAB), the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel (LBP), the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ), the Directors' Decisions (DD), and the Denials of Petitions of Rulemaking are presented in this document. These digests and indexes are intended to serve as a guide to the issuances.

Information elements common to the cases heard and ruled upon are:

- Case name (owners of facility)
- Full text reference (volume and pagination)
- Issuance number
- Issues raised by appellants
- Legal citations (cases, regulations, and statutes)
- Name of facility, Docket number
- Subject matter of issues and/or rulings
- Type of hearing (for construction permit, operating license, etc.)
- Type of issuance (memorandum, order, decision, etc.).

These information elements are displayed in one or more of five separate formats arranged as follows:

1. Case Name Index

The case name index is an alphabetical arrangement of the case names of the issuances. Each case name is followed by the type of hearing, the type of issuance, docket number, issuance number, and full text reference.

2. Digests and Headers

The headers and digests are presented in issuance number order as follows: the Commission (CLI), the Atomic Safety and Licensing Appeal Panel (ALAB), the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel (LBP), the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ), the Directors' Decisions (DD), and the Denials of Petitions for Rulemaking.

The header identifies the issuance by issuance number, case name, facility name, docket number, type of hearing, date of issuance, and type of issuance.

The digest is a brief narrative of an issue followed by the resolution of the issue and any legal references used in resolving the issue. If a given issuance covers more than one issue, then separate digests are used for each issue and are designated alphabetically.

3. Legal Citations Index

This index is divided into four parts and consists of alphabetical or alphanumerical arrangements of Cases, Regulations, Statutes, and Others. These citations are listed as given in the issuances. Changes in regulations and Statutes may have occurred to cause changes in the number or name and/or applicability of the citation. It is therefore important to consider the date of the issuance.

The references to cases, regulations, statutes, and others are generally followed by phrases that show the application of the citation in the particular issuance. These phrases are followed by the issuance number and the full text reference.

4. Subject Index

Subject words and/or phrases, arranged alphabetically, indicate the issues and subjects covered in the issuances. The subject headings are followed by phrases that give specific information about the subject, as discussed in the issuances being indexed. These phrases are followed by the issuance number and the full text reference.

5. Facility Index

This index consists of an alphabetical arrangement of facility names from the issuance. The name is followed by docket number, type of hearing, date, type of issuance, issuance number, and full text reference.

CASE NAME INDEX

ARIZONA PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY, et al.

OPERATING LICENSE; INITIAL DECISION; Docket Nos. STN-50-528-OL, STN-50-529-OL, STN-50-530-OL (ASLBP No. 80-447-01-OL); LBP-82-117A, 16 NRC 1964 (1982)

OPERATING LICENSE; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; Docket Nos. STN-50-528-OL, STN-50-529-OL, STN-50-530-OL; LBP-82-62, 16 NRC 565 (1982); LBP-82-117B, 16 NRC 2024 (1982)

ARMED FORCES RADIobiology RESEARCH INSTITUTE

BYPRODUCT MATERIALS LICENSE RENEWAL; DECISION; Docket No. 30-6931 (Renewal of Byproduct Materials License No. 19-08330-03); ALAB-682, 16 NRC 150 (1982)

BOSTON EDISON COMPANY

OPERATING LICENSE MODIFICATION; ORDER; Docket No. 50-293 (EA-81-63); CLI-82-16, 16 NRC 44 (1982)

CAROLINA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY AND NORTH CAROLINA EASTERN MUNICIPAL POWER AGENCY

OPERATING LICENSE; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; Docket Nos. 50-400-OL, 50-401-OL (ASLBP No. 82-468-01-OL); LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2069 (1982)

CINCINNATI GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY

SHOW CAUSE; ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE AND ORDER IMMEDIATELY SUSPENDING CONSTRUCTION; Docket No. 50-358 (EA 82-129); CLI-82-33, 16 NRC 1489 (1982)

CINCINNATI GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY, et al.

DISQUALIFICATION; ORDER; Docket No. 50-358; CLI-82-36, 16 NRC 1512 (1982)

OPERATING LICENSE; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; Docket No. 50-358-OL; LBP-82-54, 16 NRC 210 (1982); LBP-82-68, 16 NRC 741 (1982)

OPERATING LICENSE; ORDER; Docket No. 50-358; CLI-82-20, 16 NRC 109 (1982); CLI-82-40, 16 NRC 1717 (1982)

CLEVELAND ELECTRIC ILLUMINATING COMPANY, et al.

OPERATING LICENSE; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; Docket Nos. 50-440-OL, 50-441-OL; ALAB-706, 16 NRC 1754 (1982); LBP-82-53, 16 NRC 196 (1982); LBP-82-53A, 16 NRC 208 (1982); LBP-82-69, 16 NRC 751 (1982); LBP-82-79, 16 NRC 1116 (1982); LBP-82-89, 16 NRC 1355 (1982); LBP-82-90, 16 NRC 1359 (1982); LBP-82-98, 16 NRC 1459 (1982); LBP-82-102, 16 NRC 1597 (1982); LBP-82-104, 16 NRC 1626 (1982); LBP-82-110, 16 NRC 1895 (1982); LBP-82-114, 16 NRC 1909 (1982); LBP-82-117, 16 NRC 1955 (1982); LBP-82-119, 16 NRC 2063 (1982)

OPERATING LICENSE; ORDER; Docket Nos. 50-440-OL, 50-441-OL; LBP-82-67, 16 NRC 734 (1982)

COMMONWEALTH EDISON COMPANY

OPERATING LICENSE AMENDMENT; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; Docket No. 50-10-OLA; LBP-82-52, 16 NRC 183 (1982)

SHOW CAUSE; DIRECTOR'S DECISION UNDER 10 CFR 2.206; Docket Nos. 50-373, 50-374; DD-82-9, 16 NRC 396 (1982)

SPENT FUEL POOL AMENDMENT; FINAL INITIAL DECISION; Docket Nos. 50-237-SP, 50-249-SP; LBP-82-65, 16 NRC 714 (1982)

SPENT FUEL POOL MODIFICATION; DECISION; Docket Nos. 50-237, 50-249; ALAB-695, 16 NRC 962 (1982)

CONSOLIDATED EDISON COMPANY OF NEW YORK, INC.

ENFORCEMENT ACTION; DECISION; Docket No. 50-247; CLI-82-38, 16 NRC 1698 (1982)

SCHEDULING; ORDER GRANTING IN PART AND DENYING IN PART MOTION TO DIRECT STAFF TO RESCHEDULE MEETING; Docket No. 50-247; CLI-82-41, 16 NRC 1721 (1982)

CASE NAME INDEX

SPECIAL PROCEEDING; MEMORANDUM AND CERTIFICATION; Docket No. 50-247-SP; LBP-82-61, 16 NRC 560 (1982)

SPECIAL PROCEEDING; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; Docket No. 50-247-SP; CLI-82-15, 16 NRC 27 (1982); LBP-82-105, 16 NRC 1629 (1982); LBP-82-113, 16 NRC 1907 (1982)

SPECIAL PROCEEDING; ORDER; Docket No. 50-247; CLI-82-24, 16 NRC 865 (1982); CLI-82-25, 16 NRC 867 (1982); CLI-82-28, 16 NRC 1219 (1982)

SUSPENSION OF OPERATION; DIRECTOR'S DECISION UNDER 10 CFR 2.206; Docket No. 50-247; DD-82-12, 16 NRC 1685 (1982)

CONSUMERS POWER COMPANY

MODIFICATION ORDER AND OPERATING LICENSE; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; Docket Nos. 50-329-OM&OL, 50-330-OM&OL; ALAB-684, 16 NRC 162 (1982)

MODIFICATION ORDER AND OPERATING LICENSE; PREHEARING CONFERENCE ORDER; Docket Nos. 50-329-OM&OL, 50-330-OM&OL; LBP-82-63, 16 NRC 571 (1982)

OPERATING LICENSE AMENDMENT; ORDER OF DISMISSAL; Docket No. 50-255-OLA; LBP-82-101, 16 NRC 1594 (1982)

OPERATING LICENSE AND CONSTRUCTION PERMIT MODIFICATION ORDER; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; Docket Nos. 50-329-OM&OL, 50-330-OM&OL (ASLBP Nos. 78-389-03-OL, 80-429-02-SP); LBP-82-118, 16 NRC 2034 (1982)

OPERATING LICENSE AND CONSTRUCTION PERMIT MODIFICATION ORDER; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; Docket Nos. 50-329-OM&OL, 50-330-OM&OL; LBP-82-95, 16 NRC 1401 (1982)

REMAND; DECISION; Docket Nos. 50-329-CP, 50-330-CP; ALAB-691, 16 NRC 897 (1982)

SCHEDULING; MEMORANDUM; Docket No. 50-155-OLA; LBP-82-51A, 16 NRC 180 (1982)

SPENT FUEL POOL AMENDMENT; INITIAL DECISION; Docket No. 50-155-OLA; LBP-82-60, 16 NRC 540 (1982); LBP-82-77, 16 NRC 1096 (1982); LBP-82-78, 16 NRC 1107 (1982); LBP-82-97, 16 NRC 1439 (1982)

SPENT FUEL POOL AMENDMENT; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; Docket No. 50-155; LBP-82-111, 16 NRC 1898 (1982)

VACATION OF DECISION; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; Docket No. 50-255-SP; CLI-82-18, 16 NRC 50 (1982)

DAIRYLAND POWER COOPERATIVE

OPERATING LICENSE; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; Docket Nos. 50-409-FTOL 50-409-SC; LBP-82-58, 16 NRC 512 (1982)

DETROIT EDISON COMPANY, et al.

OPERATING LICENSE; DECISION; Docket No. 50-341-OL; ALAB-707, 16 NRC 1760 (1982)

OPERATING LICENSE; INITIAL DECISION; Docket No. 50-341; LBP-82-96, 16 NRC 1408 (1982)

DUKE POWER COMPANY

CONSTRUCTION PERMIT; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER AUTHORIZING WITHDRAWAL OF APPLICATION FOR CONSTRUCTION PERMIT WITHOUT PREJUDICE; Docket Nos. STN-50-488, STN-50-489, STN-50-490; LBP-82-81, 16 NRC 1128 (1982)

DUKE POWER COMPANY, et al.

LIMITED WORK AUTHORIZATION; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; Docket Nos. 50-413, 50-414; ALAB-687, 16 NRC 460 (1982)

OPERATING LICENSE; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; Docket Nos. 50-413, 50-414 (ASLBP No. 81-463-01-OL); LBP-82-107A, 16 NRC 1791 (1982); LBP-82-116, 16 NRC 1937 (1982)

SPECIAL PROCEEDING; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; Docket Nos. 50-413, 50-414; LBP-82-51, 16 NRC 167 (1982)

GENERAL ATOMIC COMPANY

RULEMAKING; DENIAL OF PETITION FOR RULEMAKING; Docket No. PRM-95-1 (10 CFR Part 95); DPRM-82-1, 16 NRC 861 (1982)

GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY

OPERATING LICENSE AMENDMENT; ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO WITHDRAW APPLICATION AND DISMISSING PROCEEDING WITHOUT PREJUDICE; Docket No. 70-1308 (Application to Modify License No. SNM-1265 to Increase Spent Fuel Storage Capacity); LBP-82-83, 16 NRC 1181 (1982)

SHOW CAUSE; INITIAL DECISION; Docket No. 50-70-SC; LBP-82-64, 16 NRC 596 (1982)

CASE NAME INDEX

HOUSTON LIGHTING AND POWER COMPANY

CONSTRUCTION PERMIT; ORDER; Docket No. 50-466-CP; LBP-82-94, 16 NRC 1399 (1982)

HOUSTON LIGHTING AND POWER COMPANY, et al.

OPERATING LICENSE; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; Docket Nos. STN 50-498-OL, STN 50-499-OL; LBP-82-91, 16 NRC 1364 (1982)

ILLINOIS POWER COMPANY, et al.

OPERATING LICENSE; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; Docket No. 50-461-OL; LBP-82-103, 16 NRC 1603 (1982)

KERR-MCGEE CORPORATION

MATERIALS LICENSE AMENDMENT; ORDER; Docket No. 40-2061; CLI-82-21, 16 NRC 401 (1982)

LONG ISLAND LIGHTING COMPANY

OPERATING LICENSE; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER CONFIRMING RULING ON SANCTIONS FOR INTERVENORS' REFUSAL TO COMPLY WITH ORDER TO PARTICIPATE IN PREHEARING EXAMINATIONS; Docket No. 50-322-OL (Emergency Planning); LBP-82-115, 16 NRC 1923 (1982)

OPERATING LICENSE; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER RULING ON LICENSING BOARD AUTHORITY TO DIRECT THAT INITIAL EXAMINATION OF THE PRE-FILED TESTIMONY BE CONDUCTED BY MEANS OF PREHEARING EXAMINATIONS; Docket No. 50-322-OL (Emergency Planning); LBP-82-107, 16 NRC 1667 (1982)

OPERATING LICENSE; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; Docket No. 50-322-OL (Emergency Planning); LBP-82-82, 16 NRC 1144 (1982)

OPERATING LICENSE; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; Docket No. 50-322-OL; LBP-82-73, 16 NRC 974 (1982); LBP-82-75, 16 NRC 986 (1982)

OPERATING LICENSE; ORDER; Docket No. 50-322-OL; CLI-82-17, 16 NRC 48 (1982)

SECURITY; MEMORANDUM, ORDER AND NOTICE OF SECOND IN CAMERA CONFERENCE OF COUNSEL; Docket No. 50-322-OL-2, ASLBP No. 82-478-05-OL; LBP-82-80, 16 NRC 1121 (1982)

LOUISIANA POWER AND LIGHT COMPANY

OPERATING LICENSE; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; Docket No. 50-382-OL; LBP-82-66, 16 NRC 730 (1982); LBP-82-112, 16 NRC 1901 (1982)

OPERATING LICENSE; PARTIAL INITIAL DECISION; Docket No. 50-382-OL; LBP-82-100, 16 NRC 1550 (1982)

REMAND; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; Docket No. 50-382-OL; ALAB-690, 16 NRC 893 (1982)

METROPOLITAN EDISON COMPANY

RESTART; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; Docket No. 50-289-SP; ALAB-685, 16 NRC 449 (1982); CLI-82-31, 16 NRC 1236 (1982); LBP-82-86, 16 NRC 1190 (1982)

RESTART; ORDER; Docket No. 50-289-SP; CLI-82-32, 16 NRC 1243 (1982); CLI-82-12, 16 NRC 1 (1982)

RESTART; PARTIAL INITIAL DECISION; Docket No. 50-289; LBP-82-56, 16 NRC 281 (1982)

METROPOLITAN EDISON COMPANY, et al.

OPERATING LICENSE AMENDMENT; DECISION; Docket No. 50-320-OLA; ALAB-692, 16 NRC 921 (1982)

OPERATING LICENSE; DECISION; Docket No. 50-320; ALAB-701, 16 NRC 1517 (1982)

RESTART; DECISION; Docket No. 50-289 (Environmental Issues); ALAB-705, 16 NRC 1733 (1982)

RESTART; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; Docket No. 50-289 (Design Issues); ALAB-708, 16 NRC 1770 (1982)

RESTART; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; Docket No. 50-289-SP (Management Phase); ALAB-699, 16 NRC 1324 (1982)

RESTART; ORDER; Docket No. 50-289; CLI-82-13, 16 NRC 21 (1982)

SPECIAL PROCEEDING; DECISION; Docket No. 50-289-SP (Emergency Planning); ALAB-697, 16 NRC 1265 (1982); ALAB-698, 16 NRC 1290 (1982)

MISSISSIPPI POWER & LIGHT COMPANY, et al.

OPERATING LICENSE; DECISION; Docket Nos. 50-416, 50-417; ALAB-704, 16 NRC 1725 (1982)

CASE NAME INDEX

OPERATING LICENSE; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER DENYING STATE OF LOUISIANA'S PETITION FOR INTERVENTION; Docket Nos. 50-416-OL, 50-417-OL (ASLBP No. 82-476-04-OL); LBP-82-92, 16 NRC 1376 (1982)

NUCLEAR FUEL SERVICES, INC. and NEW YORK STATE ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

OPERATING LICENSE AMENDMENT; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; Docket No. 50-201-OLA; ALAB-679, 16 NRC 121 (1982)

OFFSHORE POWER SYSTEMS

MANUFACTURING LICENSE; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; Docket No. STN 50-437-ML; ALAB-686, 16 NRC 454 (1982); ALAB-689, 16 NRC 887 (1982); CLI-82-37, 16 NRC 1691 (1982)

PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

DECOMMISSIONING; DIRECTOR'S DECISION UNDER 10 CFR 2.206; Docket No. 50-133; DD-82-7, 16 NRC 387 (1982)

OPERATING LICENSE; DECLINATION OF REVIEW; Dockets 50-275-OL, 50-323-OL; CLI-82-12A, 16 NRC 7 (1982)

OPERATING LICENSE; DIRECTOR'S DECISION UNDER 10 CFR 2.206; Docket Nos. 50-275, 50-276; DD-82-10, 16 NRC 1205 (1982)

OPERATING LICENSE; INITIAL DECISION; Docket Nos. 50-275-OL 50-323-OL; LBP-82-70, 16 NRC 756 (1982)

OPERATING LICENSE; MEMORANDUM AND CERTIFICATION TO THE COMMISSION; Docket Nos. 50-275-OL, 50-323-OL; ALAB-681, 16 NRC 146 (1982)

OPERATING LICENSE; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; Docket Nos. 50-275-OL, 50-323-OL; CLI-82-39, 16 NRC 1712 (1982)

OPERATING LICENSE; MEMORANDUM IN RESPONSE TO NRC STAFF'S MOTION FOR CLARIFICATION OF THE LICENSING BOARD'S INITIAL DECISION DATED AUGUST 31, 1982; Docket Nos. 50-275-OL, 50-323-OL; LBP-82-85, 16 NRC 1187 (1982)

PHYSICAL SECURITY; ORDER; Docket Nos. 50-275-OL, 50-323-OL; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 53 (1982); CLI-82-30, 16 NRC 1234 (1982)

PENNSYLVANIA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY and ALLEGHENY ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, INC.

OPERATING LICENSE; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; Docket Nos. 50-387-OL, 50-388-OL; ALAB-702, 16 NRC 1530 (1982); ALAB-693, 16 NRC 952 (1982)

PETITION OF SUNFLOWER COALITION

RECONSIDERATION OF AMENDED STATE AGREEMENT; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; Docket Nos. 50-361-OL, 50-362-OL; CLI-82-34, 16 NRC 1502 (1982)

PHILADELPHIA ELECTRIC COMPANY

CONSTRUCTION PERMIT SUSPENSION; DIRECTOR'S DECISION UNDER 10 CFR 2.206; Docket Nos. 50-352, 50-353; DD-82-13, 16 NRC 2115 (1982)

OPERATING LICENSE; CONFIRMATORY MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; Docket Nos. 50-352, 50-353; LBP-82-92A, 16 NRC 1387 (1982)

OPERATING LICENSE; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; Docket Nos. 50-352, 50-353; LBP-82-71, 16 NRC 965 (1982); LBP-82-72, 16 NRC 968 (1982)

PHILADELPHIA ELECTRIC COMPANY, et al.

OPERATING LICENSE; DECISION; Docket Nos. 50-277, 50-278; ALAB-701, 16 NRC 1517 (1982)

POWER AUTHORITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

ENFORCEMENT ACTION; DECISION; Docket No. 50-286; CLI-82-38, 16 NRC 1698 (1982)

SCHEDULING; ORDER GRANTING IN PART AND DENYING IN PART MOTION TO DIRECT STAFF TO RESCHEDULE MEETING; Docket No. 50-286; CLI-82-41, 16 NRC 1721 (1982)

SPECIAL PROCEEDING; MEMORANDUM AND CERTIFICATION; Docket No. 50-286-SP; LBP-82-61, 16 NRC 560 (1982)

SPECIAL PROCEEDING; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; Docket No. 50-286-SP; CLI-82-15, 16 NRC 27 (1982); LBP-82-105, 16 NRC 1629 (1982); LBP-82-113, 16 NRC 1907 (1982)

SPECIAL PROCEEDING; ORDER; Docket No. 50-286; CLI-82-24, 16 NRC 865 (1982); CLI-82-25, 16 NRC 867 (1982); CLI-82-28, 16 NRC 1219 (1982)

CASE NAME INDEX

SUSPENSION OF OPERATION; DIRECTOR'S DECISION UNDER 10 CFR 2.206; Docket No. 50-286; DD-82-12, 16 NRC 1685 (1982)

PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
SHOW CAUSE; DIRECTOR'S DECISION UNDER 10 CFR 2.206; Docket Nos. 50-443, 50-444; DD-82-8, 16 NRC 394 (1982)

PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY OF NEW HAMPSHIRE, et al.
OPERATING LICENSE; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; Docket Nos. 50-443-OL, 50-444-OL (ASLB No. 82-471-02-OL); LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1029 (1982); LBP-82-106, 16 NRC 1649 (1982)

PUBLIC SERVICE ELECTRIC AND GAS COMPANY
OPERATING LICENSE; DECISION; Docket Nos. 50-354, 50-355; ALAB-701, 16 NRC 1517 (1982)

PUGET SOUND POWER AND LIGHT COMPANY, et al.
CONSTRUCTION PERMIT; DECISION; Docket Nos. 50-522, 50-523; ALAB-700, 16 NRC 1329 (1982)

CONSTRUCTION PERMIT; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; Docket Nos. 50-522, 50-523; ALAB-683, 16 NRC 160 (1982); LBP-82-74, 16 NRC 981 (1982)

ROCHESTER GAS AND ELECTRIC CORPORATION
OPERATING LICENSE; DIRECTOR'S DECISION UNDER 10 CFR 2.206; Docket No. 50-244 (10 CFR 2.206); DD-82-11, 16 NRC 1473 (1982)

SACRAMENTO MUNICIPAL UTILITY DISTRICT
SPECIAL PROCEEDING; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; Docket No. 50-312-SP; ALAB-703, 16 NRC 1533 (1982)

SOUTH CAROLINA ELECTRIC & GAS COMPANY, et al.
OPERATING LICENSE; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; Docket No. 50-395-OL; ALAB-694, 16 NRC 958 (1982); LBP-82-84, 16 NRC 1183 (1982)

OPERATING LICENSE; PARTIAL INITIAL DECISION; Docket No. 50-395-OL; LBP-82-55, 16 NRC 225 (1982)

OPERATING LICENSE; SUPPLEMENTAL PARTIAL INITIAL DECISION; Docket No. 50-395-OL; LBP-82-57, 16 NRC 477 (1982)

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY
OPERATING LICENSE; ORDER; Docket Nos. 50-361-OL, 50-362-OL; CLI-82-14, 16 NRC 24 (1982)

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY, et al.
OPERATING LICENSE; CORRECTED MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; Docket Nos. 50-361-OL, 50-362-OL; CLI-82-35, 16 NRC 1510 (1982)

OPERATING LICENSE; DECISION; Docket Nos. 50-361-OL, 50-362-OL; ALAB-680, 16 NRC 127 (1982)

OPERATING LICENSE; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; Docket Nos. 50-361-OL, 50-362-OL; LBP-82-60A, 16 NRC 555 (1982)

OPERATING LICENSE; ORDER; Docket Nos. 50-361-OL, 50-362-OL; CLI-82-27, 16 NRC 883 (1982)

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY
OPERATING LICENSE AMENDMENT; ORDER; Docket Nos. 50-259-OLA, 50-260-OLA, 50-296-OLA; CLI-82-26, 16 NRC 880 (1982)

TEXAS UTILITIES GENERATING COMPANY, et al.
OPERATING LICENSE; ORDER DENYING RECONSIDERATION; Docket Nos. 50-445, 50-446; LBP-82-87, 16 NRC 1195 (1982)

SHOW CAUSE; ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE; Docket Nos. 50-445 50-446; LBP-82-59, 16 NRC 553 (1982)

THE REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
OPERATING LICENSE RENEWAL; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; Docket No. 50-142-OL; LBP-82-93, 16 NRC 1391 (1982); LBP-82-99, 16 NRC 1541 (1982)

UNION ELECTRIC COMPANY
OPERATING LICENSE; PARTIAL INITIAL DECISION; Docket No. STN 50-483-OL; LBP-82-109, 16 NRC 1826 (1982)

DIGESTS
ISSUANCES OF THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

CLI-82-12 METROPOLITAN EDISON COMPANY (Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit No. 1), Docket No. 50-289; RESTART; July 16, 1982; ORDER

A The Commission denies a request by the Appeal Board for authority to hear three safety issues raised by the Board *sua sponte*, and decides that the issues will be dealt with by the staff and the Commission outside the context of this adjudicatory proceeding.

CLI-82-12A PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY (Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2), Dockets 50-275-OL, 50-323-OL; OPERATING LICENSE; March 18, 1982; DECLINATION OF REVIEW

CLI-82-13 METROPOLITAN EDISON COMPANY, et al. (Three Mile Island, Unit 1), Docket No. 50-289; RESTART; July 16, 1982; ORDER

A The Commission denies a motion by the licensee asking the Commission to decide expeditiously whether (1) it intends to prepare a supplemental environmental impact statement (SEIS) on psychological health effects associated with the operation of this facility in accordance with the decision in *PANE v. NRC*, No. 81-1131 (D.C. Cir., May 14, 1982), and if so, (2) to proceed expeditiously with its preparation and circulation, and (3) to decide that no hearing would be permitted on the SEIS. The Commission determines that it does not at present have enough information to decide whether the terms of the court's decision require the preparation of an SEIS.

CLI-82-14 SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY (San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station, Units 2 and 3), Docket Nos. 50-361-OL, 50-362-OL; OPERATING LICENSE; July 16, 1982; ORDER

A On the basis of its immediate effectiveness review pursuant to 10 CFR 2.764(f), the Commission concludes that resolution of the issues covered by the Licensing Board's decisions in this operating license proceeding (LBP-82-3, 15 NRC 61 (1982); LBP-82-39, 15 NRC 1163 (1982); LBP-82-46, 15 NRC 1531 (1982)) does not present the type of safety problem which would require a further stay of their effectiveness, and decides that these decisions may go into effect. The license authorized is made subject to the condition that for operation above 5% of rated power to continue beyond six months from the date of issuance of the full-power license, the offsite medical arrangements issue retained by the Licensing Board in LBP-82-39 must be resolved or further operation above 5% must be justified under 10 CFR 50.47(c)(1). The Commission explains that its decision does not authorize issuance of the requested full-power license for Units 2 and 3 of this facility and further that they will not be issued until the staff has briefed the Commission on other, uncontested, issues and the Commission has voted on whether to authorize the licenses.

CLI-82-15 CONSOLIDATED EDISON COMPANY OF NEW YORK (Indian Point, Unit 2) and **POWER AUTHORITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK** (Indian Point, Unit 3), Docket Nos. 50-247, 50-286; SPECIAL PROCEEDING; July 27, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

A Upon consideration of a series of pleadings by licensees concerning the Commission's plan to conduct a discretionary hearing on the possible suspension of Units 2 and 3 of the Indian Point facility, the Commission denies: (1) an appeal by a licensee from the order of the Licensing Board (established at the direction of the Commission to determine, *inter alia*, the issues which the forthcoming hearing are to address) admitting certain intervenors to the hearing; (2) a petition by a licensee for directed certification of its request for stay or dismissal of the proceeding; and (3) a petition by the two licensees for directed certification of their charges that the Board exceeded or misapplied its jurisdiction in admitting contentions. The Commission, *inter alia*, provides further guidance on the admission of contentions and the formulation of issues for hearing, and remands the matter to the Board for expeditious reconsideration of its rulings on the admissibility of the contentions in light of the additional guidance.

DIGESTS
ISSUANCES OF THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

B There is nothing in 10 CFR 2.714 or the case law interpreting that rule which permits licensing boards to exclude certain groups from a licensing proceeding because of their opinions on nuclear power, either generally or as related to certain plants, or because of their conduct outside the proceeding.

C The Commission has an inherent supervisory power over the conduct of its adjudicatory proceedings, including the authority to provide guidance on the admissibility of contentions before licensing boards. See Public Service Co. of New Hampshire (Seabrook Station, Units 1 and 2), CLI-77-8, 5 NRC 503, 516-17 (1977); United States Energy Research and Development Administration (Clinch River Breeder Reactor Plant), CLI-76-13, 4 NRC 67, 75-76 (1976).

CLI-82-16 BOSTON EDISON COMPANY (Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station), Docket No. 50-293 (EA-81-63); OPERATING LICENSE MODIFICATION; July 30, 1982; ORDER

A The Commission denies a petition by the Attorney General of Massachusetts for a hearing and intervention on an order of the NRC Office of Inspection and Enforcement modifying the operating license for this facility, on the ground that the petition presents concerns outside the scope of the proceeding.

B Section 189a of the Atomic Energy Act does not provide a non-discretionary right to a hearing on all issues arguably related to an acknowledged enforcement problem without regard to the scope of the enforcement action actually proposed or taken by the Commission. In order to obtain leave to intervene in an NRC proceeding, a petitioner must demonstrate an interest affected by the licensing action, as required by 10 CFR 2.714. *BPI v. Atomic Energy Commission*, 502 F.2d 424 (D.C. Cir. 1974).

C The Commission may limit the issues in enforcement proceedings to whether the facts as stated in the order are true and whether the remedy selected is supported by those facts. Public Service Co. of Indiana (Marble Hill Nuclear Generating Station, Units 1 and 2), CLI-80-10, 11 NRC 438, 441-42 (1980).

CLI-82-17 LONG ISLAND LIGHTING COMPANY (Shoreham Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1), Docket No. 50-322-OL; OPERATING LICENSE; July 30, 1982; ORDER

A In response to a request by counsel for the applicant, the Commission directs that applicant's and intervenor's counsel be given access to those portions of the Appeal Board's opinion in the Diablo Canyon operating license (physical security) proceeding (ALAB-653) (Restricted) dealing with the definition of the design basis threat and the interpretation of the Commission's regulations regarding the appropriate number of armed responders, subject to the prior deletion of any classified information contained therein and the execution of appropriate non-disclosure affidavits. In response to a further request by intervenor's counsel for access by intervenor's consultants and for access to the entire Diablo Canyon security file, the Commission: (1) refers the request for access by intervenor's consultants to the Licensing Board with a direction to authorize access only upon a showing of need; and (2) denies access to the other portions of the opinion and the underlying record in the absence of a showing of need for such access.

CLI-82-18 CONSUMERS POWER COMPANY (Palisades Nuclear Power Facility), Docket No. 50-255-SP; VACATION OF DECISION; July 30, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

A The Commission vacates on grounds of mootness the Appeal Board's and the Licensing Board's earlier decisions (ALAB-670, 15 NRC 493 (1982); LBP-81-26, 14 NRC 247 (1981)) concerning the holding of a hearing on a confirmatory order by the Director of the Office of Inspection and Enforcement restricting licensed operator overtime work at Palisades.

B Under established NRC practice, unreviewed judgments are vacated when their appellate review becomes unavailable because of mootness. See, e.g., Boston Edison Company (Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station, Unit 2), ALAB-656, 14 NRC 965 (1981); Rochester Gas & Electric Corp. (Sterling Power Project, Nuclear Unit No. 1), ALAB-596, 11 NRC 867 (1980).

CLI-82-19 PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY (Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2), Docket Nos. 50-275-OL, 50-323-OL; PHYSICAL SECURITY; July 30, 1982; ORDER

A In response to a motion by the representative of an interested state requesting that portions of ALAB-653 (Restricted) and his petition for review of that decision which do not contain protected information be made public, the Commission releases versions of both documents with all protected information deleted. The Commission determines that the meaning of "several" as used in the design basis threat of 10 CFR 73.1(a)(1) is safeguards information under Section 147 of the Atomic Energy Act.

DIGESTS
ISSUANCES OF THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

CLI-82-20 CINCINNATI GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY, et al. (Wm. H. Zimmer Nuclear Power Station, Unit No. 1), Docket No. 50-358; OPERATING LICENSE; July 30, 1982; ORDER

- A The Commission directs the Licensing Board to dismiss certain contentions from this operating license proceeding which the Board admitted as Board issues pursuant to its *sua sponte* authority under 10 CFR 2.760a.
- B After the record is closed in an operating license proceeding, where parties proffering new contentions do not meet the legal standards for further hearings, that the contentions raise serious issues is insufficient justification to reopen the record to consider them as Board issues when they are being dealt with in the course of ongoing NRC investigation and staff monitoring.

CLI-82-21 KERR-MCGEE CORPORATION (West Chicago Rare Earths Facility), Docket No. 40-2061; MATERIALS LICENSE AMENDMENT; August 6, 1982; ORDER

- A The Commission delegates to the Director of the Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards (NMSS), or such NMSS Branch Chief or above as he may designate, the authority to conduct an informal adjudicatory proceeding on petitioner's contentions concerning licensee's application for an amendment to its 10 CFR Part 40 materials license authorizing it to perform certain work at its now-inactive thorium ore milling facility. The Commission additionally sets forth the parties to the informal proceeding and the procedures by which it will be conducted.
- B A petitioner is not entitled, under either the Atomic Energy Act or NRC regulations, to a formal, trial-type hearing on materials licensing actions. Kerr-McGee Corp. (West Chicago Rare Earths Facility), CLI-82-2, 15 NRC 232 (1982).

CLI-82-22 UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY, PROJECT MANAGEMENT CORPORATION, TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY (Clinch River Breeder Reactor Plant), Docket No. 50-537 (Exemption request under 10 CFR 50.12); CONSTRUCTION PERMIT EXEMPTION; August 12, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

- A The Commission considers a petition by intervenors for investigation into allegations that Applicants attempted to conceal certain crucial safety information from the Commission in connection with their application for a license for the Clinch River Breeder Reactor Plant. Upon review of the response of the Department of Energy to the allegations and to certain questions earlier posed by the Commission, the response of the NRC Staff to questions separately addressed to it, and the response of the intervenors, the Commission concludes that the allegations are without foundation. The Commission, therefore, denies the petition for investigation.

CLI-82-23 UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY, PROJECT MANAGEMENT CORPORATION, TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY (Clinch River Breeder Reactor Plant), Docket No. 50-537 (Exemption request under 10 CFR 50.12); CONSTRUCTION PERMIT EXEMPTION; August 17, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

- A The Commission grants in part and denies in part the Department of Energy's request for an exemption pursuant to 10 CFR 50.12 from the provision of 10 CFR 50.10(c) prohibiting the commencement of certain site or construction work prior to obtaining a construction permit or Limited Work Authorization. The Commission authorizes the applicants to conduct non-safety related site preparation activities in connection with the Clinch River facility but denies the exemption request as it pertains to safety-related activities.
- B 10 CFR 50.10(c) generally prohibits any person from clearing or excavating a nuclear power reactor site or otherwise commencing construction of a nuclear power reactor until a construction permit or a limited work authorization has been obtained following the holding of an adjudicatory hearing.
- C 10 CFR 50.12(a) provides for the case-by-case granting of exemptions from the prohibition of 10 CFR 50.10(c) if specified criteria are met.
- D The Commission may apply 10 CFR 50.12 to a "first of a kind" project: there is no indication in the regulations or past practice that exemptions for conduct of site preparation activities are to be confined to typical, commercial light water nuclear power reactors or that an exemption can be granted only if a limited work authorization under 10 CFR 50.10(e)(1) and (2) ("LWA-1") can also be granted or only if justified to meet electrical energy needs.
- E The common-law rules regarding *res judicata* do not apply, in a strict sense, to administrative agencies.
- F *Res judicata* need not be applied by an administrative agency where there are overriding public policy interests which favor relitigation.

DIGESTS
ISSUANCES OF THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

- G When an agency decision involves substantial policy issues, an agency's need for flexibility outweighs the need for repose provided by the principle of res judicata.
- H A change in external circumstances is not required for an agency to exercise its basic right to change a policy decision and apply a new policy to parties to whom an old policy applied.
- I An agency must be free to consider changes that occur in the way it perceives the facts, even though objective circumstances remain unchanged.
- J For there to be any right to a hearing under Section 189a. of the Atomic Energy Act on the grant of an exemption, such a grant must be part of a proceeding for the granting, suspending, revoking, or amending of a license or construction permit under the Atomic Energy Act.
- K The Atomic Energy Act does not require a license or a construction permit, or an adjudicatory hearing, on site preparation activities.
- L The Commission is not required by NEPA to hold formal hearings on site preparation activities because NEPA did not alter the scope of the Commission's jurisdiction under the Atomic Energy Act. *Gage v. United States Atomic Energy Commission*, 479 F.2d 1214, 1220 n.19 (D.C. Cir. 1972); 39 Fed. Reg. 14506, 14507 (April 24, 1979).
- M 10 CFR 50.12(a) provides that any exemption from the licensing requirements of 10 CFR Part 50 must be authorized by law, not endanger life or property or the common defense and security, and be in the public interest. For an exemption from 10 CFR 50.10, the Commission considers the public interest by weighing the factors set out in 10 CFR 50.12(b).
- N An exemption from Commission regulations must be consistent with the Atomic Energy Act, the National Environmental Policy Act, and other applicable law.
- O The limited work authorization procedure under 10 CFR 50.10(e)(1) and (2) ("LWA-1") and the 10 CFR 50.12(b) exemption procedure are independent avenues for applicants to begin site preparation in advance of receiving a construction permit.
- P The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requires that the Commission prepare an environmental impact statement only for major actions significantly affecting the environment.
- Q A federal agency may consider separately under NEPA the different segments of a proposed federal action under certain circumstances. Where approval of the segment under consideration will not result in any irreversible or irretrievable commitments to remaining segments of the proposed action, the agency may address the activities of that segment separately.
- R The public interest criterion for granting an exemption from 10 CFR 50.10, under 10 CFR 50.12(b), is a stringent one: exemptions of this sort are to be granted sparingly and only in extraordinary circumstances.

CLI-82-24 CONSOLIDATED EDISON COMPANY OF NEW YORK (Indian Point, Unit 2) and **POWER AUTHORITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK** (Indian Point, Unit 3), Docket Nos. 50-247, 50-286; SPECIAL PROCEEDING; September 15, 1982; ORDER

- A Following the resignation of the Chairman of the Licensing Board for this special proceeding, the Commission, pursuant to 10 CFR 2.721(b), by a 3-2 vote, reconstitutes the Licensing Board.

CLI-82-25 CONSOLIDATED EDISON COMPANY OF NEW YORK (Indian Point, Unit 2) and **POWER AUTHORITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK** (Indian Point, Unit 3), Docket Nos. 50-247, 50-286; SPECIAL PROCEEDING; September 17, 1982; ORDER

- A The Commission responds to several questions certified to it by the Licensing Board that seek clarification of previous guidance provided by the Commission on the conduct of this special proceeding.

CLI-82-26 TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY (Browns Ferry Nuclear Plant, Units 1, 2 and 3), Docket Nos. 50-259-OLA, 50-260-OLA, 50-296-OLA; OPERATING LICENSE AMENDMENT; September 15, 1982; ORDER

- A In view of the Appeal Board's declaration in ALAB-677, 15 NRC 1387 (1982), that its previous decision in ALAB-664 (15 NRC 1 (1982)) might have been different had it been timely presented with new information concerning licensee's application to store low-level radioactive waste at Browns Ferry, the Commission (1) dismisses its earlier grant of review of ALAB-664; (2) vacates that decision; and (3) remands the case to the Appeal Board for further proceedings.
- B The Commission may dismiss its grant of review of an Appeal Board decision even though the parties have briefed the issues. See, e.g., *Jones v. State Board of Education*, 397 U.S. 31 (1970).

DIGESTS
ISSUANCES OF THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

CLI-82-27 SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY, et al. (San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station, Units 2 and 3), Docket Nos. 50-361-OL, 50-362-OL; OPERATING LICENSE; September 24, 1982; ORDER

A The Commission directs the Appeal Board to certify to the Commission the question whether the phrase "contaminated injured individuals" as used in 10 CFR 50.47(b) (12) requires applicants for nuclear power plants to provide arrangements for medical services only for members of the public who have suffered traumatic injury and are also contaminated with radiation, and if not, to what extent that regulation requires advance and specific arrangements and commitments for medical services for the general public, as opposed to the general knowledge that facilities and resources exist and could be used on an ad hoc basis. The Commission states that it will not review the Appeal Board's decision (ALAB-680, 16 NRC 127 (1982)), denying intervenor's motion for a stay of the issuance of full-power licenses and that the license condition imposed by the Licensing Board concerning medical arrangements for the general public shall remain in effect. LBP-82-40, 15 NRC 1293 (1982); LBP-82-39, 15 NRC 1163 (1982).

CLI-82-28 CONSOLIDATED EDISON COMPANY OF NEW YORK (Indian Point, Unit 2) and POWER AUTHORITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK (Indian Point, Unit 3), Docket Nos. 50-247, 50-286; SPECIAL PROCEEDING; October 1, 1982; ORDER

A The Commission requests the newly reconstituted Licensing Board to estimate when it can provide its recommendations concerning certain long-term safety issues relating to Units 2 and 3 of this facility called for in CLI-81-23, 14 NRC 610 (1981).

CLI-82-29 WASHINGTON PUBLIC POWER SUPPLY SYSTEM (WPPSS Nuclear Project Nos. 1 & 2), Docket Nos. 50-397, 50-460; CONSTRUCTION PERMIT EXTENSION; October 8, 1982; ORDER

A In considering petitions for hearings on the licensee's requests for extension of the construction completion dates specified in the construction permits for two units of this facility, the Commission interprets Section 185 of the Atomic Energy Act and 10 CFR §50.55 as limiting contentions that can be raised in a construction permit extension proceeding to those that pertain to the licensee's asserted reasons for "good cause" for the delay or to other reasons showing that the licensee does not have such "good cause." In line with this interpretation, the Commission, inter alia, dismisses all but a single joint contention raised in the pending petitions as outside the scope of the proceeding and refers the remainder of the petitions to the Chairman of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel for designation of a Board to determine whether the other requirements for a hearing outlined in 10 CFR §2.714 have been met, and, if so, to conduct an appropriate proceeding under 10 CFR Part 2, Subpart G, and 10 CFR Part 50.

B The focus of any construction permit extension proceeding is to be whether good cause exists for the requested extension. Likewise, this "good cause" requirement is the focal point of any consideration of the scope of the contentions that can be admitted at such a proceeding.

C A construction permit extension proceeding is not for the purpose of engaging in an unbridled inquiry into the safety and environmental aspects of reactor construction and operation. A contention cannot be litigated in a construction permit extension proceeding when there is a pending operating license proceeding in which the issue can be raised. Prior to the operating license proceeding, a contention having nothing whatsoever to do with the causes of delay or the permit holder's justifications for an extension cannot be litigated in a construction permit proceeding. Indiana and Michigan Electric Company (Donald C. Cook Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-129, 6 AEC 414 (1973); Northern Indiana Public Service Company (Bailey Generating Station, Nuclear 1), ALAB-619, 12 NRC 558 (1980).

D Where a request for a construction permit extension has been filed and the operating license proceeding for the plant is yet to be held, persons who wish to raise health, safety or environmental concerns may, pursuant to 10 CFR §2.206, petition the Director of Nuclear Reactor Regulation to institute a show-cause proceeding under 10 CFR §2.202. The request must specify the action sought and set forth the facts that constitute the basis for the request.

E The scope of a construction permit extension proceeding under Section 185 of the Atomic Energy Act and 10 CFR §50.55 is limited to direct challenges that seek to prove that, on balance, delay was caused by circumstances that do not constitute "good cause."

F The avenue afforded for the expression of health, safety, and environmental concerns in any pending operating license proceeding, or in the absence of such a proceeding, in a petition under 10 CFR §2.202 would be exclusive despite the pendency of a construction permit extension request.

DIGESTS
ISSUANCES OF THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

G The determination of the sufficiency of a construction permit holder's reasons for delay will be influenced by whether they were the sole important reasons for the delay or whether, instead, the delay was in actuality due in significant part to other causes such as applicant's dilatory conduct of the construction work. Cook, *supra*, 6 AEC at 417.

CLI-82-30 PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY (Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2), Docket Nos. 50-275-OL, 50-323-OL; SECURITY; October 8, 1982; ORDER

A The Commission pursuant to 10 CFR 2.913 directs that all classified National Security Information be expunged from the Appeal Board's security plan decision (ALAB-653) in this proceeding and the record underlying that decision.

B 10 CFR 2.913 requires that where Restricted Data or other National Security Information has been introduced into a proceeding, such classified information shall be expunged from the record at the close of the reception of evidence "where such expunction would not prejudice the interests of a party or the public interest."

CLI-82-31 METROPOLITAN EDISON COMPANY (Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit No. 1), Docket No. 50-289-SP; RESTART; October 14, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

A The Commission, pursuant to its immediate effectiveness review of the Licensing Board's July 27, 1982 Partial Initial Decision in this proceeding, (1) determines that the Licensing Board lacked jurisdiction to impose a fine on licensee for failures with respect to the licensee's management of its examination process for reactor operator licenses and refers the matter to the Director, Office of Inspection and Enforcement, for a recommendation on whether a civil penalty proceeding should be instituted against licensee; and (2) adopts a Board recommendation that the NRC investigate a possible material false statement by licensee concerning the test score of an individual certified to the NRC for an operator's license renewal. The Commission also directs that the Appeal Board which is reviewing the Licensing Board's decision is not to consider either of these matters in its review.

B The NRC's regulations do not contain any provision conferring jurisdiction on licensing boards to impose fines *sua sponte*.

C The powers granted to a licensing board by 10 CFR 2.718 "to conduct a fair and impartial hearing according to law, to take appropriate action to avoid delay, and to maintain order" do not include the power to impose a civil penalty.

D 10 CFR 2.205(a) confers the authority to institute a civil penalty proceeding only upon the NRC's Director of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, the Director of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, and the Director, Office of Inspection and Enforcement. A licensing board becomes involved in a civil penalty proceeding only if the person charged with a violation requests a hearing. (See 10 CFR 2.205(f).)

E Under Section 234 of the Atomic Energy Act, 42 U.S.C. 2282(b), and 10 CFR 2.205 of the Commission's regulations, a person subject to imposition of a civil penalty must first be given written notice of (1) the specific statutory, regulatory or license violations, (2) the date, facts, and nature of the act or omission with which the person is charged, and (3) the proposed penalty. The person subject to the fine must then be given an opportunity to show in writing why the penalty should not be imposed.

CLI-82-32 METROPOLITAN EDISON COMPANY (Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit No. 1), Docket No. 50-289-SP; RESTART; October 22, 1982; ORDER

A The Commission, noting that whether the licensee has satisfactorily completed the various restart requirements will be determined by the NRC Staff and the Commission itself outside of this adjudicatory proceeding, directs the Appeal Board not to concern itself with the current status of licensee's compliance with those requirements.

CLI-82-33 CINCINNATI GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY (William H. Zimmer Nuclear Power Station), Docket No. 50-358 (EA 82-129); SHOW CAUSE; November 12, 1982; ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE AND ORDER IMMEDIATELY SUSPENDING CONSTRUCTION

A The Commission issues an immediately effective order suspending licensee's safety-related construction activities, including rework of previously-identified deficient construction. The Commission also orders licensee to show cause why such construction activities should not remain suspended until licensee has taken certain specified action toward providing reasonable assurance that future construction activities, including correction of existing deficiencies, will be conducted in accordance with the quality assurance criteria of 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix B, and other Commission requirements.

DIGESTS
ISSUANCES OF THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

CLI-82-34 PETITION OF SUNFLOWER COALITION; RECONSIDERATION OF AMENDED STATE AGREEMENT; November 15, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

- A The Commission denies a petition for reconsideration of its March 30, 1982 approval of an amended agreement with the State of Colorado that authorized the State to assume regulatory authority over byproduct, source and special nuclear material in quantities less than a critical mass, including uranium mill tailings.
- B Under Section 274b of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the Commission may enter into an agreement with the Governor of any State that provides for discontinuance of certain regulatory authority of the Commission and the assumption of that authority by the Agreement State.
- C Agreement States are not required under either the Atomic Energy Act or the Uranium Mill Tailings Radiation Control Act of 1978 (UMTRCA), to provide their radiation control enforcement agencies with civil penalty authority.
- D Section 274o of the Atomic Energy Act requires, *inter alia*, of Agreement States only that there be procedures under state law for judicial review of the State's written determination required to be made in licensing actions under Section 274 (o) (3) (A) (iii); Section 274o does not limit the source of those judicial procedures to any particular State statute or other authority.
- E The NRC has the authority under Section 274j of the Atomic Energy Act to terminate or suspend an agreement with a State and to reassert its own licensing authority. An agreement is not, however, to be permanently terminated or revoked for minor technical failures to comply with Section 274 or for single incidents of State inaction, but only in exceptional circumstances.
- F The NRC may temporarily suspend all or part of an agreement with a State entered into under Section 274 without notice or hearing where (1) an emergency situation exists which requires immediate action to protect the public health and safety, and (2) the State has failed to take steps necessary to contain or eliminate the dangers within a reasonable time. The temporary suspension is to remain in effect only for as long as the emergency exists. This authority is to be used only as a last resort.

CLI-82-35 SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY, et al. (San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station, Units 2 and 3), Docket Nos. 50-361-OL, 50-362-OL; OPERATING LICENSE; November 19, 1982; CORRECTED MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

- A The Commission directs the Licensing Board to suspend its proceeding concerning the adequacy of arrangements by offsite response organizations for emergency medical services until further Commission order, and orders that the license conditions imposed by the Board (LBP-82-39, 15 NRC 1163 (1982); LBP-82-40, 15 NRC 1293 (1982)) shall otherwise remain in effect.

CLI-82-36 CINCINNATI GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY, et al. (William H. Zimmer Nuclear Power Station, Unit No. 1), Docket No. 50-358; DISQUALIFICATION; November 24, 1982; ORDER

- A The Commission denies an intervenor's petition to disqualify from this proceeding a specified NRC Staff attorney for allegedly attempting to prevent the compilation of a complete record in the proceeding and exhibiting a pro-applicant bias. The Commission finds no grounds in the record for the first allegation and dismisses it. With respect to the second, the Commission determines that the allegation would be appropriately considered by the Executive Director of Operations outside the bounds of this proceeding.
- B Petitions which raise questions about the ethics and reputation of another member of the Bar should only be filed after careful research and deliberation. Moreover, although ill-feeling understandably results from any petition for disciplinary action, retaliation in kind should not be the routine response.
- C The Commission has no interest in general matters of attorney discipline and chooses to focus instead on the means necessary to keep its adjudicatory proceedings orderly and to avoid unnecessary delays. 45 Fed. Reg. 3594 (1980).
- D While the Commission has inherent supervisory power over all agency personnel and proceedings, it is not necessarily appropriate to bring any and all matters to the Commission in the first instance. Under the Commission's rules (10 CFR 2.713), where a complaint relates directly to a specified attorney's actions in a proceeding before a licensing board, that complaint should be brought to the board in the first instance if correction is necessary for the integrity of the proceedings. See 45 Fed. Reg. 3594.

DIGESTS
ISSUANCES OF THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

E A perceived bias in the attorney's view of a proceeding is not a conflict of interest in any accepted legal meaning; it is to be distinguished from the kind of conflict recognized in law in which an attorney has interests that compromise his ability to represent his client, e.g., that he has previously represented another party in the same proceeding, or has financial interests in common with another party, or the like.

CLI-82-37 OFFSHORE POWER SYSTEMS (Manufacturing License for Floating Nuclear Power Plants), Docket No. STN 50-437-ML; MANUFACTURING LICENSE; December 6, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

A For reasons different than those set forth by the Appeal Board in ALAB-686, 16 NRC 454 (1982) and ALAB-689, 16 NRC 887 (1982), the Commission finds that the immediate effectiveness review provisions of 10 CFR §2.764(e) do not apply to manufacturing licenses. For this and other reasons, the Commission holds: (1) a licensing board decision authorizing the issuance of a manufacturing license can become effective before it becomes final agency action, and (2) neither the Appeal Board nor the Commission need undertake an immediate effectiveness review of such a decision.

B A licensing board decision on a manufacturing license can become effective pursuant to 10 CFR §2.764(a) pending final Appeal Board or Commission review of that decision.

C The issuance of a manufacturing license does not conclude the construction permit review process and therefore does not present health and safety issues requiring an immediate effectiveness review under 10 CFR §2.764(e) by the Appeal Board or Commission.

CLI-82-38 CONSOLIDATED EDISON COMPANY OF NEW YORK, INC. (Indian Point, Unit 2) and **POWER AUTHORITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK** (Indian Point, Unit 3), Docket Nos. 50-247, 50-286; ENFORCEMENT ACTION; December 22, 1982; DECISION

A In its review pursuant to 10 CFR 50.54(s) of the state of offsite emergency preparedness as respects Indian Point Units 1 and 2, the Commission determines that despite the continued existence of certain previously-identified planning deficiencies, sufficient progress has been made in overcoming these deficiencies and progress will continue to be made so as not to warrant shutdown or any other enforcement action against the Indian Point licensees at the present time.

B Under 10 CFR 50.54(s), if the Commission finds after April 1, 1981 that the state of preparedness with respect to an operating nuclear power reactor does not provide reasonable assurance that adequate protective measures can and will be taken in the event of a radiological emergency, and if the identified deficiencies are not corrected within 120 days, then a determination must be made whether the reactor should be shut down until the deficiencies are remedied; whether some other enforcement action is appropriate; or whether no enforcement action is needed. Under the regulation, the decision on enforcement action is to be guided by a balancing of factors, including: whether the deficiencies are significant for the plant in question; whether adequate interim compensating actions have been or will be taken promptly; and whether there are other compelling reasons for continued operation.

CLI-82-39 PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY (Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2), Docket Nos. 50-275-OL, 50-323-OL; OPERATING LICENSE; December 23, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

A The Commission answers three certified questions relating to the Appeal Board's jurisdiction in this operating license proceeding presented by the relationship between the independent design verification program for the Diablo Canyon facility and the licensing proceeding for the plant (see ALAB-681, 16 NRC 146 (1982)). In addition, the Commission denies a request by intervenors for a hearing on applicant's request for an extension of its low-power license.

B Where a motion to reopen a licensing proceeding relates to a previously uncontested issue, the moving party must satisfy both the standards for admitting late-filed contentions (10 CFR 2.714(a)) and the criteria established by case law for reopening the record.

C A request for a low-power license does not give rise to a proceeding separate and apart from a pending full-power operating license proceeding.

DIGESTS
ISSUANCES OF THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

CLI-82-40 CINCINNATI GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY, et al. (William H. Zimmer Nuclear Power Station, Unit No. 1), Docket No. 50-358; OPERATING LICENSE; December 23, 1982; ORDER

A The Commission denies a request by intervenors in this operating license proceeding for the Commission to furnish them, at the Commission's or applicants' expense, with the services of a consultant to monitor applicants' compliance with the Commission's November 12, 1982 show-cause order (CLI-82-33, 16 NRC 1489). The Commission also decides that the procedures to be used in the selection of an independent entity to conduct a review of the status of the Zimmer facility pursuant to the show-cause order are adequate; it also declines to institute further procedures for the conduct of the status review.

B The Commission is not empowered to expend its appropriated funds for the purpose of funding consultants to intervenors in a licensing proceeding. See P.L. 97-88, Title V Section 502 (95 Stat. 1148 (1981)) and P.L. 97-276 Section 101(g) (96 Stat. 1135 (1982)).

C The Commission does not have authority to require license applicants to fund consultants or to assess fees for that purpose where the service to be performed is for intervenors' benefit and is not one needed here by the Commission to discharge its own licensing responsibilities. See Mississippi Power & Light Company v. NRC, 601 F.2d 223 (5th Cir. 1979), cert. denied 444 U.S. 1102 (1980). See also National Cable Television Association, Inc. v. United States, 415 U.S. 336 (1978). Federal Power Commission v. New England Power Co., 415 U.S. 345 (1974).

CLI-82-41 CONSOLIDATED EDISON COMPANY OF NEW YORK (Indian Point, Unit 2) and POWER AUTHORITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK (Indian Point, Unit 3), Docket Nos. 50-247, 50-286; SCHEDULING; December 23, 1982; ORDER GRANTING IN PART AND DENYING IN PART MOTION TO DIRECT STAFF TO RESCHEDULE MEETING

A The Commission denies in part and grants in part intervenor's motion to direct the NRC staff (1) to reschedule and relocate a planned meeting with its outside consultants and (2) in the future to give notice of such meetings to intervenors at the same time as to other parties.

B Under 10 CFR §2.102, the NRC staff may meet "with any one party" to a proceeding. In scheduling such a meeting, the staff will consider a variety of factors such as the number, location, and schedules of the key participants as well as resource constraints. The intervenor's opportunity to attend should be one of the factors the staff takes into account in determining the location of such meetings.

C All parties, in the interest of fairness, should be notified at the same time of the scheduling of meetings between the NRC staff and one or more parties to a proceeding.

DIGESTS ISSUANCES OF THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING APPEAL BOARDS

ALAB-679 NUCLEAR FUEL SERVICES, INC. and NEW YORK STATE ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY (Western New York Nuclear Service Center), Docket No. 50-201-OLA; OPERATING LICENSE AMENDMENT; July 8, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

- A The Appeal Board affirms a Licensing Board order (LBP-82-36, 15 NRC 1075 (1982)) denying an intervenor's request for a hearing on an amendment to the operating license for a spent fuel reprocessing and waste disposal center in light of special statutory provisions governing administration of the center (the amendment had set conditions for the termination of the co-licensee's responsibilities).
- B The Appeal Board will allow amicus participation in a hearing where the Board believes it will assist resolution of the issues and will not prejudice the rights of the parties. See, e.g., Consumers Power Company (Big Rock Point Nuclear Plant), ALAB-636, 13 NRC 312, n.2 (1981).

- C Under the West Valley Demonstration Project Act, Pub. L. No. 96-368, 94 Stat. 1347 (1980), the Commission's review of the Department of Energy's (DOE's) demonstration waste solidification plan at West Valley is limited to informal, consultative procedures; the Commission cannot therefore explore DOE's administration of the waste solidification project in a formal evidentiary hearing.

ALAB-680 SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY, et al. (San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station, Units 2 and 3), Docket Nos. 50-361-OL, 50-362-OL; OPERATING LICENSE; July 16, 1982; DECISION

- A The Appeal Board denies intervenors' motion for a stay pending appeal of the Licensing Board's initial decision (LBP-82-39, 15 NRC 1163 (1982)) which authorized the issuance of a full power operating license for Units 2 and 3 of this facility.
- B The determination whether an application for a stay of a licensing board decision should be granted is governed by the criteria in 10 CFR 2.788(e).
- C In deciding whether to allow operation of a plant during appellate review of the pertinent licensing board decision, the standard to be applied is whether operation of the plant over the additional proceedings is consistent with the requirement that there be reasonable assurance that the public health and safety not be endangered. Metropolitan Edison Co. (Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit No. 2), ALAB-486, 8 NRC 9, 46 (1978). That standard does not call upon a party to show that a serious nuclear accident is likely during the pendency of the appeal; it would be enough to show that apparent inadequacies were sufficient to raise the question whether plant operation would present an undue risk to the public in the event of a serious nuclear accident. Southern California Edison Co. (San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station, Units 2 and 3), ALAB-673, 15 NRC 688, 698 (1982).
- D Under the Commission's emergency planning regulations, an applicant for a plant operating license has an opportunity to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Commission that deficiencies in the emergency plans for the plant are not significant, that adequate interim compensating actions have been or will be taken promptly, or that there are other compelling reasons to permit plant operation. 10 CFR 50.47(c)(1).
- E In reviewing a licensing board decision in the context of a motion for a stay pending its appeal, the normal deference that an appeal board owes to the trier of facts when reviewing a decision on the merits is even more compelling. See Toledo Edison Co. (Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station, Units 1, 2 and 3), ALAB-385, 5 NRC 621, 629 (1977).
- F An appeal board may disagree with a licensing board's interpretation on an issue even if no party presses an appeal on that issue. Virginia Electric and Power Co. (North Anna Nuclear Power Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-491, 8 NRC 245, 247 (1978).

DIGESTS
ISSUANCES OF THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING APPEAL BOARDS

G Where a party has not pursued a contention before the Licensing Board in the form of proposed findings of fact, the Appeal Board will not entertain it "for the first time on appeal — absent a 'serious substantive issue.'" Public Service Electric and Gas Co. (Salem Nuclear Generating Station, Unit 1), ALAB-650, 14 NRC 43, 49 (1981).

H At the operating license stage, the NRC staff generally has the final word on all safety matters not placed into controversy by the parties. South Carolina Electric and Gas Co. (Virgil C. Summer Nuclear Station, Unit 1), ALAB-663, 14 NRC 1140, 1156 n.31 (1981).

I An operating license may not issue unless and until the agency makes the findings specified in 10 CFR 50.57 — including the ultimate finding that such issuance "will not be inimical to . . . the health and safety of the public." As to those aspects of reactor operation not considered in an adjudicatory proceeding (if one is conducted), it is the staff's duty to insure the existence of an adequate basis for each of the requisite Section 50.57 determinations. South Carolina Electric and Gas Co. (Virgil C. Summer Nuclear Station, Unit 1), ALAB-642, 13 NRC 881, 895-96 (1981), affirmed sub nom. Fairfield United Action v. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, No. 81-2042 (D.C. Cir., April 28, 1982).

J Before a full power operating license issues for a plant, the Commission must complete its immediate effectiveness review of the pertinent licensing board decision pursuant to 10 CFR 2.764(f)(2).

ALAB-681 PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY (Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2), Docket Nos. 50-275-OL, 50-323-OL; OPERATING LICENSE; July 16, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND CERTIFICATION TO THE COMMISSION

A Prior to consideration of a motion by the intervenors to reopen the record in this operating license proceeding to hear assertedly new evidence regarding breakdowns on the quality assurance/quality control program for the plant, the Appeal Board seeks Commission guidance (by way of certification) on whether the Commission intended, in its November 19, 1981 order (CLI-81-30) suspending the Diablo Canyon low-power license and establishing an independent verification program, to deprive the adjudicatory boards of jurisdiction to consider quality assurance and quality control issues involving the plant.

ALAB-682 ARMED FORCES RADIobiology RESEARCH INSTITUTE (Cobalt-60 Storage Facility), Docket No. 30-6931 (Renewal of Byproduct Materials License No. 19-08330-03); BYPRODUCT MATERIALS LICENSE RENEWAL; July 16, 1982; DECISION

A The Appeal Board reverses a Licensing Board decision (LBP-82-24, 15 NRC 652 (1982)) that held petitioner did not have standing to intervene in this materials license renewal proceeding. The Appeal Board grants the request to intervene, remands the proceeding to the Licensing Board with instructions to allow the petitioner to supplement its petition in accordance with 10 CFR 2.714(b), and orders the proceeding be consolidated with another proceeding involving renewal of the operating license for a research reactor of the same licensee, housed in the same building, if petitioner can present a litigable contention with regard to the materials license. The Appeal Board discusses the statutory requirements for notice in materials licensing cases and recommends that the Commission consider the issue in a rulemaking.

B An intervention petitioner who resides near a nuclear facility need not show a causal relationship between injury to its interest and the licensing action being sought in order to establish standing. Virginia Electric and Power Co. (North Anna Nuclear Power Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-522, 9 NRC 54, 57 n.5 (1979).

C In a materials license renewal proceeding under 10 CFR Part 30 — as in construction permit and operating license proceedings under 10 CFR Part 50 — proximity to a large source of radioactive material is sufficient to establish the requisite interest for standing to intervene. Whether a petitioner's stated concern is in fact justified must be left for consideration when the merits of the controversy are reached.

D Official notice of information in another proceeding is permissible where the parties to the two proceedings are identical, there was an opportunity for rebuttal, and no party is prejudiced by reliance on the information. See *United States v. Pierce Auto Freight Lines*, 327 U.S. 515, 527-30 (1945); 10 CFR 2.743(i).

ALAB-683 PUGET SOUND POWER AND LIGHT COMPANY, et al. (Skagit/Hanford Nuclear Power Project, Units 1 and 2), Docket Nos. 50-522, 50-523; CONSTRUCTION PERMIT; July 27, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

A Acting under the authority of 10 CFR 2.787(b), the Appeal Panel Chairman dismisses an interlocutory appeal by intervenors of the Licensing Board's rejection of certain of their contentions.

DIGESTS ISSUANCES OF THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING APPEAL BOARDS

B A person may take an interlocutory appeal from an order entered on his or her intervention petition only where the order has the effect of denying the petition in its entirety. 10 CFR 2.714a.

ALAB-684 CONSUMERS POWER COMPANY (Midland Plant, Units 1 & 2), Docket Nos. 50-329-OM&OL, 50-330-OM&OL; MODIFICATION ORDER AND OPERATING LICENSE; July 27, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

A The Appeal Board dismisses without prejudice an intervenor's purported appeal from a Licensing Board order, LBP-82-35, 15 NRC 1060 (1982), which authorized certain interim amendments to the Midland construction permits pending subsequent issuance of the Board's partial initial decision. The Appeal Board construes the intervenor's filings as a complaint against staff's compliance with and implementation of the Licensing Board's order, rather than the order itself, and leaves the matter to the intervenor to present to the Licensing Board.

B Issues relating to compliance with and implementation of a Licensing Board order, rather than the order itself, should be presented to the Licensing Board in the first instance, rather than to the Appeal Board.

C Although the time limits established by the Rules of Practice with regard to appeals from Licensing Board decisions and orders are not jurisdictional, Appeal Board policy is to construe them strictly. Nuclear Engineering Co. (Sheffield, Illinois, Low-Level Radioactive Waste Disposal Site), ALAB-606, 12 NRC 156, 160 (1980). Hence, untimely appeals are not accepted absent a demonstration of "extraordinary and unanticipated circumstances." See 10 CFR Part 2, Appendix A, IX(d)(3).

ALAB-685 METROPOLITAN EDISON COMPANY (Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit No. 1), Docket No. 50-289-SP; RESTART; August 2, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

A The Appeal Board suspends until further notice licensee's obligation to submit certain information requested as part of the Board's *sua sponte* review, and clarifies the scope of its appellate jurisdiction in this special proceeding.

B The fact that the Three Mile Island restart proceeding is a special proceeding not specifically addressed by Commission regulations does not deprive the Appeal Board of its well-established right to review *sua sponte* an issue that was contested before the Licensing Board but not raised on appeal. See generally Virginia Electric and Power Co. (North Anna Nuclear Power Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-491, 8 NRC 245, 247 (1978); Public Service Electric and Gas Co. (Salem Nuclear Generating Station, Unit 1), ALAB-650, 14 NRC 43, 49 n.6 (1981).

C Authority to review the entire record of a proceeding independently of the parties' position is different from (1) the power in operating license application proceedings to consider serious safety, environmental, and common defense and security matters not otherwise placed in issue by the parties, and (2) seeking Commission approval in cases not involving operating license applications before pursuing new safety questions not previously put in controversy or otherwise raised by the parties.

ALAB-686 OFFSHORE POWER SYSTEMS (Manufacturing License for Floating Nuclear Power Plants), Docket No. STN 50-437-ML; MANUFACTURING LICENSE; August 11, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

A The Appeal Board (1) considers the applicability of the "immediate effectiveness" regulation (10 CFR 2.764) to the Licensing Board's June 30, 1982 initial decision (LBP-82-49, 15 NRC 1658 (1982)) in this manufacturing license proceeding and concludes that it is not obliged by the regulation to conduct such a review in manufacturing license proceedings; (2) announces that in the absence of exceptions to the initial decision, it has undertaken *sua sponte* review of it; and (3) reminds the parties that the initial decision shall not constitute final agency action until completion of that review by the Appeal Board and its further order.

B The Commission's "immediate effectiveness" regulation, 10 CFR 2.764 (1982), as amended, 47 Fed. Reg. 2286 (January 15, 1982), requires in the case of construction permits, certain limited and immediate appeal board and Commission review — and, in the case of operating licenses, Commission review only — of an initial decision before it can become effective.

C Under the Commission's "immediate effectiveness" regulation, an appeal board is not obliged to conduct an immediate effectiveness review in manufacturing license proceedings.

D The only time an appeal board — as opposed to the Commission itself — is required to conduct an immediate effectiveness review is within 60 days of an initial decision authorizing the issuance of a reactor construction permit. 10 CFR 2.764(e)(2).

DIGESTS
ISSUANCES OF THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING APPEAL BOARDS

E The starting point in interpreting a regulation is the language of the regulation itself. Cf. *Lewis v. United States*, 445 U.S. 55, 60 (1980). Depending on the circumstances, it may be appropriate to consider the underlying history of the regulation as well. Cf. *Tennessee Valley Authority v. Hill*, 437 U.S. 153, 184-85 (1978).

ALAB-687 DUKE POWER COMPANY, et al. (Catawba Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2), Docket Nos. 50-413, 50-414; LIMITED WORK AUTHORIZATION; August 19, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

A The Appeal Board accepts a Licensing Board referral, pursuant to 10 CFR 2.730(f), of a number of interlocutory Licensing Board rulings conditionally admitting certain contentions in this operating license proceeding. The Appeal Board concludes that a licensing board has no authority to admit conditionally, for any reason, a contention that falls short of meeting the specificity requirements of 10 CFR 2.714(a). The Appeal Board provides further interpretation of the governing Rules of Practice relating to contentions and leaves to the Licensing Board the application of that interpretation to the contentions.

B Appeal boards are empowered to decline the acceptance of licensing board referrals.

C Regardless of whether presented on "certification" pursuant to 10 CFR 2.718(i) or by referral pursuant to 10 CFR 2.730(f), the question of whether interlocutory appellate review of an issue should be undertaken turns on whether a failure to address that issue would seriously harm the public interest, result in unusual delay or expense, or affect the basic structure of the proceeding in some pervasive or unusual manner. *Consumers Power Co. (Midland Plant, Units 1 and 2)*, ALAB-634, 13 NRC 96, 99 (1981).

D Under 10 CFR 2.714, a licensing board is not authorized to admit conditionally, for any reason, a contention that falls short of meeting the specificity requirements of the Section.

E Neither Section 189a. of the Atomic Energy Act nor Section 2.714 of the Commission's Rules of Practice permits an intervention petitioner to file a vague, unparticularized contention, followed by an endeavor to flesh it out through discovery against the applicant or the NRC staff. Rather, an intervention petitioner has an ironclad obligation to examine the publicly available documentary material pertaining to the facility in question with sufficient care to enable it to uncover any information that could serve as a foundation for a specific contention. *Northern States Power Co. (Prairie Island Nuclear Generating Plant, Units 1 and 2)*, ALAB-107, 6 AEC 188, 192, (1973), affirmed CLI-73-12, 6 AEC 241 (1973), affirmed sub nom. *BPI v. AEC*, 502 F.2d 424 (D.C. Cir. 1974).

F The wording of a regulation generally takes precedence over any contradictory suggestion in its administrative history.

G The hearing mandate of Section 189a. of the Atomic Energy Act does not confer the automatic right of intervention upon anyone; rather, the Commission may condition the exercise of that right upon the meeting of reasonable procedural requirements. *BPI v. AEC*, 502 F.2d 424, 428 (1974).

H No procedural requirement can lawfully operate to preclude from the very outset a hearing under Section 189a. of the Atomic Energy Act on an issue both within the scope of the petitioner's interest and germane to the outcome of the proceeding.

I The determination whether to accept an untimely contention which was susceptible of filing within the period prescribed by the Rules of Practice involves a consideration of all five 10 CFR 2.714(a) factors — and not just the reason (substantial or not as the case may be) why a petitioner did not meet the deadline.

J In determining whether to accept an untimely contention under 10 CFR 2.714(a), if the contention could not have been asserted with sufficient specificity during the period prescribed by the Rules of Practice due to the non-existence or public unavailability of relevant documents, that factor must be deemed controlling; it is not amenable to being overridden by the other 2.714(a) factors such as that relating to the broadening of the issues.

ALAB-688 UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY, PROJECT MANAGEMENT CORPORATION, TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY (Clinch River Breeder Reactor Plant), Docket No. 50-537; LIMITED WORK AUTHORIZATION; August 25, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

A The Appeal Board denies a petition for directed certification of an unpublished Licensing Board order (August 5, 1982) which sets forth the scope of and schedule for evidentiary hearings in the limited work authorization proceeding for this facility.

DIGESTS
ISSUANCES OF THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING APPEAL BOARDS

B A limited work authorization (LWA-1) allows preliminary construction work to be undertaken at the applicant's risk, pending completion of later hearings covering radiological health and safety issues. See 10 CFR 50.10(e)(1); Public Service Co. of Oklahoma, et al. (Black Fox Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-573, 10 NRC 775, 778 (1979). Before an LWA-1 can be granted, the staff must have issued the final environmental impact statement relating to the construction of the facility. Moreover, the Licensing Board must have made all the environmental findings required for issuance of a construction permit and "determined that . . . there is reasonable assurance that the proposed site is a suitable location for a reactor of the general size and type proposed from the standpoint of radiological health and safety considerations." 10 CFR 50.10(e)(2).

C Discretionary interlocutory review will be granted only sparingly, and then only when a licensing board's action either (a) threatens the party adversely affected with immediate and serious irreparable harm which could not be remedied by a later appeal, or (b) affects the basic structure of the proceeding in a pervasive or unusual manner. Public Service Electric and Gas Co. (Salem Nuclear Generating Station, Unit 1), ALAB-588, 11 NRC 533, 536 (1980). Especially in light of the paucity of construction permit applications, legal issues involving the timing of the admission of evidence at LWA hearings cannot be considered recurring issues of great importance to the proper functioning of the licensing process.

D An appeal board will be particularly reluctant to grant a request for directed certification where the question for which certification has been sought involves the scheduling of hearings or the timing and admissibility of evidence, see Toledo Edison Co. and Cleveland Electric Illuminating Co. (Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1), ALAB-314, 3 NRC 98, 99-100 (1976), and will be inclined to do so only to entertain a claim that a board abused its discretion by setting a hearing schedule that deprives a party of its right to procedural due process. Public Service Co. of Indiana, Inc. (Marble Hill Nuclear Generating Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-459, 7 NRC 179, 188 (1978). See generally Houston Lighting & Power Co., et al. (South Texas Project, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-637, 13 NRC 367, 370-71 (1981).

ALAB-689 OFFSHORE POWER SYSTEMS (Manufacturing License for Floating Nuclear Power Plants), Docket No. STN 50-437-ML; MANUFACTURING LICENSE; September 1, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

A The Appeal Board grants applicant's motion for clarification of its previous memorandum and order (ALAB-686, 16 NRC 454 (1982)) in which the Appeal Board (1) concluded that it is not obliged by the "immediate effectiveness" regulation (10 CFR 2.764) to conduct such a review in manufacturing license proceedings, and (2) announced that, in the absence of exceptions to the Licensing Board's initial decision (LBP-82-49, 15 NRC 1658 (1982)), it would undertake sua sponte review of it. In granting the motion for clarification, the Appeal Board explains, inter alia, the nature of its sua sponte review authority and its relationship to the effectiveness of licensing board initial decisions.

B An immediate effectiveness review of a licensing board decision is not a substitute for an appeal board's usual sua sponte review of the decision and its underlying record before the decision is accorded finality.

C Sua sponte review by an appeal board is a long-standing Commission-approved practice which is undertaken in all cases, regardless of their nature or whether exceptions have been filed. See 10 CFR 2.760(a), 2.785(a). This type of review extends to "any final disposition of a licensing proceeding that either was or had to be founded upon substantive determinations of significant safety or environmental issues." Sacramento Municipal Utility District (Rancho Seco Nuclear Generating Station), ALAB-655, 14 NRC 799, 803 (1981), quoting Washington Public Power Supply System (WPPSS Nuclear Project No. 2), ALAB-571, 10 NRC 687, 692 (1979). See also Northern States Power Company (Monticello Nuclear Generating Plant, Unit 1), ALAB-611, 12 NRC 301, 304 (1980), and cases cited.

D Only the administrative finality of a licensing board's decision is deferred pending sua sponte review by an appeal board; the effectiveness of the decision is not stayed.

E If sua sponte review uncovers problems in a licensing board's decision or the record that may require corrective action adverse to a party's interest, the appeal board's consistent practice is to give the party ample opportunity to address the matter, as appropriate. See, e.g., Rancho Seco, *supra*, 14 NRC at 803-04, 817; Monticello, *supra*, 12 NRC at 309-13; Virginia Electric and Power Co. (North

DIGESTS
ISSUANCES OF THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING APPEAL BOARDS

Anna Nuclear Power Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-529, 9 NRC 153 (1979); Virginia Electric and Power Co. (North Anna Nuclear Power Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-491, 8 NRC 245, 249-50 (1978).

ALAB-690 LOUISIANA POWER AND LIGHT COMPANY (Waterford Steam Electric Station, Unit 3), Docket No. 50-382-OL; REMAND; September 7, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

A The Appeal Board dismisses without prejudice a petitioner's appeal from a non-final order of the Licensing Board.

B The test of "finality" for appeal purposes before the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (as in the courts) is essentially a practical one. As a general matter, a licensing board's action is final for appellate purposes where it either disposes of at least a major segment of the case or terminates a party's right to participate; rulings which do neither are interlocutory. Toledo Edison Co., et al. (Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station), ALAB-300, 2 NRC 752, 758 (1975). Where a party has been given an opportunity to file a new petition for leave to intervene, the Licensing Board order that denied the prior petition is non-final and not immediately appealable.

ALAB-691 CONSUMERS POWER COMPANY (Midland Plant, Units 1 and 2), Docket Nos. 50-329-CP, 50-330-CP; REMAND; September 9, 1982; DECISION

A The Appeal Board dismisses an intervenor's appeal of the Licensing Board's decision in LBP-81-63, 14 NRC 1768 (1981), not to impose sanctions against the licensee for failure to disclose assertedly significant information in an earlier phase of this construction permit proceeding. The Appeal Board, however, pursuant to sua sponte review of the record affirms the Licensing Board's decision not to impose sanctions, but corrects certain of the Board's underlying legal conclusions.

B Requiring the submission to a licensing board of proposed findings of fact or a comparable document is not a mere formality: it gives that board the benefit of a party's arguments and permits it to resolve them in the first instance — possibly in the party's favor, obviating later appeal.

C Unless there is a serious substantive issue as to which a genuine problem has been demonstrated, an appeal board ordinarily will not entertain an issue raised for the first time on appeal. Tennessee Valley Authority (Hartsville Nuclear Plant, Units 1A, 2A, 1B, and 2B), ALAB-463, 7 NRC 341, 348 (1978). See also Public Service Electric and Gas Co., et al. (Salem Nuclear Generating Station, Unit 1), ALAB-650, 14 NRC 43, 49 (1981).

D A party that fails to submit proposed findings as requested by a licensing board, relying instead on the submissions of others, assumes the risk that such reliance might be misplaced; it must be prepared to live with the consequence that its further appeal rights will be waived. Cf. Duke Power Co. (Cherokee Nuclear Station, Units 1, 2 and 3), ALAB-440, 6 NRC 642, 644-45 (1977).

E Although parties not adversely affected by the ultimate outcome of a licensing board decision may not appeal that decision, they may defend a result in their favor on any ground presented in the record, including one rejected below. Public Service Co. of Oklahoma, et al. (Black Fox Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-573, 10 NRC 775, 789 (1979).

F Regardless of whether there is an appeal, it is appeal board practice to review sua sponte any final disposition of a licensing proceeding that either was or had to be founded upon substantive determinations of significant safety or environmental issues. Sacramento Municipal Utility District (Rancho Seco Nuclear Generating Station), ALAB-655, 14 NRC 799, 803 (1981); Washington Public Power Supply System (WPPSS Nuclear Project No. 2), ALAB-571, 10 NRC 687, 692 (1979).

G Appeal boards do not ordinarily scrutinize licensing board rulings on economic issues, intervention requests, or procedural matters in the absence of a properly perfected appeal. Louisiana Power and Light Co. (Waterford Steam Generating Station, Unit No. 3), ALAB-258, 1 NRC 45, 48 n.6 (1975); Washington Public Power Supply System (Nuclear Projects No. 1 and No. 4), ALAB-265, 1 NRC 374, 375 n.1 (1975); Boston Edison Co. (Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1), ALAB-231, 8 AEC 633-634 (1974).

H An appeal board may undertake sua sponte review of a licensing board decision concerned with the integrity of the hearing process.

I It is not the appeal board's function in a sua sponte review of a licensing board decision to undertake a detailed scrutiny of the entire record. Rather, the appeal board usually addresses only those portions of the licensing board's opinion that it believes deserve clarification or correction. Further, absence of appeal board comment on a particular licensing board statement should not be construed as either agreement or disagreement with it.

DIGESTS
ISSUANCES OF THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING APPEAL BOARDS

- J An applicant or a licensee has an obligation in NRC proceedings to provide accurate and timely information. Petition for Emergency and Remedial Action, CLI-78-6, 7 NRC 400, 418 (1978). See also Tennessee Valley Authority (Browns Ferry Nuclear Plant, Units 1, 2 and 3), ALAB-677, 15 NRC 1387 (1982). The source of this obligation is the Atomic Energy Act itself. See Section 186a, 42 U.S.C. 2236a.
- K Liability of an applicant or licensee for a material false statement in violation of Section 186a of the Atomic Energy Act does not depend on whether the applicant or licensee knew of the falsity. Virginia Electric and Power Co. (North Anna Power Station, Units 1 and 2), CLI-76-22, 4 NRC 480 (1976), aff'd sub nom. Virginia Electric and Power Co. v. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, 571 F.2d 1289 (4th Cir. 1978).
- L Under Section 186a of the Atomic Energy Act, the test for materiality is whether the information is capable of influencing the decisionmaker — not whether the decisionmaker would, in fact, have relied on it. Determinations of materiality require careful, common-sense judgments of the context in which information appears and the stage of the licensing process involved. North Anna, *supra*, 4 NRC at 487, 491.
- M A "material false statement" under Section 186a of the Atomic Energy Act encompasses omissions as well as affirmative statements. North Anna, *supra*, 4 NRC at 489.
- N In general, if a party has doubts about whether to disclose information, it should do so, as the ultimate decision with regard to materiality is for the decisionmaker, not the parties.
- O The mere existence of a question or discussion about the possible materiality of information does not necessarily make the information material.
- P Intent to deceive is irrelevant in determining whether there has been a material false statement under Section 186a of the Atomic Energy Act; a deliberate effort to mislead the NRC, however, is relevant to the matter of sanctions, once a material false statement has been found.
- Q Information concerning a licensee's or an applicant's intent to deceive may call into question its "character" — a matter the Commission is authorized to consider under Section 182 of the Atomic Energy Act, 42 U.S.C. 2232a — or its ability and willingness to comply with agency regulations, as Section 103b, 42 U.S.C. 2133b, requires.
- R The Commission's Rules of Practice require parties and their representatives to conduct themselves with honor, dignity, and decorum as they should before a court of law. 10 CFR 2.713(a).
- S The Commission generally follows the American Bar Association's Code of Professional Responsibility in judging lawyer conduct in NRC proceedings. See, e.g., Northern Indiana Public Service Co. (Bailly Generating Station, Nuclear-1), ALAB-204, 7 AEC 835, 838 (1974).
- T Canon 7 of the ABA Code of Professional Responsibility — which exhorts lawyers to represent their clients "zealously within the bounds of the law" — and its associated Ethical Considerations and Disciplinary Rules provide the standards by which attorneys should abide in the preparation of testimony for NRC proceedings.
- U In judging the propriety of a lawyer's participation in the preparation of testimony of a witness, the key factor is not who originated the words that comprise the testimony, but whether the witness can truthfully attest that the statement is complete and accurate to the best of his or her knowledge.
- V Gamesmanship and sporting conduct between or among lawyers and parties is not condoned in Nuclear Regulatory Commission proceedings.

ALAB-692 METROPOLITAN EDISON COMPANY, et al. (Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit No. 2), Docket No. 50-320-OLA; OPERATING LICENSE AMENDMENT; September 14, 1982; DECISION

- A Following the conduct of additional evidentiary hearings by the Appeal Board on the probability of a heavy aircraft (one weighing more than 200,000 pounds) crashing into the TMI-2 plant, the Board finds the analyses performed by the NRC Staff and the applicants produced acceptable results based upon data then at hand (pre-1978 data). As to any future return of the plant to service, the Appeal Board requires an updated analysis of the crash probability prior to its operation (and at least once every three years thereafter), and such protective action as the analysis might indicate.
- B The following technical issues are discussed: Aircraft crash probability; Bayesian Theory; Confidence limits (precision, uncertainty).

DIGESTS
ISSUANCES OF THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING APPEAL BOARDS

ALAB-693 PENNSYLVANIA POWER AND LIGHT COMPANY and ALLEGHENY ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, INC. (Susquehanna Steam Electric Station, Units 1 and 2), Docket Nos. 50-387-OL, 50-388-OL; OPERATING LICENSE; September 28, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

- A** The Appeal Board dismisses an intervenor's appeal from the Licensing Board's initial decision (LBP-82-30, 15 NRC 771 (1982)) authorizing the issuance of full-power operating licenses for Units 1 and 2 of this facility. The Appeal Board notes that the initial decision does not constitute final agency action until it completes *sua sponte* review of it.
- B** A party's brief must (1) specify the precise portion of the record relied upon in support of the assertion of error, 10 CFR 2.762(a), and (2) relate to matters raised in the party's proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law. An appeal board will not ordinarily entertain arguments raised for the first time on appeal, absent a serious substantive issue. Public Service Electric and Gas Co., et al. (Salem Nuclear Generating Station, Unit 1), ALAB-650, 14 NRC 43, 49 (1981); Tennessee Valley Authority (Hartsville Nuclear Plant, Units 1A, 2A, 1B, and 2B), ALAB-463, 7 NRC 341, 348 (1978). See also Consumers Power Co. (Midland Plant, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-691, 16 NRC 897, 906-07 (1982).
- C** An appeal may be dismissed when a party's brief contains only conclusory assertions without sufficient information to dispose of its arguments intelligently. Public Service Co. of Oklahoma, et al. (Black Fox Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-573, 10 NRC 775, 786-87 (1979). See also Duke Power Co. (Catawba Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-355, 4 NRC 397, 413 (1976).
- D** Prior to issuing an operating license, the Director of Nuclear Reactor Regulation must find that Commission regulations (including those implementing NEPA) have been satisfied and that the activities authorized by the license can be conducted without endangering the health and safety of the public. See 10 CFR 50.4(d), 50.57; Northern States Power Co. (Prairie Island Nuclear Generating Plant, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-455, 7 NRC 41, 44 (1978), remanded on other grounds *sub nom*. *Minnesota v. Nuclear Regulatory Commission*, 602 F.2d 412 (D.C. Cir. 1979).
- E** Lay representatives generally are not held to the same standard for appellate briefs that is expected of lawyers. *Salem*, *supra*, 14 NRC at 50 n.7. Nonetheless, NRC litigants appearing *pro se* or through lay representatives are in no way relieved by that status of any obligation to familiarize themselves with the Commission's rules. To the contrary, all individuals and organizations electing to become parties to NRC licensing proceedings can fairly be expected both to obtain access to a copy of the rules and refer to it as the occasion arises. *Pennsylvania Power and Light Co. and Allegheny Electric Cooperative, Inc. (Susquehanna Steam Electric Station, Units 1 and 2)*, ALAB-563, 10 NRC 449, 450 n.1 (1979).
- F** An intervenor in NRC licensing proceedings has a basic obligation to "structure [its] participation so that it is meaningful, so that it alerts the agency to [its] position and contentions." *Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corp. v. Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc.*, 435 U.S. 519, 553 (1978).

ALAB-694 SOUTH CAROLINA ELECTRIC & GAS COMPANY, et al. (Virgil C. Summer Nuclear Station, Unit 1), Docket No. 50-395-OL; OPERATING LICENSE; September 28, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

- A** The Appeal Board dismisses exceptions filed by the applicants to the Licensing Board's partial initial decision in this operating license proceeding (LBP-82-55, 16 NRC 225 (1982)). The Appeal Board announces it will undertake *sua sponte* review of that decision and a later Licensing Board partial initial decision (LBP-82-57, 16 NRC 447 (1982)), authorizing the issuance of an operating license for the plant, and reminds the parties that neither initial decision shall be deemed to have achieved administrative finality pending the completion of that review and further order.
- B** Exceptions are not necessary to defend a decision in one's favor. Only where a party is aggrieved by or dissatisfied with the action taken below and invokes the Appeal Board's jurisdiction to change the result need exceptions be filed — or are they permitted. Public Service Co. of Indiana, Inc. (Marble Hill Nuclear Generating Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-459, 7 NRC 179, 202 (1978). See also Duke Power Co. (Cherokee Nuclear Station, Units 1, 2 and 3), ALAB-478, 7 NRC 772, 773 (1978); Consumers Power Co. (Midland Plant, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-282, 2 NRC 9, 10 n.1 (1975); Northern States Power Co. (Prairie Island Nuclear Generating Plant, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-252, 8 AEC 1175, 1177, affirmed, CLI-75-1, 1 NRC 1 (1975); Toledo Edison Co. (Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station), ALAB-157, 6 AEC 858, 859 (1973).

DIGESTS
ISSUANCES OF THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING APPEAL BOARDS

ALAB-695 COMMONWEALTH EDISON COMPANY (Dresden Station, Units 2 and 3), Docket Nos. 50-237, 50-249; SPENT FUEL POOL MODIFICATION; September 29, 1982; DECISION

A On completion of its *sua sponte* review of the Licensing Board's two initial decisions in this spent fuel pool modification proceeding (LBP-81-37, 14 NRC 708 (1981); LBP-82-65, 16 NRC 714 (1982)) (undertaken in the absence of any exceptions to either decision), the Appeal Board affirms the Licensing Board's decisions permitting (1) the modification of Unit 3's spent fuel pool; and (2) allowing the sought increase in spent fuel pool storage capacity for Units 2 and 3.

ALAB-696 WISCONSIN ELECTRIC POWER COMPANY (Point Beach Nuclear Plant, Unit 1), Docket No. 50-266-OLA; OPERATING LICENSE AMENDMENT; October 1, 1982; DECISION

A The Appeal Board affirms a Licensing Board order (LBP-81-55, 14 NRC 1017 (1981)) authorizing the issuance of a license amendment permitting Unit 1 of this facility to operate without removing from service six degraded tubes that had been repaired by a sleeving technique. The Appeal Board also discusses the special "show cause" procedure and litigation standard employed by the Licensing Board for expediting the license amendment proceeding and advises that use of similar procedures should be avoided in the future.

B Exceptions not adequately briefed are waived. Public Service Electric and Gas Company, et al. (Salem Nuclear Generating Station, Unit 1), ALAB-650, 14 NRC 43, 49-50 (1981), aff'd sub nom. Township of Lower Alloways Creek v. Public Service Electric and Gas Co., 687 F.2d 732 (3rd Cir. 1982); Public Service Company of Indiana, Inc. (Marble Hill Nuclear Generating Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-461, 7 NRC 313, 315 (1978); Tennessee Valley Authority (Hartsville Nuclear Plant, Units 1A, 2A, 1B and 2B), ALAB-367, 5 NRC 92, 104 n.59 (1977); Duke Power Company (Catawba Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-355, 4 NRC 397, 413-14 (1976).

C When an intervenor is represented by counsel, an appeal board has no obligation to piece together or to restructure vague references in its brief in order to make intervenor's arguments for it. See Salem, *supra*, 14 NRC at 51.

D The test of "finality" for appeal purposes is essentially a practical one. As a general matter, a licensing board's action is final for appellate purposes where it either disposes of at least a major segment of the case or terminates a party's right to participate; rulings which do neither are interlocutory. Toledo Edison Company, et al. (Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station), ALAB-300, 2 NRC 752, 758 (1975).

E The appealability of a licensing board order is determined by the nature of the order, not the name it bears. Kansas Gas and Electric Company and Kansas City Power and Light Company (Wolf Creek Nuclear Generating Station, Unit No. 1), ALAB-331, 3 NRC 771, 774 & n.5 (1976).

F Admission as a party to a Commission proceeding based, *inter alia*, on the proffering of at least one acceptable contention does not preclude summary disposition or guarantee a party a hearing on its contentions. Houston Lighting and Power Company (Allens Creek Nuclear Generating Station, Unit 1), ALAB-590, 11 NRC 542, 550 (1980).

G An appeal board will not reverse a licensing board's scheduling rulings unless the "board abused its discretion by setting a hearing schedule that deprives a party of its right to procedural due process" [footnote omitted]. Public Service Company of Indiana, Inc. (Marble Hill Nuclear Generating Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-459, 7 NRC 179, 188 (1978).

H While a licensing board should endeavor to conduct a licensing proceeding in a manner that takes account of the special circumstances faced by any participant, the fact that a party may possess fewer resources than others to devote to the proceeding does not relieve that party of its hearing obligations. Statement of Policy on Conduct of Licensing Proceedings, CLI-81-8, 13 NRC 452, 454 (1981).

I Sua sponte review of a licensing board's decision by an appeal board is a long-standing Commission-approved practice that is undertaken in all cases, regardless of their nature or whether exceptions have been filed. Offshore Power Systems (Manufacturing License for Floating Nuclear Power Plants), ALAB-689, 16 NRC 887, 890 (1982). See Boston Edison Company (Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1), ALAB-231, 8 AEC 633 (1974).

J In conducting its *sua sponte* review, an appeal board does not ordinarily examine a licensing board's rulings on procedural matters. See Consumers Power Company (Midland Plant, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-691, 16 NRC 897, 908 (1982); Pilgrim, *supra*, 8 AEC at 633-34.

K The procedures set forth in the Rules of Practice are the only ones that should be used (absent explicit Commission instructions in a particular case) in any licensing proceeding.

DIGESTS
ISSUANCES OF THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING APPEAL BOARDS

- L** A licensing board is not authorized to admit conditionally, for any reason, a contention that falls short of meeting the requirement of reasonable specificity set forth in 10 CFR §2.714. Duke Power Company, et al. (Catawba Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-687, 16 NRC 460, 467 (1982).
- M** The Commission's Rules of Practice do not permit an intervention petitioner to file a vague, unparticularized contention, followed by an endeavor to flesh it out through discovery against the applicant or the NRC staff. *Id.* at 468.
- N** Discovery on the subject matter of a contention in a licensing proceeding can be obtained only after the contention has been admitted to the proceeding. *Id.* at 467 n.12.
- O** In the interest of expedition, a motion for summary disposition may be filed at any time in the course of a proceeding. 10 CFR §2.749(a). See also 46 Fed. Reg. 30328, 30330-31 (June 8, 1981). If the licensing board determines that there are no genuine issues of material fact, it may grant summary disposition even before discovery is otherwise completed if the party opposing the motion cannot identify what specific information it seeks to obtain through further discovery. 10 CFR §2.749(c). See also *Fed. R. Civ. P.* 56(f); *Sec. & Exch. Comm'n v. Spence & Green Chemical Co.* 612 F.2d 896, 901 (5th Cir. 1980), cert. denied, 449 U.S. 1082 (1981); *Donofrio v. Camp*, 470 F.2d 428, 431-32 (D.C. Cir. 1972).
- P** As a general matter when expedition is necessary, the Commission's Rules of Practice are sufficiently flexible to permit it by ordering such steps as shortening — even drastically in some circumstances — the various time limits for the party's filings and limiting the time for, and type of, discovery. See 10 CFR §2.711. See also Statement of Policy on Conduct of Licensing Proceedings, CLI-81-8, 13 NRC 452 (1981). Steps to expedite a case are appropriate only upon a party's good cause showing that expedition is essential. 10 CFR §2.711.
- Q** A licensing board's regulation of a proceeding pursuant to 10 CFR §2.718 should not encompass procedures fundamentally departing from those set forth in the Rules of Practice. See 10 CFR Part 2, Appendix A.

ALAB-697 METROPOLITAN EDISON COMPANY, et al. (Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit No. 1), Docket No. 50-289-SP (Emergency Planning); SPECIAL PROCEEDING; October 22, 1982; DECISION

- A** In the first of its appellate decisions in this special proceeding to determine whether Unit 1 of this facility should be permitted to resume operation, the Appeal Board affirms the Licensing Board's disposition of the emergency planning issues raised on appeal by the intervenors pro se from the Licensing Board's second partial initial decision (LBP-81-59, 14 NRC 1211 (1981)), subject to the condition that the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania's agricultural information brochure be distributed to all farmers in the plume exposure pathway emergency planning zone prior to restart.
- B** Under Commission emergency planning regulations, licensees must establish procedures for notification of state and local emergency response organizations and must have the capability to notify responsible state and local governmental agencies within fifteen minutes of declaration of an emergency. 10 CFR 50.47(b)(5); 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix E, Sec. IV.D.3. Provision must also be made for prompt communications among principal response organizations to emergency personnel. 10 CFR 50.47(b)(6).
- C** Commission regulations designate two regions to be used for emergency planning purposes. The "plume exposure pathway emergency planning zone" consists of an area with a radius of approximately 10 miles surrounding a nuclear power facility. The "ingestion exposure pathway emergency planning zone" is an area with a radius of approximately 50 miles surrounding the facility. 10 CFR 50.47(c)(2).
- D** In NRC licensing proceedings, the licensee or applicant generally bears the ultimate burden of proof. 10 CFR 2.732.
- E** Pursuant to 10 CFR 50.47(b)(7), licensees must periodically make information available to members of the public concerning how they will be notified and what their initial actions should be in an emergency. Provisions must be made for yearly dissemination of "basic emergency planning information, such as the methods and times required for public notification and the protective actions planned if an accident occurs, general information as to the nature and effects of radiation, and a listing of local broadcast stations that will be used for dissemination of information during an emergency." 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix E, Section IV.D.2. These general standards and the guidelines set out in NUREG-0654, FEMA-Rep-1, Rev. 1, "Criteria for Preparation and Evaluation of Radiological

DIGESTS ISSUANCES OF THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING APPEAL BOARDS

Emergency Response Plans and Preparedness in Support of Nuclear Power Plants" (November 1980) provide a reasonable framework for evaluating the sufficiency of educational material.

F The Commission's emergency planning regulations do not require any protective measures for livestock unless they are necessary to protect the farmers. See 10 CFR 50.47(b)(10), (c)(2).

G The exact size and configuration of the ingestion exposure pathway emergency planning zone surrounding a nuclear plant are determined "in relation to local emergency response needs and capabilities as they are affected by such conditions as demography, topography, land characteristics, access routes, and jurisdictional boundaries." 10 CFR 50.47(c)(2). Protective actions that are appropriate to the locale must be developed for the ingestion exposure pathway EPZ. 10 CFR 50.47(b)(10).

H The following technical issues are discussed: Emergency plans; Environmental detection of radioactive iodine following accidental releases of radioactivity.

ALAB-698 METROPOLITAN EDISON COMPANY, et al. (Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit No. 1), Docket No. 50-289-SP (Emergency Planning); SPECIAL PROCEEDING; October 22, 1982; DECISION

A In the second of its appellate decisions considering emergency planning issues in this special proceeding to determine whether Unit 1 of the facility should be permitted to resume operation, the Appeal Board affirms the Licensing Board's holding in LBP-81-59, 14 NRC 1211, 1455-1707 (1981) not to require the predistribution of thermoluminescent dosimeters (TLDs) to state and local emergency workers, reverses the Licensing Board's holding regarding the staffing of the Emergency Operations Facility (EOF), and adopts the licensee's plan on this matter subject to certain conditions. The Appeal Board also holds that a test of emergency support operations as a condition of restart is unnecessary, and concludes that the state of the licensee's onsite and offsite emergency preparedness provides reasonable assurance that adequate protective measures can and will be taken in the event of an emergency. The Appeal Board further reviews sua sponte the NRC staff's incident response plan and certain guidelines in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania's plan regarding protective action, and makes various recommendations to the staff and to the Commission based on that review.

B The Commission's emergency planning regulations provide generally that no license may be issued unless a finding is made that the state of onsite and offsite emergency preparedness provides reasonable assurance that adequate protective measures can and will be taken in the event of a radiological emergency.

C The distribution of appropriate dosimeters to emergency workers in conjunction with other protective measures may serve to comply with the requirements of the emergency planning regulations relating to the protection of emergency workers in a radiological emergency.

D Documents such as the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) findings and determinations, NUREG-0654 and FEMA REP-2, somewhat like the staff's Regulatory Guides, do not rise to the level of regulatory requirements. Neither do they constitute the only method of meeting applicable regulatory requirements. Cf. Fire Protection for Operating Nuclear Power Plants (10 CFR 50.48), CLI-81-11, 13 NRC 778, 782 n.2 (1981); Gulf States Utilities Company (River Bend Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-444, 6 NRC 760, 772-773 (1977).

E In the absence of other evidence, adherence to regulatory guidance may be sufficient to demonstrate compliance with regulatory requirements. Petition for Emergency and Remedial Action, CLI-78-6, 7 NRC 400, 406-407 (1978). Generally speaking, however, such guidance is treated simply as evidence of legitimate means for complying with regulatory requirements, and the staff is required to demonstrate the validity of its guidance if it is called into question during the course of litigation. Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corp. (Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station), CLI-74-40, 8 AEC 809, 811 (1974).

F Commission regulations, 10 CFR 50.47 and 10 CFR Part 50 Appendix E, require the establishment of two separate facilities — one onsite, the other offsite — for the management of accidents. Licensees must provide for "timely augmentation of response capabilities" and specify "the interfaces among various onsite response activities and offsite support and response activities." 10 CFR 50.47(b)(2). The Emergency Operation Facility (EOF) is expressly referred to as the place where licensees must accommodate state and local emergency response staff. 10 CFR 50.47(b)(3).

G There is no express emergency planning regulation governing the location from which protective action recommendations must be made.

H The precise means of implementing the Commission's emergency planning regulations require a high degree of judgment. The mere fact that a licensee's approach is somewhat different from

DIGESTS
ISSUANCES OF THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING APPEAL BOARDS

the staff guidance does not render it impermissible or necessarily inconsistent with the need to provide adequate protection for the public.

I The following technical issues are discussed: Dosimetry; Thermoluminescent dosimeters; Emergency Operations Facilities; Emergency Support Operations; Emergency Response Plans.

ALAB-699 METROPOLITAN EDISON COMPANY, et al. (Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit No. 1), Docket No. 50-289-SP (Management Phase); RESTART; October 27, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

A The Appeal Board accepts the Licensing Board's referral of an intervenor's motion to reopen the management phase of the record in this restart proceeding. The motion was filed after the filing of exceptions to the Board's initial decision. The Appeal Board decides that jurisdiction to rule on a motion to reopen filed at that time rests with it rather than the Licensing Board, but defers ruling on the motion until it has achieved greater familiarity with the record.

B A licensing board is implicitly empowered to reopen a proceeding at least until the issuance of its initial decision, but no later than either the filing of exceptions or the expiration of the period during which the Commission or an appeal board can exercise its right to review the record. See 10 CFR §§2.717(a), 2.760(a), 2.718(j).

C Jurisdiction to rule on a motion to reopen filed after exceptions have been taken rests with the appeal board rather than the licensing board.

D An appeal board, unlike other appellate tribunals, has the option of reopening the record and receiving new evidence itself, if necessary, obviating remand to a licensing board. See, e.g., Pacific Gas and Electric Company (Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-598, 11 NRC 878-79 (1980).

E The disposition of a motion to reopen turns on whether (1) it is timely, (2) it addresses a significant issue, and (3) a different result might have been reached if the new material had been previously considered. Diablo Canyon, *supra*, 11 NRC at 879.

ALAB-700 PUGET SOUND POWER AND LIGHT COMPANY, et al. (Skagit/Hanford Nuclear Power Project, Units 1 and 2), Docket Nos. 50-522, 50-523; CONSTRUCTION PERMIT; October 29, 1982; DECISION

A The Appeal Board reverses a Licensing Board decision (LBP-82-74, 16 NRC 981 (1982)) that held petitioner (an authorized representative of the collective fishing interests of four Columbia River Indian tribes) did not have standing to intervene in this construction permit proceeding and remands the proceeding to the Licensing Board with instructions to grant the petition subject to its finding of at least one admissible contention proffered by the petitioner.

B A licensing board is not obliged to grant an intervention petition simply because it is unopposed; the board must still evaluate it for compliance with Commission intervention requirements.

C An appeal board will not overturn a licensing board's denial of intervention without reviewing that decision on the merits, even if the appeal is unopposed.

D To obtain standing to intervene in an NRC licensing proceeding, a petitioner must allege (1) an "injury in fact" that has occurred or will probably result from the proposed licensing action, and (2) an interest that is within the "zone of interests" protected by the Atomic Energy Act. Portland General Electric Company, et al. (Pebble Springs Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2), CLI-76-27, 4 NRC 610, 613-14 (1976).

E An organization is not precluded from intervening in an NRC licensing proceeding merely because one of its constituent members has already intervened.

F An organization can have standing as a representative of its members' interest. *Warth v. Seldin*, 422 U.S. 490, 511 (1975); *Sierra Club v. Morton*, 405 U.S. 727, 739 (1972).

G An organization specifically empowered by its members to promote certain of their interests has those members' authorization to act as their representative in any proceeding that may affect those interests. See *Hunt v. Washington Apple Advertising Commission*, 432 U.S. 333, 342-45 (1977); *Virginia Electric and Power Company* (North Anna Nuclear Power Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-536, 9 NRC 402, 404 n.2 (1979); *Houston Lighting and Power Company* (Allens Creek Nuclear Generating Station, Unit 1), ALAB-535, 9 NRC 377, 395-96 & n.25 (1979).

DIGESTS
ISSUANCES OF THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING APPEAL BOARDS

ALAB-701 PHILADELPHIA ELECTRIC COMPANY, et al. (Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station, Units 2 and 3), Docket Nos. 50-277, 50-278; METROPOLITAN EDISON COMPANY, et al. (Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit No. 2), Docket No. 50-320; and PUBLIC SERVICE ELECTRIC AND GAS COMPANY (Hope Creek Generating Station, Units 1 and 2), Docket Nos. 50-354, 50-355; OPERATING LICENSE; November 19, 1982; DECISION

A The Appeal Boards for this consolidated proceeding determine that intervenors have failed to demonstrate a need for a further evidentiary hearing on the question of the effects on human health of the annual fuel cycle radon releases attributable to the operation of the Peach Bottom (Unit 3), Three Mile Island (Unit 2), and Hope Creek (Units 1 and 2) reactors; and conclude on the basis of the existing evidentiary record that the health effects of those annual releases are not sufficiently significant to Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) cost-benefit balances against operation of these facilities. The Boards terminate their review of the initial decisions in each of the three proceedings (LBP-74-42, 7 AEC 1022 (1974) (Peach Bottom); LBP-77-70, 6 NRC 1185 (1977) (TMI-2); LBP-78-15, 7 NRC 642 (1978) (Hope Creek)) and affirm each decision except to the extent modified in their previous review on other issues.

B The following technical issues are discussed: Health effects of radon releases from nuclear fuel cycle; Expertise of witnesses; Natural release of radon.

ALAB-702 PENNSYLVANIA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY and ALLEGHENY ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, INC. (Susquehanna Steam Electric Station, Units 1 and 2), Docket Nos. 50-387-OL, 50-388-OL; OPERATING LICENSE; November 22, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

A On sua sponte review of the Licensing Board's initial decision authorizing the issuance of operating licenses for Units 1 and 2 of this facility (LBP-82-30, 15 NRC 771 (1982)), the Appeal Board agrees with the applicants and NRC staff on the need for amending the technical specifications for Unit 1 to include a limiting condition for operation that restricts increases in unidentified leakage in that Unit's reactor coolant system. Finding no other errors requiring corrective action, the Appeal Board announces the completion of its sua sponte review.

ALAB-703 SACRAMENTO MUNICIPAL UTILITY DISTRICT (Rancho Seco Nuclear Generating Station), Docket No. 50-312-SP; SPECIAL PROCEEDING; November 23, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

A In the course of sua sponte review of the Licensing Board's initial decision (LBP-81-12, 13 NRC 557 (1981)) in this special proceeding — instituted to determine the adequacy of certain requirements for continued operation ordered by the Commission following the March 1979 accident at Three Mile Island — the Appeal Board decides upon consideration of additional information submitted by the licensee and the NRC staff that, with one exception, the matters identified in its October 7, 1981 order (ALAB-655, 14 NRC 799) as calling for further information are now satisfactorily clarified or resolved. The Appeal Board defers final ruling in the proceeding, pending consideration of information yet to be received on the remaining matter.

B The following technical issues are discussed: Loss-of-coolant (LOCA) analysis; Pump suction line breaks; Auxiliary feedwater (AFW) flow; High pressure injection (HPI) nozzles; Thermal cycles; Pressurizer level indication; Loose thermal sleeves.

ALAB-704 MISSISSIPPI POWER & LIGHT COMPANY, et al. (Grand Gulf Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2), Docket Nos. 50-416, 50-417; OPERATING LICENSE; December 8, 1982; DECISION

A The Appeal Board affirms, subject to the outcome of pending judicial proceedings, the Licensing Board's decision (LBP-82-92, 16 NRC 1376 (1982)) denying a late-filed petition to intervene in this otherwise uncontested operating license proceeding for failure to meet the late intervention criteria of 10 CFR §2.714(a).

B Absent a showing of good cause for late filing, an intervention petitioner must make a "compelling showing" on the other four factors stated in 10 CFR §2.714(a) governing late intervention. South Carolina Electric and Gas Company, et al. (Virgil C. Summer Nuclear Station, Unit 1), ALAB-642, 13 NRC 881, 886 (1981), aff'd sub nom. Fairfield United Action v. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, 679 F.2d 261 (D.C. Cir. 1982). A licensing board's evaluation of those factors will not be disturbed by an appeal board unless the licensing board has abused its discretion. *Id.* at 885.

C When an intervention petitioner addresses the 10 CFR §2.714(a) (iii) criterion for late intervention requiring a showing how its participation may reasonably be expected to assist in developing a

DIGESTS
ISSUANCES OF THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING APPEAL BOARDS

sound record, it should set out with as much particularity as possible the precise issues it plans to cover, identify its prospective witnesses, and summarize their proposed testimony. See generally Summer, *supra*, 13 NRC at 894; The Detroit Edison Company (Greenwood Energy Center, Units 2 and 3), ALAB-476, 7 NRC 759, 764 (1978). Vague assertions regarding petitioner's ability or resources are insufficient.

D A Commission policy statement is binding on its adjudicatory boards. Northern States Power Company (Prairie Island Nuclear Generating Plant, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-455, 7 NRC 41, 51 (1978), remanded on other grounds sub nom. *Minnesota v. Nuclear Regulatory Commission*, 602 F.2d 412 (D.C. Cir. 1979).

ALAB-705 METROPOLITAN EDISON COMPANY, et al. (Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit No. 1), Docket No. 50-289 (Environmental Issues); RESTART; December 10, 1982; DECISION

A The Appeal Board affirms the Licensing Board's rejection in its partial initial decision on environmental issues in the TMI-1 restart proceeding (LBP-81-60, 14 NRC 1724), of an intervenor's contention calling for an analysis of the environmental effects of so-called "Class 9 accidents." The Appeal Board rules that neither NEPA, nor Commission policy or instructions applicable to this proceeding, requires further analysis of such accidents.

B It is well-settled that NEPA does not require an evaluation of environmental impacts that are "deemed only remote and speculative possibilities." *Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corp. v. National Resources Defense Council*, 435 U.S. 519, 551 (1978), quoting *NRDC v. Morton*, 458 F.2d 827, 837-38 (D.C. Cir. 1972).

ALAB-706 CLEVELAND ELECTRIC ILLUMINATING COMPANY, et al. (Perry Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2), Docket Nos. 50-440-OL, 50-441-OL; OPERATING LICENSE; December 15, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

A The Appeal Board denies applicants' motion for directed certification of the Licensing Board's order (LBP-82-98, 16 NRC 1459 (1982)) admitting three late-filed contentions of intervenors in this operating license proceeding.

B Appeal board review of an interlocutory licensing board ruling via directed certification is discretionary and granted infrequently. A party invoking review by this means must demonstrate that the board's action either (a) threatens the party adversely affected with immediate and serious irreparable harm which could not be remedied by a later appeal, or (b) affects the basic structure of the proceeding in a pervasive or unusual manner. *Public Service Electric and Gas Company (Salem Nuclear Generating Station, Unit 1)*, ALAB-588, 11 NRC 533, 536 (1980), and cases cited. A ruling that does no more than admit a contention has a low potential for meeting that standard. *Duke Power Company, et al. (Catawba Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2)*, ALAB-687, 16 NRC 460, 464 (1982).

C The admission by a licensing board of more late-filed than timely contentions does not, in and of itself, affect the basic structure of a licensing proceeding in a pervasive or unusual manner warranting interlocutory appeal board review. If the late-filed contentions have been admitted by the board in accordance with 10 CFR §2.714, it cannot be said that the board's rulings have affected the case in a pervasive or unusual manner. Rather, the board will have acted in furtherance of the Commission's own rules.

D Neither the Commission's Rules of Practice nor the pertinent Statement of Consideration puts an absolute or relative limit on the number of contentions that may be admitted to a licensing proceeding. See 10 CFR §2.714(a), (b); 43 Fed. Reg. 17798, 17799 (Apr. 26, 1978).

E The fact that applicants will be unable to regroup the time and financial expense needed to litigate late-filed contention is a factor that is present when any contention is admitted and thus does not provide the type of unusual delay that warrants interlocutory appeal board review. *Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company, et al. (Perry Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2)*, ALAB-675, 15 NRC 1105, 1114 (1982).

ALAB-707 THE DETROIT EDISON COMPANY, et al. (Enrico Fermi Atomic Power Plant, Unit 2), Docket No. 50-341-OL; OPERATING LICENSE; December 21, 1982; DECISION

A The Appeal Board affirms a Licensing Board decision (LBP-82-96, 16 NRC 1408 (1982)) denying an intervention petition filed after the close of the evidentiary record for failure to meet the criteria governing late intervention specified in 10 CFR §2.714(a). The Appeal Board forwards the petition and accompanying materials to the Director of Nuclear Reactor Regulation with a request that they be treated as a 10 CFR §2.206 petition.

DIGESTS
ISSUANCES OF THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING APPEAL BOARDS

B An appeal board will not overturn a licensing board's denial of a late intervention petition under the criteria specified in 10 CFR §2.714(a) unless the board has abused its direction. *South Carolina Electric and Gas Company, et al. (Virgil C. Summer Nuclear Station, Unit 1)*, ALAB-642, 13 NRC 881, 885 (1981), aff'd sub nom. *Fairfield United Action v. Nuclear Regulatory Commission*, 679 F.2d 261 (D.C. Cir. 1982).

C A party seeking to reopen a proceeding for consideration of a newly recognized contention must satisfy an objective test of good cause. Among other things, the party seeking to reopen must show that the issue it now seeks to raise could not have been raised earlier. *Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corp. (Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station)*, ALAB-138, 6 AEC 520, 523 (1973). In addition, the party must show that the matter it wishes to have considered is (1) timely presented, (2) addressed to a significant issue, and (3) susceptible of altering the result previously reached. See *Pacific Gas and Electric Company (Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2)*, CLI-81-5, 13 NRC 361, 364-65 (1981); *Kansas Gas and Electric Company and Kansas City Power and Light Company (Wolf Creek Generating Station, Unit No. 1)*, ALAB-462, 7 NRC 320, 338 (1978).

D In the absence of good cause, a petitioner must make a "compelling showing" on the other four 10 CFR §2.714(a) factors in order to justify late intervention. *Summer*, *supra*, 13 NRC at 886. See *Mississippi Power & Light Company, et al. (Grand Gulf Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2)*, ALAB-704, 16 NRC 1725, 1730 (1982).

E In addressing the factor of the extent to which it can assist in developing a sound record, a petitioner "should set out with as much particularity as possible the precise issues it plans to cover, identify its prospective witnesses, and summarize their proposed testimony. Vague assertions regarding petitioner's ability or resources . . . are insufficient." *Grand Gulf*, *supra*, 16 NRC at 1730 (citations omitted).

F Until the parties to a proceeding that oppose a late intervention petition suggest another forum that appears to promise a full hearing on the claims petitioner seeks to raise, a petitioner need not identify and particularize other remedies as inadequate.

G The Commission's late intervention rules are the kind of reasonable procedural rules it is entitled to establish for participation in its proceedings. *BPI v. Atomic Energy Commission*, 502 F.2d 424 (D.C. Cir. 1974). See generally *Summer*, *supra*.

H In every case, a petitioner that for some reason cannot gain admittance to a construction permit or operating license hearing, but wishes to raise health, safety, or environmental concerns before the NRC may file a request with the Director of Nuclear Reactor Regulation under 10 CFR §2.206 asking the Director to institute a proceeding to address those concerns. The Director can then either institute a show-cause proceeding if he believes one is warranted, or issue a written statement of reasons explaining why no regulatory action is necessary. See *Washington Public Power Supply System (WPPSS Nuclear Project Nos. 1 & 2)*, CLI-82-29, 16 NRC 1221, 1228-29 (1982). See also *Porter County Chapter of the Izaak Walton League of America, Inc. v. Nuclear Regulatory Commission*, 606 F.2d 1363, 1369-70 (D.C. Cir. 1979).

ALAB-708 METROPOLITAN EDISON COMPANY, et al. (Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit No. 1), Docket No. 50-289 (Design Issues); RESTART; December 29, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

A The Appeal Board orders a limited reopening of the evidentiary record in this restart proceeding and directs the licensee and the NRC staff to prepare supplemental testimony on specified issues concerning, *inter alia*, the capability of the "feed and bleed" and two-phase (boiler-condenser) natural circulation processes to remove decay heat from the reactor core in the event of a loss of main feedwater or a small-break loss-of-coolant accident at TMI-1.

B The following technical issues are discussed: Decay Heat Removal Methods — Feed and Bleed Cooling; Natural Circulation Cooling with Emergency Feedwater — (Single-phase and two-phase (boiler-condenser) natural circulation flow, Emergency Feedwater System Reliability, Reactor Coolant System Vents).

DIGESTS
ISSUANCES OF THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARDS

LBP-82-51 DUKE POWER COMPANY, et al. (Catawba Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2), Docket Nos. 50-413, 50-414; SPECIAL PROCEEDING; July 8, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

- A The Licensing Board overrules various objections to its Order issued following a prehearing conference pursuant to §10 CFR 2.751a. The Board also denies requests for referral of certain issues to the Appeal Board.
- B Where an Intervenor seeking to challenge an Applicant's security plan does not produce a qualified expert to review the plan and declines to submit to a protective order, its vague contentions must be dismissed for failure to meet conditions that could produce an acceptably specific contention.

LBP-82-51A CONSUMERS POWER COMPANY (Big Rock Point Plant), Docket No. 50-155-OLA; SPENT FUEL POOL AMENDMENT; July 8, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

- A The Licensing Board affirms, over objections of the NRC Staff, a phased schedule for the filing of findings of fact and conclusions of law subsequent to an evidentiary hearing. Under the schedule, all parties are required to make simultaneous filings of findings of fact and conclusions of law on each of the contentions and all parties have simultaneous rights of reply.
- B A Board may require phased findings of fact and conclusions of law subsequent to an evidentiary hearing in order to expedite the decision process by permitting the Board to begin analyzing the record efficiently. Under a phased schedule, early findings may be required prior to the 30 days allowed for applicants under the procedural regulations. The Board may also require simultaneous filing of these phased findings, in order to expedite the proceeding and to encourage staff to develop an independent position.

LBP-82-52 COMMONWEALTH EDISON COMPANY (Dresden Nuclear Power Station, Unit No. 1), Docket No. 50-10-OLA; OPERATING LICENSE AMENDMENT; July 12, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

- A Pursuant to a Memorandum and Order of the Commission directing its establishment (CLI-81-25, 14 NRC 616 (1981)), the Licensing Board rules that one individual and two organizations have standing to intervene in this proceeding concerned with chemical decontamination of Dresden Unit 1 but, because it finds that none of the contentions advanced by Petitioners are acceptable under 10 CFR §2.714 and CLI-81-25, the Board denies the petitions.
- B An organization petitioning to intervene as a representative of its members must demonstrate that it has at least one member with personal standing who has authorized the organization to represent his or her interest.
- C Purely academic interest in a problem is not an interest encompassed by 10 CFR §2.714. In order to satisfy 10 CFR §2.714, an injury in fact must be alleged.
- D In order to be admitted for litigation, a contention must inform the Board and the parties of the matters sought to be litigated. Particularly where substantial technical information is available indicating the bases for the applicant's proposal and the Staff's position, Petitioners' contentions must indicate the specific respects in which they quarrel with that information.

LBP-82-53 CLEVELAND ILLUMINATING COMPANY, et al. (Perry Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 & 2), Docket Nos. 50-440-OL, 50-441-OL; OPERATING LICENSE; July 12, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

- A The Board admits late-filed contentions on psychological stress, the degradation of electrical wiring from radiation-induced embrittlement of electrical insulation, and the impropriety of considering local economic effects as benefits for purposes of the Draft Environmental Statement, but requires intervenors to further particularize two of the contentions prior to hearing.

DIGESTS
ISSUANCES OF THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARDS

- B** The Board refuses to admit a late-filed contention that the plant's closed-cycle cooling system should be replaced by a radial well system, such as has been employed at Grand Gulf Nuclear Station, in order to reduce the number of fish, fish eggs and larvae destroyed through impingement and entrainment. The Board also refuses to admit a contention that the environmental analysis must consider the possible use of nuclear fuel for nuclear weapons, should the government subsequently decide to permit the use of laser isotope separation techniques to accomplish this purpose.
- C** In addition, the Board rules that the decision in *Natural Resources Defense Council v. NRC*, Civil Action No. 74-1586 (April 27, 1982), which has not been accompanied by a mandate, does not provide grounds for reconsidering an earlier ruling excluding a contention on the safe disposal and storage of radioactive materials.
- D** Intervenors may be excused for lateness in filing if they keep current with reputable sources of information such as *Science*, *Science News*, and the *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientist*. They need not keep up with all NRC literature and all technical literature concerning nuclear reactors.
- E** The Commission is required to consider psychological stress in its environmental analysis providing that there is proof that a nuclear plant will cause people in the vicinity of the plant to suffer anxieties of such severity as to be medically recognized impairments of psychological health.
- F** A court decision purporting to strike down a portion of the Commission's rules on the consideration of waste disposal issues in NEPA analyses does not invalidate those rules until the court issues its mandate. Prior to the issuance of a mandate, the rule is valid and a contention contradicting the rule cannot be admitted.
- G** A contention that fuel stored in a spent fuel pool might subsequently be used to manufacture nuclear weapons is not cognizable under NEPA because weapons manufacture is not part of the proposed action and would require either federal legislation or further federal administrative action.
- H** When the Commission has decided to implement a rule on the environmental qualification of electrical equipment but has not yet decided when to make the rule effective, it is appropriate to admit a contention on the subject. Provision may be made for applicant or staff to stay discovery on the contention if they wish.
- I** The following technical issues are discussed: Embrittlement of electrical insulation; environmental qualification of electric wiring; radiation, effects on polymers; polymer degradation due to radiation; psychological stress, legal standard for NEPA consideration; impingement of fish, minimum standard for NEPA consideration; entrainment of fish, minimum standard for NEPA consideration.

LBP-82-53A CLEVELAND ELECTRIC ILLUMINATING COMPANY, et al. (Perry Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 & 2), Docket Nos. 50-440-OL, 50-441-OL; OPERATING LICENSE; July 19, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

- A** The Licensing Board revises its earlier decision (LBP-82-53) and dismisses a psychological stress contention based on a statement of policy issued by the Commission.
- LBP-82-54 CINCINNATI GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY, et al. (Zimmer Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1), Docket No. 50-358-OL; OPERATING LICENSE; July 15, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER**
- A** Licensing Board rules that an intervenor proposing eight untimely contentions challenging applicants' quality assurance procedures and character and competence to operate a nuclear facility failed to meet the standards of 10 CFR 2.714. In light of the seriousness of the issues, the Board adopts them *sua sponte*.
- B** When untimely contentions are advanced on the eve of an initial decision which ordinarily would conclude Licensing Board consideration of an application, the proponent must furnish substantial justification for the delay.
- C** When untimely proposed contentions raise issues so serious that a decision adverse to the applicant might require denial of an operating license, the Licensing Board may exercise its authority under 10 CFR §2.718(j) and 2.760a to reopen the record and admit the contentions as Board-raised issues.
- D** It is a clear requirement for representational standing that an organization seeking to represent the interests of its members submit evidence of authorization to do so from at least one member with standing to participate in the proceeding.

DIGESTS
ISSUANCES OF THE ATOMICSafety AND LICENSING BOARDS

LBP-82-55 SOUTH CAROLINA ELECTRIC AND GAS COMPANY, et al. (Virgil C. Summer Nuclear Station, Unit 1), Docket No. 50-395-OL; OPERATING LICENSE; July 20, 1982; PARTIAL INITIAL DECISION

- A In this Partial Initial Decision the Licensing Board resolves the seismic issues in controversy in favor of plant safety concluding that the seismic safety of the Summer Nuclear Plant will be assured if the operating license is made subject to two conditions: (1) that seismic monitoring be continued at least until December 31, 1983, and that the NRC Staff reevaluate at that time the need for further monitoring; and (2) that Applicants successfully complete within the first year of operation a confirmatory program to demonstrate to the NRC Staff's satisfaction that explicit safety margins exist for each component necessary for shutdown and continued heat removal in the event of the maximum potential shallow earthquake.
- B The following technical issues are discussed: Reservoir-induced seismicity — occurrence after impoundment, shallow earthquakes and near-source earthquakes; Ground motion — peak accelerations, amplification from bedrock (soil, topographical, soil-pad interaction), response spectra, theoretical models and empirical data; Magnitude potential — deep vs. shallow earthquakes, source dimension, deviatoric stress; Seismic structural capacity — engineered structures, equipment and components, natural frequencies and reduction of motion (imbedment of foundation).

LBP-82-56 METROPOLITAN EDISON COMPANY (Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit 1), Docket No. 50-289; RESTART; July 27, 1982; PARTIAL INITIAL DECISION

- A The Licensing Board issues its third and concluding partial initial decision which resolves the special restart proceeding in favor of restarting TMI Unit 1 subject to certain recommendations, conditions and a monetary penalty.
- B Technical issues discussed: utility's responsibility to train and examine candidates for NRC operator licenses; utility's responsibility to certify only competent candidates for NRC operator licenses; standards for maintaining and renewing operator licenses; the NRC operator licensing responsibilities; auditing of utility's operator training and examination program; the method of validating NRC operator license examination for specific plants; proctoring and grading NRC operator licensing examinations; quality assurance applied to training and testing operators; redundant assurance of reactor operator competence; reactor coolant chemistry; reactor coolant pump bearing and seals.
- C Licensing Board appointed Special Master pursuant to 10 CFR 2.722(a)(2) and specified issues to be heard by Special Master.
- D Licensing Board adopts as its own the evidentiary record made before Special Master.
- E The Board, not the Special Master, is authorized by Notice of Hearing, regulations and statute to render Administrative Procedure Act initial decision. Special Master's report is advisory only. Board must render decision based on its own understanding of the reliable, probative and substantial evidence.
- F Licensing Board affords weight to Special Master's reported direct observations of witness demeanor; but where Special Master's conclusions are materially affected by witness demeanor, Licensing Board must give especially careful consideration to whether or not other more objective witness credibility standards are consistent with Special Master's conclusions.
- G Where inferences and factual conclusions depend upon the ethical orientation and expectations of the fact-finder, Licensing Board relies upon its collegial judgment but accepts Special Master's conclusions as informed advice.
- H Results of hearing before Special Master and its effect upon the entire proceeding before the Board are exclusively within the jurisdiction of the Board vis-a-vis the jurisdiction delegated to the Special Master.
- I Licensing Board does not endorse Special Master's recommendation that NRC examination cheaters be referred for criminal prosecution, because criminal prosecution has not been shown to relate to jurisdiction granted by Notice of Hearing.
- J Licensing Board has no jurisdiction and authority to direct the NRC Staff to conduct future investigation into alleged false material statement under ruling of Carolina Power and Light Company (Shearon Harris, Units 1-4), CLI-80-12, 11 NRC 514 (1980).

DIGESTS
ISSUANCES OF THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARDS

- K** Although not presiding over a proceeding noticed as a civil penalty case, Licensing Board nevertheless imposes a monetary penalty on licensed utility of \$100,000 for negligent failure to safeguard the integrity of the utility's operator examination process, failure to instill an attitude of respect for the utility- and NRC-administered examinations, failure to assure the quality of operator training instruction and negligence in the certification of candidates for NRC operator licensing. Board's jurisdiction to impose monetary penalty flows from authority set out in Notice of Hearing to require long-term measures necessary to provide reasonable assurance that Three Mile Island Unit 1 can be operated without endangering the public health and safety.
- L** Upon issuing a partial initial decision, Licensing Board retained jurisdiction over a portion of the subject matter of that decision because of new information on cheating on the NRC operator licensing examination.
- M** NRC investigator's testimony that operator licensing examination candidate told him that another operator licensing examination candidate attempted to cheat, particularly in light of uncertain memories of investigator and the informing candidate, is unreliable hearsay.
- N** Rumors that an employee of Licensee cheated are the worst kind of hearsay (United States v. Mandel, 591 F.2d 1347 (4th Cir. 1979); cert. denied, 100 S. Ct. 1647; 445 U.S. 961; 64 L. Ed. 2d 36 (1980)) and not worthy of evidentiary weight as to the truth of the rumors. Rumors may be considered, however, in assessing thoroughness of investigation and may be pursued in the interest of a complete evidentiary record.
- O** The Board finds that it is fair to draw an inference unfavorable to a suspected cheater where, as a voluntary witness, suspected cheater alone has solution to mystery surrounding his activities and fails to explain his activities despite opportunity to do so.
- P** Certification to the NRC's Operator Licensing Branch that licensed operator has requalified based upon the known improper assistance of another operator is a false material statement under the Atomic Energy Act.
- Q** Licensing Board finds that two licensed operators cheated on company-administered license qualification examination but, because operators have not had notice of charges against them or opportunity to confront evidence because of sequestration, no action may be taken against their personal operator licenses without further proceeding. However, findings that the operators cheated are findings against the licensed utility.

LBP-82-57 SOUTH CAROLINA ELECTRIC AND GAS COMPANY, et al. (Virgil C. Summer Nuclear Station, Unit 1), Docket No. 50-395-OL; OPERATING LICENSE; August 4, 1982; SUPPLEMENTAL PARTIAL INITIAL DECISION

- A** In this Supplemental Partial Initial Decision the Licensing Board authorizes the issuance of a full-term operating license subject to certain conditions relating to seismic safety, emergency preparedness and steam generator tube problems. The Board considered issues involving anticipated transients without scram (ATWS), emergency preparedness, quality assurance/quality control, and health effects from the operation of the facility and from the uranium fuel cycle.
- B** The following technical issues are discussed: Health effects — risk estimators, linear model, and super linear model

LBP-82-58 DAIRYLAND POWER COOPERATIVE (La Crosse Boiling Water Reactor), Docket Nos. 50-409-FTOL, 50-409-SC; OPERATING LICENSE; August 2, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

- A** The Licensing Board grants the motions of the NRC Staff and Applicant for summary disposition of all environmental contentions and concludes its consideration of other environmental questions which had arisen during the course of this full-term operating license proceeding.
- B** The Commission and Appeal Board have encouraged the use of summary disposition to resolve contentions where an intervenor has failed to establish a genuine issue exists.
- C** The Commission's summary disposition procedures have been analogized to Rule 56 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Decisions arising under the Federal Rules thus may serve as guidelines to licensing boards in applying the Commission's summary disposition procedures.
- D** The burden of proof lies upon the movant for summary disposition, who must demonstrate the absence of any issue of material fact. If a movant fails to make the requisite showing, its motion may be denied even in the absence of any response by the proponent of a contention.

DIGESTS
ISSUANCES OF THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARDS

- E Where a movant for summary disposition fails to include the requisite "separate, short and concise statement of the material facts as to which the moving party contends that there is no genuine issue to be heard," or where the statement is inadequate, a Board may dismiss the motion for summary disposition as procedurally defective or, alternatively, can decline to give the statement the effect it would otherwise be accorded.
- F Compliance with the design objectives set forth in 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix I, establishes that the doses to offsite individuals are as low as reasonably achievable.
- G To warrant consideration of alleged environmental effects of plant operation at an evidentiary hearing, more must be shown than that those effects are theoretically possible.
- H Unless a nuclear plant has environmental disadvantages in comparison to reasonable alternatives, differences in financial costs do not enter into the NEPA process and, hence, into NRC's cost-benefit balance. Only after an environmentally superior alternative has been identified do economic considerations become relevant.
- I Issues concerning alternative energy sources in general may no longer be considered in operating license proceedings.
- J Issues raising need for power in general may no longer be considered in operating license proceedings. Lack of a previous NEPA review would not be the type of "special circumstance" needed to justify such consideration.
- K In proceedings instituted prior to June, 1980, serious (Class 9) accidents may be considered only upon a showing of "special circumstances."

LBP-82-59 TEXAS UTILITIES GENERATING COMPANY, et al. (Comanche Peak Steam Electric Station, Units 1 and 2), Docket Nos. 50-445, 50-446; SHOW CAUSE; August 4, 1982; ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

- A The Licensing Board orders the NRC Staff to show cause why sanctions should not be imposed for the Staff's refusal to obey a Board order to identify by name individuals interviewed in connection with an investigation and to provide unexpurgated copies of signed statements taken from them. The investigation concerned allegations by a former quality control inspector that he had been wrongfully discharged for reporting defects in construction which he had identified in the performance of his job and the investigation report had been introduced as an exhibit by the Staff.
- B A qualified informer's privilege exists in NRC practice only for informers who have been given promises and pledges of anonymity.
- C Informer's privilege must yield when, in the context of an ongoing hearing on safety issues, a Board needs the protected information to determine the credibility of witnesses on contested matters.

LBP-82-60 CONSUMERS POWER COMPANY (Big Rock Point Plant), Docket No. 50-155-OLA; SPENT FUEL POOL AMENDMENT; August 6, 1982; INITIAL DECISION

- A This is the first of a series of initial decisions concerning an amendment to permit 441 fuel assemblies to be stored in the spent fuel pool at Big Rock Point, compared to a current authorization for only 193 assemblies. This decision directs that certain changes be made in the emergency planning pamphlet that is distributed within the Emergency Planning Zone for the purpose of informing people about procedures to follow in case of an emergency at the nuclear plant. The decision also finds that there is as yet no adequate plan to distribute the pamphlet in public places or to inform transients, including large numbers of skiers and summer tourists, of appropriate steps to take in an emergency.
- B Applicant must demonstrate that a satisfactory prompt notification system is in place.
- C A satisfactory emergency plan must provide an adequate opportunity for both the permanent and transient adult population to become aware of appropriate steps to take in an emergency.
- D The requirement that there be an emergency planning pamphlet is an intrinsic part of the regulatory scheme requiring a prompt notification system. Its purpose is to give residents and transients the information they need to respond to audible alarm systems and to be sufficiently knowledgeable to understand the importance of responding.

LBP-82-60A SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY, et al. (San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station, Units 2 and 3), Docket Nos. 50-361-OL, 50-362-OL; OPERATING LICENSE; August 6, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

- A The Licensing Board decides that the utility of the further proceedings it had contemplated on the need for medical arrangements in the offsite emergency planning has been called into question by an Appeal Board ruling indicating that such arrangements are not necessary. The Board calls for com-

DIGESTS
ISSUANCES OF THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARDS

ments from the parties on whether further proceedings may actually produce a better record on the question of need for medical services offsite.

LBP-82-61 CONSOLIDATED EDISON COMPANY OF NEW YORK (Indian Point, Unit No. 2) and **POWER AUTHORITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK** (Indian Point, Unit No. 3), Docket Nos. 50-247-SP, 50-286-SP; SPECIAL PROCEEDING; August 9, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND CERTIFICATION

- A The Licensing Board seeks further Commission guidance concerning the Commission's July 27, 1982 Memorandum and Order (CLI-82-15, 16 NRC 27) directing the Board to reconsider its rulings on contentions.
- B The Licensing Board requests Commission guidance as to whether it should require that any proffered testimony on risk treat both the consequences and the probability of accidents; or whether it may admit testimony on consequences (or probability) alone if testimony on probability (or consequences) is received from some other source.
- C The Licensing Board requests Commission guidance as to whether it should continue to hear evidence on certain emergency planning questions posed by the Commission in light of the decision of the NRC Regional Administrator to require licensees pursuant to 10 CFR §50.54 to cure significant deficiencies in their emergency plans as identified by the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

LBP-82-62 ARIZONA PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY, et al. (Palo Verde Nuclear Generating Station, Units 1, 2 and 3), Docket Nos. STN-50-528-OL, STN-50-529-OL, STN-50-530-OL; OPERATING LICENSE; August 12, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

- A The Licensing Board issues a Memorandum and Order denying Intervenor's Petition for directed certification of two evidentiary rulings made during the operating license proceeding.
- B The availability of directed certification is an exception to the Commission's general rule against interlocutory appeals (10 CFR 2.730(f)) and, as such, is to be resorted to only in "exceptional circumstances." Consumers Power Company (Midland Plant, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-382, 5 NRC 603, 606 (1977).
- C The D.C. Circuit's opinion in *Natural Resources Defense Council v. NRC*, 685 F.2d 459 (D.C. Cir. 1982) does not affect this proceeding in such a manner as to present a "novel question of policy or law" under 10 CFR Part 2, Appendix A(V)(f)(4).

LBP-82-63 CONSUMERS POWER COMPANY (Midland Plant, Units 1 and 2), Docket Nos. 50-329-OM&OL, 50-330-OM&OL; MODIFICATION ORDER AND OPERATING LICENSE; August 14, 1982; PREHEARING CONFERENCE ORDER

- A The Licensing Board issues a Prehearing Conference Order ruling on contentions submitted following issuance of the Staff's Safety Evaluation Report (SER) and Draft Environmental Statement (DES).
- B Where contentions are filed after 15 days prior to the special prehearing conference, those contentions are considered as late-filed and may be admitted only upon a balancing of all of the five factors listed in 10 CFR §2.714(a)(1). Where "good cause" for failure to file on time (factor i) has not been demonstrated, a contention may still be accepted, but the burden of justifying acceptance of a late contention on the basis of the other factors is considerably greater.
- C Newly arising information has long been recognized as providing "good cause" for acceptance of a late contention. Indiana and Michigan Electric Co. (Donald C. Cook Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2), CLI-72-75, 5 AEC 13, 14 (1972); Cincinnati Gas and Electric Co., et al. (William H. Zimmer Nuclear Station), LBP-80-14, 11 NRC 570, 574 (1980), appeal dismissed, ALAB-595, 11 NRC 860 (1980).
- D Where untimely contentions arise from the Three Mile Island Unit 2 accident, or the Commission's regulatory response to that accident, a Licensing Board must not only balance the factors in 10 CFR §2.714(a)(1) but also must take into account the Commission's December 18, 1980 Statement of Policy on that subject. CLI-80-42, 12 NRC 654.
- E The proponent of a late-filed contention should affirmatively address the five factors in 10 CFR §2.714(a)(1) and demonstrate that, on balance, the contention should be admitted. In considering that showing, a Board may take into account the circumstance that a pro se intervenor is involved.
- F Insofar as timeliness is concerned, the standards for evaluating the acceptability of late-filed contentions are the same as those for evaluating the admissibility of an untimely intervention petition — i.e., the standards appearing in 10 CFR §2.714(a)(1).

DIGESTS
ISSUANCES OF THE ATOMICSafety AND LICENSING BOARDS

- G Dissatisfaction with the performance of another party (including the Staff) upon whom one had been relying cannot serve as an acceptable justification for an untimely intervention or for the late filing of a contention.
- H In considering the admissibility of contentions, a Licensing Board cannot resolve factual questions going to the merits of a contention. Houston Lighting and Power Co. (Allens Creek Nuclear Generating Station, Unit 1), ALAB-590, 11 NRC 542, 547-49 (1980).
- I It is unreasonable to expect an intervenor to examine reports of incidents at various reactors and file contentions based on them at a time when it is not known how or whether the lessons of that incident are incorporated into the reactor under consideration.
- J When a matter is involved in rulemaking, the Commission may elect to require an issue which is part of that rulemaking to be heard as part of that rulemaking. Where it does not impose such a requirement, an issue is not barred from being considered in adjudications being conducted at that time. Furthermore, rulemaking does not preclude litigation of a contention questioning an applicant's compliance with an interim rule in effect during the pendency of the rulemaking proceeding.
- K "Sunk costs" are not appropriately considered in an operating license cost-benefit balance.
- L Effective March 31, 1982, the Commission eliminated entirely requirements for financial qualifications review for, inter alia, electric utilities applying for operating licenses. This amendment is applicable to ongoing proceedings and requires dismissal of previously accepted financial qualifications contentions.

LBP-82-64 GENERAL ELECTRIC CO. (Vallecitos Nuclear Center — General Electric Test Reactor, Operating License No. TR-1), Docket No. 50-70-SC; SHOW CAUSE; August 16, 1982; INITIAL DECISION

- A In this Show Cause proceeding to establish seismic and geologic design bases for the site and to determine whether the shutdown GE test reactor can withstand them, the Licensing Board majority issues an initial decision accepting the design bases proposed by licensee and NRC Staff, and authorizes a restart of the facility as structurally modified. In a separate opinion, the Board Chairman disagrees with the geologic design basis, questions some of the expert evidence offered at hearing, and would authorize a restart of the facility only with a further modification.
- B The following technical issues are discussed: Ground faulting — evidence of offsets, estimates of surface offset, probability of offset, fault deflection; Ground motion — peak accelerations, effective peak acceleration, combined with surface offset, vertical accelerations; Structural capacity — cantilever loading, lack of containment integrity.

LBP-82-65 COMMONWEALTH EDISON COMPANY (Dresden Station, Units 2 and 3), Docket Nos. 50-237-SP, 50-249-SP; SPENT FUEL POOL AMENDMENT; August 17, 1982; FINAL INITIAL DECISION

- A The Licensing Board's final initial decision authorizes the issuance of appropriate license amendments to permit replacement of the current spent fuel storage racks in each of the Dresden Units 2 and 3 spent fuel pools with 33 high-density storage racks. The conditions and commitments set forth in the partial initial decision (LBP-81-37, 14 NRC 708 (1981)) are carried forward with this decision. At present, reracking is the safest and least costly alternative for meeting requirements for spent fuel storage.
- B The following technical issues are discussed: Alternatives to reracking; relevance of unresolved safety issues to the spent fuel pool modification; validity of mathematical analyses of loads imparted to pool floor during postulated rocking of racks during seismic events.

LBP-82-66 LOUISIANA POWER AND LIGHT COMPANY (Waterford Steam Electric Station, Unit 3), Docket No. 50-382-OL; OPERATING LICENSE; August 17, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

- A The Licensing Board reopens the record in view of applicant's failure to submit as evidence an informational brochure, whose adequacy was in contention.
- B The pre-emergency public information program (10 CFR §50.47(b)(7)) is neither minor nor insignificant. A proper program will avoid chaotic public response to an emergency and minimize risk to the public. Southern California Edison Company, et al. (San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station, Units 2 and 3), LBP-82-39, 15 NRC 1163, 1203 (1982).

DIGESTS
ISSUANCES OF THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARDS

- C The form and content of informational brochures drafted to satisfy the pre-emergency public information requirement of NRC regulations (10 CFR §50.47(b)(7)) are not so clearly established by regulations that compliance therewith is a matter of course. See, e.g., Cincinnati Gas & Electric Company, et al. (Wm. H. Zimmer Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1), LBP-82-48, 15 NRC 1549, 1602 (1982); Consumers Power Company (Big Rock Point Plant), LBP-82-60, 16 NRC 540, 545-46 (1982).
- D The opinions of applicant's witnesses that an informational brochure, not submitted as evidence, would meet the Commission's emergency planning requirements are not an adequate substitute for Licensing Board examination of the actual brochure; such secondary sources, even when bolstered by the NRC Staff's and FEMA's assurance of a subsequent review, do not constitute "reasonable assurance" that the pre-emergency public information program will be properly implemented. See Pacific Gas and Electric Company (Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-580, 11 NRC 227, 228-31 (1980).
- E The term "reasonable assurance" requires more than a mere checklist comparison against regulatory criteria. Southern California Edison Company, et al. (San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station, Units 2 and 3), LBP-81-36, 14 NRC 691, 699 (1981). The term connotes the existence of a reasonable plan. Public Service Company of New Hampshire, et al. (Seabrook Station, Units 1 and 2), CLI-78-1, 7 NRC 1, 18 (1978). The reasonableness of a plan cannot be determined when the essential elements of that plan are indeterminate.
- F The adequacy of the pre-emergency public information program is a significant issue that calls for subjective evaluation; delegation of this determination would be improper.

LBP-82-67 CLEVELAND ELECTRIC ILLUMINATING COMPANY, et al. (Perry Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 & 2), Docket Nos. 50-440-OL, 50-441-OL; OPERATING LICENSE; August 18, 1981; ORDER

- A The Licensing Board resolves a motion to compel answers to interrogatories. Applicants are not required to respond to interrogatories concerning the ingestion pathway emergency planning zone, which is not relevant to the admitted contention about the evacuation EPZ. However, applicants are required to respond to all questions relevant to evacuation, including: (1) the use of resources on-site that might also be needed off-site, (2) the ability of responsible individuals promptly to recognize emergency conditions, (3) the assignment of administrative responsibility for maintaining the prompt alert and notification system, (4) meteorological and radiation release monitoring, and (5) the qualification and training of individuals responsible for communicating with off-site agencies about emergency conditions.
- B Applicants must provide a reasonably complete response to interrogatories. Their answers should not require the sifting of materials to obtain a complete answer but they may describe precisely the portions of documents that contain the requested information.
- C Questions about applicant utility's financial qualifications for fulfilling its emergency planning responsibilities are beyond the scope of an operating license proceeding.
- D Under a contention concerning the possible need for an automatic standby liquid control system, applicant must answer questions about the comparative advantages and disadvantages of that system compared to a manual standby liquid control system.
- E Other interrogatories discussed by the Board concerned various aspects of emergency planning (NUREG-0654 criteria, initiating conditions, administrative responsibility, financial responsibility, meteorological monitoring, radiological monitoring, communications).

LBP-82-68 THE CINCINNATI GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY, et al. (Wm. H. Zimmer Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1), Docket No. 50-358-OL; OPERATING LICENSE; August 24, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

- A Acting on Applicants' Motion for Reconsideration and Clarification of the June 21 Initial Decision, LBP-82-48, 15 NRC 1549 (1982), the Licensing Board: (1) authorizes the issuance of a license permitting fuel loading, low power testing, and operation not in excess of 5% of rated power subject to the condition that the authorization will be revoked should the Commission, on reconsideration, reverse its order in CLI-82-20, 16 NRC 109 (1982), which required the dismissal of eight safety-related contentions; and (2) denied Applicants' relief from further proceedings ordered in the Initial Decision with respect to emergency evacuation of schools and submission of FEMA findings.

DIGESTS
ISSUANCES OF THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARDS

B Where a licensing board finds that all matters in contention, other than those relating to NRC and FEMA review of offsite emergency preparedness, have been resolved either favorably to applicant or through the issuance of appropriate license conditions, it may, pursuant to 10 CFR §50.47, as amended (47 Fed. Reg. 30232 [July 13, 1982]), authorize the Director of Nuclear Reactor Regulation to issue a license authorizing fuel loading and low power operations not in excess of 5% of rated power. Authorization of the issuance of such a license by the Director, upon his making all requisite findings, may be made even in the absence of a motion by the applicant pursuant to 10 CFR 50.57(c) for a low power license.

C Pursuant to 10 CFR §50.47(a)(1), the NRC must find, prior to the issuance of a license for the full power operation of a nuclear reactor, that the state of onsite and offsite emergency preparedness provides reasonable assurance that adequate protective measures can and will be taken in the event of a radiological emergency. In accordance with 10 CFR §50.47(a)(2) the Commission is to base its finding on a review of the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA's) "findings and determinations as to whether state and local emergency plans are adequate and capable of being implemented," and on a review of the NRC Staff assessment of applicant's onsite emergency plans.

D Pursuant to 10 CFR §50.47(a)(2), a FEMA finding as to the status of offsite emergency planning preparedness will constitute a rebuttable presumption on the question of the adequacy of such plans. Based upon existing precedent, it is unclear whether this presumption attaches only to FEMA's final formal findings on the state of offsite emergency preparedness, or whether such a presumption may be accorded to preliminary or interim FEMA findings.

E As a rebuttable presumption dissolves in the face of reliable and probative evidence to the contrary, the practical effect of any rebuttable presumption created by 10 CFR §50.47(a)(2) would be of little moment with regards to contested aspects of FEMA's findings, leaving a licensing board free to weigh the testimony of each party on its own merits. See *Metropolitan Edison Company (Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit No. 1)*, LBP-81-59, 14 NRC 1211, 1465 (1981).

F A licensing board must base its findings on the status of offsite emergency preparedness, pursuant to 10 CFR §50.47(a)(2), on FEMA's testimony as to its review of those portions of the state and local plans related to the contentions, as viewed in light of other testimony adduced at hearing. While a licensing board may rely on testimony based on FEMA's interim findings in making its own findings, it need not be satisfied with testimony so preliminary and conclusory as to fail to meet the same standards expected of other testimony in Commission proceedings. To do so would deprive both the board and parties of any meaningful opportunity to cross-examine FEMA witnesses as to the bases for the Government's conclusions.

G A licensing board may not delegate to the NRC Staff, or to FEMA, its obligation to resolve issues placed into controversy in an operating license proceeding, however conscientiously they may pursue their work. See *Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company, et al. (Perry Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2)*, ALAB-298, 2 NRC 730, 736-737 (1975); *Public Service Company of Indiana, Inc. (Marble Hill Nuclear Generating Station, Units 1 and 2)*, ALAB-461, 7 NRC 313, 318 (1978); *Metropolitan Edison Company (Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit No. 1)*, LBP-81-59; 14 NRC 1211, 1419 (1981). To do so would be a clear violation of section 189 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, as it would render the hearing process a nullity.

H Where FEMA testimony based upon its interim findings as to the state of offsite emergency planning is so preliminary and conclusory as to fail to permit meaningful cross-examination of Government witnesses as to the bases for their conclusions, it is appropriate for a board to permit reopening of the record on offsite emergency planning matters upon a lesser showing of good cause than that which is ordinarily required to reopen a record. Such a showing shall be based upon particular parts of the final FEMA findings and the Staff's final supplement to its Safety Evaluation Report which relate to admitted contentions, and shall demonstrate that an opportunity for cross-examination, as distinguished, for example, from an opportunity for further written comment, is required for a full and true disclosure of the facts.

I A motion for reconsideration must state specifically the respects in which an initial decision is erroneous. See 10 CFR §2.771. It will not suffice to allege that a decision has had an unintended effect, without specifying how the board is supposed to have erred in reaching its findings. If reasons now exist justifying a different result, they must be presented on the record, not in the form of an unsworn memorandum of law from counsel, which is not evidence.

DIGESTS
ISSUANCES OF THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARDS

LBP-82-69 CLEVELAND ELECTRIC ILLUMINATING COMPANY, et al. (Perry Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 & 2), Docket Nos. 50-440-OL, 50-441-OL; OPERATING LICENSE; August 30, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

- A In this Memorandum and Order the Board rules that it cannot go beyond the Commission's Statement of Policy on psychological stress issues (47 Fed. Reg. 31762, July 16, 1982) because the Statement had the effect of depriving it of jurisdiction over the intervenor's psychological stress contention. It also ruled that certification of the issue to the Commission was not proper because intervenor had failed to show why interlocutory review was necessary rather than review, in due course, upon appeal.
- B When a policy statement issued by the Commission orders licensing boards not to consider psychological stress contentions unless they meet specified criteria, boards are deprived of jurisdiction over such issues and are prohibited from inquiring into the procedural regularity of the policy statement.
- C A party may not obtain certification of an issue unless it demonstrates that it will suffer substantial harm if it is deprived of interlocutory review and is compelled to await completion of the licensing board's action before it pursues an appeal.

LBP-82-70 PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY (Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2), Docket Nos. 50-275-OL, 50-323-OL; OPERATING LICENSE; August 31, 1982; INITIAL DECISION

- A In this Initial Decision, the Licensing Board authorizes the issuance of a full power operating license for the Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2, subject to certain conditions specified by the Board and with the caveat that the decision not impinge on the status of the Commission's previously ordered suspension of the plant's low-power license or on the independent design verification program ordered by the Commission.
- B Pressurizer heaters are not required to be designed and constructed to "safety-grade" standards by either Commission requirements or by the standards of 10 CFR Part 100, Appendix A, III.(a).
- C Power-operated relief valves, when used to protect a system against low-temperature overpressurization, must be designed and constructed to "safety-grade" standards.
- D State and local governments have the responsibility to set emergency planning zones around nuclear power plants. The zones may be geographically larger than those specified in the Commission's rules; however, Commission rules govern the test of adequacy of emergency planning.
- E An early warning System must be capable of notifying essentially 100 percent of a population within 5 miles of a nuclear power plant within 15 minutes. Essentially 100 percent of the population within the entire EPZ must be notified within 45 minutes.
- F Formal FEMA findings on the adequacy of offsite emergency planning are required prior to license issuance but are not required for the hearing.

LBP-82-71 PHILADELPHIA ELECTRIC COMPANY (Limerick Generating Station, Units 1 and 2), Docket Nos. 50-352, 50-353; OPERATING LICENSE; September 2, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

- A The Licensing Board denies a motion to admit a contention concerning psychological stress caused by viewing a cooling tower plume because the Licensing Board is not authorized by the Commission to admit such a contention, the contention is without basis, and the motion was not timely.
- B As required by the Commission's policy statement of July 22, 1982 (47 Fed. Reg. 31762), a Licensing Board is without authority to admit a contention alleging that psychological stress will result from the operation of a nuclear plant when no serious nuclear accident has occurred at the site.
- C A contention alleging that psychological stress will result from operation of a nuclear power plant may not be litigated if it is without basis even if it otherwise satisfied the Commission's criteria for admitting psychological stress contentions.

LBP-82-72 PHILADELPHIA ELECTRIC COMPANY (Limerick Generating Station, Units 1 and 2), Docket Nos. 50-352, 50-353; OPERATING LICENSE; September 3, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

- A The Licensing Board reaffirms its holding that a preclusion clause in the Delaware River Basin Compact renders the Licensing Board without jurisdiction to reassess the impacts of an allocation of water from the Delaware River made by the Delaware River Basin Commission.

DIGESTS
ISSUANCES OF THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARDS

B Pursuant to section 15.1(s)(1) of the Delaware River Basin Compact, the Licensing Board is precluded from reassessing the impacts of a decision by the Delaware River Basin Commission, concurred in by the Federal member of the Commission, allocating water from the Delaware River for the cooling of a nuclear plant.

LBP-82-73 LONG ISLAND LIGHTING COMPANY (Shoreham Nuclear Power Station Unit 1), Docket No. 50-322-OL; OPERATING LICENSE; September 3, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

A Ruling on the effects of potential conflicts of interest which the Board had noted because applicant's contractor for its probabilistic risk assessment had also served as a subcontractor for the NRC Staff on certain aspects of the Staff's systems interaction program, the Licensing Board concludes that in the interest of fundamental fairness to all parties, the Staff should have noted the existence of such potential conflicts of interest on the record, together with a description of any steps taken to avoid or mitigate their effects. However, *in the circumstances of this case, the Board holds that any defects in the fairness of this proceeding were cured by the Board's discovery and disclosure of this potential conflict of interest, which gave all parties the opportunity for cross-examination on this point, and by the Staff's obvious lack of reliance on its subcontractor's views in its testimony in this proceeding.*

B Parties to Commission proceedings have the obligation to disclose all potential conflicts of interest, whether or not a party believes them to be material and relevant to a licensing proceeding. Such disclosure permits other parties the opportunity to cross-examine opposing witnesses regarding any bias which may be alleged to exist as a result of a potential conflict of interest.

C Fundamental fairness dictates that parties to Commission proceedings disclose all potential conflicts of interest, whether or not a party believes them to be material and relevant to a licensing proceeding. While the "materiality and relevance" of new information is required to be considered in determining whether a party has a duty to disclose such new information in an NRC proceeding, Tennessee Valley Authority (Browns Ferry Nuclear Plant, Units 1, 2 and 3), ALAB-677, 15 NRC 1387 (1982); Duke Power Co. (McGuire Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-143, 6 AEC 623, 625 (1973), these standards are not applicable in a situation where there is an issue as to the fundamental fairness of the conduct of parties to a proceeding. Fundamental fairness clearly requires the disclosure of potential conflicts of interest, such that, after opposing parties have had an opportunity for cross-examination, the Board may determine the materiality of such information.

LBP-82-74 PUGET SOUND POWER AND LIGHT COMPANY, et al. (Skagit/Hanford Nuclear Power Project, Units 1 and 2), Docket Nos. 50-522, 50-523; CONSTRUCTION PERMIT; September 3, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

A The Licensing Board rules on the disposition of two late-filed petitions to intervene in this proceeding, denying the petition filed by the Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission (CRITFC) for lack of standing and granting the petition filed by the Yakima Indian Nation, subject to the requirement that at least one contention acceptable under 10 CFR § 2.714(b) be filed.

B An organization may represent only its own members. Long Island Lighting Company (Shoreham Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1), LBP-77-11, 5 NRC 481, 483 (1977). The requirements for standing, injury in fact and an interest "arguably within the zone of interest" protected by the statute, must be fulfilled by the organization itself through its own membership. Portland General Electric Company, et al. (Pebble Springs Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2), CLI-76-27, 4 NRC 610, 613 (1976).

C An untimely petition to intervene may be granted if it is found that a balancing of the five factors set forth in 10 CFR § 2.714(a)(1) favors intervention. Some weight may be attached to the fact that the lateness, though not justified, is not extreme and will not delay the proceeding. Duke Power Company (Amendment to Materials License SNM-1773 — Transportation of Spent Fuel from Oconee Nuclear Station for Storage at McGuire Nuclear Station), ALAB-528, 9 NRC 146, 150 (1979).

D 10 CFR § 2.714(b) requires a petitioner for intervention to file a supplement containing at least one admissible contention. Cincinnati Gas and Electric Company, et al. (William H. Zimmer Nuclear Station), LBP-80-14, 11 NRC 570, 571 (1980).

DIGESTS
ISSUANCES OF THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARDS

LBP-82-75 LONG ISLAND LIGHTING COMPANY (Shoreham Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1), Docket No. 50-322-OL; OPERATING LICENSE; September 7, 1982; SUPPLEMENTAL PRE-HEARING CONFERENCE ORDER

- A The Licensing Board issues its Supplemental Prehearing Conference Order ruling on intervenors' "Phase One Consolidated Emergency Planning Contentions," which primarily relates to Applicant's onsite emergency planning efforts.
- B Pursuant to 10 CFR §2.707, a licensing board is empowered on the failure of a party to comply with a prehearing conference order to "make such orders in regard to the failure as are just." Based upon the Appeal Board's ruling in Commonwealth Edison Company (Byron Nuclear Power Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-678, 15 NRC 1400 (1982) the out-of-hand dismissal of intervenors' proposed contentions solely for failing to either further particularize certain contentions or to pursue settlement negotiations is unwarranted. A more appropriate course of action in such a case is to simply rule on intervenors' proposed contentions as they now stand, dismissing those which lack adequate bases and specificity.
- C Pursuant to 10 CFR §2.714, an intervenor must set forth those matters which it seeks to litigate "with reasonable basis and specificity." This power of the Commission to require that intervenors make such a threshold showing prior to the admission of a contention has been upheld by the Federal Courts. See *BPI v. Atomic Energy Commission*, 502 F.2d 424, 428-429 (D.C. Cir. 1973).
- D A contention alleging an entire emergency response plan to be inadequate, in that it fails to consider certain matters, is required pursuant to 10 CFR §2.714 to specify the way in which identified portions of the plan are alleged to be inadequate. In advancing such a contention, it is intervenors' obligation to assert how the identified portions of an emergency plan are rendered inadequate by its failure to consider such matters.
- E Pursuant to 10 CFR §50.47(b)(12), emergency response plans for nuclear power reactors must include arrangements for "contaminated injured" individuals. As interpreted by the Appeal Board in Southern California Edison Company, et al. (San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station, Units 2 and 3), ALAB-680, 16 NRC 127, 137 (1982) "contaminated injured" is a distinct category of injury, encompassing potential patients whose traumatic (i.e., physical) injuries are complicated by radioactive contamination. People who suffer radiation injury, without accompanying traumatic injury, are unlikely to need emergency treatment because the clinical course of radiation injury unfolds over time and is seldom, if ever, life-threatening. Thus, for a serious nuclear accident to result in the hospitalization of large numbers of people, not only must an already unlikely accident be severe, but also the emergency response to protect the public must be ineffectual. But see Southern California Edison Company, et al. (San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station, Units 2 and 3), CLI-82-27, 16 NRC 883 (1982).

LBP-82-76 PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY OF NEW HAMPSHIRE, et al. (Seabrook Station, Units 1 and 2), Docket Nos. 50-443-OL, 50-444-OL (ASLBP No. 82-471-02-OL); OPERATING LICENSE; September 13, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

- A The Licensing Board rules on petitions to intervene and admission of contentions, and schedules further proceedings.

LBP-82-77 CONSUMERS POWER COMPANY (Big Rock Point Plant), Docket No. 50-155; SPENT FUEL POOL AMENDMENT; September 14, 1982; INITIAL DECISION

- A In this Initial Decision, the Licensing Board holds that the applicant must carry the burden of proof in demonstrating that the off-site emergency plan has complied with the Commission's emergency planning rules and guidance. It must carry that burden whether or not it is primarily responsible for performing the functions involved in the plan. Because applicant did not carry that burden, it must demonstrate to the Board that the deficiencies in its plan have been remedied, are not serious, or are being remedied through adequate interim compensating actions. The deficiencies include failures of proof related to the training of local officials or school officials, the need for transportation of persons who lack personal vehicles, the availability of a satisfactory method of alerting school bus drivers who are not on duty, that there is adequate transportation for schoolchildren, that there is an adequate list of invalids being maintained and that there is an adequate method of establishing emergency bus routes.
- B Intervenor's contention that applicant had not implemented adequate administrative controls to prevent cask drops over the spent fuel pool was dismissed for lack of merit.

DIGESTS
ISSUANCES OF THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARDS

C Applicant has the burden of proof to demonstrate that the off-site emergency plan complies with Commission rules and guidance. The burden must be carried whether or not applicant is primarily responsible for carrying out a particular aspect of the plan.

D A Licensing Board prescribes procedures by which applicant may remedy deficiencies in its case concerning the adequacy of emergency planning.

E The following technical issues are discussed: Emergency planning (estimating training needs); emergency planning; administrative controls (cask drops).

LBP-82-78 CONSUMERS POWER COMPANY (Big Rock Point Plant), Docket No. 50-155; SPENT FUEL POOL AMENDMENT; September 15, 1982; INITIAL DECISION

A In this Initial Decision, the Licensing Board finds that an environmental impact assessment, prepared with respect to an amendment to expand the capacity of a spent fuel storage pool, was adequate. Intervenors did not successfully challenge its negative findings concerning the lack of any significant environmental impacts.

B Additionally, the Board finds that the environmental impact assessment adequately treated alternatives to the spent fuel when it found that the pool modification "will not result in any significant change in the commitment of water, land and air resources" and when it also found that the use of stainless steel to fabricate new fuel racks is an "insignificant" use of that resource. Intervenor also failed to make an effective challenge to this Staff's basis for this finding.

C An environmental impact appraisal prepared with respect to the expansion of the capacity of a spent fuel pool need not discuss further the alternatives to an expansion of the pool if the appraisal has an adequate basis for finding that the expansion would not cause any unresolved conflicts about alternative uses of resources.

D An environmental impact statement need not be prepared with respect to the expansion of the capacity of a spent fuel pool if the environmental impact appraisal prepared for the project had an adequate basis for concluding that the expansion of a spent fuel pool would not cause any significant environmental impact.

LBP-82-79 CLEVELAND ELECTRIC ILLUMINATING COMPANY, et al. (Perry Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 & 2), Docket Nos. 50-440-OL, 50-441-OL; OPERATING LICENSE; September 15, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

A The Licensing Board denies admission of a contention on dose levels to human beings from routine emissions from the Perry plant because the intervenor failed to show good cause for late filing. Intervenor had argued that the issue could be raised because it had appeared for the first time in the Draft Environmental Statement for Perry, but intervenor had no answer for the opposing argument that the same matter had been raised in the Final Safety Analysis Report, issued months earlier.

B The Board also considered whether to raise this issue *sua sponte* but it concluded that the Commission had already considered the matter in several earlier proceedings and that *sua sponte* consideration was not appropriate.

C Discussion of an issue in the Draft Environmental Statement does not provide good cause for late filing of a contention, if the same material was included in the Final Safety Analysis Report (FSAR) filed by the applicant.

D If a contention is excluded from a proceeding because there is no good cause for late filing, the Board should nevertheless consider whether to declare the issue to be an important safety or environmental issue and to raise that issue *sua sponte*.

LBP-82-80 LONG ISLAND LIGHTING COMPANY (Shoreham Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1), Docket No. 50-322-OL-2 (ASLB No. 82-478-05-OL); SECURITY; September 16, 1982; MEMORANDUM, ORDER AND NOTICE OF SECOND IN CAMERA CONFERENCE OF COUNSEL

A Upon referral from the Commission, the Licensing Board authorizes the release to two of intervenor's security consultants/experts of two portions of a restricted Appeal Board decision [Diablo Canyon, ALAB-653 (1981) (Restricted)] regarding the definition of design basis threat and interpretation of regulations concerning the appropriate number of armed responders.

B Intervenor county government established requisite need of two of its security consultants/experts for access to two portions of restricted Appeal Board decision regarding definition of design basis threat and number of armed responders, even though those portions also contain minimal amount of specific information concerning security plan at another nuclear plant.

DIGESTS
ISSUANCES OF THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARDS

C Where Commission previously authorized release of two portions of restricted Appeal Board decision to attorneys for intervenor county government, the same portions of that decision will be released to intervenor's consultants/experts who have filed testimony on the areas discussed in the Appeal Board decision.

D Release of portions of restricted Appeal Board decision to intervenor's consultants/experts will be conditioned upon their execution of affidavits of non-disclosure of the plant physical security information contained in that decision.

E Security plans for nuclear plants are deemed to be commercial or financial information pursuant to 10 CFR §2.790(d) and may only be disclosed to counsel and expert witnesses who have a need to know after application of a balancing of interests test.

LBP-82-81 DUKE POWER COMPANY (Perkins Nuclear Station, Units 1, 2 and 3, Docket Nos. STN-50-488, STN-50-489, STN-50-490; CONSTRUCTION PERMIT; September 20, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER AUTHORIZING WITHDRAWAL OF APPLICATION FOR CONSTRUCTION PERMIT WITHOUT PREJUDICE

A The Licensing Board authorizes the withdrawal without prejudice of the application for construction permits for the Perkins Nuclear Station, denies Intervenors' motion to dismiss the Perkins application with prejudice, and denies the Intervenors' request for attorney's fees and litigation expenses.

B Licensing Boards under 10 CFR 2.707(a) may authorize the withdrawal of an application after the notice of hearing has issued on such terms as it may prescribe, but any terms prescribed must be related to any legal harm to parties or the public that a withdrawal would cause.

C Federal rules favor withdrawal without prejudice where no party will be harmed thereby. The possibility of another hearing on the application standing alone does not constitute legal harm, and does not in itself justify a conditional withdrawal. Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(a)(1), (2); *LeCompte v. Mr. Chip, Inc.*, 528 F.2d 601, 604 (5th Cir. 1976).

D A Licensing Board may attach reasonable conditions on a withdrawal without prejudice to protect parties and public from legal harm; or if legal harm is unavoidable, the Licensing Board may order a dismissal with prejudice but only to the extent necessary to avoid legal harm.

E The Applicant would have the option of selecting reasonable conditions on a withdrawal without prejudice, including the payment of intervenors' attorney's fees, or a withdrawal with prejudice as to specific issues. *Yoffé v. Keller Indus., Inc.*, 580 F.2d 126, 131, n.13 (5th Cir. 1978).

F A distinction must be made between the American rule which bars an award of attorney's fees to the prevailing party absent a specific statute authorizing payment, as reconfirmed in *Alyeska Pipeline Serv. v. Wilderness Soc.*, 421 U.S. 240 (1975), and requiring the reimbursement of attorney's fees as a condition of withdrawal of an application without prejudice. The latter is not an award for winning anything, but is to save a party from the expense and effort of preparing a defense twice because of the withdrawal without prejudice.

G There is nothing about NRC practice and regulations which bars the payment of money as a condition for withdrawal of an application without prejudice.

H An unusual situation prevails in an NRC proceeding with respect to a dismissal in that (1) it is a mandatory licensing proceeding, not a simple adversary litigation, and (2) the dismissal is sought after a hearing and decision on the merits.

I Where an intervenor has lost on the merits of an issue, it will suffer no legal harm from a dismissal of an application without prejudice, because the worst that can beset an intervenor in that case is that it will be afforded an unearned second opportunity to prevail on the issue.

J Intervenors have standing to seek a dismissal with prejudice and attorney's fees. Subsumed in the right to intervene with NRC proceedings is the right to enjoy the benefits of the ensuing litigation; to preserve any victory for later use in a renewed litigation, or to be saved from legal harm if the need arises again to litigate an issue upon which intervenors prevailed.

LBP-82-82 LONG ISLAND LIGHTING COMPANY (Shoreham Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1), Docket No. 50-322-OL (Emergency Planning); OPERATING LICENSE; September 22, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER RULING ON LILCO'S MOTION TO COMPEL DISCOVERY OF SUFFOLK COUNTY EMERGENCY PLANNING DOCUMENTS

A The Licensing Board rules on claims of attorney-client, work product and executive privileges asserted by a governmental intervenor in opposition to two discovery requests from applicant for the production of certain emergency planning documents.

DIGESTS
ISSUANCES OF THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARDS

B Pursuant to 10 CFR §2.741(d), the party upon whom a request for the production of documents is served must serve upon the requesting party, within 30 days after service of the request, a response stating either that the requested inspection and copying will be permitted, or stating reasons why the requested discovery is objectionable. Pursuant to 10 CFR §2.740(f)(1), an evasive or incomplete answer or response shall be treated as a failure to answer or respond.

C A party opposing a discovery request need not seek a protective order, pursuant to 10 CFR §2.740(c), so long as he does respond to the request by objecting. In ruling upon a motion to compel made in accordance with §2.740(f), however, a board is empowered to make such a protective order as it would make upon a motion made pursuant to §2.740(c). A party objecting to the production of a document on grounds of privilege therefore has the obligation to specify in its response to a document request those same matters which it would be required to set forth in attempting to establish "good cause" for the issuance of a protective order.

D What constitutes "good cause" for the issuance of a protective order depends upon the kind of protective order being sought. In order to show good cause for the issuance of a protective order, pursuant to 10 CFR §2.740(c), to avoid the disclosure of documents for which an evidentiary privilege is claimed, a party must specifically designate and describe (1) the documents claimed to be privileged, (2) the privilege being asserted and (3) the precise reasons why the party believes the privilege to apply to such documents.

E A party asserting certain documents to be privileged from discovery must bear the burden of proving that it is entitled to such protection, see *In re Fischel*, 557 F.2d 209 (9th Cir. 1977), and this includes pleading such claims adequately in its response. Claims of privilege must be specifically asserted with respect to particular documents, and may not be raised by blanket objection that all matters which could fit a particular document request are privilege. See *United States v. El Paso Company*, No. 81-2484 (5th Cir. August 13, 1982); *United States v. Davis*, 636 F.2d 1028, 1044, n.20 (5th Cir. 1981). This is because discovery privileges are not absolute, and may or may not apply to a particular document, depending upon a variety of circumstances.

F It is not sufficient for a party asserting certain documents to be privileged from discovery to await a motion to compel from the party seeking discovery prior to setting forth its assertions of privilege and identifying those matters which it claims to be privileged. Such a practice places an unfair burden upon the party seeking discovery and occasions unnecessary delays. Claims of privilege are untenable unless asserted in the response to the discovery request.

G Pursuant to 10 CFR §2.740(b)(1), parties may generally obtain discovery "regarding any matter, not privileged, which is relevant to the subject matter in the proceeding. . . ." While the only discovery privilege codified in the NRC regulations is the work production doctrine, the Commission decision to model §2.740(b) after Rule 26(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure implicitly adopted those privileges which have been recognized by Federal Courts interpreting Rule 26(b).

H While the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure are not themselves directly applicable to practice before the Commission, judicial interpretation of a Federal Rule can serve as guidance for the interpretation of a similar or analogous NRC discovery rule. *Toledo Edison Company, et al. (Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station)*, ALAB-300, 2 NRC 752, 760 (1975); *Cincinnati Gas & Electric Company, et al. (Wm. H. Zimmer Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1)*, LBP-82-47, 15 NRC 1538, 1542 (1982).

I The purpose of the attorney-client privilege is to encourage full and frank communication between attorneys and their clients and thereby promote broader public interests in the observance of law and administration of justice. *Upjohn Co. v. United States*, 449 U.S. 383, 389 (1981). An attorney's involvement in, or recommendation of a transaction does not place a cloak of secrecy around all incidents of such a transaction. In *re Fischel*, 557 F.2d 209, 212 (9th Cir. 1977). The attorney-client privilege does not protect disclosure of the underlying facts communicated to the attorney. *Upjohn*, 449 U.S. at 395. A communication from the attorney to the client should be privileged only if the client had a reasonable expectation in the confidentiality of the statement, if it was necessary to obtain informed legal advice and might not have been made absent the privilege. *Ohio-Sealy Mattress Manufacturing Company v. Kaplan*, 9 F.R.D. 21, 28 (N.D. Ill. 1980).

J The fact that a document is authored by in-house counsel, rather than by an independent attorney, is not relevant to a determination of whether such a document is privileged. In such cases, however, the privilege protects only communications revealing confidences of the client or seeking

DIGESTS
ISSUANCES OF THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARDS

legal advice, not matters relating solely to the conduct of the client's business. *O'Brien v. Board of Education of City School District of City of New York*, 86 F.R.D. 548, 549 (S.D.N.Y. 1980); *In re Fischel*, 557 F.2d 209, 211 (9th Cir. 1977).

K To be privileged from discovery by the work product doctrine, as codified in 10 CFR §2.740(b)(2), a document must be both prepared by an attorney, or by a person working at the direction of an attorney, and prepared in anticipation of litigation. "Ordinary work product," which does not include the mental impressions, conclusions, legal theories or opinions of the attorney or his agents, may be obtained by an adverse party upon a showing of "substantial need of the materials in preparation of his case and that he is unable without undue hardship to obtain the substantial equivalent of the materials by other means." 10 CFR §2.740(b)(2). Opinion work product is not discoverable, so long as the material was in fact prepared by an attorney or his agent in anticipation of litigation, and not assembled in the ordinary course of business, or pursuant to public requirements unrelated to litigation. *In re Murphy*, 560 F.2d 326, 334-336 (8th Cir. 1977).

L Cases decided under Exemption 5 of the Freedom of Information Act, which relates to inter-agency or intra-agency letters or memoranda, may be looked to for guidance in resolving claims of executive privilege in NRC proceedings related to discovery. While the discovery rules for claims of executive privilege "can only be applied under Exemption 5 by way of rough analogies," *EPA v. Mink*, 410 U.S. 73, 86 (1973), the similarities between these matters are sufficient such that Exemption 5 cases may be used as guidance, taking a common sense approach which recognizes any differing equities presented in FOIA cases. See *Mink*, 410 U.S. at 91. FOIA cases, for example, do not consider a party's need for requested documents. *NLRB v. Sears*, 421 U.S. 132, 149 n.16 (1975). NRC FOIA cases do consider the public interest of such disclosures, however. See *Consumers Power Company (Palisades Nuclear Power Facility)*, ALJ-80-1, 12 NRC 117, 122-126 (1980) and cases cited therein.

M A governmental intervenor does not waive its claims of executive privilege by its participation as a litigant in an NRC proceeding. *Consumers Power Company (Palisades Nuclear Power Facility)*, ALJ-80-1, 12 NRC 117, 127-128 (1980).

N The privilege against disclosure of intragovernment documents containing advisory opinions, recommendations and deliberations is a part of the broader executive privilege. Its purpose is to encourage frank discussions within the government regarding the formulation of policy and the making of decisions. Documents shielded by executive privilege remain privileged even after the decision to which they pertain has been effected, since such disclosure at any time could inhibit the free flow of advice. *Federal Open Market Committee of the Federal Reserve System v. Merrill*, 443 U.S. 340, 360, (1979).

O The executive privilege is a qualified privilege, and does not attach to purely factual communications, or to severable factual portions of communications, the disclosure of which would not compromise military or state secrets. Furthermore, even communications which fall within the protection of the privilege may be disclosed upon an appropriate showing of need. An objective balancing test is used to determine a party's need for such documents, weighing the importance of the documents to the party seeking their production, and the availability elsewhere of the information contained in the documents, against the government interest in secrecy. *United States v. Leggett & Platt, Inc.*, 542 F.2d 655, 658-659 (6th Cir. 1976), cert. denied, 430 U.S. 945 (1977).

LBP-82-83 GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY (General Electric Morris Operation), Docket No. 70-1308 (Application to Modify License No. SNM-1265 to Increase Spent Fuel Storage Capacity); OPERATING LICENSE AMENDMENT; September 21, 1982; ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO WITHDRAW APPLICATION AND DISMISSING PROCEEDING WITHOUT PREJUDICE

LBP-82-84 SOUTH CAROLINA ELECTRIC AND GAS COMPANY, et al. (Virgil C. Summer Nuclear Station, Unit 1), Docket No. 50-395-OL; OPERATING LICENSE; September 24, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

A The Licensing Board denies intervenor's request for a stay of the initial decision authorizing the issuance of an operating license, and grants intervenor's further request for leave to reply to NRC Staff's and applicants' oppositions to intervenor's request to reopen proceeding.

B In determining whether to grant a stay to reopen the proceeding after the initial decision has issued, the Licensing Board will consider the same four factors specified by 10 CFR §2.788(e) relating to stays pending appeal.

DIGESTS
ISSUANCES OF THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARDS

C If an intervenor cannot present his case, the proper method to institute a proceeding by which the NRC would conduct its own investigation is to request action under 10 CFR §2.206. It is not the Licensing Board's function to assist intervenors in preparing their cases and searching for their expert witnesses.

LBP-82-85 PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY (Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2), Docket Nos. 50-275-OL, 50-323-OL; OPERATING LICENSE; September 27, 1982; MEMORANDUM IN RESPONSE TO NRC STAFF'S MOTION FOR CLARIFICATION OF THE LICENSING BOARD'S INITIAL DECISION DATED AUGUST 31, 1982

A In response to an NRC Staff motion, the Licensing Board clarifies certain matters pertaining to its Initial Decision of August 31, 1982.

LBP-82-86 METROPOLITAN EDISON COMPANY (Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit No. 1), Docket No. 50-289; RESTART; September 29, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

A The Licensing Board rules that it is without jurisdiction to rule on intervenor's motion to reopen the record after issuance of the Board's initial decision on the subject of the motion.

B After the issuance of a licensing board's initial decision on a particular issue, exclusive jurisdiction over the issue lies with the appeal board. Section 2.717(a) of the Rules of Practice is reconcilable with §2.718(j) in that the identity of the presiding officer with exclusive jurisdiction over a particular issue changes as the proceeding moves up the appellate ladder. The parties should not be able to bestow jurisdiction on a presiding officer by selecting the tribunal for the relief sought by a motion.

LBP-82-87 TEXAS UTILITIES GENERATING COMPANY, et al. (Comanche Peak Steam Electric Station, Units 1 and 2), Docket Nos. 50-445, 50-446; OPERATING LICENSE; September 30, 1982; ORDER DENYING RECONSIDERATION

A The Licensing Board directs the Staff to identify by name individuals identified by letter of the alphabet in an inspection report which the Staff introduced in evidence, and to produce unexpurgated copies of signed statements taken from those individuals. If the Staff fails either to comply with or seek appellate review of this order, the Licensing Board indicates it will impose sanctions upon Staff counsel.

B Informer's privilege applies only to those who confidentially volunteer information to government officials charged with enforcing a law, not to everyone interviewed during the course of an ensuing investigation.

C A single request for confidentiality cannot be used to shield an entire investigation from scrutiny in an adjudicatory setting.

D It is improper for the NRC Staff to attempt to dictate to the Licensing Board what matters it may or may not consider. The Licensing Board is the sole judge of its informational needs and is not required to act merely as an umpire calling balls and strikes.

E The Licensing Board has the right and duty to develop a full record for decision-making in the public interest. The independence and integrity of licensing boards is fundamental to due process.

F Congress has authorized the NRC to provide hearings upon the request of any person whose interest may be affected by the licensing process and to establish licensing boards to conduct such hearings.

G The Rules of Practice in Part 2 of 10 CFR are the method by which NRC ensures that all parties are provided procedural as well as substantive due process.

H Parties and their representatives are expected to conduct themselves before a licensing board as they would before a court of law.

I A licensing board is empowered to impose sanctions for a party's failure to obey or reasonably appeal from its order, even if the behavior is based upon the party's belief that the order is invalid.

LBP-82-88 WISCONSIN ELECTRIC POWER COMPANY (Point Beach Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2), Docket Nos. 50-266-OLA, 50-301-OLA; OPERATING LICENSE AMENDMENT; October 1, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

A The Licensing Board grants summary disposition as to all contested issues except whether eddy current testing is sufficiently reliable to detect potentially dangerous through-wall cracks in sleeves inserted within corroded steam generator tubes, and a related issue whether the eddy current tests are necessary to assure the safety of the repaired steam generator.

DIGESTS
ISSUANCES OF THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARDS

- B Summary disposition is granted with respect to: (1) several contentions found to be irrelevant to the sleeving demonstration program, (2) a contention concerning the unreliability of temporary workers, and (3) a contention concerning the safety of the steam generator during sleeving. These latter two contentions were dismissed because there was no evidence that they presented genuine issues. The temporary workers contention was based on experience at an entirely different nuclear plant and did not directly question sleeving procedures to be used at Point Beach. The loose parts contention was dismissed because all of the planned work will be done on the primary side, so that loose parts cannot be left on the secondary side where they might cause mechanical damage.
- C When a licensing board directs the filing of a motion for litigable issues in order to offset a procedural advantage enjoyed by an intervenor, that motion is governed by the same procedural rules applicable to a motion for summary disposition, except that the intervenor has the burden of going forward. Intervenor's rights are not prejudiced because it enjoys ample opportunity to demonstrate the existence of genuine issues of fact, including the right to file a reply, under this procedure.
- D Although the procedural rules require the filing of separate statements of genuine issues of fact in response to a motion for summary disposition, there may be no prejudice to the other parties from failure to follow this precise requirement, under circumstances where intervenor's filings specify its allegations and provide authority for them. Unless the parties are prejudiced by this technical deficiency, it is not appropriate to provide a remedy for this lapse.
- E Irrelevant contentions must be dismissed in the course of a decision on summary disposition. In an amendment proceeding concerning repair of steam generator tubes, contentions concerning the effect of steam generator tube ruptures (without establishing a basis for believing the ruptures will occur), the possibility of impermissible radiation releases, alleged dangers from pre-existing explosive plugs, and embrittlement of the reactor pressure vessel are irrelevant to the sleeving application.
- F A letter, purportedly sent on applicant's letterhead stationery by a trusted professional employee, is sufficient basis for establishing the existence of a genuine issue of fact for the purpose of summary disposition. In the absence of a direct challenge to the authenticity of the letter, intervenor need not establish the admissibility in evidence of this letter in order to prevail at the summary disposition stage.
- G An Atomic Safety and Licensing Board requires the filing of clearly written, logically constructed findings of fact that discuss the proper interpretation of all the testimony in light of applicable law and regulations.
- H When a substantive issue survives summary disposition, the hearing should not only address the truth of that issue but should explore its implications for relief, either in the form of a license condition or denial of a license.
- I The following technical issues are discussed: Eddy current testing; steam generator; Stress corrosion cracking — steam generator; Intergranular attack — steam generator; Thermal treatment of stainless steel to retard corrosion; Steam generator tube integrity; Steam generator repair; Steam generator — loose parts; Steam generator — leak before break.

LBP-82-89 CLEVELAND ELECTRIC ILLUMINATING COMPANY, et al. (Perry Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 & 2), Docket Nos. 50-440-OL, 50-441-OL; OPERATING LICENSE; October 6, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

- A When applicant objects to the admission of a late-filed contention, intervenors may file a response. This response should not, however, be an excuse for omitting necessary materials from the initial filing of the late-filed contention. If intervenors raise new issues in their response, the applicant should have an opportunity to respond to those.
- B Intervenors should be permitted to respond to applicant's objections to their late-filed contentions. Applicant may respond to new material found in the response.
- C When a party introduces new material into a filing, opposing parties should have an opportunity to comment on the new material.

LBP-82-90 CLEVELAND ELECTRIC ILLUMINATING COMPANY, et al. (Perry Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 & 2), Docket Nos. 50-440-OL, 50-441-OL; OPERATING LICENSE; October 8, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

- A The Licensing Board admits a late-filed contention concerning inadequate consideration of economic consequences of accidents. The contention's basis was found in a recently published study that employed input-output analysis to estimate the effects of a possible nuclear accident at the Perry Nuclear Power Plant. Because this appeared to have been the first time such an analysis had been

DIGESTS
ISSUANCES OF THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARDS

employed, and because the use of the analysis might require amendment of a portion of the Final Environmental Statement, it was considered to contribute to good cause for late filing.

B The use of a new technique for the economic modelling of nuclear accidents may furnish good cause for late-filing of a challenge to the treatment of economic costs of accidents in the Final Environmental Statement.

C The following technical issues are discussed: Costs of nuclear accidents (use of input-output analysis); Input-output analysis of costs of nuclear accidents.

LBP-82-91 HOUSTON LIGHTING AND POWER COMPANY, et al. (South Texas Project, Units 1 and 2), Docket Nos. STN 50-498-OL, STN 50-499-OL; OPERATING LICENSE; October 15, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

A The Licensing Board grants the motion of an intervenor to adopt one of the contentions of another intervenor that has withdrawn from the proceeding but denies the motion to adopt four other contentions of the departed intervenor. The Board also dismisses several other proposed contentions.

B The withdrawal of a party from an operating license proceeding normally serves to remove that party's contentions from the proceeding (at least insofar as those contentions have not yet been heard).

C Contentions filed later than 15 days prior to the special prehearing conference in an operating license proceeding are considered as late-filed. Except in limited circumstances, they may be admitted only upon a favorable balancing of all of the five factors set forth in 10 CFR §2.714(a)(1). Where "good cause" for failure to file on time (factor (i)) has not been demonstrated, a contention may still be accepted, but the burden of justifying acceptance of a late contention on the basis of the other factors is considerably greater.

D The "good cause" factors of 10 CFR §2.714(a)(1) apply equally to the admissibility of both late-filed intervention petitions and late-filed contentions.

E The required balancing of the "lateness" factors of 10 CFR §2.714(a)(1) is not obviated by the circumstance that the proffered contentions are those of a participant that has withdrawn from the proceeding. Gulf States Utilities Company (River Bend Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-444, 6 NRC 760, 795-98 (1977).

F Even where the lateness factors of 10 CFR §2.714(a)(1) are balanced in favor of admitting a late-filed contention, a tardy petitioner with no good excuse for lateness may be required to take the proceeding as it finds it.

G A motion of a pro se intervenor to adopt late-filed contentions is not to be held to those standards of clarity and precision to which a lawyer's filing might reasonably be expected to adhere.

H The withdrawal of one party does not constitute "good cause" for the belated delay of a petitioner in seeking to substitute itself for the withdrawing party, or in seeking to adopt the withdrawing party's contentions.

LBP-82-92 MISSISSIPPI POWER AND LIGHT COMPANY, et al. (Grand Gulf Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2), Docket Nos. 50-416-OL, 50-417-OL (ASLBP No. 82-476-04-OL); OPERATING LICENSE; October 20, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER DENYING STATE OF LOUISIANA'S PETITION FOR INTERVENTION

A The Licensing Board denies an untimely petition to intervene filed by the State of Louisiana in a previously uncontested matter.

B A licensing board has jurisdiction pursuant to 10 CFR §2.717(a) to rule on an untimely petition to intervene even though the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation already has issued a low power operating license.

C Where a state seeks to intervene and attain party status pursuant to 10 CFR §2.714(a)(1) rather than participate as an interested state pursuant to 10 CFR §2.715(c), its untimely petition to intervene will be evaluated under the criteria for nontimely petitions to intervene set forth in §2.714(a)(1).

D In evaluating the factors enumerated in 10 CFR §2.714(a) for late-filed petitions, the Board finds that the State of Louisiana failed to establish good cause for its late-filing, offered no showing of its ability to make a substantial contribution to the record, and sought to expand the issues and delay the proceeding. The Board denies the petition to intervene because the above factors outweighed the finding that no other means were available to protect the State's interest and no other party would represent that interest.

DIGESTS
ISSUANCES OF THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARDS

E Because the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals granted a motion to stay the issuance of its mandate in NRDC v. NRC, 685 F.2d 459 (D.C. Cir. 1982), (in which it found Table S-3 to be invalid) and subsequently a petition for certiorari was filed in the Supreme Court, Table S-3 remains in force and, pursuant to 10 CFR §2.758, this Board is unable to consider challenges to its validity.

LBP-82-92A PHILADELPHIA ELECTRIC COMPANY (Limerick Generating Station, Units 1 and 2), Docket Nos. 50-352, 50-353; OPERATING LICENSE; October 20, 1982; CONFIRMATORY MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

- A** The Licensing Board denies a motion by an intervenor to postpone a hearing covering limited environmental issues related to the supplementary cooling water system.
- B** A licensing board in an operating license proceeding does not in the first instance control the construction schedule. Nor is a decision by that licensing board necessary before construction can commence when that construction is the subject of a previously issued Final Environment Statement.
- C** A licensing board may hold a hearing in advance of issuance of an environmental impact statement on limited environmental issues concerning impacts of operation of an unbuilt part of the plant when such a hearing could facilitate implementation of any measures found necessary to mitigate operational environmental impacts. The licensing board will not address the ultimate cost/benefit balance at that time.

LBP-82-93 THE REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA (UCLA Research Reactor), Docket No. 50-142-OL; OPERATING LICENSE RENEWAL; October 22, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

- A** On consideration of intervenor's motion to summarily dismiss motions for summary disposition of all contentions, or alternative relief, on the grounds that the motions are a misuse of the summary disposition process and a delaying factor under 10 CFR §2.749(a), Licensing Board adopts a bifurcated procedure for consideration of motions for summary disposition. Motion to dismiss motions for summary disposition is denied.
- B** The provisions of 10 CFR §2.749(a) which authorize a licensing board to summarily dismiss motions for summary disposition filed shortly before the hearing commences or during the hearing if the other parties on the board would be required to divert substantial resources from the hearing in order to respond is not applicable to such motions filed in advance of the setting of a hearing schedule.
- C** Motions for summary disposition resolve, on the merits, contentions which involve no factual disputes. This requires a determination of, first, the facts about which there is no genuine dispute, and second, the legal consequences flowing from those facts.
- D** Where motions for summary disposition are filed against essentially all contentions, the summary disposition process can be managed better by requiring the parties to initially address the question of which facts are not in dispute and to defer their arguments as to the legal consequences flowing from those facts.

LBP-82-94 HOUSTON LIGHTING AND POWER COMPANY (Allens Creek Nuclear Generating Station, Unit 1), Docket No. 50-466-CP; CONSTRUCTION PERMIT; October 28, 1982; ORDER

LBP-82-95 CONSUMERS POWER COMPANY (Midland Plant, Units 1 and 2), Docket Nos. 50-329 -OM&OL, 50-330-OM&OL; OPERATING LICENSE AND CONSTRUCTION PERMIT MODIFICATION ORDER; October 29, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

- A** The Licensing Board accepts a portion of a new contention founded upon information in the Staff's recently issued Final Environmental Statement.
- B** Where the cost-benefit balance appearing in the Final Environmental Statement (FES) reflects modifications to the benefit, but not the cost, components of the balance appearing in the Draft Environmental Statement (DES), the entire cost-benefit balance in the FES is considered to be new information for purposes of ruling on contentions assertedly based on new information in the FES.
- C** There is no requirement that any quantum of supporting data be provided in the FES.
- D** "Sunk costs" are not appropriately considered in an operating license cost-benefit balance. They should not be utilized with respect to either the cost or the benefit side of the balance.

LBP-82-96 THE DETROIT EDISON COMPANY, et al. (Enrico Fermi Atomic Power Plant, Unit 2), Docket No. 50-341; OPERATING LICENSE; October 29, 1982; INITIAL DECISION

- A** In this Initial Decision, the Director of Nuclear Reactor Regulation is authorized to issue a full-power operating license. The Board found no merit in the intervenor's contentions, which alleged that site security was inadequate during construction, that quality assurance was inadequate, that a prime contractor was improperly replaced, that there were flaws in construction, and that the evacuation

DIGESTS
ISSUANCES OF THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARDS

route was inadequate for residents of a small community near the reactor. The Board denied an untimely petition by Monroe County, Michigan, to intervene in the proceeding.

B An evacuation route may be adequate despite the fact that persons using it must travel toward the reactor for a short distance before traveling away from the reactor.

C In judging an untimely petition under 10 CFR §2.714(a), a petition which lacks good cause for delay, will broaden the issues, and will delay the proceeding, will be denied, despite the fact that no other party will represent the petitioner's asserted interest.

LBP-82-97 CONSUMERS POWER COMPANY (Big Rock Point Plant), Docket No. 50-155; SPENT FUEL POOL AMENDMENT; October 29, 1982; INITIAL DECISION

A The Licensing Board rules that applicant must amend its application to comply with Commission guidance that the neutron multiplication factor (k_{eff}) in the proposed expansion of its spent fuel pool must not under any conditions, including extremely low densities of water, exceed 0.95. In this plant, the spent fuel pool is within the containment, and the Board required a showing that k_{eff} would not exceed 0.95 even after substantial boil-off occurred, as it might during a TMI-2 type incident accompanied by a loss of cooling in the fuel pool. The Board also requires analysis of a very low water density environment, characterized as a "mist," in which there appears to be a possibility that supercriticality might be achieved. Applicant's argument that the mist environment should be governed by regulations permitting a k_{eff} of 0.98 for dry fuel is rejected by the Board.

B Expansion of racks in a plant in which the spent fuel pool is within the containment must meet the requirement that k_{eff} not exceed 0.95 even under conditions of pool boiling or of very low density water.

C The following technical issues are discussed: k_{eff} (spent fuel pool); Neutron multiplication factor (spent fuel pool); Spent fuel pool (k_{eff}); Temperature (effect on k_{eff} in spent fuel pool); Void formation (effect on k_{eff} in spent fuel pool); Water density (effect on k_{eff} in spent fuel pool).

LBP-82-98 CLEVELAND ELECTRIC ILLUMINATING COMPANY, et al. (Perry Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 & 2), Docket Nos. 50-440-OL, 50-441-OL; OPERATING LICENSE; October 29, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

A The Board admits three late-filed contentions, dealing with risks to control systems from turbine missiles, the need for in-core thermocouples to indicate the adequacy of core cooling, and the ability to detect and mitigate steam erosion in valves and piping. One contention, dealing with concerns raised by a former General Electric Company engineer about the integrity of the containment, is denied without prejudice to resiling. Contentions about the thermal-hydraulic response of the core to a seismic event and about the proper fire-suppression system for the control room are excluded.

B The Board rules that good cause for late-filing may be furnished when the Staff changes a prior position on an issue. Although this may not affect the availability of knowledge about the issue, it does affect an intervenor's reasonable decisions about how to manage its resources.

C In this case, the Board established the special rule that intervenors must file replies to applicant's arguments concerning the admissibility of late-filed contentions. If an intervenor's required reply does not address sections of the FSAR indicated by the applicant to be dispositive of a late-filed contention, the Board will accept applicant's version of the facts. However, applicant may not shift the burden of going forward in this manner to the intervenor by referring to a document that is not available to the Board.

D The change of a staff position on an issue can contribute to good-cause for late filing of a contention because it affects intervenor's reasonable management decisions about where to concentrate its resources.

E The following technical issues are discussed: Containment design (concerns of Mr. John Humphrey); Effect of seismic events on core thermohydraulics; Fire-suppression in the control room; In-core thermocouples; Steam erosion — detection and mitigation; Turbine missiles.

LBP-82-99 THE REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA (UCLA Research Reactor), Docket No. 50-142-OL; OPERATING LICENSE RENEWAL; November 1, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

A The Licensing Board rules on a discovery dispute between Intervenor Committee to Bridge the Gap (CBG) and the NRC Staff concerning a disagreement on the scope of discovery to be permitted on the subject of the professional associations of the authors of a study on the Argonaut reactor prepared by the Battelle Memorial Institute for the NRC Staff. The Board orders a response to only those interrogatories which need to be answered in order to assess the professional credibility of one of the

DIGESTS
ISSUANCES OF THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARDS

consultants. The Board denies as unlikely to lead to admissible evidence CBG's request to order the authors of the study to reply to those questions which seek to probe the consultants' personal acquaintances.

B A Staff consultant's opinion may not be disqualified on the ground of bias when the views expressed are formed in the course of performing the advisor's proper functions for the agency. *Rombough v. Federal Aviation Administration*, 594 F.2d 893, 900 (2d Cir. 1979); *Starr v. Federal Aviation Administration*, 589 F.2d 307, 315 (7th Cir. 1978). When the opinion is formed as a result of work performed for an NRC licensee, however, the possibility of bias cannot be automatically dismissed.

LBP-82-100 LOUISIANA POWER AND LIGHT COMPANY (Waterford Steam Electric Station, Unit 3), Docket No. 50-382-OL; OPERATING LICENSE; November 3, 1982; PARTIAL INITIAL DECISION

A The Licensing Board issues its first of two partial initial decisions on the application for an operating license for the Waterford Steam Electric Station, Unit 3. The Board commands to the Commission the Board's discussion of unresolved generic safety issue A-45, Shutdown Decay Heat Removal.

B At the operating license stage, a licensing board passes only upon contested matters; however, it has the residual power to delve *sua sponte* into any serious matter which has not been put into issue by a party. Once an operating license board has resolved any contested issues as well as any issues raised *sua sponte*, the decision as to all other matters which need to be considered prior to the issuance of the operating license is the responsibility of the NRC Staff and it alone.

C A licensing board must refrain from scrutinizing the substance of particular explanations in the SER justifying operation of a plant prior to the resolution of an unresolved generic safety issue. The Board should only look to see whether the generic issue has been taken into account in a manner that is at least plausible and that, if proven to be of substance, would be adequate to justify operation. *Virginia Electric and Power Company (North Anna Nuclear Power Station, Units 1 and 2)*, ALAB-491, 8 NRC 245 (1978).

D It would be inappropriate for a licensing board to solicit evidence to resolve definitively an unresolved generic safety issue assessed by the NRC Staff, when the issue is also being actively pursued by Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards. Cf. *Cincinnati Gas and Electric Company, et al. (Wm. H. Zimmer Nuclear Power Station, Unit No. 1)*, CLI-82-20, 16 NRC 109 (1982).

E There is no standard for judging the adequacy of evacuation routes; nor has a minimum evacuation time been set. However, estimates are required of the amount of time needed to evacuate the entire population within the plume exposure EPZ over the presently existing roads. Since such estimates form the basis for protective action decisions, the estimates must be reasonably reliable.

F Emergency planning is a continuous process, and a licensing board's findings are predictive. If plans are sufficiently detailed and concrete to provide a licensing board reasonable assurance that they can and will be implemented in the event of an emergency, then implementation of details can properly be overseen by the NRC Staff.

G 10 CFR Part 50, App. E., §F.1 requires a periodic full-scale exercise which tests as much of the emergency plans as is reasonably achievable without mandatory public participation. This section precludes a licensing board from requiring public evacuation during an exercise.

H Other protective measures, such as sheltering and administration of radioprotective drugs, do not obviate plans for timely evacuation of special populations.

I License conditions that require only a purely objective determination are appropriate for post-hearing ministerial resolution by the NRC Staff; reopening the record is not warranted.

J Synergistic effects are exceedingly unlikely to occur at the very low levels of radiation calculated to result from releases of gaseous and liquid effluents during normal plant operation. Further, even if synergistic effects did occur, they would be so small as to be clinically undetectable. Therefore, Applicant and the NRC Staff did not err in failing to assess synergistic effects. NEPA's requirement that environmental effects of a proposed agency action be described is subject to a rule of reason. An agency need not foresee the unforeseeable. *Scientists' Institute for Public Information v. Atomic Energy Commission*, 481 F.2d 1079, 1092 (D.C. Cir. 1973).

K The environmental statement may be deemed amended *pro tanto* to include our findings and conclusions. *Allied-General Nuclear Services, et al. (Barnwell Nuclear Fuel Plant Separations Facility)*, ALAB-296, 2 NRC 671 (1975); 10 CFR §51.52(b)(3).

DIGESTS
ISSUANCES OF THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARDS

L The following technical issues are discussed: Consideration of generic safety questions in the safety evaluation report (Shutdown decay heat removal, Seismic qualification of equipment); Emergency plans (Evacuation plans, Protective measures — radioprotective drugs (potassium iodide)); Synergism (Low-level radiation releases, Multiplicative interaction of low-level radiation and chemical carcinogens).

LBP-82-101 CONSUMERS POWER COMPANY (Palisades Nuclear Power Facility), Docket No. 50-255-OLA; OPERATING LICENSE AMENDMENT; November 8, 1982; ORDER OF DISMISSAL

A The Licensing Board dismisses the operating license amendment proceeding where the sole intervenor defaults in failing to attend a prehearing conference and failing to respond to a show cause order.

B In an operating license amendment matter, where an intervenor has been admitted as a party and subsequently fails to attend a scheduled prehearing conference or give notice or explanation for such failure and, thereafter, fails to respond to an order to show cause, it will be found to be in default, dismissed as a party, and its previously admitted contentions will be dismissed.

LBP-82-102 CLEVELAND ELECTRIC ILLUMINATING COMPANY, et al. (Perry Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 & 2), Docket Nos. 50-440-OL, 50-441-OL; OPERATING LICENSE; November 8, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

A The Licensing Board reviews a set of interrogatories addressed to the Staff concerning the Standby Liquid Control System Contention. The Board finds that certain questions are irrelevant because they relate to Anticipated Transient Without Scram generally, and not to the admitted contention. However, the Board decides that intervenor is seeking necessary information and phrases its own questions so that information necessary to a complete record can be obtained in an efficient manner, without unduly burdening Staff.

B Intervenor may obtain information about other, arguably analogous plants in the course of discovery.

C When the Board's review of the intervenor's interrogatories persuades it that there may be substantial gaps in the record resulting from these requests, the Board may phrase its own questions to fill the gaps.

D The following technical issues are discussed: Standby Liquid Control System; Human Error; Anticipated Transient Without Scram.

LBP-82-103 ILLINOIS POWER COMPANY, et al. (Clinton Power Station, Unit No. 1), Docket No. 50-461-OL; OPERATING LICENSE; November 10, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

A The Licensing Board admits two supplemental contentions submitted by the Intervenor, and it denies admission of seven contentions by the Intervenor and two issues proposed for litigation by the State of Illinois. The Board also deletes one previously admitted contention and grants a motion for summary disposition of one contention.

B Commission guidance in TMI-1 Restart, Metropolitan Edison Company (Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit No. 1), CLI-80-16, 11 NRC 674 (1980) permits the litigation of hydrogen control in individual cases under 10 CFR Part 100 if it is determined that there is a credible loss of coolant scenario entailing hydrogen generation, hydrogen combustion, containment breach or leaking, and offsite radiation doses in excess of the Part 100 guideline values. See Duke Power Company (William B. McGuire Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2), LBP-81-13, 13 NRC 652 (1981) and ALAB-669, 15 NRC 453 (1982); and Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company, et al. (Perry Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 & 2), LBP-82-15, 15 NRC 555 (1982) and ALAB-675, 15 NRC 1105 (1982).

C Contentions related to financial qualification of the Applicant for a construction permit or an operating license for production or utilization facilities shall not be considered. See 47 Fed. Reg. 13750 et seq. (March 31, 1982) and revised 10 CFR §2.104(b)(1)(iii) and 10 CFR §2.104(c)(4).

D The Appeal Board provides guidance concerning the litigability of generic issues. In Gulf States Utilities Company (River Bend Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-444, 6 NRC 760, 773 (1977) it states:

To establish the requisite nexus between the permit or license application and a TSAR item (or Task Action Plan), it must generally appear both (1) that the undertaken or contemplated project has safety significance insofar as the reactor under review is concerned, and (2) that the fashion in which the application deals with the matter in question is unsatisfactory, that because of the failure to consider a particular item there has been an in-

DIGESTS
ISSUANCES OF THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARDS

sufficient assessment of a specific type of risk for the reactor, or that the short-term solution offered in the application to a problem under staff study is inadequate. (footnote omitted)

- E New paragraph 10 CFR §51.53(c), effective March 22, 1982, prohibits admission of contentions proffered by a party concerning need for power or alternate energy sources for the proposed plant in operating license hearings. See 47 Fed. Reg. 12943 (March 26, 1982).
- F Contentions alleging psychological stress resulting from Commission-licensed activities must meet three criteria: 1) the impact must consist of post-traumatic anxieties, 2) the impact must be accompanied by physical effects, and 3) the post-traumatic anxieties must have been caused by fears of recurring catastrophe. See the Commission's statement of policy issued July 16, 1982, 47 Fed. Reg. 31762 (July 22, 1982).

LBP-82-104 CLEVELAND ELECTRIC ILLUMINATING COMPANY, et al. (Perry Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 & 2), Docket Nos. 50-440-OL, 50-441-OL; OPERATING LICENSE; November 15, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

- A The Licensing Board excludes intervenors' late-filed contention, based on a Science News article, concerning adverse effects on reactor operator performance caused by shift rotation schedules that failed to account for "circadian rhythms." The Board excludes the contention primarily because there was substantial pre-existing knowledge that improper shift rotations might cause fatigue and adversely affect operator performance and intervenor failed to show the significance of the allegedly new information about "circadian rhythms."
- B The appearance of an article in a popular science publication could provide good cause for late filing, but the intervenor must demonstrate the extent to which new information in the article differs from previously available information. In addition, intervenor's discussion of the article must demonstrate its ability to contribute to the development of a sound record in the proceeding.
- C The following technical issues are discussed: Shift Rotation — Effect on Personnel Performance; Human Factors (Shift Rotation); Circadian Rhythm (Effect on Efficiency of Operator Performance).

LBP-82-105 CONSOLIDATED EDISON COMPANY OF NEW YORK (Indian Point, Unit No. 2) and POWER AUTHORITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK (Indian Point, Unit No. 3), Docket Nos. 50-247-SP, 50-286-SP; SPECIAL PROCEEDING; November 15, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

- A The Licensing Board sets forth its final decision on the contentions to be litigated in this proceeding (except for emergency planning issues), a schedule, and procedural matters related thereto.
- B Licensees are required to show they have taken steps to provide equivalent or better measures than called for in regulatory guides if they do not, in fact, comply with the specific requirements set forth in the guides.
- C A Commission decision that residual radiation health effects may be litigated in an individual licensing proceeding, even for plants which comply with 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix I, is applicable to this special proceeding. Therefore, the Licensing Board may admit a contention concerning the environmental costs associated with the routine release of radiation from the power plants.

LBP-82-106 PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY OF NEW HAMPSHIRE, et al. (Seabrook Station, Units 1 and 2), Docket Nos. 50-443-OL, 50-444-OL (ASLB No. 82-471-02-OL); OPERATING LICENSE; November 17, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

- A The Licensing Board denies motions for certification of objections to its Prehearing Conference Order rulings on the admissibility of contentions. The Licensing Board grants in part and denies in part motions for reconsideration of that order.
- B Although interlocutory appeal is generally prohibited, 10 CFR §2.730(f), certification is permitted where it is shown that failure to resolve the issue immediately will cause detriment to the public interest or unusual delay or expense.
- C An interlocutory appeal will only be accepted where a Licensing Board's ruling either (1) threatened appellant with immediate and serious irreparable impact or (2) affected the basic structure of the proceeding in a pervasive or unusual manner. Public Service Company of Indiana, Inc. (Marble Hill Nuclear Generating Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-405, 3 NRC 1190, 1192 (1977).
- D Certification is particularly inappropriate where the subject of the interlocutory appeal is a Licensing Board's rejections of contentions. Project Management Corporation, Tennessee Valley Authority (Clinch River Breeder Reactor Plant, ALAB-326, 3 NRC 406 (1976)).

DIGESTS
ISSUANCES OF THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARDS

E A Licensing Board may treat an interlocutory appeal as a motion for reconsideration. Public Service Company of Oklahoma, et al. (Black Fox Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-370, 5 NRC 131 (1977).

F 10 CFR §2.714 requires a petitioner to set forth the bases for each contention with reasonable specificity. This standard requires that a contention be stated with particularity (Alabama Power Co. (Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-183, 7 AEC 210, 216 (1974)), and that the petitioner state the "reasons" for its concern (Houston Lighting and Power Company (Allens Creek Nuclear Generating Station, Unit 1), ALAB-590, 11 NRC 542, 548 (1980)). The standard does not require the Licensing Board to address the merits of a contention when determining its admissibility (id.) and does not require the petitioner to detail supporting evidence (Mississippi Power and Light Co. (Grand Gulf Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-130, 6 AEC 423, 426 (1973)).

G In delineating the reason (i.e., basis) for a contention, an intervenor should establish a nexus between the substance of the contention and the statutory and regulatory scope of a Licensing Board's concern. To do so, an intervenor should allege with particularity that a part of an applicant's plant or operation thereof fails to comply with a specified regulation; or in the case where there is a "regulatory gap," an intervenor should allege that such a regulatory gap exists and allege with particularity facts that if proven would warrant concern. Where there is no allegation of non-compliance with a specified regulation, a Licensing Board must discern whether a reasonably prudent person would be concerned by the contention. Consumers Power Co. (Midland Plant, Units 1 and 2), CLI-74-5, 7 AEC 19, 32 n.27 (1974), rev'd sub nom., Aeschliman v. NRC, 547 F.2d 622 (D.C. Cir. 1976), rev'd sub nom., Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corp. v. NRDC, 435 U.S. 519, 553-54 (1978).

H Generic safety issues may be the subject of a contention, but such a contention must establish a nexus between the issue and the license application. In particular, the contention must show that 1) the generic issue has safety significance for the particular reactor and 2) the fashion in which the application deals with the matter is unsatisfactory or the short-term solution offered to the problem under study is inadequate. Gulf States Utilities Company (River Bend Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-444, 6 NRC 760 (1977).

I A Licensing Board's declination to rewrite inadmissible contentions does not constitute error. Commonwealth Edison Co. (Zion Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-226, 8 AEC 381, 406 (1974).

J 10 CFR §50.47(a)(2) precludes a Licensing Board from requiring completed preparedness exercises prior to a licensing decision; the section does not obviate planning requirements.

LBP-82-107 LONG ISLAND LIGHTING COMPANY (Shoreham Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1), Docket No. 50-322-OL (Emergency Planning); OPERATING LICENSE; November 19, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER RULING ON LICENSING BOARD AUTHORITY TO DIRECT THAT INITIAL EXAMINATION OF THE PRE-FILED TESTIMONY BE CONDUCTED BY MEANS OF PREHEARING EXAMINATIONS

A The Licensing Board concludes that it has the authority under the Administrative Procedure Act, the Atomic Energy Act and NRC Regulations to direct that the parties to the Shoreham operating licensing proceeding conduct their initial cross-examination, redirect and recross-examination with the respect to Phase I (primarily onsite) emergency planning issues by means of prehearing examinations in the nature of depositions. The Board orders that such examinations be held to expedite this proceeding and directs that portions of the transcripts of such examinations may be moved into evidence. Follow-up questions from the Board and parties would then be permitted at formal hearings before the Board.

B The Atomic Energy Act does not itself specify the nature of the hearings required to be held pursuant to Section 189(a), 42 USC §2239; its reference to "a hearing" neither distinguishes between rulemaking and adjudication nor states explicitly whether either must be conducted through formal "on the record" proceedings. However, "[t]he Commission has . . . invariably distinguished between the two, and has provided formal hearings in licensing cases, as contrasted with informal hearings in rulemaking proceedings confined to written submissions and non-record interviews." Siegel v. Atomic Energy Commission, 400 F.2d 778, 785 (D.C. Cir. 1968); Citizens For a Safe Environment v. Atomic Energy Commission, 489 F.2d 1018, 1021 (3rd Cir. 1974).

C By virtue of Section 181 of the Atomic Energy Act, 42 USC §2231, "the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act shall apply to all agency action taken under this Act." Pursuant to Section 7(c) of the APA, 5 USC §556(d), a party to an administrative adjudicatory hearing does not have an unlimited right to cross-examine witnesses, but is instead entitled only "to conduct such cross-examination as may be required for a full and true disclosure of the facts."

DIGESTS
ISSUANCES OF THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARDS

D Directing that parties to an operating license proceeding conduct their initial cross-examination by means of prehearing examinations in the nature of depositions is not violative of the APA, so long as the procedure employed does not prejudice the rights of any party. Administrative Procedure Act, Section 7(c), 5 USC §556(d).

E A licensing board has the authority to direct that parties to an operating license proceeding conduct their initial cross-examination by means of prehearing examinations in the nature of depositions. Pursuant to 10 CFR §2.718, a board has the power to regulate the course of the hearing and the conduct of the participants, as well as to take any other action consistent with the APA. See also 10 CFR §2.757, 10 CFR Part 2, App. A, IV. In expediting the hearing process using the case management methods contained in Part 2, a board should ensure that the hearings are fair, and produce a record which leads to high quality decisions and adequately protect the public health and safety and the environment. Statement of Policy on Conduct of Licensing Proceedings, CLI-81-8, 13 NRC 452, 453 (1981).

F The fact that a procedure for the conduct of initial cross-examination by means of prehearing examinations in the nature of depositions has not previously been implemented in NRC licensing hearings does not mean that the procedure is invalid. It is always within the discretion of a court or an administrative agency to relax or modify its procedural rules adopted for the orderly transaction of business before it when in a given case the ends of justice require it. Such an exercise of discretion is not reviewable except upon a showing of substantial prejudice to the complaining party. *American Farm Lines v. Black Ball Freight Service*, 397 U.S. 532, 538-539 (1970).

G While use of innovative procedures might be appropriate in highly litigated cases involving sophisticated intervenors represented by a number of competent counsel to expedite those proceedings, the use of the same procedures in a case involving a pro se intervenor unfamiliar with adjudicatory procedures might be fundamentally unfair. Which procedural devices ought to be used in a particular proceeding is a decision best committed to the sound discretion of a licensing board as a part of its general duty to regulate the course of the hearing and the conduct of the participants. See 10 CFR §2.718(e); 5 USC §556(c)(7).

LBP-82-107A DUKE POWER COMPANY, et al. (Catawba Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2), Docket Nos. 50-413, 50-414 (ASLBP No. 81-463-01-OL); OPERATING LICENSE; December 1, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

A The Licensing Board grants the petitions to intervene of six individuals and organizations. The Board admits numerous safety and environmental contentions and defers ruling on certain other contentions for which necessary documentation was not yet available. Rulings on proposed security plan contentions are also deferred pending the Board's review of the qualification of the intervenors' experts.

B A Licensing Board has broad discretion to defer rulings on contentions which may later be made more specific on the basis of information not yet available, or to proceed with rulings on such contentions without waiting for more information.

C Where a contention is advanced on the basis of new information following the original deadline for filing contentions, its proponent has the burden of explaining — in appropriate detail and separate from the contention's text — what is new about the contention and why it could not have been advanced previously.

D A contention concerning a certain accident scenario is barred in an operating license proceeding by the doctrine of collateral estoppel where the same scenario advanced by the same party was found to be not credible in the construction permit proceeding.

E As a general rule, a generic issue should be addressed in a rulemaking proceeding, if one is pending or about to commence, and not in an individual case. However, since simultaneous consideration of a generic issue in litigation and rulemaking is not necessarily precluded, unless the Commission mandates that result, the basic criterion is safety — whether there is a substantial safety reason for litigating the issue as the rulemaking progresses.

LBP-82-108 WISCONSIN ELECTRIC POWER COMPANY (Point Beach Nuclear Plant, Unit 1), Docket No. 50-266-OLA-2; OPERATING LICENSE AMENDMENT; December 10, 1982; SPECIAL PRE-HEARING CONFERENCE ORDER

A The Licensing Board declares intervenor Wisconsin's Environmental Decade to be in default of its hearing obligations and dismisses its petition to intervene. The Board also considers intervenor's contentions and finds each to be irrelevant or without basis.

DIGESTS
ISSUANCES OF THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARDS

- B When an intervenor failed to appear at a Special Prehearing Conference, the Board applied factors found in the Statement of Policy on Conduct of Licensing Proceedings, 46 Fed. Reg. 28533 (May 27, 1982), in order to determine what sanction was appropriate.
- C A party wishing to attend an alternate engagement instead of a Special Prehearing Conference must establish the importance of that engagement and that it took reasonable steps to avoid the scheduling conflict. When a party's motion to reorganize the schedule of a hearing fails because it has not met the criteria for rescheduling, it may be warned that it risks default for nonattendance at the scheduled conference. Nonattendance may then properly result in a default.
- D In an amendment proceeding, contentions concerning the safety of parts of the plant not involved in the amendment are not admissible unless the petitioner first establishes that a grant of the amendment would in some way worsen these safety concerns.
- E Petitioner cited a source that stated that *hydraulic expansion of a steam generator tube* would make it susceptible to stress corrosion cracking. This source was found not to be an adequate basis for a contention because the amendment being sought utilized a *hydraulic roll* rather than *hydraulic expansion*. The alleged basis was found to be irrelevant and the contention was not admitted.

LBP-82-109 UNION ELECTRIC COMPANY (Callaway Plant, Unit 1), Docket No. STN 50-483-OL; OPERATING LICENSE; December 13, 1982; PARTIAL INITIAL DECISION

- A In a Partial Initial Decision, the Licensing Board rules that isolated construction deficiencies do not show a pattern of a programmatic breakdown in Applicant's quality assurance program. The Board determines that pending a resolution of emergency planning contentions and the making of requisite findings by the Director of Nuclear Regulation, the Director would be authorized to issue an operating license for the Callaway Plant, Unit 1.
- B A lack of knowledge that quality deficiencies have been recorded by Applicant's construction contractor represents a failure in meeting quality assurance criteria under Commission's regulations in 10 CFR Part 50 Appendix B.
- C Documented reinspection results where the objective is to discover the extent of a problem that could affect quality is a requirement of the Commission's quality assurance criteria.
- D Where quality control inspectors provide reports three months after the reported event occurred, under circumstances where the information contained in such reports is similar and only a single inspector noted comments thereon, such documents are considered worthless.
- E A proof of the adequacy of quality assurance activities can be ascertained by comparing actual performance against functional standards established in the Applicant's program.
- F The following technical issues are discussed: Construction Deficiencies — Materials Integrity and Safety, Concrete Density, Welding Defects, Substandard Piping, Radiographic Technique, Code Enforcement.

LBP-82-110 CLEVELAND ELECTRIC ILLUMINATING COMPANY, et al. (Perry Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 & 2), Docket Nos. 50-440-OL, 50-441-OL; OPERATING LICENSE; December 13, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

- A The Licensing Board declines to reconsider its earlier decision admitting a hydrogen control contention and reaffirms its earlier decision that petitioners have sufficient basis for the admission of this contention.
- B Motions for reconsideration ordinarily must be filed within ten days of a Board decision. Thereafter the Board decision becomes the law of the case, subject to untimely reconsideration only upon demonstration of good cause for late filing.

LBP-82-111 CONSUMERS POWER COMPANY (Big Rock Point Plant), Docket No. 50-155; SPENT FUEL POOL AMENDMENT; December 14, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

- A The Licensing Board rules that it lacks jurisdiction to reopen the record on an issue that pends before the Appeal Board, or to permit discovery with respect to that issue.
- B Once an appeal of an issue is taken, the Licensing Board is divested of jurisdiction over that issue and may not order discovery concerning whether or not it is appropriate for the record on the issue to be reopened.

LBP-82-112 LOUISIANA POWER AND LIGHT COMPANY (Waterford Steam Electric Station, Unit 3), Docket No. 50-382-OL; OPERATING LICENSE; December 14, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

- A The Licensing Board grants in part and denies in part Applicant's Motion For Reconsideration or Clarification.

DIGESTS
ISSUANCES OF THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARDS

- B License conditions addressing off-site emergency planning issues need not be met prior to issuance of a fuel loading and low power license. 10 CFR §50.47(d).
- C Absent a motion filed pursuant to 10 CFR §50.57(c), the issue whether fuel loading and low power operation should be authorized is not before a Licensing Board.
- D 10 CFR §50.47 requires a finding that there is reasonable assurance that adequate protective measures can and will be taken, and adequate protective measures include a means for evacuating special populations. The regulations do not preclude a Licensing Board from requiring letters of agreement for the provision of drivers to evacuate the special populations.

LBP-82-113 CONSOLIDATED EDISON COMPANY OF NEW YORK (Indian Point, Unit No. 2) and POWER AUTHORITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK (Indian Point, Unit No. 3), Docket Nos. 50-247-SP, 50-286-SP; SPECIAL PROCEEDING; December 15, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

- A The Licensing Board grants the NRC Staff a protective order regarding an interrogatory requesting the Staff to identify and list its ten most serious criticisms of the Indian Point Probabilistic Safety Study.
- B Neither 10 CFR §2.741, concerning the production of documents, nor 10 CFR §2.740, concerning discovery in general, requires the NRC Staff to compile a list of criticisms of a document at issue in the proceeding or to formulate a position on those criticisms in response to an interrogatory. It is sufficient for the Staff to provide to the Intervenor those documents containing the Staff criticisms from which the Intervenor itself may compile a list.

LBP-82-114 CLEVELAND ELECTRIC ILLUMINATING COMPANY, et al. (Perry Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 & 2), Docket Nos. 50-440-OL, 50-441-OL; OPERATING LICENSE; December 22, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

- A The Licensing Board denies in part and grants in part the NRC staff's motions for summary disposition of various contentions.
- B The Board discusses the standards for summary disposition, accepting principles presented to it both by the applicant and by an intervenor.
- C An affidavit submitted on summary disposition may present an opinion on an ultimate issue of fact, such as whether the quality assurance program has been satisfactory. However, unless the basis for this conclusion is stated, the Board may not grant summary disposition based on such an opinion. The Board must make decisions on ultimate issues of fact based on its own judgment and it may not substitute a staff judgment for its own.
- D When an intervenor has demonstrated that there is a genuine issue of fact concerning serious deficiencies in the management of a quality assurance program, in violation of NRC regulations, there is a presumption that such deficiencies resulted in safety problems. Applicant may rebut this presumption either by showing that there were no serious management deficiencies or by showing that these deficiencies did not cause safety problems that will affect plant operation.
- E The following technical issues are discussed: Asiatic clams, Corbicula fluminea, Scram discharge volume (Mark III containment), Mark III containment (scram discharge volume), Quality assurance (control of contractors), LOCA (pipe break in scram discharge volume; Mark III containment).

LBP-82-115 LONG ISLAND LIGHTING COMPANY (Shoreham Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1), Docket No. 50-322-OL (Emergency Planning); OPERATING LICENSE; December 22, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER CONFIRMING RULING ON SANCTIONS FOR INTERVENORS' REFUSAL TO COMPLY WITH ORDER TO PARTICIPATE IN PREHEARING EXAMINATIONS

- A The Licensing Board issues an order confirming its previous oral rulings finding intervenors to be in default of a previous board order, and stating its reasons for concluding dismissal of intervenors' onsite emergency planning contentions to be an appropriate sanction.
- B A licensing board is not expected to sit idly by when parties refuse to comply with its orders. Pursuant to 10 CFR §2.718, a licensing board has the power and the duty to maintain order, to take appropriate action to avoid delay and to regulate the course of the hearing and the conduct of the participants. Furthermore, pursuant to 10 CFR §2.707, the refusal of a party to comply with a Board order relating to its appearance at a proceeding constitutes a default for which a licensing board "may make such orders in regard to the failure as are just."

DIGESTS
ISSUANCES OF THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARDS

- C A spectrum of sanctions, from minor to severe, is available to licensing boards to assist in the management of proceedings. In selecting a sanction, boards should consider the relative importance of the unmet obligation, its potential for harm to other parties or the orderly conduct of the proceeding, whether its occurrence is an isolated incident or a part of a pattern of behavior, the importance of the safety or environmental concerns raised by the party, and all of the circumstances. Boards should attempt to tailor sanctions to mitigate the harm caused by the failure of a party to fulfill its obligations and bring about improved future compliance. Statement of Policy on the Conduct of Licensing Proceedings, CLI-81-8, 13 NRC 452, 454 (1981); Commonwealth Edison Company (Byron Nuclear Power Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-678, 15 NRC 1400, 1416-20 (1982).
- D A licensing board is to be accorded the same respect as a court of law. See 10 CFR §2.713(a).
- E A party may not simply refuse to comply with a board order, even if it believes the board decision to have been based upon an erroneous interpretation of the law. Appropriate sanctions may be imposed for a refusal to comply with a board order, and a party may not be later heard to complain that its rights were unjustly abridged after having willfully refused to participate further in a matter. Northern Indiana Public Service Company (Baily Generating Station, Nuclear-1), ALAB-224, 8 AEC 244 (1974). Except in the most extraordinary circumstances, a party must comply with an order unless and until it is either stayed or overturned on appeal.
- F An intervenor's intentional waiver of both its right to cross-examine and its right to present witnesses with regard to certain contentions amounts to the effective abandonment of those contentions, in that the party has thus refused to prosecute whatever case it might otherwise have been able to make. In the absence of circumstances which would justify a board's exercise of its *sua sponte* powers, an intervenor's abandonment of its contentions precludes the board's litigation of these matters in an operating license proceeding, as such issues are no longer "in controversy" among the parties so as to be litigable. See 10 CFR §2.760a.

LBP-82-116 DUKE POWER COMPANY, et al. (Catawba Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2), Docket Nos. 50-413, 50-414 (ASLBP No. 81-463-01-OL); OPERATING LICENSE; December 22, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

- A The Licensing Board rules on various pending motions related to discovery.
- B A claim of privilege from disclosure, such as the attorney-client privilege, must be made with particularity, including clear identification of documents, or parts thereof, and why each identified document is privileged.
- C A contention is not subject to dismissal merely because the intervenor fails to respond in discovery by supplying its factual basis. The "basis" requirement of 10 CFR §2.714 is a pleading requirement which an intervenor can meet and not yet have any supporting factual basis.
- D A party is entitled to direct answers or objections to each interrogatory posed. General objections are insufficient. The burden is on the objector to show why the question is not proper.
- E An intervenor advancing a truthful claim of lack of knowledge about its contention is entitled to a reasonable opportunity to develop its case on those contentions through discovery against the applicants and NRC Staff before it can be required to provide responsive answers in discovery.
- F Valid safety contentions do not invariably involve alleged noncompliance with a specific safety rule. A contention about a matter not covered by a specific rule need only allege that it poses a significant safety problem.
- G A Licensing Board need not issue a ruling on a motion for a protective order unless a timely motion to compel is filed. In the absence of a timely motion to compel, the motion for protective order will be deemed granted.

LBP-82-117 CLEVELAND ELECTRIC ILLUMINATING COMPANY, et al. (Perry Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 & 2), Docket Nos. 50-440-OL, 50-441-OL; OPERATING LICENSE; December 23, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

- A The Licensing Board directs the NRC staff to respond to relevant interrogatories propounded by intervenor concerning hydrogen release, and to answer certain questions propounded by the Board itself.
- B When the Staff has done extensive work in an area, such as hydrogen control, it must answer relevant interrogatories covering that area.
- C When the Board's review of the intervenor's interrogatories persuades it that there may be substantial gaps in the record resulting from these requests, the Board may phrase its own questions to

DIGESTS
ISSUANCES OF THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARDS

fill the gaps. It need not wait until the hearing to ask questions. It need not notify the Commission about the questions if they are related to an admitted contention and therefore are not *sua sponte*.

D The Board defines "necessary" as used in 10 CFR §2.720(h)(2)(ii). The definition adopted rejects the suggestion of the Commission's staff that intervenors cannot obtain discovery if they only suspect that answers to their questions will be necessary to their case. The Board refused to erect a test that would permit questions to be asked only if the intervenor first knew what the answers would be.

E An Atomic Safety and Licensing Board need not notify the Commission that it is asking questions that are relevant to an admitted contention. Such questions are not *sua sponte*.

F Interrogatories asked by the non-lawyer representative of an intervenor should be answered fully, interpreting the interrogatories reasonably, both in light of their wording and the purpose of the intervenor. Litigation is not a game but is a search for meaningful answers.

LBP-82-117A ARIZONA PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY, et al. (Palo Verde Nuclear Generating Station, Units 1, 2 and 3), Docket Nos. STN-50-528-OL, STN-50-529-OL, STN-50-530-OL (ASLB No. 80-447-01-OL); OPERATING LICENSE; December 30, 1982; INITIAL DECISION

A The Licensing Board issues a Partial Initial Decision authorizing the issuance of an operating license for Palo Verde Unit 1. The Board finds that:

1. There is reasonable assurance that there will be a sufficient supply of effluent from the 91st Avenue and the Tolleson Wastewater Treatment Plants to meet the operational requirements of the three Palo Verde units.
2. There is reasonable assurance that the sources of water available to the Phoenix metropolitan area during the first five years of operation of all Palo Verde units and beyond are sufficient that the occurrence of an event triggering Section 21 of Agreement No. 13904, which could curtail the supply of water to Palo Verde in the event of an emergency, is remote.
3. The estimated requirements of effluent for condenser cooling are not understated.
4. Effluent is not required for the safe shutdown of the Palo Verde units.

B The Commission is not obligated under NEPA to consider all issues which are currently the subject of litigation in other forums and which one day in the future might have an impact on the amount of effluent available to Palo Verde.

C Where environmental effects are remote and speculative, agencies are not precluded from proceeding with a project even though all uncertainties are not removed.

D Although the Commission will take cognizance of activities before other legal tribunals when facts so warrant, it should not delay the licensing proceeding or withhold license merely because some other legal tribunal might conceivably take future action which may later have an impact upon the operation of a nuclear facility.

E Environmental uncertainties raised by Intervenors in NRC proceedings do not result in a per se denial of the license, but rather are subject to a rule of reason.

F Under NEPA, cost-benefit balancing is now required, but only if the proposed nuclear plant has environmental disadvantages in comparison to possible alternatives. Consumers Power Company (Midland Plants, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-458, 7 NRC 155, 162 (1978).

G Cost-benefit comparison has been limited further by the Commission's recent amendment to 10 CFR Part 51 which precludes alternative energy source issues from being considered in operating license proceedings. 47 Fed. Reg. 12940 (March 26, 1982).

H The following technical issues are discussed: Water supply adequacy, Cooling water supply.

LBP-82-117B ARIZONA PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY, et al. (Palo Verde Nuclear Generating Station, Units 1, 2 and 3), Docket Nos. STN-50-528-OL, STN-50-529-OL, STN-50-530-OL; OPERATING LICENSE; December 30, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

A The Licensing Board grants the petition of West Valley Agricultural Protection Council, Inc. (West Valley) to intervene in this licensing proceeding, and reopens the record for Units 2 and 3 for the limited purpose of considering West Valley's Contention III regarding salt deposition.

B An untimely petition to intervene in a proceeding may be granted if it is found that a balancing of the factors set forth in 10 CFR 2.714(a)(1) favors intervention.

C The test for meeting the burden of reopening the record is that stated in Pacific Gas and Electric Company (Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-598, 11 NRC 876, 879 (1980):

1. Is the motion timely?
2. Does it address significant safety (or environmental) issues?

DIGESTS
ISSUANCES OF THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARDS

3. Might a different result have been reached had the newly proffered material been considered initially?

LBP-82-118 CONSUMERS POWER COMPANY (Midland Plant, Units 1 and 2), Docket Nos. 50-329-OM&OL, 50-330-OM&OL (ASLBP Nos. 78-389-03-OL, 80-429-02-SP); OPERATING LICENSE AND CONSTRUCTION PERMIT MODIFICATION ORDER; December 30, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

- A The Licensing Board rules on rewritten contentions of an intervenor in the operating license proceeding.
- B In considering the acceptability of a contention, a Licensing Board may not determine factual questions going to the merits of the contention. Houston Lighting and Power Company (Allens Creek Nuclear Generating Station, Unit 1), ALAB-590, 11 NRC 542, 547-49 (1980).
- C When a matter is involved in rulemaking, the Commission may elect to require an issue which is part of that rulemaking to be heard as part of that rulemaking. Where it does not impose such a requirement, an issue is not barred from being considered in adjudications being conducted at that time.
- D During a rulemaking on a particular subject, there shall be no different adjudicatory consideration of an issue (absent Commission direction to the contrary) than there would have been in the absence of the rulemaking.
- E The question whether an issue should be dealt with through rulemaking or adjudication is one of policy for the Commission to make; it is beyond the scope of authority delegated to Licensing Boards. Where the Commission has not limited the authority of Licensing Boards to hear an issue, a Board cannot decline to hear the issue just because it happens to involve a matter involved in rulemaking.
- F Where standards appear in the Standard Review Plan and not in a specific regulation, they may be modified, upon proper showing, at the behest of an applicant or other party.
- G As a result of the Commission's October 29, 1982 policy statement on fuel cycle matters, Licensing Boards are required to consider the current Table S-3 (10 CFR §51.23(c)) as still in effect, despite a Court ruling which raised questions concerning its validity. Fuel cycle matters must be considered only under that Table, and a contention challenging the Table must be dismissed. Any decision or license authorization relying on Table S-3 will be subject to the outcome of pending judicial proceedings in this matter.

LBP-82-119 CLEVELAND ELECTRIC ILLUMINATING COMPANY, et al. (Perry Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 & 2), Docket Nos. 50-440-OL, 50-441-OL; OPERATING LICENSE; December 30, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

- A The Licensing Board grants summary disposition on three issues relating to the performance of a 30 degree sector steam test, the improper consideration of local employment and tax levels in the environmental impact statement and failure to consider adequately the economic effects of serious nuclear accidents. In dismissing the 30 degree sector steam test contention, the Board also reviews the evidence and decides that it is not appropriate to raise *sua sponte* the issue of the adequacy of that test.
- B The following technical issues are discussed: 30 degree sector steam test; Local economic effects as a NEPA consideration; Class nine accident; Serious nuclear accident, consideration of economic effects; Test for adequacy of core spray in a BWR.

LBP-82-119A CAROLINA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY AND NORTH CAROLINA EASTERN MUNICIPAL POWER AGENCY (Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2), Docket Nos. 50-400-OL, 50-401-OL (ASLBP No. 82-468-01-OL); OPERATING LICENSE; September 2, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

DIGESTS ISSUANCES OF DIRECTORS' DECISIONS

DD-82-7 PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY (Humboldt Bay Power Plant, Unit 3), Docket No. 50-133; DECOMMISSIONING; July 7, 1982; DIRECTOR'S DECISION UNDER 10 CFR 2.206

A The Director of Nuclear Reactor Regulation denies a petition under 10 CFR 2.206 that requests action to revoke the operating license for the Humboldt Bay plant and to decommission the facility.

DD-82-8 PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY OF NEW HAMPSHIRE (Seabrook Nuclear Station, Units 1 & 2), Docket Nos. 50-443, 50-444; SHOW CAUSE; July 6, 1982; DIRECTOR'S DECISION UNDER 10 CFR 2.206

A The Director of Nuclear Reactor Regulation denies a petition under 10 CFR 2.206 that requested initiation of show-cause proceedings on the basis of the licensee's alleged lack of financial qualifications.

B In light of the elimination of the Commission's financial qualification requirements, the Director of Nuclear Reactor Regulation denies a request for initiation of show-cause proceedings in the absence of a connection between alleged financial constraints and a particular safety problem.

DD-82-9 COMMONWEALTH EDISON COMPANY (LaSalle County Generating Station, Units 1 and 2), Docket Nos. 50-373, 50-374; SHOW CAUSE; July 19, 1982; DIRECTOR'S DECISION UNDER 10 CFR 2.206

A The Director of Nuclear Reactor Regulation denies in part petitions filed under 10 CFR 2.206 by the Illinois Attorney General and the Illinois Friends of the Earth regarding deficiencies in construction of LaSalle Unit 1. Remaining matters concerning LaSalle Unit 2 are under investigation.

DD-82-10 PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY (Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2), Docket Nos. 50-275, 50-276; OPERATING LICENSE; September 22, 1982; DIRECTOR'S DECISION UNDER 10 CFR 2.206

A The Director of Nuclear Reactor Regulation denies a petition under 10 CFR 2.206 requesting the issuance of an order to Pacific Gas & Electric Co. to show cause why it should not be directed to file amendments to its pending operating license applications concerning the restructuring by PG&E of the Diablo Canyon Project organization and management.

DD-82-11 ROCHESTER GAS AND ELECTRIC CORPORATION (R. E. Ginna Nuclear Power Plant), Docket No. 50-244; OPERATING LICENSE; October 8, 1982; DIRECTOR'S DECISION UNDER 10 CFR 2.206

A Acting on a referral from the Commission of the petitioner's request for review of a partial denial (DD-82-3, 15 NRC 1348) of its earlier petition, the Director of Nuclear Reactor Regulation denies the petitioner's request for additional relief with respect to further operation of the R. E. Ginna Nuclear Power Plant.

B The following technical issues are discussed: Steam generator tube rupture events and repairs.

DD-82-12 CONSOLIDATED EDISON COMPANY (Indian Point, Unit No. 2) and POWER AUTHORITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK (Indian Point, Unit No. 3), Docket Nos. 50-247, 50-286; SUSPENSION OF OPERATION; November 26, 1982; DIRECTOR'S DECISION UNDER 10 CFR 2.206

A The Director of the Office of Inspection and Enforcement denies a petition filed by the Union of Concerned Scientists and the New York Public Interest Research Group which requested immediate suspension of operation of Indian Point Units 2 and 3 on the basis of inadequate State and local planning and preparedness for radiological emergencies.

B In the absence of compelling circumstances requiring such action, licensees are generally permitted 4 months to secure corrective action for emergency planning and preparedness deficiencies before the NRC takes enforcement action for such deficiencies.

DIGESTS
ISSUANCES OF DIRECTORS' DECISIONS

DD-82-13 PHILADELPHIA ELECTRIC COMPANY (Limerick Generating Station, Units 1 and 2), Docket Nos. 50-352, 50-353; CONSTRUCTION PERMIT SUSPENSION; December 7, 1982; DIRECTOR'S DECISION UNDER 10 CFR 2.206

- A The Acting Director of Nuclear Reactor Regulation denies a petition filed by Del-Aware which requested suspension or revocation of the construction permits for the Limerick Station unless the licensee submitted an alternative to the planned Supplemental Cooling Water Supply System at Point Pleasant, Pennsylvania.
- B The scope of the NRC's environmental review of a project may be limited to one segment of a project so long as (1) that portion has independent utility and (2) the approval of that segment does not foreclose alternatives to the part of the project not being considered.
- C The Director need not consider issues raised in a 10 CFR 2.206 petition which the petitioner is litigating or had an opportunity to raise before a Licensing Board in a pending adjudication or for which the petitioner provides no factual basis for the requested relief.
- D The Director will not institute proceedings to suspend or revoke construction permits on environmental matters in the absence of a showing of a major change in material facts.
- E The NRC staff may use environmental impact statements prepared by other agencies as the basis for its own assessment of the environmental impacts of a proposed section.

DIGESTS ISSUANCES OF DENALS OF PETITIONS FOR RULEMAKING

DPRM-82-1 GENERAL ATOMIC COMPANY, Docket No. PRM-95-1 (10 CFR Part 95); RULEMAKING; August 26, 1982; DENIAL OF PETITION FOR RULEMAKING

A The Nuclear Regulatory Commission is hereby denying a petition for rulemaking submitted by the General Atomic Company (GAC) in a letter to the Secretary of the Commission dated May 19, 1981. The petition requested that the Commission amend its regulation relating to the classification guidance provided by sub-topic 112 of Appendix A, "Classification Guide for Safeguards Information," to 10 CFR Part 95 to change the CONFIDENTIAL-National Security Information (CNSI) classification category to unclassified (U) or to delete sub-topic 112 from Appendix A.

DPRM-82-2 WELLS EDDLEMAN, Docket No. PRM-2-11; OPERATING LICENSE; September 30, 1982; DENIAL OF PETITION FOR RULEMAKING

A The Commission denies a petition requesting that the Commission amend its rules of practice for domestic licensing proceedings to require a separate operating license hearing for each power reactor unit at a nuclear power plant site on the grounds that the requested amendments are unnecessary, contrary to sound administrative practice, and inconsistent with existing law.

B There is no reason to believe that an amendment to NRC regulations to require an exclusive hearing on each reactor unit will result in or enhance the consideration of any issues which could not also have been considered and considered equally well in a hearing on two or more units.

C There is no reason to believe that the class of persons who could be included or excluded from participating in an operating license hearing on two or more reactor units constructed on a multiunit site would be different from the class of persons who would be included or excluded from participating in an OL hearing devoted exclusively to any single reactor unit constructed on the same multiunit site.

D A separate operating license is issued for each reactor unit constructed on a multiunit site even though a consolidated hearing is held on several reactor units. Before an operating license for a reactor unit is issued, the Commission must make the requisite findings and determinations required by the regulations in effect at the time of license issuance.

E Rules of practice permit the Commission to consider two or more applications in the same licensing review and to consolidate two or more proceedings for hearing.

F Although used infrequently, the Commission's rules of practice also provide procedures for severing a proceeding dealing with two or more reactor units and for holding a separate operating license hearing on each reactor unit.

G The requested amendment would, if adopted, have the effect of requiring a mandatory OL hearing in connection with the issuance of an OL for each nuclear power reactor. In this respect, the requested amendment is contrary to the clear intent of Congress which, in 1962, amended section 189a. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to eliminate the requirement for mandatory hearings in OL proceedings and to permit the Commission, in any case in which a hearing was not requested, to issue an OL without a hearing.

H The OL hearing is limited to examining substantial changes or conditions which have occurred since the issuance of the construction permit and issues which were deferred for consideration at the OL stage of the proceeding.

I It is inappropriate to consider the issue of sufficient NRC personnel in a licensing proceeding, including a hearing on an OL. Issues relating to Commission personnel involve the internal organization and management of the agency which is subject to Congressional authorization, and for which the Commission, not a license applicant or an intervenor, has sole responsibility.

J The Commission has amended its regulations in 10 CFR Parts 2 and 50 to eliminate entirely requirements for financial qualifications review and findings for electric utilities that are applying for construction permits or operating licenses for production or utilization facilities.



LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX CASES

A. L. Meckling Barge Lines, Inc. v. United States, 368 U.S. 324 (1961)
remanding of case based on record that no longer represents case's actual situation; CLI-82-26, 16 NRC 881 (1982)

Aberdeen & Rockfish RR Company v. SCRAP, 422 U.S. 289, 319 (1975)
procedures needed to make serious accident evaluation for operating power reactors; ALAB-705, 16 NRC 1753 (1982)

Able Investment Company v. United States, 53 F.R.D. 485 (D. Neb. 1971)
material encompassed by attorney work product doctrine; LBP-82-82, 16 NRC 1161, 1162 (1982)

Adickes v. Kress and Company, 398 U.S. 144, 157 (1970)
burden of proof in summary disposition motions; LBP-82-58, 16 NRC 519 (1982)

Advisory Comm. Note to 1970 Amendments to Fed. R. Civ. Proc., 48 F.R.D. 459, 499 (1970)
adaptation of NRC discovery rules from Federal Rules; LBP-82-82, 16 NRC 1159 (1982)

Aeschliman v. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, 547 F.2d 622 (D.C. Cir. 1976)
need to consider environmental impacts of nuclear fuel cycle; ALAB-691, 16 NRC 903 (1982)

Alabama Power Company (Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-182, 7 AEC 210 (1974)
relitigation of serious accident scenarios; LBP-82-107A, 16 NRC 1808 (1982)

Alabama Power Company (Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-182, 7 AEC 210, 216 (1974)
legal standard for admissibility of contentions; LBP-82-106, 16 NRC 1654 (1982)
limitation on matters to be resolved in operating license proceedings; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1086 (1982)

Alabama Power Company (Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-182, 7 AEC 210, 217 (1974)
analogy between summary disposition procedures and Rule 56 of Federal Rules of Civil Procedure; LBP-82-58, 16 NRC 519-20 (1982)

Alabama Power Company (Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2), CLI-74-12, 7 AEC 203 (1974)
application of collateral estoppel; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1044, 1081 (1982)

Alexander v. Hall, 64 F.R.D. 152, 155 (D.S.C. 1974)
definition of amicus curiae; ALAB-679, 16 NRC 125 (1982)

Allied General Nuclear Services (Barnwell Fuel Receiving and Storage Station), ALAB-328, 5 NRC 420 (1976)
standing of petitioner in decontamination proceeding to litigate related waste disposal issues; LBP-82-52, 16 NRC 191 (1982)

Allied General Nuclear Services, et al. (Barnwell Fuel Receiving and Storage Station), ALAB-328, 3 NRC 420, 422 (1976)
insufficiency of interest test alone to confer standing; LBP-82-74, 16 NRC 983 (1982)

Allied-General Nuclear Services, et al. (Barnwell Nuclear Fuel Plant Separations Facility), ALAB-296, 2 NRC 671 (1975)
amendment of environmental statement to include Board findings and conclusions; LBP-82-100, 16 NRC 1571 (1982)

Alyeska Pipeline Serv. v. Wilderness Soc., 421 U.S. 240; 44 L.Ed.2d 141; 95 S.Ct. 1612 (1975)
basis for award of intervenors' attorney's fees; LBP-82-81, 16 NRC 1139 (1982)

American Cyanamid Company v. McGhee, 317 F.2d 295 (5th Cir. 1963)
conditions that require payment of costs and attorney's fees; LBP-82-81, 16 NRC 1139 (1982)

American Farm Lines v. Black Ball Freight Service, 397 U.S. 532, 538-539 (1970)
use of new procedure for cross-examination; LBP-82-107, 16 NRC 1677 (1982)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX CASES

American Fruit Purveyors, Inc., 30 Ad. L. 2d 584 (1971)
support of Board proposal to require pre-hearing examination by oral deposition questions; LBP-82-107, 16 NRC 1675 (1982)

American Public Gas Association v. FPC, 498 F.2d 718, 723 (D.C. Cir. 1974)
limitation on method of cross-examination; LBP-82-107, 16 NRC 1676 (1982)

American Textile Mfrs. Inst., Inc. v. Donovan, 452 U.S. 490, 494 n.2 (1981)
separate participation in a proceeding by an organization and its constituent members; ALAB-700, 16 NRC 1333 (1982)

Arizona Public Service Company, et al. (Palo Verde Nuclear Generating Station, Units 1, 2 and 3), ALAB-336, 4 NRC 3, 4 (1976)
consideration of effect of taxes in NEPA cost basis analysis; LBP-82-103, 16 NRC 1613 (1982)
limitations on benefits to be considered in an operating license cost-benefit balance; LBP-82-95, 16 NRC 1405 (1982)

Arizona Public Service Company, et al. (Palo Verde Nuclear Generating Station, Units 1, 2 and 3), DD-80-22, 11 NRC 919, 931 (1980)
need to reopen license proceedings to consider class 9 accidents; ALAB-705, 16 NRC 1751, (1982)

Arizona Public Service Company, et al. (Palo Verde Nuclear Generating Station, Units 1, 2 and 3), LBP-76-21, 3 NRC 662 (1976)
impact of salt drift on flora and fauna near Palo Verde facility; LBP-82-117B, 16 NRC 2027 (1982)

Arizona v. California, 373 U.S. 546 (1963)
Colorado River water supply mandated for Arizona; LBP-82-117A, 16 NRC 1987 (1982)

Associated General Contractors v. Otter Tail Power Company, 611 F.2d 684 (8th Cir. 1979)
ability of intervenor groups to represent their members adequately; CLI-82-15, 16 NRC 32 (1982)

Austracan, (U.S.A.) Inc. v. M/V Lemoncore, 500 F.2d 237, 239-40 (5th Cir. 1974)
situations giving rise to appealable order; ALAB-690, 16 NRC 895 (1982)

Ball v. E.I. DuPont de Nemours & Company, 519 F.2d 715, 718 (6th Cir. 1975)
standard for qualification of expert witnesses; ALAB-701, 16 NRC 1524 (1982)

Black v. Sheraton Corp., 371 F.Supp. 97 (D.D.C. 1974)
burden to demonstrate entitlement to executive privilege; LBP-82-82, 16 NRC 1165 (1982)

Boat Transit, Inc. v. United States, 1970 Federal Carrier Cases, §82, 215 (E.D. Mich. 1970), aff'd, 401 U.S. 928 (1971)
use of cross-examination in written form; LBP-82-107, 16 NRC 1675 (1982)

Boston Edison Company (Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1), ALAB-231, 8 AEC 633 (1974)
extent of Appeal Board sua sponte review authority; ALAB-689, 16 NRC 890 (1982)

Boston Edison Company (Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1), ALAB-231, 8 AEC 633-34 (1974)
appellate sua sponte review of Licensing Board decisions; ALAB-696, 16 NRC 1262 (1982)
appellate review of Licensing Board rulings on economic issues, intervention requests, or procedural matters; ALAB-691, 16 NRC 908 (1982)

Boston Edison Company, et al. (Pilgrim Nuclear Generating Station, Unit 2), ALAB-656, 14 NRC 965 (1981)
remanding of case based on record that no longer represents case's actual situation; CLI-82-26, 16 NRC 881 (1982)
vacation of unreviewed judgments because of mootness; CLI-82-18, 16 NRC 51 (1982)

Boston Edison Company, et al. (Pilgrim Nuclear Generating Station, Unit 2), LBP-75-30, 1 NRC 579 (1975)
guidance on rules governing interrogatories; LBP-82-116, 16 NRC 1940 (1982)

Boston Edison Company, et al. (Pilgrim Nuclear Generating Station, Unit No. 2), LBP-76-7, 3 NRC 156 (1976)
sanction for failure of a party to attend prehearing conference; LBP-82-101, 16 NRC 1596 (1982)

BPI v. Atomic Energy Commission, 502 F.2d 424 (D.C. Cir. 1974)
Commission authority to establish procedural rules for late intervention; ALAB-707, 16 NRC 1767 (1982)

intervention on enforcement actions; CLI-82-16, 16 NRC 45 (1982)

reasonableness of basis with specificity standard for admissibility of contentions; LBP-82-106, 16 NRC 1654 (1982)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX CASES

BPI v. Atomic Energy Commission, 502 F.2d 424, 428 (1974)
purpose of basis with specificity requirement for admission of contentions; LBP-82-106, 16 NRC 1655 (1982)

BPI v. Atomic Energy Commission, 502 F.2d 424, 428-429 (D.C. Cir. 1974)
requirement for threshold showing of basis and specificity for admission of contention; LBP-82-75, 16 NRC 993 (1982)

BPI v. Atomic Energy Commission, 502 F.2d 428 (D.C. Cir. 1974)
conditions to the right to a hearing; ALAB-687, 16 NRC 469 (1982)

Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen v. Chicago, M., St. P. & P.R.R., 380 F.2d 605, 608-09 (D.C. Cir., per Burger, J.), certiorari denied, 389 U.S. 928 (1967)
justification for dismissal of intervenor for failure to attend prehearing conference; LBP-82-115, 16 NRC 1935 (1982)

Burlington Industries v. Exxon Corp., 65 F.R.D. 26, 37 (D. Md. 1974)
communications encompassed by attorney-client privilege; LBP-82-82, 16 NRC 1158 (1982)

Calvert Cliffs Coordinating Committee v. Atomic Energy Commission, 449 F.2d 1109, 1119 (D.C. Cir. 1971)
Licensing Board responsibility to develop the record; LBP-82-87, 16 NRC 1199 (1982)

Calvert Cliffs Coordinating Committee, Inc. v. Atomic Energy Commission, 449 F.2d 1109, 1114, 1128 (D.C. Cir. 1971)
evaluation of environmental costs of nuclear power plant construction; LBP-82-92A, 16 NRC 1388 (1982)

Carolina Environmental Study Group v. United States, 510 F.2d 796 (D.C. Cir. 1976)
challenges to regulatory guidance on class 9 accident analysis; ALAB-705, 16 NRC 1736 (1982)

Carolina Environmental Study Group v. United States, 510 F.2d 796, 801 (D.C. Cir. 1975)
standard for objective agency decisionmaking in NEPA cases; LBP-82-99, 16 NRC 1547 (1982)

Carolina Power and Light Company (Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1, 2, 3 and 4), ALAB-577, 11 NRC 18, 23-24, reversed in part of other ground's, CLI-80-12, 11 NRC 514 (1980)
standard for appeal by uninjured party; ALAB-694, 16 NRC 960 (1980)

Carolina Power and Light Company (Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1, 2, 3 and 4), CLI-74-22, 7 AEC 939 (1974)
Commission authority to allow construction activities prior to issuance of construction permit; CLI-82-23, 16 NRC 421 (1982)

Carolina Power and Light Company (Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1, 2, 3, and 4), LBP-78-2, 7 NRC 83 (1978)
jurisdiction of Licensing Board to reopen the record; LBP-82-54, 16 NRC 214 (1982)

Carolina Power and Light Company and North Carolina Eastern Municipal Power Agency (Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2), LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2069, 2075 (1982)
admissibility of track record contention questioning managerial and technical competence of applicant; LBP-82-107A, 16 NRC 1795 (1982)

Cass v. United States, 417 U.S. 72 (1974)
determining intent of regulations; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 62 (1982)

Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.A. v. Occupational Safety and Health Administration, 636 F.2d 464 (D.C. Cir. 1979)
limits on agency prerogatives to interpret policy statements; LBP-82-69, 16 NRC 753 (1982)

Chapman v. Pacific Tel. & Tel. Company, 613 F.2d 193 (9th Cir. 1979)
NRC Staff duty to obey Licensing Board orders; LBP-82-87, 16 NRC 1203 (1982)

Chelsea Neighborhood Ass'ns v. U.S. Postal Service, 516 F.2d 378, 388 (2d Cir. 1975)
consideration of psychological stress issues under NEPA; LBP-82-53, 16 NRC 203 (1982)

Cherry v. Brown-Frazier-Whitney, 528 F.2d 965 (D.C. Cir. 1976)
persistence of applicant in seeking decision on the merits of its construction permit application as cause for dismissal with prejudice; LBP-82-81, 16 NRC 1136 (1982)

Cincinnati Gas and Electric Company, et al. (William H. Zimmer Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1), CLI-82-20, 16 NRC 109 (1982)
receipt of evidence on Staff justification for use of decay heat removal system; LBP-82-100, 16 NRC 1559 (1982)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX CASES

Cincinnati Gas and Electric Company, et al. (William H. Zimmer Nuclear Power Station), LBP-79-22, 10
NRC 213 (1979)
application of 2.714(a) lateness factors to statements of issues offered by a State; LBP-82-103, 16 NRC 1615 (1982)

Cincinnati Gas and Electric Company, et al. (William H. Zimmer Nuclear Power Station), LBP-80-14, 11
NRC 570, 571 (1980)
contention requirement for intervention; LBP-82-74, 16 NRC 985 (1982)

Cincinnati Gas and Electric Company, et al. (William H. Zimmer Nuclear Power Station), LBP-80-14, 11
NRC 570, 574 (1980), appeal dismissed, ALAB-595, 11 NRC 860 (1980)
example of good cause for acceptance of late contention; LBP-82-63, 16 NRC 577 (1982)

Cincinnati Gas and Electric Company, et al. (William H. Zimmer Nuclear Power Station), LBP-80-14, 11
NRC 570, 575 (1980)
showing necessary on other factors when good cause for late intervention is not shown; LBP-82-117B, 16 NRC 2026 (1982)

Cincinnati Gas and Electric Company, et al. (William H. Zimmer Nuclear Power Station), LBP-80-24, 12
NRC 231, 237 (1980)
importance of intervenor's ability to contribute to the record through late-filed contentions
significance of late-filed contention's ability to contribute to the record; LBP-82-91, 16 NRC 1368 (1982)
standards for admitting late-filed TMI contentions; LBP-82-63, 16 NRC 578 (1982)

Cincinnati Gas and Electric Company, et al. (William H. Zimmer Nuclear Power Station), LBP-81-2, 13
NRC 36, 40-41 (1981)
factors considered by Licensing Board before granting summary disposition motion; LBP-82-114, 16 NRC 1912 (1982)

Cincinnati Gas and Electric Company, et al. (William H. Zimmer Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1), LBP-82-47, 15 NRC 1538, 1542 (1982)
use of interpretations of Federal Rules as guidance for interpreting similar NRC rules; LBP-82-82, 16 NRC 1157 (1982)

Cincinnati Gas and Electric Company, et al. (William H. Zimmer Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1), LBP-82-47, 15 NRC 1538, 1545-46 (1982)
objections to discovery requests; LBP-82-82, 16 NRC 1154 (1982)
situations during prehearing examinations calling for protective order; LBP-82-107, 16 NRC 1681 (1982)

Cincinnati Gas and Electric Company, et al. (William H. Zimmer Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1), LBP-82-48, 15 NRC 1602 (1982)
form and contents of emergency planning public information brochures; LBP-82-66, 16 NRC 732 (1982)

Cincinnati Gas and Electric Company, et al. (William H. Zimmer Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1), LBP-82-54, 16 NRC 210 (1982), rev'd. on other grounds, CLI-82-20, 16 NRC 109 (1982)
standards for reopening a record on new issues; LBP-82-117B, 16 NRC 2032 (1982)

Citizens for a Safe Environment v. Atomic Energy Commission, 489 F.2d 1018, 1021 (3d Cir. 1974)
definition of licensing proceeding; LBP-82-107, 16 NRC 1674 (1982)

Citizens to Save Spencer County v. EPA, 600 F.2d 844, 876 (D.C. Cir. 1979)
limits on agency prerogatives to interpret policy statements; LBP-82-69, 16 NRC 753 (1982)

Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company, et al. (Perry Nuclear Power Plant), LBP-81-24, 14 NRC 175, 184 (1981)
use of special prehearing conference to determine admissibility of contentions; LBP-82-108, 16 NRC 1814 (1982)

Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company, et al. (Perry Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-298, 2 NRC 730, 736-737 (1975)
delegation of Licensing Board authority to NRC Staff; LBP-82-68, 16 NRC 748 (1982)

Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company, et al. (Perry Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-443, 6 NRC 741 (1977)
burdens met in Staff's and applicants' statements of material facts regarding ATWS contention; LBP-82-57, 16 NRC 482, 483 (1982)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX CASES

Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company, et al. (Perry Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-443, 6 NRC 741, 748 (1977)
Commission cognizance of activities before other tribunals; LBP-82-117A, 16 NRC 1991 (1982)

Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company, et al. (Perry Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-443, 6 NRC 741, 752 (1977)
Licensing Board responsibility to develop the record; LBP-82-87, 16 NRC 1199 (1982)

Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company, et al. (Perry Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-443, 6 NRC 741, 753-54 (1977)
analogy between summary disposition procedures and Rule 56 of Federal Rules of Civil Procedure;
LBP-82-58, 16 NRC 519-20 (1982)
standard applied in admitting issues to trial; LBP-82-88, 16 NRC 1340 (1982)

Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company, et al. (Perry Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-443, 6 NRC 741, 755 (1977)
circumstances in which summary disposition motion is appropriate; LBP-82-114, 16 NRC 1912 (1982)

Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company, et al. (Perry Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-675, 15 NRC 1105 (1982)
admissibility of hydrogen control contentions; LBP-82-103, 16 NRC 1610 (1982)
circumstances warranting interlocutory Appeal Board review via directed certification; ALAB-706, 16 NRC 1756 (1982)

Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company, et al. (Perry Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-675, 15 NRC 1105, 1113-14 (1982)
interlocutory review to avoid unusual delay; ALAB-687, 16 NRC 464 (1982)

Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company, et al. (Perry Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2), LBP-81-24, 14 NRC 175 (1981) at 181-184
criteria for admissibility of contentions; LBP-82-108, 16 NRC 1821 (1982)

Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company, et al. (Perry Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2), LBP-81-24, 14 NRC 175, 199-200 (1981)
relitigation of issues at operating license stage by intervenors not parties to construction permit proceeding; LBP-81-24, 16 NRC 1087 (1982)

Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company, et al. (Perry Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2), LBP-81-24, 14 NRC 175, 209 (1981)
retention of Board jurisdiction over unresolved safety issues; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2111-12 (1982)

Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company, et al. (Perry Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2), LBP-82-1A, 15 NRC 43 (1982)
consideration of generic safety issues in operating license proceedings; LBP-82-103, 16 NRC 1619 (1982)
Licensing Board authority to decline to hear an issue because it is the subject of a rulemaking;
LBP-82-118, 16 NRC 2038 (1982)

Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company, et al. (Perry Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2), LBP-82-11, 15 NRC 348, 351-52 (1982)
good cause for late filing; LBP-82-53, 16 NRC 200 (1982)

Commissioner v. Sunnen, 333 U.S. 591, 599-600 (1948)
exception to the rule of res judicata; CLI-82-23, 16 NRC 420 (1982)

Commonwealth Edison Company (Byron Nuclear Power Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-659, 14 NRC 983, 985, n.2 (1981)
exception to termination of Licensing Board jurisdiction under 2.718(j); LBP-82-86, 16 NRC 1191 (1982)

Commonwealth Edison Company (Byron Nuclear Power Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-678, 15 NRC 1400 (1982)
consideration of intervenor's status as a petitioner rather than a party in applying sanction for nonappearance; LBP-82-108, 16 NRC 1816 (1982)
determining sanctions to be imposed on NRC Staff; LBP-82-59, 16 NRC 538 (1982)
guidance on rules governing interrogatories; LBP-82-116, 16 NRC 1940 (1982)
imposition of sanctions for party's failure to comply with prehearing conference order; LBP-82-75, 16 NRC 989-90 (1982)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX CASES

Commonwealth Edison Company (Byron Nuclear Power Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-678, 15 NRC 1400, 1416-20 (1982)
test for determining appropriate sanctions for default; LBP-82-115, 16 NRC 1929 (1982)

Commonwealth Edison Company (Byron Nuclear Power Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-678, 15 NRC 1421, n.39 (1982)
application of NEPA "rule of reason" to applicant's responses to interrogatories; LBP-82-67, 16 NRC 736 (1982)

Commonwealth Edison Company (Dresden Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1), CLI-81-25, 14 NRC 616, 622-23 (1981)
effect of pendency of Board proceedings on NRC Staff's authority to issue immediately effective amendment to construction permit; CLI-82-29, 16 NRC 1231 (1982)

Commonwealth Edison Company (Dresden Nuclear Power Station, Units 2 and 3), ALAB-695, 16 NRC 962 (1982)
Appeal Board task on a sua sponte review; ALAB-698, 16 NRC 1323 (1982)

Commonwealth Edison Company (Zion Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-196, 7 AEC 457, 460 (1974)
adaptation of NRC discovery rules from Federal Rules; LBP-82-82, 16 NRC 1159 (1982)

Commonwealth Edison Company (Zion Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-226, 8 AEC 381, 406 (1974)
intervenor objection to Board refusal to rewrite its contention; LBP-82-106, 16 NRC 1660 (1982)

Conservation Society of Southern Vermont v. Secretary of Transportation, 531 F.2d 637 (2d Cir. 1976)
conditions allowing segmentation of major federal actions; CLI-82-23, 16 NRC 424 (1982)

Consolidated Edison Company of New York, Inc. (Indian Point, Unit 2), CLI-81-1, 13 NRC 1, 5 n.4 (1981)
basis for considering risk of operating TMI-1; ALAB-705, 16 NRC 740, 748, 753 (1982) (1982)

Consolidated Edison Company of New York, Inc. (Indian Point, Unit 2), CLI-81-23, 14 NRC 610 (1981)
basis for considering risk of operating TMI-1; ALAB-705, 16 NRC 1740 (1982)

Consolidated Edison Company of New York, Inc. (Indian Point, Unit 2), CLI-81-23, 14 NRC 610, 612 (1981)
application of new policy approach on TMI issues; ALAB-705, 16 NRC 1740, 1747 (1982)

Consolidated Edison Company of New York, Inc. (Indian Point, Units 1 and 2) and Power Authority of the State of New York (Indian Point, Unit 3), DD-80-5, 11 NRC 351 (1980)
ability of NRC Staff to discharge its responsibility to consider 2.206 petitions; CLI-82-29, 16 NRC 1229 (1982)
use of 2.206 procedures to protect late intervention petitioner's interests; ALAB-707, 16 NRC 1768 (1982)

Consolidated Edison Company of New York, Inc. (Indian Point, Units 1, 2 and 3), ALAB-304, 3 NRC 1 (1976)
allegations of future harm from decontamination of other reactors not a basis for standing; LBP-82-52, 16 NRC 185 (1982)

Consolidated Edison Company of New York, Inc. (Indian Point, Units 1, 2 and 3), ALAB-304, 3 NRC 1, 6 (1976)
role of NRC Staff; LBP-82-87, 16 NRC 1200 (1982)

Consolidated Edison Company of New York, Inc. (Indian Point, Units 1, 2 and 3), ALAB-319, 3 NRC 188 (1976)
NRC Staff responsibility for health and safety findings; LBP-82-100, 16 NRC 1556 (1982)

Consolidated Edison Company of New York, Inc. (Indian Point, Units 1, 2 and 3), ALAB-319, 3 NRC 188, 190 (1976)
limitation on matters to be resolved in operating license proceedings; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1086 (1982)

Consolidated Edison Company of New York, Inc. (Indian Point, Units 1-3), CLI-75-8, 2 NRC 173, 177 (1975)
showing required for reopening a record; DD-82-13, 16 NRC 2127 (1982)
use of 2.206 procedures as a vehicle for reconsideration of previously decided issues; DD-82-13, 16 NRC 2119 (1982)

Consumers Power Company (Big Rock Point Nuclear Plant), ALAB-636, 13 NRC 312 (1981)
need for discussion of alternatives to spent fuel pool expansion at Big Rock Point; LBP-82-78, 16 NRC 1109, 1111 (1982)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX CASES

need to consider continued plant operation resulting from grant of license amendment; LBP-82-52, 16 NRC 194 (1982)

Consumers Power Company (Big Rock Point Nuclear Plant), ALAB-636, 13 NRC 312, note 2 (1981)
when amicus participation is allowed; ALAB-679, 16 NRC 126 (1982)

Consumers Power Company (Big Rock Point Plant), LBP-82-60, 16 NRC 540, 545-46 (1982)
form and contents of emergency planning public information brochures; LBP-82-66, 16 NRC 732 (1982)

Consumers Power Company (Midland Plant, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-33, 4 AEC 701 (1971)
disclosure of material protected by executive privilege; LBP-82-82, 16 NRC 1163 (1982)

Consumers Power Company (Midland Plant, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-60, 5 AEC 261 (1972)
preclusion of consideration of fuel cycle contentions; LBP-82-118, 16 NRC 2038 (1982)

Consumers Power Company (Midland Plant, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-235, 8 AEC 645 (1974)
exception to termination of Licensing Board jurisdiction under 2.718(j); LBP-82-86, 16 NRC 1191 (1982)

Consumers Power Company (Midland Plant, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-235, 8 AEC 645, 646 (1974)
time for filing objections to nonfinal decisions; LBP-82-72, 16 NRC 971 (1982)

Consumers Power Company (Midland Plant, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-270, 1 NRC 473, 476 (1975)
failure of intervenor to support its assertions on appeal; ALAB-693, 16 NRC 955 (1982)

Consumers Power Company (Midland Plant, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-282, 2 NRC 9, 10 n.1 (1975)
necessity for filing exceptions; ALAB-694, 16 NRC 959-60 (1982)

Consumers Power Company (Midland Plant, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-315, 3 NRC 101 (1976)
exception to rule placing burden of proof on proponent of show cause order; LBP-82-64, 16 NRC 655 (1982)

potential for delay in Commission-ordered remedy for construction deficiencies at Zimmer; CLI-82-33, 16 NRC 1501 (1982)

Consumers Power Company (Midland Plant, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-382, 5 NRC 603 (1977)
propriety of calling independent experts as Board witnesses; LBP-82-55, 16 NRC 277 (1982)

Consumers Power Company (Midland Plant, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-382, 5 NRC 603, 606 (1977)
circumstances in which directed certification is warranted; LBP-82-62, 16 NRC 567 (1982)

Consumers Power Company (Midland Plant, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-382, 5 NRC 603, 608 (1977)
discretion of Licensing Board to use independent experts as witnesses; LBP-82-55, 16 NRC 270 (1982)

Consumers Power Company (Midland Plant, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-395, 5 NRC 772, 779 (1977)
time for evaluating environmental costs of nuclear power plant construction; LBP-82-92A, 16 NRC 1388 (1982)

Consumers Power Company (Midland Plant, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-458, 7 NRC 155, 161-63 (1978)
consideration of financial costs in NEPA cost-benefit balance; LBP-82-58, 16 NRC 526 (1982); LBP-82-117A, 16 NRC 1993 (1982)

Consumers Power Company (Midland Plant, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-634, 13 NRC 96, 99 (1981)
appeal board authority to decline Licensing Board referrals; ALAB-687, 16 NRC 464 (1982)

Consumers Power Company (Midland Plant, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-674, 15 NRC 1101 (1982)
consideration of sunk costs at operating license stage; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2088 (1982)
jurisdiction of Operating License Board to consider sufficiency of quality assurance at Seabrook; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1069 (1982)

Consumers Power Company (Midland Plant, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-674, 15 NRC 1101, 1102-03 (1982)
limitation on matters to be resolved in operating license proceedings; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1086 (1982)
proper forum for resolution of supplemental cooling water system issues; DD-82-13, 16 NRC 2127 (1982)

Consumers Power Company (Midland Plant, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-691, 16 NRC 897 (1982)
censure of counsel for blanket assertions of privilege; LBP-82-82, 16 NRC 1154 (1982)

Consumers Power Company (Midland Plant, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-691, 16 NRC 897, 906-07 (1982)
standard for consideration of issues raised for first time on appeal; ALAB-693, 16 NRC 956 (1982)

Consumers Power Company (Midland Plant, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-691, 16 NRC 897, 908 (1982)
scope of appellate sua sponte review; ALAB-696, 16 NRC 1262 (1982)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX CASES

Consumers Power Company (Midland Plant, Units 1 and 2), CLI-73-38, 6 AEC 1082, 1083 (1973)
use of less drastic measures to resolve construction deficiencies at Zimmer; CLI-82-33, 16 NRC 1500 (1982)

Consumers Power Company (Midland Plant, Units 1 and 2), CLI-74-5, 7 AEC 19, 32 n.27 (1974), rev'd sub nom. Aeschliman v. NRC, 547 F.2d 622 (D.C. Cir. 1976), rev'd sub nom. Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corp. v. Natural Resources Defense Counsel, 435 U.S. 519, 553-54 (1978)
admissibility of contentions not alleging noncompliance with a specified regulation; LBP-82-106, 16 NRC 1655 (1982)

Consumers Power Company (Midland Plant, Units 1 and 2), LBP-78-27, 8 NRC 275 (1978)
practices and membership policies of intervenor groups; CLI-82-15, 16 NRC 32-33 (1982)

Consumers Power Company (Midland Plant, Units 1 and 2), LBP-82-63, 16 NRC 571, 577, 586 (1982)
applicability of good cause factor to admissibility of late-filed petitions for intervention and late-filed contentions; LBP-82-91, 16 NRC 1367, 1368 (1982)

Consumers Power Company (Palisades Nuclear Power Facility), ALJ-80-1, 12 NRC 117, 121-26 (1980)
application of Exemption 5 of Freedom of Information Act to intragovernmental communications; LBP-82-82, 16 NRC 1163 (1982)

Consumers Power Company (Palisades Nuclear Power Facility), ALJ-80-1, 12 NRC 117, 127-28 (1980)
waiver of claims of executive privilege by participation as a litigant; LBP-82-82, 16 NRC 1164 (1982)

Consumers Power Company (Palisades Nuclear Power Facility), LBP-79-20, 10 NRC 108, 113 (1979)
satisfaction of interest test for standing; LBP-82-74, 16 NRC 983 (1982)

Crest Auto Supplies, Inc. v. Ero Manufacturing Company, 360 F.2d 896, 899 (7th Cir. 1966)
favorability in viewing summary disposition motion; LBP-82-58, 16 NRC 519 (1982)

Crete Carrier Corp. v. United States, 577 F.2d 49, 50 (8th Cir. 1978)
use of cross-examination in written form; LBP-82-107, 16 NRC 1675 (1982)

Dairyland Power Cooperative (La Crosse Boiling Water Reactor), DD-80-9, 11 NRC 392 (1980)
ability of NRC Staff to discharge its responsibility to consider 2.206 petitions; CLI-82-29, 16 NRC 1229 (1982)

Dairyland Power Cooperative (La Crosse Boiling Water Reactor), DD-80-9, 11 NRC 392 (1980)
use of 2.206 procedures to protect late intervention petitioner's interests; ALAB-707, 16 NRC 1768 (1982)

Dairyland Power Cooperative (La Crosse Boiling Water Reactor), LBP-80-2, 11 NRC 44 (1980)
need for study of alternatives to spent fuel pool expansion; LBP-82-78, 16 NRC 1108 (1982)

Dairyland Power Cooperative (La Crosse Boiling Water Reactor), LBP-80-2, 11 NRC 44, 47 (1980),
affirmed (in pertinent part), ALAB-617, 12 NRC 430 (1980)
transferral of operating authority; LBP-82-58, 16 NRC 515 (1982)

Dairyland Power Cooperative (La Crosse Boiling Water Reactor), LBP-80-2, 11 NRC 44, 73-77 (1980)
interpretation of the term "available resources"; LBP-82-78, 16 NRC 1112 (1982)

Dairyland Power Cooperative (La Crosse Boiling Water Reactor), LBP-81-7, 13 NRC 257, 264-65 (1981)
potential for delay in Commission-ordered remedy for construction deficiencies at Zimmer; CLI-82-33, 16 NRC 1501 (1982)

Detroit Edison Company (Enrico Fermi Atomic Power Plant, Unit 2), ALAB-470, 7 NRC 473, 475 (1978)
part-ownership of facility as standing to intervene; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1032 (1982)

Detroit Edison Company (Greenwood Energy Center, Units 2 and 3), ALAB-476, 7 NRC 759, 762 (1978)
general principle concerning delay of proceeding by late intervention; LBP-82-92, 16 NRC 1384 (1982)

Detroit Edison Company (Greenwood Energy Center, Units 2 and 3), ALAB-476, 7 NRC 759, 764 (1978)
standard for late intervention petitioner's showing of ability to contribute to a sound record; ALAB-704, 16 NRC 1730 (1982)

Donofrio v. Camp, 470 F.2d 428, 431-32 (D.C. Cir. 1972)
Board authority to grant summary disposition before discovery is completed; ALAB-696, 16 NRC 1263 (1982)

Duke Power Company (Amendment to Materials License SNM-1773 — Transportation of Spent Fuel from Oconee Nuclear Station for Storage at McGuire Nuclear Station), ALAB-528, 9 NRC 146, 150 (1979)
weight given to untimeliness of intervention petition, when lateness is not extreme; LBP-82-74, 16 NRC 985 (1982)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX CASES

Duke Power Company (Amendment to Materials License SNM-1773 — Transportation of Spent Fuel from Oconee Nuclear Station for Storage at McGuire Nuclear Station), ALAB-651, 14 NRC 307, 313 (1981) segmentation of environmental review; DD-82-13, 16 NRC 2119 (1982)

Duke Power Company (Catawba Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-355, 4 NRC 397, 402-05 (1976) Appeal Board deference to Licensing Board judgment in close cases; ALAB-698, 16 NRC 1320 (1982)

Duke Power Company (Catawba Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-355, 4 NRC 397, 413 (1976) disposition of unsupported briefs; ALAB-693, 16 NRC 956 (1982)

Duke Power Company (Catawba Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-355, 4 NRC 397, 413-14 (1976) waiver of inadequately briefed exceptions; ALAB-696, 16 NRC 1255 (1982)

Duke Power Company (Catawba Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-687, 16 NRC 460 (1982) admissibility of contentions based on unavailable information; LBP-82-75, 16 NRC 1008, 1009, 1017 (1982); LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1044, 1055, 1068, 1075, 1079, 1080, 1094 (1982); LBP-82-91, 16 NRC 1367 (1982); LBP-82-106, 16 NRC 1658 (1982) application of specificity requirement to contentions based on unavailable documents; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2071 (1982) conditional admission of contentions not meeting the specificity requirement; LBP-82-98, 16 NRC 1464 (1982) denial of contentions addressing offsite emergency planning issues; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1030 (1982) filing of contentions based on SER and DES; LBP-82-103, 16 NRC 1606 (1982)

Duke Power Company (Catawba Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-687, 16 NRC 460, 465 (1982) appeal board reluctance to certify questions involving scheduling; ALAB-688, 16 NRC 475 (1982)

Duke Power Company (Catawba Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-687, 16 NRC 460, 467 (1982) contravention of hearing rights; LBP-82-87, 16 NRC 1200 (1982)

Duke Power Company (Catawba Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-687, 16 NRC 460, 467 n.12, 468 (1982) Board adherence to Rules of Practice for timely resolution of Commission proceedings; ALAB-696, 16 NRC 1263 (1982)

Duke Power Company (Catawba Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-687, 16 NRC 460, 467-70 (1982) time for raising contentions based on FES; LBP-82-92A, 16 NRC 1389 (1982)

Duke Power Company (Catawba Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-687, 16 NRC 460, 468 n.14 (1982) consideration of cost-benefit balance in FES as new information; LBP-82-95, 16 NRC 1403 (1982)

Duke Power Company (Catawba Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2), LBP-74-5, 7 AEC 82, 93 (1974) relitigation of issues heard at construction permit stage; LBP-82-107A, 16 NRC 1799 (1982)

Duke Power Company (Catawba Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2), LBP-75-34, 1 NRC 626, 642-46 (1975) limitation on considering study bolt scenario for serious accident; LBP-82-107A, 16 NRC 1808 (1982)

Duke Power Company (Catawba Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2), LBP-82-16, 15 NRC 566, 571-72 and n.6 (1982); LBP-82-50, 15 NRC 1746 (1982) circumstances inappropriate for applying five-factor test to late-filed contentions; LBP-82-63, 16 NRC 577 (1982)

Duke Power Company (Catawba Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2), LBP-82-16, 15 NRC 566, 583 (1982) showing required for admission of contention not alleging noncompliance with a specified regulation; LBP-82-106, 16 NRC 1655 (1982)

Duke Power Company (Cherokee Nuclear Station, Units 1, 2 and 3), ALAB-440, 6 NRC 642, 644-45 (1977) consequences of intervenor's failure to file proposed findings of fact; ALAB-691, 16 NRC 907 (1982) good cause standards applied to existing intervenor seeking to adopt withdrawing intervenor's contentions; LBP-82-91, 16 NRC 1369 (1982) lack of justification for untimely intervention; LBP-82-63, 16 NRC 586 (1982)

Duke Power Company (Cherokee Nuclear Station, Units 1, 2 and 3), ALAB-440, 6 NRC 643, 644 (1977) claim of misplaced reliance on another party to represent an intervenor's interests as cause for late intervention; LBP-82-117B, 16 NRC 2027 (1982)

Duke Power Company (Cherokee Nuclear Station, Units 1, 2 and 3), ALAB-478, 7 NRC 772, 773 (1978) necessity for filing exceptions; ALAB-694, 16 NRC 959 (1982)

Duke Power Company (Oconee Nuclear Station, Units 1, 2, and 3), DD-79-6, 9 NRC 661-662 (1979) showing necessary in 2,206 petitions; DD-82-13, 16 NRC 2121 (1982)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX CASES

Duke Power Company (Perkins Nuclear Station, Units 1, 2 and 3), ALAB-431, 6 NRC 460, 462 (1977)
showing necessary on other factors when good cause for late intervention is not shown; LBP-82-117B,
16 NRC 2026 (1982)

Duke Power Company (Perkins Nuclear Station, Units 1, 2 and 3), ALAB-591, 11 NRC 741, 742 n.3 (1980)
Appeal Board declination to decide jurisdictional issues; ALAB-699, 16 NRC 1326 (1982)
Licensing Board authority to reopen a proceeding; ALAB-699, 16 NRC 1327 (1982)

Duke Power Company (Perkins Nuclear Station, Units 1, 2 and 3), ALAB-597, 11 NRC 870 (1980)
subject matter jurisdiction of Licensing Board; LBP-82-86, 16 NRC 1191 (1982)

Duke Power Company (Perkins Nuclear Station, Units 1, 2 and 3), ALAB-597, 11 NRC 870, 873-74 (1980)
Appeal Board declination to decide jurisdictional issues; ALAB-699, 16 NRC 1326 (1982)

Duke Power Company (Perkins Nuclear Station, Units 1, 2 and 3), ALAB-597, 11 NRC 870, 874 n.8 (1980)
time for filing objections to nonfinal decisions; LBP-82-72, 16 NRC 971 (1982)

Duke Power Company (Perkins Nuclear Station, Units 1, 2 and 3), ALAB-615, 12 NRC 350, 352 (1980)
adoption of withdrawing intervenor's contentions by another party; LBP-82-91, 16 NRC 1368 (1982)
showing required of pro se intervenor for admission of late-filed contention; LBP-82-63, 16 NRC 578
(1982)

Duke Power Company (Perkins Nuclear Station, Units 1, 2, and 3), LBP-78-25, 8 NRC 87, 100 (1978)
Appeal Board concurrence with conclusion of; ALAB-650, 14 NRC 909 (1982)
health effects of radon emissions from mining and milling of uranium; ALAB-701, 156 NRC 1519
(1982)

Duke Power Company (William B. McGuire Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-143, 6 AEC 623, 625
(1973)
application of relevance and materiality standards; LBP-82-73, 16 NRC 978 (1982)

Duke Power Company (William B. McGuire Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-669, 15 NRC 453
(1982)
admissibility of hydrogen control contentions; LBP-82-103, 16 NRC 1610 (1982)
scope of hydrogen control issue considered; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1065 (1982)

Duke Power Company (William B. McGuire Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-669, 15 NRC 453, 475
(1982)
standard for qualification of expert witnesses; ALAB-701, 16 NRC 1524 (1982)

Duke Power Company (William B. McGuire Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2), CLI-81-15, 14 NRC 1, 5
(1981)
consideration of hydrogen control issues in manufacturing license proceedings; CLI-82-37, 16 NRC
1695 (1982)

Duke Power Company (William B. McGuire Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2), LBP-73-7, 6 AEC 92, 106-108
(1973)
rejection of stud bolt scenario for serious accident; LBP-82-107A, 16 NRC 1808 (1982)

Duke Power Company (William B. McGuire Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2), LBP-79-13, 9 NRC 489 (1979)
litigation of hydrogen gas control contentions; LBP-82-103, 16 NRC 1609 (1982)

Duke Power Company (William B. McGuire Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2), LBP-81-13, 13 NRC 652, 674
(1981)
reopening operating license proceeding to consider hydrogen control contention; LBP-82-103, 16
NRC 1610 (1982)

Duke Power Company v. Carolina Environmental Study Group, 438 U.S. 59, 74 (1978)
proximity to radioactive source as basis for standing to intervene; ALAB-682, 16 NRC 154 (1982)

Easton Utilities Commission v. AEC, 424 F.2d 847, 852 (D.C. Cir. 1970)
withdrawal of one party as good cause for another intervenor's belated adoption of the withdrawing
party's contentions; LBP-82-91, 16 NRC 1369 (1982)

Eisen v. Carlisle & Jacquelin, 417 U.S. 156, 173-175 (1974)
loss of right to hearing through lack of notice; ALAB-682, 16 NRC 158 (1982)

Energy Reserves Group, Inc. v. Department of Energy, 89 F.2d 1082, 1096 (T.E.C.A. 1978)
limits on agency prerogatives to interpret policy statements; LBP-82-69, 16 NRC 753 (1982)

Environmental Defense Fund v. Corps of Engineers of the United States Army, 470 F.2d 289, 296 (8th Cir.
1972)
standard for objective agency decisionmaking in NEPA cases; LBP-82-99, 16 NRC 1547 (1982)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX CASES

Environmental Defense Fund v. Hoffman, 566 F.2d 1060, 1067 (8th Cir. 1977)
need to consider fuel cycle contribution to radon already in the environment; ALAB-701, 16 NRC 1527 (1982)

Environmental Defense Fund, Inc. v. Hoffman, 566 F.2d 1060, 1071 (8th Cir. 1977)
procedures needed to make serious accident evaluation for operating power reactors; ALAB-705, 16 NRC 1753 (1982)

EPA v. Mink, 410 U.S. 73, 86-87 and n.34 (1973)
application of Exemption 5 of Freedom of Information Act to intragovernmental communications; LBP-82-82, 16 NRC 1163 (1982)

Federal Open Market Committee of the Federal Reserve System v. Merrill, 443 U.S. 340, 360 (1979)
length of time documents shielded by executive privilege remain privileged; LBP-82-82, 16 NRC 1164 (1982)

Federal Power Commission v. Arizona Edison Company, 194 F.2d 679, 683-86 (9th Cir. 1952)
justification for dismissal of intervenor for failure to attend prehearing conference; LBP-82-115, 16 NRC 1935 (1982)

Federal Power Commission v. New England Power Company, 415 U.S. 345 (1974)
NRC authority to require utility-applicants to pay fees for intervenors' consultants; CLI-82-40, 16 NRC 1719 (1982)

Final Rule on Emergency Planning, CLI-80-40, 12 NRC 636, 638 (1980)
Commission reliance on NUREG-0654 for implementing emergency regulations; ALAB-698, 16 NRC 1299 (1982)

Fire Protection for Operating Nuclear Power Plants (10 CFR 50.48), CLI-81-11, 13 NRC 778, 782 n.2 (1981)
methods for meeting regulatory requirements for emergency planning; ALAB-698, 16 NRC 1299 (1982)

Fisher v. United States, 425 U.S. 391, 403-05 (1976)
purpose of attorney-client privilege; LBP-82-82, 16 NRC 1157 (1982)

Florida Power & Light Company (St. Lucie Plant, Unit No. 2), ALAB-661, 14 NRC 1117, 1123 n.15 (1981)
scope of Licensing Board jurisdiction to consider antitrust issues; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2097 (1982)

Florida Power & Light Company (Turkey Point, Units 3 and 4), 4 AEC 9, 11-12, affirmed sub nom. Siegel v. AEC, 400 F.2d 778, 781-84 (D.C. Cir. 1968)
providing design features for particularized threats of sabotage; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 73 (1982)

Florida Power & Light Company (Turkey Point, Units 3 and 4), 4 AEC 9, 12-13 (1967)
standards for safeguarding special nuclear materials; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 76 (1982)

Florida Power & Light Company (Turkey Point, Units 3 and 4), ALAB-660, 14 NRC 987 (1981)
functioning of steam generators in nuclear power plants; ALAB-696, 16 NRC 1250 (1982)

Frito-Lay of Puerto Rico, Inc. v. Canas, 92 F.R.D. 384 (D.P.R. 1981)
specificity required of motion for reconsideration; LBP-82-68, 16 NRC 749 (1982)

FTC v. Texaco, 555 F.2d 867, 881 (D.C. Cir. 1977), cert. denied, 431 U.S. 974 (1977) rehearing denied, 434 U.S. 883 (1977) at 893-94
application of res judicata when agency decision involves substantial policy issues; CLI-82-23, 16 NRC 420 (1982)

FTC v. Texaco, Inc., 377 U.S. 33, 42-44 (1964)
Commission authority to determine means for deciding a particular issue; LBP-82-118, 16 NRC 2038 (1982)

Gage v. United States Atomic Energy Commission, 479 F.2d 1214, 1220 n.19 (D.C. Cir. 1972)
need for hearing on construction activities initiated prior to construction permit issuance; CLI-82-23, 16 NRC 421 (1982)

Georgia Power Company (Alvin W. Vogtle Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2), DD-79-4, 9 NRC 582 (1979)
appropriateness of suspending construction permits for nuclear facilities based on alleged changed circumstances; DD-82-13, 16 NRC 2126 (1982)

Goldberg v. Kelly, 397 U.S. 254, 269 (1970)
tailoring of hearing procedures to competency of a party's legal representatives; LBP-82-107, 16 NRC 1679 (1982)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX CASES

Gordon v. United States, 438 F.2d 858, 875 (5th Cir.), cert. denied 404 U.S. 828 (1971)
scope of informer's privilege; LBP-82-87, 16 NRC 1198 (1982)

Greene County Planning Board v. FPC, 455 F.2d 412, 419 (2nd Cir. 1972)
Licensing Board responsibility to develop the record; LBP-82-87, 16 NRC 1199 (1982)

Gulf States Utilities Company (River Bend Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-183, 7 AEC 222, 228 (1974)
advantage of use of summary disposition rule; LBP-82-58, 16 NRC 519 (1982)

Gulf States Utilities Company (River Bend Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-358, 4 NRC 558 (1976)
effect of change in intervening organization's representation of membership; LBP-82-54, 16 NRC 215
(1982)

Gulf States Utilities Company (River Bend Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-444, 6 NRC 760 (1977)
Board responsibility to consider unresolved generic safety issues in spent fuel pool modification
proceeding; LPB-82-65, 16 NRC 723 (1982)

conditional admission of contentions not meeting the specificity requirement; LBP-82-98, 16 NRC
1464 (1982)

obligations of interested state admitted as full party; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1079 (1982)
place for review of unresolved safety issues; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1043 (1982)

Gulf States Utilities Company (River Bend Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-444, 6 NRC 760, 768 (1977)
application of 2.714(a) lateness of factors to statements of issues offered by a State; LBP-82-103, 16
NRC 1615 (1982)

Gulf States Utilities Company (River Bend Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-444, 6 NRC 760, 771-73 (1977)
failure of station blackout contention to satisfy nexus requirement; LBP-82-63, 16 NRC 591 (1982)

Gulf States Utilities Company (River Bend Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-444, 6 NRC 760, 772-73 (1977)
methods for meeting regulatory requirements for emergency planning; ALAB-698, 16 NRC 1299
(1982)

Gulf States Utilities Company (River Bend Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-444, 6 NRC 760, 773 (1977)
requirement for litigation of generic safety issues; LBP-82-106, 16 NRC 1657 (1982)

validity of a contention based on a generic issue; LBP-82-103, 16 NRC 1608 (1982)

Gulf States Utilities Company (River Bend Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-444, 6 NRC 760, 795-98 (1977)
factors considered in good cause determination for admission of late-filed contentions; LBP-82-91, 16
NRC 1367, 1369 (1982)

Gulf States Utilities Company (River Bend Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-444, 6 NRC 760, 796-98 (1977)
differences between participation as an interested state and as a full party; LBP-82-92, 16 NRC 1381,
1382 (1982)

Hanly v. Kleindienst, 471 F.2d 823, 834 (2d Cir. 1972)
procedures needed to make serious accident evaluation for operating power reactors; ALAB-705, 16
NRC 1753 (1982)

Harrison v. Northern Trust Company, 317 U.S. 476, 479 (1943)
determining intent of regulations; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 62 (1982)

Health Research Group v. Kennedy, 82 F.R.D. 21 (D.D.C. 1979)
intervention by a group having sponsors rather than members; CLI-82-15, 16 NRC 31, 32 (1982)

Hickman v. Taylor, 329 U.S. 495 (1947)
material encompassed by lawyer work product; ALAB-691, 16 NRC 917 (1982)

Hickman v. Taylor, 329 U.S. 495, 508 (1947)
adaptation of NRC discovery rules from Federal Rules; LBP-82-82, 16 NRC 1159 (1982)

Holiday Queen Land Corp. v. Baker, 489 F.2d 1031, 1032 (5th Cir. 1974)
basis for departing from rule of dismissal of applications without prejudice; LBP-82-81, 16 NRC 1135
(1982)

Houston Lighting and Power Company (Allens Creek Nuclear Generating Station), ALAB-635, 13 NRC
309, 310 (1981)
standards for granting discretionary interlocutory review; LBP-82-62, 16 NRC 568 (1982)

Houston Lighting and Power Company (Allens Creek Nuclear Generating Station, Unit 1), ALAB-535, 9
NRC 377 (1979)
failure of organization to comply with requirements for standing; LBP-82-52, 16 NRC 185 (1982)
representational requirement for organization seeking standing to intervene; LBP-82-54, 16 NRC 216
(1982)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX

CASES

Houston Lighting and Power Company (Allens Creek Nuclear Generating Station, Unit 1), ALAB-535, 9
NRC 377, 395-96 & n.25 (1979)
 authority of an organization to represent its members, for purpose of standing to intervene;
 ALAB-700, 16 NRC 1334 (1982)

Houston Lighting and Power Company (Allens Creek Nuclear Generating Station, Unit 1), ALAB-547, 9
NRC 638 (1979)
 appeal board policy concerning enforcement time limits on appeals from Licensing Board proceedings;
 ALAB-684, 16 NRC 165 (1982)

Houston Lighting and Power Company (Allens Creek Nuclear Generating Station, Unit 1), ALAB-565, 10
NRC 521 (1979)
 response by intervenor to applicants' arguments opposing motion to reopen record; LBP-82-54, 16
 NRC 213 (1982)
 responses of intervenors to applicant, Staff, and Board questions; LBP-82-63, 16 NRC 576 (1982)

Houston Lighting and Power Company (Allens Creek Nuclear Generating Station, Unit 1), ALAB-565, 10
NRC 521, 525 (1979)
 responses to motions concerning late-filed contentions; LBP-82-89, 16 NRC 1356 (1982)

Houston Lighting and Power Company (Allens Creek Nuclear Generating Station, Unit 1), ALAB-590, 11
NRC 542 (1980)
 admission of "regulatory gap" contentions; LBP-82-106, 16 NRC 1656 (1982)
 consideration of a contention's merits in determining its admissibility; LBP-82-106, 16 NRC 1654
 (1982)
 consideration of factual evidence in ruling on admissibility of contentions; LBP-82-103, 16 NRC 1607
 (1982)
 exclusion of contention through undercutting of expert witness's credibility; LBP-82-98, 16 NRC 1466
 (1982)
 use of summary disposition procedures; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2071 (1982)

Houston Lighting and Power Company (Allens Creek Nuclear Generating Station, Unit 1), ALAB-590, 11
NRC 542, 546 (1980)
 consideration of intervenor's pro se status in balancing of lateness factors; LBP-82-91, 16 NRC 1368
 (1982)
 consideration of totally deficient brief prepared by layman; ALAB-693, 16 NRC 957 (1982)
 showing required of pro se intervenor for admission of late-filed contention; LBP-82-63, 16 NRC 578
 (1982)

Houston Lighting and Power Company (Allens Creek Nuclear Generating Station, Unit 1), ALAB-590, 11
NRC 542, 547-49 (1980)
 consideration of a contention's merits at the admission stage; LBP-82-118, 16 NRC 2037 (1982)
 resolution of factual questions in considering admissibility of contentions; LBP-82-63, 16 NRC 581,
 583, 587, 588 (1982)

Houston Lighting and Power Company (Allens Creek Nuclear Generating Station, Unit 1), ALAB-590, 11
NRC 542, 549 (1980)
 evaluation of late intervention petitioner's ability to contribute to a sound record; LBP-82-117B, 16
 NRC 2029 (1982)

Houston Lighting and Power Company (Allens Creek Nuclear Generating Station, Unit 1), ALAB-590, 11
NRC 542, 550 (1980)
 rights conferred on a party by its admission to a proceeding; ALAB-696, 16 NRC 1258, 1263 (1982)

Houston Lighting and Power Company (Allens Creek Nuclear Generating Station, Unit 1), ALAB-590, 11
NRC 542, 550-51 (1980)
 encouragement of use of summary disposition procedures; LBP-82-58, 16 NRC 519 (1982)
 use of summary disposition to avoid unnecessary hearings; LBP-82-114, 16 NRC 1911 (1982)

Houston Lighting and Power Company (Allens Creek Nuclear Generating Station, Unit 1), ALAB-590, 11
NRC 542, 551 (1980)
 time for establishing factual support for contentions; LBP-82-116, 16 NRC 1945 (1982)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX CASES

Houston Lighting and Power Company (Allens Creek Nuclear Generating Station, Unit 1), ALAB-671, 15 NRC 508 (1982)
admissibility of contentions dealing with need for power and alternatives to nuclear power plants; LBP-82-103, 16 NRC 1607 (1982)
standards for evaluating new contentions; LBP-82-63, 16 NRC 576 (1982)

Houston Lighting and Power Company (Allens Creek Nuclear Generating Station, Unit 1), ALAB-671, 15 NRC 508, 509 (1982)
application of five-factor test to abandoned contentions being adopted by another intervenor; LBP-82-91, 16 NRC 1367 (1982)

Houston Lighting and Power Company (Allens Creek Nuclear Generating Station, Unit 1), ALAB-671, 15 NRC 508, 511 (1982)
interpretation of delay factor for evaluating late intervention petitions; ALAB-707, 16 NRC 1766 (1982)

Houston Lighting and Power Company (South Texas Project, Units 1 and 2), LBP-81-54, 14 NRC 918, 922-23 & n.4 (1981)
circumstances allowing invocation of Appeal Board's *sua sponte* authority; ALAB-685, 16 NRC 452 (1982)

Houston Lighting and Power Company, et al. (South Texas Project, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-381, 5 NRC 582, 590-91 (1977)
termination of Licensing Board's jurisdiction in each proceeding; ALAB-699, 16 NRC 1326 (1982)

Houston Lighting and Power Company, et al. (South Texas Project, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-608, 12 NRC 168, 170 (1980)
standards for granting discretionary interlocutory review; LBP-82-62, 16 NRC 568 (1982)

Houston Lighting and Power Company, et al. (South Texas Project, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-637, 13 NRC 367, 370 (1981)
standards for granting discretionary interlocutory review; LBP-82-62, 16 NRC 568 (1982)

Houston Lighting and Power Company, et al. (South Texas Project, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-637, 13 NRC 367, 370-71 (1981)
appeal board reluctance to certify questions involving scheduling; ALAB-688, 16 NRC 475 (1982)

Houston Lighting and Power Company, et al. (South Texas Project, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-639, 13 NRC 469, 471, 473-74, 475 n.20, 476, 477, 478 n.26 (1981)
yielding of informer's privilege; LBP-82-59, 16 NRC 537-38 (1982)

Houston Lighting and Power Company, et al. (South Texas Project, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-639, 13 NRC 469, 483 n.6 (1981)
extent of informer's privilege; LBP-82-87, 16 NRC 1202 (1982)

Houston Lighting and Power Company, et al. (South Texas Project, Units 1 and 2), CLI-77-13, 5 NRC 1303, 1305 (1977)
jurisdiction of Licensing Board after issuance of low-power license; LBP-82-92, 16 NRC 1379 (1982)

Houston Lighting and Power Company, et al. (South Texas Project, Units 1 and 2), CLI-80-32, 12 NRC 281 (1980)
denial of operating license because of management incompetence; LBP-82-54, 16 NRC 221, 223 (1982)

Houston Lighting and Power Company, et al. (South Texas Project, Units 1 and 2), LBP-79-27, 10 NRC 563 (1979), affirmed summarily, ALAB-575, 11 NRC 14 (1980)
application of collateral estoppel to relitigation of tourism impact contention; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1081 (1982)

Hunt v. Washington Apple Advertising Commission, 432 U.S. 333, 342-45 (1977)
authority of an organization to represent its members, for purpose of standing to intervene; ALAB-700, 16 NRC 1334 (1982)

Hunt v. Washington State Apple Advertising Commission, 432 U.S. 333 (1977)
ability of intervenor groups to represent their members adequately; CLI-82-15, 16 NRC 32 (1982)

Illinois Power Company (Clinton Power Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-340, 4 NRC 27, 46 (1976)
limitations on benefits to be considered in an operating license cost-benefit balance; LBP-82-95, 16 NRC 1405 (1982)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX CASES

Illinois Power Company (Clinton Power Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-340, 4 NRC 27, 48 (1976)
circumstances requiring cost-benefit balancing for proposed nuclear plant; LBP-82-117A, 16 NRC 1993 (1982)
consideration of financial costs in NEPA cost-benefit balance; LBP-82-58, 16 NRC 526 (1982)

Illinois Power Company (Clinton Power Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-340, 4 NRC 27, 49 (1976)
consideration of effect of taxes in NEPA cost basis analysis; LBP-82-103, 16 NRC 1613 (1982)

Illinois Power Company, et al. (Clinton Power Station, Units 1 and 2), LBP-81-56, 14 NRC 1035 (1981)
severance of consolidated proceedings; DPRM-82-2, 16 NRC 1215 (1982)

In re Fischel, 557 F.2d 209 (9th Cir. 1977)
burden of proof for claim of executive privilege; LBP-82-82, 16 NRC 1153 (1982)

In re Fischel, 557 F.2d 209, 211, 212 (9th Cir. 1977)
communications encompassed by attorney-client privilege; LBP-82-82, 16 NRC 1158 (1982)

In re Grand Jury Subpoena Dated November 8, 1979, 622 F.2d 933, 934 n.1 (6th Cir. 1980)
extent of attorney work product privilege; ALAB-650, 14 NRC 917 (1982)

In re Murphy, 560 F.2d 326, 334, 336 n.20 (8th Cir. 1977)
clarification of attorney work product doctrine; LBP-82-82, 16 NRC 1160, 1161 (1982)

In re Sealed Case, 676 F.2d 793, at 806-807
specificity required of claims of executive privilege; LBP-82-82, 16 NRC 1153 (1982)

In re Walsh, 623 F.2d 489, 494 (7th Cir.), cert. denied sub nom. Walsh v. United States, 449 U.S. 994 (1980)
communications encompassed by attorney-client privilege; LBP-82-82, 16 NRC 1159 (1982)

Indiana and Michigan Electric Company (Donald C. Cook Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-129, 6 AEC 414, 417, 420 (1973)
scope of construction permit proceeding; CLI-82-29, 16 NRC 1226, 1227, 1230 (1982)

Indiana and Michigan Electric Company (Donald C. Cook Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2), CLI-72-75, 5 AEC 13, 14 (1972)
example of good cause for acceptance of late contention; LBP-82-63, 16 NRC 577 (1982)

International Harvester Company v. Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission, 628 F.2d 982, 986 (7th Cir. 1980)
application of res judicata by an administrative agency; CLI-82-23, 16 NRC 420 (1982)

Iowa Electric Light & Power Company (Duane Arnold Energy Center), ALAB-108, 6 AEC 195 (1973)
appeal board policy concerning enforcement time limits on appeals from Licensing Board proceedings; ALAB-684, 16 NRC 165 (1982)

Jack Winter, Inc. v. Koratron Company, Inc., 54 F.R.D. 44, 46 (N.D. Cal. 1971)
communications encompassed by attorney-client privilege; LBP-82-82, 16 NRC 1158 (1982)

Jersey Central Power and Light Company (Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station), ALAB-612, 12 NRC 314 (1980)
extent of Appeal Board sua sponte review authority; ALAB-689, 16 NRC 890 (1982)

Jicarilla Apache Tribe of Indians v. Morton, 47 F.2d 1275, 1280 (9th Cir. 1973)
scope of information concerning environmental impact of a project to be obtained before project initiation; LBP-82-62, 16 NRC 569 (1982)

Jones v. SEC, 298 U.S. 1, 19 (1936)
basis for departing from rule of dismissal of applications without prejudice; LBP-82-81, 16 NRC 1135 (1982)

Jones v. State Board of Education, 397 U.S. 31 (1970)
dismissal of grant of review when parties have already briefed the issues; CLI-82-26, 16 NRC 881 (1982)

Joseph v. U.S. Civil Service Commission, 554 F.2d 1140, 1153 n.24 (D.C. Cir. 1977)
limits on agency prerogatives to interpret policy statements; LBP-82-69, 16 NRC 753 (1982)

Kansas Gas and Electric Company and Kansas City Power and Light Company (Wolf Creek Generating Station, Unit 1), ALAB-462, 7 NRC 320, 338 (1978)
admissibility of contention; LBP-82-53, 16 NRC 199 (1982)
burden of proponent of motion to reopen record; LBP-82-84, 16 NRC 1185 (1982)
responsibility of intervenor requesting that record be reopened; LBP-82-96, 16 NRC 1436 (1982)
showing necessary to reopen a proceeding; ALAB-707, 16 NRC 1765 (1982)
standards for reopening the record; LBP-82-117B, 16 NRC 2031 (1982)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX CASES

Kansas Gas and Electric Company and Kansas City Power and Light Company (Wolf Creek Nuclear Generating Station, Unit 1), ALAB-327, 3 NRC 408, 416-417 (1976)
standards for showing good cause for a protective order; LBP-82-82, 16 NRC 1153 (1982)

Kansas Gas and Electric Company and Kansas City Power and Light Company (Wolf Creek Nuclear Generating Station, Unit No. 1), ALAB-331, 3 NRC 771, 774 & n.5 (1976)
factor determining appealability of an order; ALAB-696, 16 NRC 1256-57 (1982)

Kent Corp. v. NLRB, 530 F.2d 612 (5th Cir.), cert. denied, 429 U.S. 920 (1976)
material encompassed by attorney work product doctrine; LBP-82-82, 16 NRC 1161, 1162 (1982)

Kerr-McGee Corp. (West Chicago Rare Earth Facility), CLI-82-2, 15 NRC 232, 244-46 (1982), petition for review pending sub nom. City of West Chicago v. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, No. 82-1575 (7th Cir., filed April 8, 1982)
requirements for giving notice of materials license actions; ALAB-682, 16 NRC 157 (1982)

Kerr-McGee Corp. (West Chicago Rare Earth Facility), CLI-82-2, 15 NRC 232, 247-62 (1982), petition for review pending sub nom. City of West Chicago v. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, No. 82-1575 (7th Cir., filed April 8, 1982)
type of hearing required for materials licensing action; ALAB-682, 16 NRC 155, 157-59 (1982)

Kleppe v. Sierra Club, 427 U.S. 390 (1976)
conditions allowing segmentation of major federal actions; CLI-82-23, 16 NRC 424 (1982)

Kleppe v. Sierra Club, 427 U.S. 390, 403 et seq. (June 28, 1976)
NEPA consideration of use of spent fuel for nuclear weapons; LBP-82-53, 16 NRC 199 (1982)

Lacey v. Lumber Mutual Fire Insurance Company, 554 F.2d 1204 (1st Cir. 1977)
specificity required of motion for reconsideration; LBP-82-68, 16 NRC 749 (1982)

LeCompte v. Mr. Chip, Inc., 528 F.2d 601, 603-05 (5th Cir. 1976)
Licensing Board discretion to prescribe terms for withdrawal of construction permit application; LBP-82-81, 16 NRC 1134, 1139 (1982)

Lewis v. United States, 445 U.S. 55, 60 (1980)
interpretation of immediate effectiveness regulation; ALAB-686, 16 NRC 456 (1982)

Life of the Land v. Brinegar, 485 F.2d 460 (9th Cir. 1973), cert. denied, 416 U.S. 961 (1974)
need for consideration of alternatives to nuclear power plants; LBP-82-117A, 16 NRC 1992 (1982)

Long Island Lighting Company (Jamesport Nuclear Power Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-292, 2 NRC 631, 648 (1975)
lack of availability of other means to protect late intervention petitioner's interests; ALAB-707, 16 NRC 1767 (1982)

Long Island Lighting Company (Shoreham Nuclear Power Station), ALAB-39, 4 AEC 727 (1971)
Board discretion to conduct hearings outside 10-mile EPZ; CLI-82-15, 16 NRC 37 (1982)

Long Island Lighting Company (Shoreham Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1), ALAB-12, 4 AEC 413 (1970)
bias of Licensing Board member through professional associations; LBP-82-99, 16 NRC 1547 (1982)

Long Island Lighting Company (Shoreham Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1), ALAB-99, 6 AEC 53 (1973)
preclusion of consideration of fuel cycle contentions; LBP-82-118, 16 NRC 2038 (1982)

Long Island Lighting Company (Shoreham Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1), LBP-77-11, 5 NRC 481, 483 (1977)
representation, by an organization, of individuals other than its own members; LBP-82-74, 16 NRC 984 (1982)

Long Island Lighting Company (Shoreham Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1), LBP-82-19, 15 NRC 601 (1982)
lack of basis for litigation of system's interaction contention; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1034 (1982)

Long Island RR Company v. United States, 318 F.Supp. 490, 499 (E.D.N.Y. 1970) 498 F.2d at 723
limitation on method of cross-examination; LBP-82-107, 16 NRC 1676 (1982)

Louisiana Power and Light Company (Waterford Steam Generating Station, Unit No. 3), ALAB-258, 1 NRC 45, 48 n.6 (1975)
appellate review of Licensing Board rulings on economic issues, intervention requests, or procedural matters; ALAB-691, 16 NRC 908 (1982)

extent of Appeal Board sua sponte review authority; ALAB-689, 16 NRC 890 (1982)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX CASES

Louisiana Power and Light Company (Waterford Steam Generating Station, Unit No. 3), ALAB-690, 16 NRC 893 (1982)
 appealability of Licensing Board order authorizing license amendment; ALAB-696, 16 NRC 1256 (1982)

Lower Alloways Creek v. Public Service Electric and Gas Company, 687 F.2d 732 (3d Cir. 1982)
 automatic invocation of EIS process; ALAB-705, 16 NRC 1746 (1982)

Lunn v. United Aircraft Corp., 26 F.R.D. 12, 18 (D.C. Del. 1960)
 liability of plaintiff for defendant's attorney's fees; LBP-82-81, 16 NRC 1142 (1982)

Maine Yankee Atomic Power Company (Maine Yankee Atomic Power Station), ALAB-161, 6 AEC 1003 (1973)
 lack of regulatory requirement for probabilistic risk assessment; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1033, 1050 (1982)

Maine Yankee Atomic Power Company (Maine Yankee Atomic Power Station), ALAB-161, 6 AEC 1003, 1010 (1973)
 burden of applicant regarding safety issues; LBP-82-106, 16 NRC 1654-55 (1982)

Manhattan General Equipment Company v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, 297 U.S. 129, 134-35 (1936)
 preclusion of hearing on germane issues through unlawful procedural requirements; ALAB-687, 16 NRC 469 (1982)

Martin v. Easton Publishing Company, 85 F.R.D. 312, 315 (E.D. Pa. 1980)
 application of NEPA "rule of reason" to applicant's responses to interrogatories; LBP-82-67, 16 NRC 736 (1982)

Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission v. Postal Service, 487 F.2d 1029, 1036-37 (D.C. Cir. 1973)
 evaluation of environmental impact of site preparation activities in context of zoning; CLI-82-23, 16 NRC 427 (1982)

Maxwell v. NLRB, 414 F.2d 477, 479 (6th Cir. 1969)
 application of res judicata when agency decision involves substantial policy issues; CLI-82-23, 16 NRC 420 (1982)

McKenna v. Seaton, 104 U.S. App. D.C. 50, 259 F.2d 780
 Commission discretion in administering its procedural rules; LBP-82-107, 16 NRC 1678 (1982)

Metro Ed. v. PANE, 51 U.S.L.W. 3339 (U.S. Nov. 2, 1982) (No. 81-2399)
 need for supplemental EIS on psychological stress issues related to restart of TMI-1, ALAB-705, 16 NRC 1737 (1982)

Metropolitan Edison Company (Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit No. 1), ALAB-685, 16 NRC 449, 451-52 (1982)
 Appeal Board task on a sua sponte review; ALAB-698, 16 NRC 1323 (1982)

Metropolitan Edison Company (Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit No. 1), CLI-80-16, 11 NRC 674 (1980)
 interpretation of policy statement regarding hydrogen issue in; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1064 (1982)
 need for credible hydrogen generation scenario for admission of contention; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1040, 1050, 1062 (1982)

Metropolitan Edison Company (Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit No. 1), CLI-80-16, 11 NRC 674, 675 (1980)
 proper response to generic challenges to regulations; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 74 (1982)
 criteria for litigating hydrogen control issues in individual licensing proceedings; LBP-82-107A, 16 NRC 1808 (1982)
 litigation of generic issues that are the subject of ongoing rulemaking, in individual licensing proceedings; LBP-82-107A, 16 NRC 1809 (1982)
 litigation of hydrogen gas control contentions; LBP-82-103, 16 NRC 1609 (1982)
 showing required for admission of contention not alleging noncompliance with a specified regulation; LBP-82-106, 16 NRC 1655 (1982)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX CASES

Metropolitan Edison Company (Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit No. 1), CLI-82-12, 16 NRC 1 (1982)
appellate consideration of uncontested safety issues in cases other than operating license applications; ALAB-685, 16 NRC 452 (1982)

Metropolitan Edison Company (Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit No. 1), LBP-80-17, 11 NRC 893 (1980)
guidance on rules governing interrogatories; LBP-82-116, 16 NRC 1940 (1982)

Metropolitan Edison Company (Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit No. 1), LBP-81-59, 14 NRC 1211, 1419 (1981)
delegation of Licensing Board authority to NRC Staff; LBP-82-68, 16 NRC 748 (1982)

Metropolitan Edison Company (Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit No. 1), LBP-81-59, 14 NRC 1211, 1465 (1981)
practical effect of rebuttable presumption with regard to contested FEMA findings; LBP-82-68, 16 NRC 746 (1982)

Metropolitan Edison Company, et al. (Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit No. 1), ALAB-699, 16 NRC 1324 (1982)
Licensing Board jurisdiction to reopen record on issue pending before Appeal Board; LBP-82-111, 16 NRC 1899 (1982)

Metropolitan Edison Company, et al. (Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit No. 2), ALAB-384, 5 NRC 612, 615 (1977)
showing necessary on other factors when good cause for late intervention is not shown; LBP-82-117B, 16 NRC 2026 (1982)

Metropolitan Edison Company, et al. (Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit No. 2), ALAB-486, 8 NRC 9, 46 (1978)
standard applied in deciding whether to allow plant operation during appellate review; ALAB-680, 16 NRC 130 (1982)

Metropolitan Edison Company, et al. (Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit No. 2), CLI-80-13, 11 NRC 519, 531-32 (1980)
potential of excluded radiation dose contention as *sua sponte* issue; LBP-82-79, 16 NRC 1119 (1982)

Michigan Consolidated Gas Company v. FPC, 283 F.2d 204, 226 (D.C. Cir. 1960)
Licensing Board responsibility to develop the record; LBP-82-87, 16 NRC 1199 (1982)

Minnesota v. NRC, 602 F.2d 412 (D.C. Cir. 1979)
objection to rejection of waste confidence contention; LBP-82-51, 16 NRC 172 (1982)

Mississippi Power & Light Company (Grand Gulf Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-704, 16 NRC 1725 (1982)
authorization for license subject to outcome of fuel cycle litigation; LBP-82-118, 16 NRC 2046 (1982)

Mississippi Power & Light Company (Grand Gulf Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-704, 16 NRC 1725, 1730 (1982)
showing necessary to justify late intervention in the absence of good cause; ALAB-707, 16 NRC 1765, 1766 (1982)

Mississippi Power & Light Company v. NRC, 601 F.2d 223 (5th Cir. 1979), cert. denied, 444 U.S. 1102 (1980)
NRC authority to require utility-applicants to pay fees for intervenors' consultants; CLI-82-40, 16 NRC 1718 (1982)

Mississippi Power and Light Company (Grand Gulf Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-130, 6 AEC 423 (1973)
consideration of factual evidence in ruling on admissibility of contentions; LBP-82-103, 16 NRC 1607 (1982)

Mississippi Power and Light Company (Grand Gulf Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-130, 6 AEC 423, 424-25 (1973)
encouragement of use of summary disposition procedures; LBP-82-58, 16 NRC 519 (1982)

Mississippi Power and Light Company (Grand Gulf Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-130, 6 AEC 423, 426 (1973)
evidence required to support a contention in pleading stage; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2071 (1982)
explanation of basis requirement for admission of contentions; LBP-82-116, 16 NRC 1943 (1982)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX CASES

rejection of transmission lines contention; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1085 (1982)
supporting evidence required for admissibility of a contention; LBP-82-106, 16 NRC 1654 (1982)

Moog Industries v. FTC, 355 U.S. 411 (1958)
scope of proceedings on enforcement actions; CLI-82-16, 16 NRC 46 (1982)

Mullane v. Central Hanover Bank and Trust Company, 339 U.S. 306, 314 (1950)
loss of right to hearing through lack of notice; ALAB-682, 16 NRC 158 (1982)

Murel v. Baltimore City Criminal Court, 407 U.S. 355 (1972)
Commission review of Appeal Board decision on operating license amendment improvidently granted; CLI-82-26, 16 NRC 881 (1982)

Mutual Fund Investors Inc. v. Putnam Management Company, 553 F.2d 620, 624 (9th Cir. 1977)
definition of material fact; LBP-82-114, 16 NRC 1911 (1982)

National Cable Television Association, Inc. v. United States, 415 U.S. 336 (1978)
NRC authority to require utility-applicants to pay fees for intervenors' consultants; CLI-82-40, 16 NRC 1718-19 (1982)

National Wildlife Federation, et al. v. Cotter Corp., et al., 646 P.2d 393 (1981)
judicial review of uranium licensing decisions; CLI-82-34, 16 NRC 1506 (1982)

Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc. v. Morton, 458 F.2d 287, 837-838 (D.C. Cir. 1972)
need for consideration of alternatives to nuclear power plants; LBP-82-117A, 16 NRC 1992 (1982)

Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc. v. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, 547 F.2d 633 (D.C. Cir. 1976), rev'd sub nom. **Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corp. v. Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc.**, 435 U.S. 519, 548-49 (1978)
revisions to S-3 rule; ALAB-704, 16 NRC 1728 (1982)
challenges to fuel cycle rule; LBP-82-118, 16 NRC 2045 (1982)
effect of S-3 rule; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2084 (1982)
failure of intervenor's contention to present "novel question of policy or law"; LBP-82-62, 16 NRC 569 (1982)
reliance on Table S-3 to evaluate environmental effects of uranium fuel cycle; LBP-82-107A, 16 NRC 1806 (1982)
use of decision as basis for late-filed radiation dose contention; LBP-82-79, 16 NRC 1117 (1982)

Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc. v. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, 685 F.2d 459 (D.C. Cir. 1982), cert. granted, 51 U.S.L.W. 3419 (Nov. 29, 1982) (No. 82-545, 1982 Term)
exclusion of nuclear fuel cycle contentions from licensing proceedings; ALAB-704, 16 NRC 1727 (1982)

Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc. v. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, 685 F.2d 459, 467 (D.C. Cir. 1982)
invalidation of Table S-3 Rule; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1076 (1982)

Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc. v. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Civil Action No. 74-1586 (April 27, 1982)
admissibility of waste disposal contention; LBP-82-53, 16 NRC 205 (1982)

New England Patriots Football Club, Inc. v. University of Colorado, 592 F.2d 1196 (1st Cir. 1979)
distinction between *amicus curiae* and traditional party; ALAB-679, 16 NRC 126 (1982)

New England Power Company, et al. (NEP, Units 1 and 2), LBP-78-9, 7 NRC 271, 279 (1978)
review and amendment of Staff EIS; LBP-82-78, 16 NRC 1111 (1982)

New York State Energy Research and Development Agency v. Nuclear Fuel Services, Inc., CIV-81-18E (W.D.N.Y. Oct. 16, 1981), rev'd, No. 81-7736 (2d Cir., Dec. 8, 1981)
responsibility for waste disposal facility; ALAB-679, 16 NRC 124 (1982)

Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation (Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station, Unit 2), ALAB-264, 1 NRC 347, 352-69 (1975)
rule applicable to cases involving changes in need for power forecasts; LBP-82-81, 16 NRC 1138 (1982)

Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation (Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station, Unit 2), ALAB-264, 1 NRC 347, 373 n.91 (1975)
extent of Appeal Board *sua sponte* review authority; ALAB-689, 16 NRC 890 (1982)

NLRB v. Bell Aerospace Company 416 U.S. 267, 293 (1974)
Commission authority to determine means for deciding a particular issue; LBP-82-118, 16 NRC 2038 (1982)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX CASES

NLRB v. Grace Company, 184 F.2d 126, 129
Commission discretion in administering its procedural rules; LBP-82-107, 16 NRC 1678 (1982)

NLRB v. Monsanto Chemical Company, 205 F.2d 763, 764
Commission discretion in administering its procedural rules; LBP-82-107, 16 NRC 1678 (1982)

NLRB v. Sears, 421 U.S. 132, 149, n.16 (1975)
equities to be considered in civil discovery cases which are not considered in FOIA cases; LBP-82-82, 16 NRC 1163 (1982)

NLRB v. Union Nacional De Trabajadores, 611 F.2d 926, 928 n.1 (1st Cir. 1979)
respect to be accorded a Licensing Board; LBP-82-115, 16 NRC 1931 (1982)

North Alabama Express, Inc. v. United States, 585 F.2d 783, 789 (5th Cir. 1978)
loss of right to hearing through lack of notice; ALAB-682, 16 NRC 158 (1982)

Northern Indiana Public Service Company (Bailly Generating Station, Nuclear-1), ALAB-204, 7 AEC 835, 838 (1974)
code for judging lawyer conduct in NRC proceedings; ALAB-691, 16 NRC 916 (1982)

Northern Indiana Public Service Company (Bailly Generating Station, Nuclear-1), ALAB-224, 8 AEC 244 (1974)
tailoring choice of sanctions to mitigate harm caused by defaulting party; LBP-82-115, 16 NRC 1934 (1982)

Northern Indiana Public Service Company (Bailly Generating Station, Nuclear-1), ALAB-619, 12 NRC 558 (1980)
use of 2.206 procedures to protect late intervention petitioner's interests; ALAB-707, 16 NRC 1768 (1982)

Northern Indiana Public Service Company (Bailly Generating Station, Nuclear-1), ALAB-619, 12 NRC 558 (1980) at 565
scope of license amendment proceeding; LBP-82-108, 16 NRC 1818 (1982)

Northern Indiana Public Service Company (Bailly Generating Station, Nuclear-1), ALAB-619, 12 NRC 558, 573 n.18 (1980)
consideration of site suitability issues in construction permit extension proceeding; CLI-82-29, 16 NRC 1226, 1227 (1982)

Northern Indiana Public Service Company (Bailly Generating Station, Nuclear-1), CLI-79-11, 10 NRC 733, 737 (1979), remanded on other grounds, *State of Illinois v. NRC*, 661 F.2d 253 (D.C. Cir. 1981)
amendment of construction permits; DD-82-1207

Northern States Power Company (Monticello Nuclear Generating Plant, Unit 1), ALAB-10, 4 AEC 390, 399 (1970)
referral to Appeal Board of ruling compelling disclosure of informants' identities; LBP-82-87, 16 NRC 1202 (1982)

Northern States Power Company (Monticello Nuclear Generating Plant, Unit 1), ALAB-611, 12 NRC 301, 304, 309 (1980)
Appeal Board authority to retain jurisdiction over radon issue; ALAB-691, 16 NRC 909 (1982)

Northern States Power Company (Monticello Nuclear Generating Plant, Unit 1), ALAB-611, 12 NRC 301, 304, 309-13 (1980)
extent of Appeal Board *sua sponte* review authority; ALAB-689, 16 NRC 890-91 (1982)

Northern States Power Company (Prairie Island Nuclear Generating Plant, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-107, 6 AEC 188 (1973), affirmed CLI-73-12, 6 AEC 241 (1973), affirmed sub nom. *BPI v. AEC*, 502 F.2d 424 (D.C. Cir. 1974)
timing of discovery on contentions; ALAB-687, 16 NRC 467 (1982)

Northern States Power Company (Prairie Island Nuclear Generating Plant, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-244, 8 AEC 857, 862 (1974)
consideration of financial costs in NEPA cost-benefit balance; LBP-82-58, 16 NRC 526 (1982)
extent of NRC regulatory authority over applicant's business judgments; LBP-82-117A, 16 NRC 1994 (1982)

Northern States Power Company (Prairie Island Nuclear Generating Plant, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-244, 8 AEC 857, 864, reconsideration denied, ALAB-252, 8 AEC 1175 (1974), aff'd, CLI-75-1, 1 NRC 1 (1975)
consequences of intervenor's failure to file proposed findings of fact; ALAB-691, 16 NRC 906 (1982)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX CASES

Northern States Power Company (Prairie Island Nuclear Generating Plant, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-252, 8
AEC 1175, 1177, affirmed, CLI-75-1, 1 NRC 1 (1975)
necessity for filing exceptions; ALAB-694, 16 NRC 960 (1982)

Northern States Power Company (Prairie Island Nuclear Generating Plant, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-288, 2
NRC 390, 393 (1975)
effect of change in intervenor's residence; LBP-82-54, 16 NRC 216 (1982)

Northern States Power Company (Prairie Island Nuclear Generating Plant, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-343, 4
NRC 169 (1976)
functioning of steam generators in nuclear power plants; ALAB-696, 16 NRC 1250 (1982)

Northern States Power Company (Prairie Island Nuclear Generating Plant, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-455, 7
NRC 41 (1978)
denial of license on basis of environmental uncertainties raised by intervenors in NRC proceedings;
LBP-82-117A, 16 NRC 1992 (1982)

Northern States Power Company (Prairie Island Nuclear Generating Plant, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-455, 7
NRC 41, 44 (1978), remanded on other grounds sub nom. Minnesota v. Nuclear Regulatory
Commission, 602 F.2d 412 (D.C. Cir. 1979)
findings on NEPA compliance to be made by Director prior to issuance of operating license;
ALAB-693, 16 NRC 956 (1982)

Northern States Power Company (Prairie Island Nuclear Generating Plant, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-455, 7
NRC 41, 48 (1978)
showing required to warrant consideration of alleged adverse environmental effects of plant operation;
LBP-82-58, 16 NRC 526 (1982)

Northern States Power Company (Prairie Island Nuclear Generating Plant, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-455, 7
NRC 41, 51 (1978), remanded on other grounds sub nom. Minnesota v. Nuclear Regulatory
Commission, 602 F.2d 412 (D.C. Cir. 1979)
binding nature of Commission policy statement; ALAB-704, 16 NRC 1732 (1982)

Northern States Power Company (Prairie Island Nuclear Generating Plant, Units 1 and 2), CLI-73-12, 6
AEC 241, 242 (1973), aff'd sub nom. BPI v. AEC, 502 F.2d 424 (D.C. Cir. 1974)
encouragement of use of summary disposition procedures; LBP-82-58, 16 NRC 519 (1982)

Northern States Power Company et al. (Tyrone Energy Park, Unit 1), ALAB-464, 7 NRC 372, 374 n.4
(1978)
Appeal Board declination to decide jurisdictional issues; ALAB-699, 16 NRC 1326 (1982)
Licensing Board jurisdiction to consider motion to reopen record received after Licensing Board's final
decision; LBP-82-86, 16 NRC 1191 (1982)

Nothdurft v. Ross, 104 Misc.2d 898 (N.Y. Sup. Ct. 1980), aff'd 445 N.Y.S.2d 222 (N.Y. App. Div. 1981)
lack of jurisdiction to address motives of legislator in enacting statute; LBP-82-72, 16 NRC 970 (1981)

NRDC v. Morton, 458 F.2d 827, 835, 837-38 (D.C. Cir. 1972)
consideration of remote and speculative environmental effects in licensing a facility; LBP-82-117A, 16
NRC 1992 (1982); LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2085 (1982)

NRDC v. Morton, 458 F.2d 827, 837-38 (D.C. Cir. 1972)
need to evaluate environmental impact of remote and speculative possibilities; ALAB-705, 16 NRC
1744 (1982)

NRDC v. NRC, 581 F.2d 166 (2d Cir. 1978)
need for suspension of licensing proceedings pending outcome of waste confidence proceeding;
ALAB-704, 16 NRC 1731 (1982)

NRDC v. NRC, 685 F.2d 459 (D.C. Cir. 1982)
consideration of challenges to Table S-3 in operating license proceedings; LBP-82-92, 16 NRC 1377,
1385 (1982)

disposition of motion raising Table S-3 issues; LBP-82-100, 16 NRC 1556 (1982)
treatment of S-3 table; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2090-91 (1982)

Nuclear Engineering Company, Inc. (Sheffield, Illinois, Low-Level Radioactive Waste Disposal Site),
ALAB-606, 12 NRC 156, 159-60 (1980)
acceptance of untimely appeals; ALAB-684, 16 NRC 165 (1982)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX CASES

Nuclear Engineering Company, Inc. (Sheffield, Illinois, Low-Level Radioactive Waste Disposal Site), ALAB-606, 12 NRC 156, 160 (1980)
 test of "finality" for appeal purposes; ALAB-690, 16 NRC 894 (1972)

Nuclear Fuel Services, Inc. and New York State Atomic and Space Development Authority (West Valley Reprocessing Plant), CLI-75-4, 1 NRC 273, 275 (1975)
 factors evaluated in accepting untimely contentions; ALAB-687, 16 NRC 470 (1982); LBP-82-117B, 16 NRC 2026 (1982)

Nuclear Fuel Services, Inc. and New York State Atomic and Space Development Authority (West Valley Reprocessing Plant), CLI-75-4, 1 NRC 273, 275, 276 (1975)
 acceptance of late contention where "good cause" factor has not been demonstrated; LBP-82-63, 16 NRC 577 (1982); LBP-82-91, 16 NRC 1367-68 (1982)

Nuclear Regulatory Commission (Licensees Authorized to Possess . . . Special Nuclear Materials), CLI-77-3, 5 NRC 16, 20 (1977)
 use of less drastic measures to resolve construction deficiencies at Zimmer; CLI-82-33, 16 NRC 1500 (1982)

O'Brien v. Board of Education of City School District of City of New York, 86 F.R.D. 548, 549 (S.D.N.Y. 1980)
 relevance of document's author to document's status as privileged; LBP-82-82, 16 NRC 1158 (1982)

Office of Communication of United Church of Christ v. FCC, 359 F.2d 994, 1005-06 (D.C. Cir. 1966)
 showing required for admission of contention not alleging noncompliance with a specified regulation; LBP-82-106, 16 NRC 1655 (1982)

Offshore Power Systems (Floating Nuclear Power Plants), ALAB-489, 8 NRC 194, 209 (1978)
 special circumstances allowing for discussion of Class 9 accidents; ALAB-705, 16 NRC 1748 (1982)

Offshore Power Systems (Floating Nuclear Power Plants), ALAB-489, 8 NRC 194, 210 n.52 (1978)
 guidance followed by NRC Staff and adjudicatory boards on class 9 accident analysis; ALAB-705, 16 NRC 1736 (1982)

Offshore Power Systems (Floating Nuclear Power Plants), ALAB-489, 8 NRC 194, 210-11, 214-18 (1978)
 class 9 accident analysis in individual cases; ALAB-705, 16 NRC 1746 (1982)

Offshore Power Systems (Floating Nuclear Power Plants), ALAB-517, 9 NRC 8, 11 (1979)
 standards for granting discretionary interlocutory review; LBP-82-62, 16 NRC 568 (1982)

Offshore Power Systems (Floating Nuclear Power Plants), CLI-79-9, 10 NRC 257 (1979)
 special circumstances allowing for discussion of Class 9 accidents; ALAB-705, 16 NRC 1748 (1982)

Offshore Power Systems (Floating Nuclear Power Plants), CLI-79-9, 10 NRC 257, 258-59 (1979)
 origin and meaning of Class 9 accident concept; ALAB-705, 16 NRC 1735 (1982)

Offshore Power Systems (Manufacturing License for Floating Nuclear Power Plants), ALAB-689, 16 NRC 887, 890-91 & n.4 (1982)
 finality of initial decision; ALAB-693, 16 NRC 954 (1982); ALAB-699, 16 NRC 1326 (1982)

Offshore Power Systems (Manufacturing License for Floating Nuclear Power Plants), ALAB-689, 16 NRC 887, 890-91 (1982)
 sua sponte review of Licensing Board decisions; ALAB-694, 16 NRC 960 (1980); ALAB-696, 16 NRC 1262 (1982)

Ohio-Sealy Mattress Manufacturing Company v. Kaplan, 90 F.R.D. 21, 28 (N.D. Ill. 1980)
 communications encompassed by attorney-client privilege; LBP-82-82, 16 NRC 1157, 1159 (1982)

Pacific Gas & Electric Company (Stanislaus Nuclear Project, Unit No. 1), LBP-77-45, 6 NRC 159, 163 (1977)
 showing necessary by party opposing summary disposition motion; LBP-82-114, 16 NRC 1912 (1982)

Pacific Gas and Electric Company (Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 1), CLI-81-30, 14 NRC 950, 956-57 (1981)
 procedure for obtaining public views on entity chosen to conduct review at Zimmer; CLI-82-40, 16 NRC 1719 (1982)

Pacific Gas and Electric Company (Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-410, 5 NRC 1398, 1401-02 (1977)
 test to be applied to request for release of protected information; LBP-82-80, 16 NRC 1124 (1982)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX CASES

Pacific Gas and Electric Company (Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-410, 5 NRC 1398, 1405 (1977)
burden for demonstrating credentials of a witness; LBP-82-51, 16 NRC 176 (1982)

Pacific Gas and Electric Company (Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-504, 8 NRC 406, 410 (1978)
circumstances in which directed certification is warranted; LBP-82-62, 16 NRC 567 (1982)

Pacific Gas and Electric Company (Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-580, 11 NRC 227 (1980)
assurance of proper implementation of emergency plan; LBP-82-66, 16 NRC 732 (1982)

Pacific Gas and Electric Company (Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-583, 11 NRC 447, 448 (1980)
claim of misplaced reliance on another party to represent an intervenor's interests as cause for late intervention; LBP-82-117B, 16 NRC 2027 (1982)

Pacific Gas and Electric Company (Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-592, 11 NRC 746 (1980)
guidelines for release of security plans to intervenors; LBP-82-80, 16 NRC 1124 (1982)
guidelines for release of security plans to intervenors; LBP-82-80, 16 NRC 1124 (1982)

Pacific Gas and Electric Company (Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-598, 11 NRC 876 (1980)
assumption of jurisdiction over seismic issues by Appeal Board; LBP-82-86, 16 NRC 1192 (1982)

Pacific Gas and Electric Company (Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-598, 11 NRC 876, 878-79 (1980)
jurisdiction to rule on a motion to reopen; ALAB-699, 16 NRC 1327 (1982)

Pacific Gas and Electric Company (Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-598, 11 NRC 876, 879 (1980)
standards for reopening the record; LBP-82-117B, 16 NRC 2031 (1982)

Pacific Gas and Electric Company (Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-644, 13 NRC 903 (1981)
basis for determining horizontal ground acceleration at GE test reactor site; LBP-82-64, 16 NRC 680 (1982)
propriety of calling independent experts as Board witnesses; LBP-82-55, 16 NRC 277 (1982)

Pacific Gas and Electric Company (Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-644, 13 NRC 903, 937 (1981)
demonstration of validity of regulatory guidance; ALAB-698, 16 NRC 1299 (1982)

Pacific Gas and Electric Company (Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-644, 13 NRC 903, 996 (1981)
Appeal Board task on a sua sponte review; ALAB-698, 16 NRC 1323 (1982)

Pacific Gas and Electric Company (Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2), CLI-81-5, 13 NRC 361 (1981)
standards to be satisfied by party moving to reopen a record; CLI-82-39, 16 NRC 1715 (1982)

Pacific Gas and Electric Company (Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2), CLI-81-5, 13 NRC 361, 362 (1981)
need for separate hearing on low-power and full-power licenses; CLI-82-39, 16 NRC 1715 (1982)

Pacific Gas and Electric Company (Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2), CLI-81-5, 13 NRC 361, 362-63 (1981)
responsibility of intervenor requesting that record be reopened; LBP-82-96, 16 NRC 1436 (1982)

Pacific Gas and Electric Company (Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2), CLI-81-5, 13 NRC 361, 364-65 (1981)
showing necessary to reopen a proceeding; ALAB-707, 16 NRC 1765 (1982)

Pacific Gas and Electric Company (Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2), CLI-81-6, 13 NRC 443 (1981)
proper forum for resolution of supplemental cooling water system issues; DD-82-13, 16 NRC 2127 (1982)

Pacific Gas and Electric Company (Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2), CLI-81-6, 13 NRC 443 (1981)
responsibility of adjudicatory boards to determine necessity for serious accident analysis; ALAB-705, 16 NRC 1747 (1982)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX CASES

Pacific Gas and Electric Company (Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2), CLI-82-1, 15 NRC 225 (1982)
type of withheld information constituting material false statement; ALAB-691, 16 NRC 913 (1982)

Pacific Gas and Electric Company (Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2), CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 53 (1982)
publication of restricted document; LBP-82-80, 16 NRC 1123 (1982)

Pacific Gas and Electric Company (Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2), LBP-78-19, 7 NRC 989, 1026 (1978)
synergistic effects of routine radioactive releases from Waterford plant; LBP-82-100, 16 NRC 1571 (1982)

Pacific Gas and Electric Company (Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2), LBP-81-27, 14 NRC 325, 331 (1981)
lack of specificity of systems interaction contention; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1034 (1982)

Pennsylvania Power and Light Company (Susquehanna Steam Electric Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-693, 16 NRC 952 (1982)
consequence of intervenor's failure to brief exceptions; ALAB-696, 16 NRC 1255 (1982)

Pennsylvania Power and Light Company and Allegheny Electric Cooperative, Inc. (Susquehanna Steam Electric Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-563, 10 NRC 449, 450 n.1 (1979)
standard for appellate briefs of pro se intervenors; ALAB-693, 16 NRC 956 (1956)

Pennsylvania Power and Light Company and Allegheny Electric Cooperative, Inc. (Susquehanna Steam Electric Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-593, 11 NRC 761, 762 (1980)
standards for granting discretionary interlocutory review; LBP-82-62, 16 NRC 568 (1982)

Pennsylvania Power and Light Company and Allegheny Electric Cooperative, Inc. (Susquehanna Steam Electric Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-613, 12 NRC 317 (1980)
guidance on rules governing interrogatories; LBP-82-116, 16 NRC 1940 (1982)

Pennsylvania Power and Light Company and Allegheny Electric Cooperative, Inc. (Susquehanna Steam Electric Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-613, 12 NRC 317, 323 (1980)
limitations on discovery against NRC Staff; LBP-82-99, 16 NRC 1544 (1982)

Pennsylvania Power and Light Company and Allegheny Electric Cooperative, Inc. (Susquehanna Steam Electric Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-613, 12 NRC 317, 340 (1980)
failure of contention's proponent to respond to summary disposition motion; LBP-82-58, 16 NRC 520 (1982)
intervenor's responsibility to provide basis for contested issue; ALAB-697, 16 NRC 1271 (1982)

Pennsylvania Power and Light Company and Allegheny Electric Cooperative, Inc. (Susquehanna Steam Electric Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-641, 13 NRC 550, 551 (1981)
standards for granting discretionary interlocutory review; LBP-82-62, 16 NRC 568 (1982)

Pennsylvania Power and Light Company and Allegheny Electric Cooperative, Inc. (Susquehanna Steam Electric Station, Units 1 and 2), LBP-79-6, 9 NRC 291, 297-98 (1979)
standing of petitioners in license application proceeding to litigate issues related to distant uranium mines; LBP-82-52, 16 NRC 192 (1982)

Pennsylvania Power and Light Company and Allegheny Electric Cooperative, Inc. (Susquehanna Steam Electric Station, Units 1 and 2), LBP-81-8, 13 NRC 335, 337 (1981), directed certification denied, ALAB-641, 13 NRC 550 (1981)
favorability in viewing summary disposition motion; LBP-82-58, 16 NRC 519 (1982)

People Against Nuclear Energy v. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, 678 F.2d 222 (D.C. Cir. 1982)
consideration of effects of psychological stress on emergency communications/notification personnel; LBP-82-75, 16 NRC 1013 (1982)
interpretation of; LBP-82-69, 16 NRC 752 (1982)
litigation of psychological stress contentions; LBP-82-53, 16 NRC 202 (1982)
preparation of supplemental EIS on psychological health effects of operation of TMI; CLI-82-13, 16 NRC 21 (1982)
withdrawal of psychological stress contention; LBP-82-103, 16 NRC 1611 (1982)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX CASES

People Against Nuclear Energy v. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, 678 F.2d 222 (D.C. Cir.), cert. granted sub nom. Metro. Ed. v. People Against Nuclear Energy, 51 U.S.L.W. 3339 (U.S. Nov. 2, 1982) characterization of neighboring populations for purpose of considering class 9 accidents; ALAB-705, 16 NRC 1750 (1982)

People Against Nuclear Energy v. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, 678 F.2d 222, 231 n.14, 245-47 (D.C. Cir. 1982) need for further environmental analysis prior to restart of TMI-1; ALAB-705, 16 NRC 1737, 1744 (1982)

People Against Nuclear Energy v. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, 678 F.2d 222, 233-34 (D.C. Cir. 1982) petition for cert. filed, 51 U.S.L.W. 3006 (U.S. July 1, 1982) submission of psychological stress contention based on; LBP-82-71, 16 NRC 966 (1982)

Permian Basin Area Rate Cases, 29 FPC 588 (1963) cross-examination of witnesses by deposition; LBP-82-107, 16 NRC 1676 (1982)

Petition for Emergency and Remedial Action, CLI-78-6, 7 NRC 400, 406-07 (1978) demonstration of compliance with regulatory requirements; ALAB-698, 16 NRC 1299 (1982)

Petition for Emergency and Remedial Action, CLI-78-6, 7 NRC 400, 418 (1978) applicant/licensee obligation to provide accurate and timely information in NRC proceeding; ALAB-691, 16 NRC 910 (1982)

Petition for Emergency and Remedial Action, CLI-80-21, 11 NRC 707 (1980) failure of applicant to comply with regulations on environmental qualification of electrical equipment; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2091 (1982)

Petition for Emergency and Remedial Action, CLI-80-21, 11 NRC 707 (1980) admission of contentions on equipment qualification testing; LBP-82-63, 16 NRC 585 (1982) lessons of TMI not incorporated; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1048 (1982)

Petition for Emergency and Remedial Action, CLI-80-21, 11 NRC 707, 711 (1980) requirements for environmental qualification of safety-related electrical equipment; LBP-82-106, 16 NRC 1657 (1982)

Petition of Sunflower Coalition, CLI-81-13, 13 NRC 847 (1981) failure of Colorado radiation control program to comply with UMTRCA; CLI-82-34, 16 NRC 1507 (1982)

Petition of Sunflower Coalition, CLI-81-13, 13 NRC 847, 858 (1981) adequacy of means to enforce Colorado uranium mill tailings regulations; CLI-82-34, 16 NRC 1506 (1982)

Philadelphia Electric Company (Fulton Generating Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-657, 14 NRC 967, 973, 974-79 (1981) guidelines for determining whether withdrawal of construction permit application should be with or without prejudice; LBP-82-81, 16 NRC 1131, 1134 (1982)

Philadelphia Electric Company (Limerick Generating Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-262, 1 NRC 163, 205-06 (1975) elimination of license condition; LBP-82-117A, 16 NRC 1994 (1982)

Philadelphia Electric Company (Limerick Generating Station, Units 1 and 2), LBP-74-44, 7 AEC 1098 (1974) consideration of environmental disadvantages in cost-benefit balancing; LBP-82-117A, 16 NRC 1994 (1982)

Philadelphia Electric Company (Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station, Units 2 and 3), ALAB-216, 8 AEC 13 (1974) rejection of transmission lines contention; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1085 (1982)

Philadelphia Electric Company (Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station, Units 2 and 3), ALAB-216, 8 AEC 13, 20 (1974) conditions for admission of safety contentions; LBP-82-106, 16 NRC 1655 (1982) purpose of basis with specificity requirement for admission of contentions; LBP-82-106, 16 NRC 1655 (1982)

purpose of specificity requirement for admissibility of contentions; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2070 (1982)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX CASES

Philadelphia Electric Company (Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station, Units 2 and 3), ALAB-216, 8 AEC 13, 20-21 (1974)
rejection of contentions attacking statutory requirements; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1035 (1982)

Philadelphia Electric Company (Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station, Units 2 and 3), ALAB-640, 13 NRC 487 (1981)
appellate review of record in; ALAB-691, 16 NRC 909 (1982)
assessment of health effects of radon emissions during the fuel cycle; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2099 (1982)
standing of petitioners in license application proceeding to litigate issues related to distant uranium mines; LBP-82-52, 16 NRC 192 (1982)

Philadelphia Electric Company (Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station, Units 2 and 3), ALAB-640, 13 NRC 487, 547 (1981)
synergistic effects of routine radioactive releases from Waterford plant; LBP-82-100, 16 NRC 1571 (1982)

Philadelphia Electric Company (Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station, Units 2 and 3) ALAB-640, 13 NRC 487, 496 (1981)
consideration of health effects of radon decay products; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2085 (1982)

Philadelphia Electric Company (Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station, Units 2 and 3) ALAB-480, 7 NRC 796 (1978)
assessment of health effects of radon emissions during the fuel cycle; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2099 (1982)

Pickus v. United States Board of Parole, 507 F.2d 1107 (D.C. Cir. 1974)
limits on agency prerogatives to interpret policy statements; LBP-82-69, 16 NRC 753 (1982)

Poller v. Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc., 368 U.S. 464, 473 (1962)
favorability in viewing summary disposition motion; LBP-82-58, 16 NRC 519 (1982)

Porter County Chapter of the Izaak Walton League of America, Inc. v. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, 606 F.2d 1363, 1369-70 (D.C. Cir. 1979)
use of 2.206 procedures to protect late intervention petitioner's interests; ALAB-707, 16 NRC 1768 (1982)

Porter County Chapter of the Izaak Walton League v. AEC, 533 F.2d 1011 (7th Cir.), cert. denied, 429 U.S. 858 (1976)
challenges to regulatory guidance on class 9 accident analysis; ALAB-705, 16 NRC 1736 (1982)

Portland General Electric Company, et al. (Pebble Springs Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2), CLI-76-27, 4 NRC 610 (1976)
discretionary intervention by petitioners without a valid contention; LBP-82-52, 16 NRC 194 (1982)

Portland General Electric Company, et al. (Pebble Springs Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2), CLI-76-27, 4 NRC 610, 613-14 (1976)
criteria for standing to intervene in construction permit proceeding; ALAB-700, 16 NRC 1333 (1982)
establishing interest under the Atomic Energy Act for standing to intervene; ALAB-682, 16 NRC 155 (1982)

Portland General Electric Company, et al. (Pebble Springs Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2), CLI-76-27, 4 NRC 610, 613-14 (1976)
intervention as a matter of right; LBP-82-74, 16 NRC 983 (1982)

Portland General Electric Company, et al. (Pebble Springs Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2), CLI-76-27, 4 NRC 610, 616 (1976)
right to discretionary hearing on enforcement action; CLI-82-16, 16 NRC 46 (1982)

Portland General Electric Company, et al. (Pebble Springs Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2), CLI-76-27, 4 NRC 610, 617 (1976)
importance of intervenor's ability to contribute to record through late-filed contention; LBP-82-63, 16 NRC 577 (1982)
significance of late-filed contention's ability to contribute to the record; LBP-82-91, 16 NRC 1368 (1982)

Portland General Electric Company, et al. (Trojan Nuclear Plant), ALAB-531, 9 NRC 263, 266 (1979)
interpretation of the term "available resources"; LBP-82-78, 16 NRC 1111-12 (1982)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX CASES

Potomac Alliance v. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, 682 F.2d 1030 (D.C. Cir. 1982)
need for suspension of licensing proceedings pending outcome of waste confidence proceeding;
ALAB-704, 16 NRC 1731 (1982)

Potomac Electric Power Company (Douglas Point Nuclear Generating Station), ALAB-218, 8 AEC 79 (1974)
litigability of ATWS contentions; LBP-82-118, 16 NRC 2037 (1982)

Potomac Electric Power Company (Douglas Point Nuclear Generating Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-218, 8 AEC 79, 85 (1974)
acceptance of contentions that are the subject of rulemaking; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1036 (1982)
extent of consideration of ATWS issues; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2107 (1982)

Power Authority of the State of New York (Greene County Nuclear Power Plant), LBP-79-8, 9 NRC 339, 340 (1976)
factors considered by Licensing Board before granting summary disposition motion; LBP-82-114, 16 NRC 1912 (1982)

Power Reactor Development Corp. v. Electrical Union, 367 U.S. 396, 404 (1961)
applicant's entitlement to a license on showing of compliance with rules; LBP-82-116, 16 NRC 1946 (1982)

Project Management Corporation (Clinch River Breeder Reactor Plant), ALAB-326, 3 NRC 406 (1976)
certification on the basis of Licensing Board rejection of contentions; LBP-82-106, 16 NRC 1653 (1982)

Project Management Corporation (Clinch River Breeder Reactor Plant), ALAB-354, 4 NRC 383, 384 (1976)
showing necessary on other factors when good cause for late intervention is not shown; LBP-82-117B, 16 NRC 2026 (1982)

Public Service Company of Indiana, Inc. (Marble Hill Nuclear Generating Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-339, 4 NRC 20, 48 (1976)
circumstances requiring cost-benefit balancing for proposed nuclear plant; LBP-82-117A, 16 NRC 1993 (1982)

Public Service Company of Indiana, Inc. (Marble Hill Nuclear Generating Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-405, 5 NRC 1190, 1191 (1977)
appeal board authority to decline Licensing Board referrals; ALAB-687, 16 NRC 464 (1982)

Public Service Company of Indiana, Inc. (Marble Hill Nuclear Generating Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-405, 5 NRC 1190, 1192 (1977)
circumstances in which an Appeal Board will take interlocutory review; LBP-82-106, 16 NRC 1653 (1982)
standards for granting discretionary interlocutory review; LBP-82-62, 16 NRC 568 (1982)

Public Service Company of Indiana, Inc. (Marble Hill Nuclear Generating Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-459, 7 NRC 179, 188 (1978)
appeal board reluctance to certify questions involving scheduling; ALAB-688, 16 NRC 475 (1982)
reversal of Licensing Board's scheduling rulings; ALAB-696, 16 NRC 1260 (1982)

Public Service Company of Indiana, Inc. (Marble Hill Nuclear Generating Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-459, 7 NRC 179, 202 (1978)
necessity for filing exceptions; ALAB-694, 16 NRC 959 (1982)

Public Service Company of Indiana, Inc. (Marble Hill Nuclear Generating Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-461, 7 NRC 313, 315 (1978)
waiver of inadequately briefed exceptions; ALAB-696, 16 NRC 1255 (1982)

Public Service Company of Indiana, Inc. (Marble Hill Nuclear Generating Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-461, 7 NRC 313, 318 (1978)
delegation of Licensing Board authority to NRC Staff; LBP-82-68, 16 NRC 748 (1982)

Public Service Company of Indiana, Inc. (Marble Hill Nuclear Generating Station, Units 1 and 2), CLI-80-10, 11 NRC 438 (1980)
use of NRC resources for public hearings; LBP-82-54, 16 NRC 215 (1982)

Public Service Company of Indiana, Inc. (Marble Hill Nuclear Generating Station, Units 1 and 2), CLI-80-10, 11 NRC 438, 439 (1980)
criteria for admission of interested state as full party; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1079 (1982)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX CASES

Public Service Company of Indiana, Inc. (Marble Hill Nuclear Generating Station, Units 1 and 2),
CLI-80-10, 11 NRC 438, 443 (1980)
showing necessary in 2.206 petitions; DD-82-13, 16 NRC 2121 (1982)

Public Service Company of Indiana, Inc. (Marble Hill Nuclear Generating Station, Units 1 and 2),
CLI-80-10, 11 NRC 438, at 441-42 (1980)
scope of proceedings on enforcement actions; CLI-82-16, 16 NRC 45 (1982)

Public Service Company of Indiana, Inc., and Wabash Valley Power Association, Inc. (Marble Hill Nuclear Generating Station, Units 1 and 2), DD-79-10, 10 NRC at 129 (1979)
appropriateness of suspending construction permits for nuclear facilities based on alleged changed circumstances; DD-82-13, 16 NRC 2126 (1982)

Public Service Company of Indiana, Inc., and Wabash Valley Power Association, Inc. (Marble Hill Nuclear Generating Station, Units 1 and 2), DD-79-17, 10 NRC 613, 614-615 (1979)
showing necessary in 2.206 petitions; DD-82-13, 16 NRC 2121 (1982)

Public Service Company of New Hampshire, et al. (Seabrook Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-271, 1 NRC 478, 482 (1975)
relief for intervenors following denial of certification of contentions; LBP-82-51, 16 NRC 171 (1982)

Public Service Company of New Hampshire, et al. (Seabrook Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-271, 1 NRC 478, 482-83 (1975)
petition for directed certification of unpublished order; ALAB-688, 16 NRC 473 (1982)

Public Service Company of New Hampshire, et al. (Seabrook Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-349, 4 NRC 235, 271 (1976)
construction halted because of invalidity of cost-benefit analysis; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1076 (1982)

Public Service Company of New Hampshire, et al. (Seabrook Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-422, 6 NRC 33, 41 (1977)
burden of explanation of Board rulings; LBP-82-60A, 16 NRC 557 (1982)

Public Service Company of New Hampshire, et al. (Seabrook Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-471, 7 NRC 477, 479 (1978)
consideration of local economic effects in cost-benefit analysis; LBP-82-53, 16 NRC 204 (1982)

Public Service Company of New Hampshire, et al. (Seabrook Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-667, 15 NRC 421 (1982)
propriety of calling independent experts as Board witnesses; LBP-82-55, 16 NRC 277 (1982)

Public Service Company of New Hampshire, et al. (Seabrook Station, Units 1 and 2), CLI-76-17, 4 NRC 451, 462 (1976)
role of NRC Staff; LBP-82-87, 16 NRC 1200 (1982)

Public Service Company of New Hampshire, et al. (Seabrook Station, Units 1 and 2), CLI-77-8, 5 NRC 503, 516-17 (1977)
Commission authority to provide guidance on admissibility of contentions before Licensing Boards; CLI-82-15, 16 NRC 34 (1982)

Public Service Company of New Hampshire, et al. (Seabrook Station, Units 1 and 2), CLI-77-8, 5 NRC 503, 534 (1977)
consideration of "sunk costs" in operating license cost-benefit balance; LBP-82-63, 16 NRC 587 (1982)

consideration of sunk costs in an operating license cost-benefit balance; LBP-82-95, 16 NRC 1404 (1982)

factoring of environmental effects of effluent pH into NEPA cost-benefit analysis; LBP-82-107A, 16 NRC 1799 (1982)

Public Service Company of New Hampshire, et al. (Seabrook Station, Units 1 and 2), CLI-78-1, 7 NRC 1, 18 (1978)
interpretation of the term "reasonable assurance"; LBP-82-66, 16 NRC 732 (1982)

Public Service Company of New Hampshire, et al. (Seabrook Station, Units 1 and 2), CLI-78-1, 7 NRC 1, 24 (1978)
Licensing Board avoidance of pointless litigation; LBP-82-72, 16 NRC 970 (1982)

Public Service Company of New Hampshire, et al. (Seabrook Station, Units 1 and 2), CLI-78-14, 7 NRC 952, 958 at fn. 5 (1978)
Commission cognizance of activities before other tribunals; LBP-82-117A, 16 NRC 1991 (1982)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX

CASES

Public Service Company of New Hampshire, et al. (Seabrook Station, Units 1 and 2), CLI-78-14, 7 NRC 952, 959-60 (1978)
time for evaluating environmental costs of nuclear power plant construction; LBP-82-92A, 16 NRC 1388 (1982)

Public Service Company of New Hampshire, et al. (Seabrook Station, Units 1 and 2), LBP-74-36, 7 AEC 877, 878-79 (1974)
use of Federal Rules in application of 10 CFR 2.749; LBP-82-58, 16 NRC 519 (1982)

Public Service Company of New Hampshire, et al. (Seabrook Station, Units 1 and 2), LBP-76-26, 3 NRC 857, 881-82 (1976)
application of collateral estoppel to relitigation of tourism impact contention; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1081 (1982)

Public Service Company of Oklahoma, et al. (Black Fox Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-370, 5 NRC 131 (1977)
treatment of interlocutory appeal as motion for reconsideration; LBP-82-106, 16 NRC 1653 (1982)

Public Service Company of Oklahoma, et al. (Black Fox Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-573, 10 NRC 775, 778 (1979)
activities allowed under limited work authorization; ALAB-688, 16 NRC 473 (1982)

Public Service Company of Oklahoma, et al. (Black Fox Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-573, 10 NRC 775, 779 (1979)
context for considering accidents in DES analysis; LBP-82-107A, 16 NRC 1798 (1982)

Public Service Company of Oklahoma, et al. (Black Fox Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-573, 10 NRC 775, 787 (1979)
disposition of unsupported briefs; ALAB-693, 16 NRC 956 (1982)

Public Service Company of Oklahoma, et al. (Black Fox Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-573, 10 NRC 775, 789 (1979)
grounds for defense of Licensing Board decision; ALAB-650, 14 NRC 908 (1982)

Public Service Company of Oklahoma, et al. (Black Fox Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-573, 10 NRC 775, 804 (1979)
admissibility of contention; LBP-82-53, 16 NRC 199 (1982)

Public Service Company of Oklahoma, et al. (Black Fox Station, Units 1 and 2), CLI-80-8, 11 NRC 433, 434-35 (1980)
exceptional cases warranting consideration of class 9 accidents; ALAB-705, 16 NRC 1736 (1982)

Public Service Company of Oklahoma, et al. (Black Fox Station, Units 1 and 2), CLI-80-31, 12 NRC 264 (1980)
estimation of risks from radiation resulting from normal nuclear power plant operation; LBP-82-57, 16 NRC 501 (1982)

Public Service Company of Oklahoma, et al. (Black Fox Station, Units 1 and 2), CLI-81-31, 12 NRC 264 (1980)
admissibility of contention asserting need to include health effects in NEPA cost-benefit analysis; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2076 (1982)

Public Service Company of Oklahoma, et al. (Black Fox Station, Units 1 and 2), LBP-78-26, 8 NRC 102 (1978)
use of U.S. Army Corps of Engineers witnesses as Board-appointed experts; LBP-82-55, 16 NRC 277 (1982)

Public Service Company of Oklahoma, et al. (Black Fox Station, Units 1 and 2), LBP-78-26, 8 NRC 102, 120 (1978) aff'd ALAB-573, 10 NRC 775 (1979)
test for considering environmental uncertainties in licensing proceeding; LBP-82-117A, 16 NRC 1992 (1982)

Public Service Electric and Gas Company, et al. (Hope Creek Generating Station, Units 1 and 2), LBP-78-15, 7 NRC 642, 674 ff. (1978) aff'd, ALAB-518, 9 NRC 14 (1979)
Commission guidance sought on Licensing Board treatment of testimony on risks; LBP-82-61, 16 NRC 563 (1982)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX CASES

Public Service Electric and Gas Company, et al. (Salem Nuclear Generating Station, Unit 1), ALAB-588, 11 NRC 533, 536 (1980)
circumstances warranting interlocutory Appeal Board review via directed certification; ALAB-706, 16 NRC 1756 (1982)
standard to be met by request for directed certification; ALAB-688, 16 NRC 474 (1982)
standards for granting discretionary interlocutory review; LBP-82-62, 16 NRC 568 (1982)

Public Service Electric and Gas Company, et al. (Salem Nuclear Generating Station, Unit 1), ALAB-650, 14 NRC 43, 49 (1981)
Board standard for considering issues raised for the first time on appeal; ALAB-680, 16 NRC 143 (1982)
standard for considering issues raised for first time on appeal; ALAB-650, 14 NRC 907 (1981)

Public Service Electric and Gas Company, et al. (Salem Nuclear Generating Station, Unit 1), ALAB-650, 14 NRC 43, 49 n.6 (1981)
appeal board right to review any issues contested before a Licensing Board; ALAB-685, 16 NRC 452 (1982)

Public Service Electric and Gas Company, et al. (Salem Nuclear Generating Station, Unit 1), ALAB-650, 14 NRC 43, 49, 50 n.7 (1981)
contents of briefs on appeal; ALAB-693, 16 NRC 956 (1982)

Public Service Electric and Gas Company, et al. (Salem Nuclear Generating Station, Unit 1), ALAB-650, 14 NRC 43, 68-69 (1981)
litigability of waste confidence contentions; LBP-82-51, 16 NRC 172 (1982)

Public Service Electric and Gas Company, et al. (Salem Nuclear Generating Station, Unit 1), ALAB-650, 14 NRC 43, 69 (1981)
preclusion of litigation of waste disposal issues; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2102 (1982)

Public Service Electric and Gas Company, et al. (Salem Nuclear Generating Station, Unit 1), ALAB-650, 14 NRC 43, 49-51 (1981), aff'd sub nom. Township of Lower Alloways Creek v. Public Service Electric and Gas Company, 687 F.2d 732 (3rd Cir. 1982)
waiver of inadequately briefed exceptions; ALAB-696, 16 NRC 1255 (1982)

Public Service Electric and Gas Company, et al. (Salem Nuclear Generating Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-136, 6 AEC 487, 489 (1973)
consideration of intervenor's pro se status in balancing of lateness factors; LBP-82-91, 16 NRC 1368 (1982)
consideration of totally deficient brief prepared by layman; ALAB-693, 16 NRC 957 (1982)
showing required of pro se intervenor for admission of late-filed contention; LBP-82-63, 16 NRC 578 (1982)

Puerto Rico Electric Power Authority (North Coast Nuclear Plant, Unit 1), ALAB-662, 14 NRC 1125, 1135 n.11, 1136-37 (1981)
guidelines for determining whether withdrawal of construction permit application should be with or without prejudice; LBP-82-81, 16 NRC 1131, 1134, 1138 (1982)

Puget Sound Power and Light Company, et al. (Skagit Nuclear Power Project, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-552, 10 NRC 1, 9 (1979)
reliance on erroneous information as cause for late intervention; LBP-82-117B, 16 NRC 2029 (1982)

Puget Sound Power and Light Company, et al. (Skagit Nuclear Power Project, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-559, 10 NRC 162, 172-73 (1979), vacated as moot CLI-80-34, 12 NRC 407 (1980)
claim of misplaced reliance on another party to represent an intervenor's interests as cause for late intervention; LBP-82-117B, 16 NRC 2027 (1982)

Puget Sound Power and Light Company, et al. (Skagit Nuclear Power Project, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-572, 10 NRC 693, 694 (1979)
standards for granting discretionary interlocutory review; LBP-82-62, 16 NRC 568 (1982)

Randolph v. Collectramatic, Inc., 590 F.2d 844, 848 (10th Cir. 1979)
standard for qualification of expert witnesses; ALAB-701, 16 NRC 1524 (1982)

Rivera v. Patino, 524 F.Supp. 136 (N. Dis. Calif., July 9, 1981)
limits on agency prerogatives to interpret policy statements; LBP-82-69, 16 NRC 753 (1982)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX CASES

RKO General, Inc. v. Federal Communications Commission, 670 F.2d 215, 229 (D.C. Cir. 1981), cert. denied, 102 S.Ct. 1974, 2931 (1982)
conduct expected of attorneys in NRC proceedings; ALBA-650, 14 NRC 919 (1982)

Rochester Gas and Electric Corporation (R. E. Ginna Nuclear Power Plant), DD-82-3, 15 NRC 1348 (1982)
remedy for petitioner proffering issues unrelated to license amendment; LBP-82-108, 16 NRC 1820 (1982)

Rochester Gas and Electric Corporation, et al. (Sterling Power Project, Nuclear Unit No. 1), ALAB-596, 11 NRC 867 (1980)
remanding of case based on record that no longer represents case's actual situation; CLI-82-26, 16 NRC 881 (1982)
vacation of unreviewed judgments because of mootness; CLI-82-18, 16 NRC 51 (1982)

Rombough v. Federal Aviation Administration, 594 F.2d 893, 900 (2d Cir. 1979)
standard for determining bias on part of NRC Staff consultant; LBP-82-99, 16 NRC 1548 (1982)

Roviaro v. United States, 353 U.S. 53, 60-61 (1957)
yielding of informer's privilege; LBP-82-59, 16 NRC 538 (1982)

Sacramento Municipal Utility District (Rancho Seco Nuclear Generating Station), ALAB-655, 14 NRC 799, 803 (1981)
scope of *sua sponte* review of final disposition of Licensing Board decision; ALAB-691, 16 NRC 908 (1982)
sua sponte review of unopposed decision to authorize manufacturing license for nuclear power reactors; ALAB-686, 16 NRC 455 (1982)

Sacramento Municipal Utility District (Rancho Seco Nuclear Generating Station), ALAB-655, 14 NRC 799, 803-04, 817 (1981)
nature of cases subject to *sua sponte* review by Appeal Board; ALAB-689, 16 NRC 890-91 (1982)

Sacramento Municipal Utility District (Rancho Seco Nuclear Generating Station), ALAB-655, 14 NRC 799, 816 (1981)
acceptance of contentions that are the subject of rulemaking; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1036 (1982)
litigation of generic issues that are the subject of ongoing rulemaking, in individual licensing proceedings; LBP-82-107A, 16 NRC 1809 (1982)

Sacramento Municipal Utility District (Rancho Seco Nuclear Generating Station), ALAB-703, 16 NRC 1533 (1982)
use of hot leg vents to remove steam during small-break LOCAs; ALAB-708, 16 NRC 1780 (1982)

Scenic Hudson Preservation Conference v. Federal Power Commission, 354 F.2d 608, 620 (2d Cir. 1965)
appropriateness of Board questions on admitted contentions; LBP-82-117, 16 NRC 1961 (1982)
Licensing Board responsibility to develop the record; LBP-82-87, 16 NRC 1199 (1982)

Scientists' Institute for Public Information v. Atomic Energy Commission, 481 F.2d 1079, 1092 (D.C. Cir. 1973)
standard for determining environmental effects of a proposed agency action; LBP-82-100, 16 NRC 1571 (1982); LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2085 (1982)

SCM Corp. v. Xerox Corp., 70 F.R.D. 508 (D. Conn.), interlocutory appeal dismissed, 534 F.2d 1031 (2d Cir. 1976)
communications encompassed by attorney-client privilege; LBP-82-82, 16 NRC 1158 (1982)

Sec. & Exch. Comm'n v. Spence & Green Chemical Company, 612 F.2d 896, 901 (5th Cir. 1980), cert. denied, 449 U.S. 1082 (1981)
Board authority to grant summary disposition before discovery is completed; ALAB-696, 16 NRC 1263 (1982)

Sedco International v. Cory, 81-2007; 81-2056 (8th Cir. August 2, 1982)
purpose of attorney-client privilege; LBP-82-82, 16 NRC 1159 (1982)

Sholly v. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, 651 F.2d 780 (D.C. Cir. 1980) (per curiam), cert. granted, 451 U.S. 1016 (1981)
need for separate hearing on low-power and full-power licenses; CLI-82-39, 16 NRC 1715 (1982)

Sholly v. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, 651 F.2d 780 (D.C. Cir.), cert. granted, 451 U.S. 1016 (1981)
preclusion of procedural modifications that would foreclose a party's contentions; CLI-82-23, 16 NRC 422 (1982)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX CASES

Sholly v. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, 651 F.2d 780, 787 n.20 (D.C. Cir. 1980), rehearing en banc denied, 651 F.2d 792, cert. granted, 101 S. Ct. 3004 (1981)
loss of right to hearing through lack of notice; ALAB-682, 16 NRC 158 (1982)

Siegel v. Atomic Energy Commission, 400 F.2d 778, 784 (D.C. Cir. 1968)
examples of common defense and security standards; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 76 (1982)

Siegel v. Atomic Energy Commission, 400 F.2d 778, 785 (D.C. Cir. 1968)
definition of licensing proceeding; LBP-82-107, 16 NRC 1674 (1982)

Sierra Club v. Froehlke, 534 F.2d 1289 (8th Cir. 1976)
conditions allowing segmentation of major federal actions; CLI-82-23, 16 NRC 424 (1982)

Sierra Club v. Morton, 405 U.S. 727 (1972)
standing of petitioner in decontamination proceeding to litigate related waste disposal issues; LBP-82-52, 16 NRC 191 (1982)

Sierra Club v. Morton, 405 U.S. 727, 739 (1972)
demonstration of an organization's standing as a representative of its members' interest; ALAB-700, 16 NRC 1334 (1982)

Sierra Club v. Morton, 405 U.S. 727, 939, 940 (1972)
satisfaction of interest test for standing; LBP-82-74, 16 NRC 983 (1982)

Smith v. FTC, 403 F.Supp. 1000, 1015, n.45 (D. Del. 1975)
guidelines for resolving claims of executive privilege in NRC proceedings related to discovery; LBP-82-82, 16 NRC 1164 (1982)

South Carolina Electric and Gas Company (Virgil C. Summer Nuclear Station, Unit 1), ALAB-642, 13 NRC 881, 895-96 (1981), affirmed sub nom. Fairfield United Action v. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, No. 81-2042 (D.C. Cir., April 28, 1982)
responsibility of NRC Staff on uncontested safety issues; ALAB-680, 16 NRC 143 (1982)

South Carolina Electric and Gas Company, et al. (Virgil C. Summer Nuclear Station, Unit 1), ALAB-642, 13 NRC 881 (1981)
weight given to availability of other means to protect tardy intervenor's interests' LBP-82-92, 16 NRC 1383 (1982)

South Carolina Electric and Gas Company, et al. (Virgil C. Summer Nuclear Station, Unit 1), ALAB-642, 13 NRC 881, 884, 887 (1981)
standards for admitting late-filed TMI contentions; LBP-82-63, 16 NRC 578 (1982)

South Carolina Electric and Gas Company, et al. (Virgil C. Summer Nuclear Station, Unit 1), ALAB-642, 13 NRC 881, 885, 886, 894, 895 (1981), aff'd sub nom. Fairfield United Action v. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, 679 F.2d 261 (D.C. Cir. 1982)
cause for overturning Licensing Board decision rejecting late intervention petition; ALAB-707, 16 NRC 1764 (1982)

South Carolina Electric and Gas Company, et al. (Virgil C. Summer Nuclear Station, Unit 1), ALAB-642, 13 NRC 881, 885, 886, 894, 895 (1981), aff'd sub nom. Fairfield United Action v. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, 679 F.2d 261 (D.C. Cir. 1982)
showing necessary to justify intervention petition filed four years late; ALAB-704, 16 NRC 1730 (1982)

South Carolina Electric and Gas Company, et al. (Virgil C. Summer Nuclear Station, Unit 1), ALAB-642, 13 NRC 881, 887 n.4 (1981)
good cause standards applied to existing intervenor seeking to adopt withdrawing intervenor's contentions; LBP-82-91, 16 NRC 1369 (1982)

South Carolina Electric and Gas Company, et al. (Virgil C. Summer Nuclear Station, Unit 1), ALAB-642, 13 NRC 881, 895 (1981)
weights given to factors used to evaluate admissibility of late-filed contentions; LBP-82-91, 16 NRC 1367 (1982)

South Carolina Electric and Gas Company, et al. (Virgil C. Summer Nuclear Station, Unit 1), ALAB-663, 14 NRC 1140, 1156 n.31 (1981)
responsibility of NRC Staff on uncontested safety issues; ALAB-680, 16 NRC 143 (1982)

South Carolina Electric and Gas Company, et al. (Virgil C. Summer Nuclear Station, Unit 1), LBP-81-11, 13 NRC 420, 423 (1981)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX

CASES

claim of misplaced reliance on another party to represent an intervenor's interests as cause for late intervention; LBP-82-117B, 16 NRC 2027 (1982)

Southern California Edison Company (San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station, Units 2 and 3), ALAB-171, 7 AEC 37, 39 (1974)
Commission cognizance of activities before other tribunals; LBP-82-117A, 16 NRC 1991 (1982)

Southern California Edison Company, et al. (San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station, Units 2 and 3), ALAB-268, 1 NRC 383, 399 (1975)
Staff interference with Licensing Board's performance of its duties; LBP-82-87, 16 NRC 1200 (1982)

Southern California Edison Company, et al. (San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station, Units 2 and 3), ALAB-673, 15 NRC 688, 698
showing required for stay of Licensing Board decision pending appeal; ALAB-680, 16 NRC 130 (1982)

Southern California Edison Company, et al. (San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station, Units 2 and 3), ALAB-680, 16 NRC 127 (1982)
guidance implementing Commission's emergency planning requirements; ALAB-707, 16 NRC 1763 (1982)

Southern California Edison Company, et al. (San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station, Units 2 and 3), ALAB-680, 16 NRC 127, 135-39 (1982)
viability of medical services contention in light of decision in; LBP-82-75, 16 NRC 997-99 (1982)

Southern California Edison Company, et al. (San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station, Units 2 and 3), LBP-81-36, 14 NRC 691, 699 (1981)
requirement for reasonable assurance determination; LBP-82-66, 16 NRC 732 (1982)

Southern California Edison Company, et al. (San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station, Units 2 and 3), LBP-82-3, 15 NRC 61 (1982)
propriety of calling independent experts as Board witnesses; LBP-82-55, 16 NRC 277 (1982)

Southern California Edison Company, et al. (San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station, Units 2 and 3), LBP-82-3, 15 NRC 61, 78-82 (1982)
relitigation of serious accident scenarios; LBP-82-107A, 16 NRC 1808 (1982)

Southern California Edison Company, et al. (San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station, Units 2 and 3), LBP-82-39, 15 NRC 1203 (1982)
significance of pre-emergency public information program; LBP-82-66, 16 NRC 732 (1982)

Southern California Edison Company, et al. (San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station, Units 2 and 3), LBP-82-39, 15 NRC 1212, n.33 (1982)
entitlement of interim FEMA finding to rebuttable presumption; LBP-82-68, 16 NRC 746 (1982)

Starr v. Federal Aviation Administration, 589 F.2d 307, 315 (7th Cir. 1978)
standard for determining bias on part of NRC Staff consultant; LBP-82-99, 16 NRC 1548 (1982)

State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Company v. Department of Transportation, 680 F.2d 206, 229 (D.C. Cir. 1982)
need for a Board to state reasons for altering consistent interpretations of a statute; LBP-82-107, 16 NRC 1679 (1982)

State of Alaska v. Andrus, 580 F.2d 465, 473 (D.C. Cir. 1978) vacated in part, sub nom., Western Oil and Gas Association v. Alaska, 439 U.S. 922 (1978)
consideration of remote and speculative environmental effects in licensing a facility; LBP-82-117A, 16 NRC 1992 (1982)
scope of information concerning environmental impact of a project to be obtained before project initiation; LBP-82-62, 16 NRC 569 (1982)

Statement of Policy on Conduct of Licensing Proceedings, CLI-81-8, 13 NRC 452 (1981)
steps for expediting a proceeding; ALAB-696, 16 NRC 1263 (1982)

Statement of Policy on Conduct of Licensing Proceedings, CLI-81-8, 13 NRC 452, 453 (1981)
use of Board powers to focus a proceeding; LBP-82-107, 16 NRC 1677, 1680 (1982)

Statement of Policy on Conduct of Licensing Proceedings, CLI-81-8, 13 NRC 452, 454 (1981)
application of sanctions; LBP-82-116, 16 NRC 1940, 1947 (1982)
power of Licensing Board to impose sanctions on defaulting party; LBP-82-115, 16 NRC 1928 (1982)
relevance of a party's resources to its hearing obligations; ALAB-696, 16 NRC 1261 (1982)

Statement of Policy on Conduct of Licensing Proceedings, CLI-81-8, 13 NRC 452, 456 (1981)
basis for timely rulings on psychological stress contentions; LBP-82-53, 16 NRC 203 (1982)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX

CASES

Licensing Board jurisdiction for referral of ruling conditionally admitting nonspecific contentions; ALAB-687, 16 NRC 465 (1982)

Statement of Policy on Conduct of Licensing Proceedings, CLI-81-8, 13 NRC 452, 456-57 (1981)
certification of question to Commission to avoid licensing delays; ALAB-681, 16 NRC 149 (1982)

Statement of Policy on Conduct of Licensing Proceedings, CLI-81-8, 13 NRC 452, 457 (1981)
limitations on summary disposition motions; LBP-82-93, 16 NRC 1394 (1982)
use of summary disposition to avoid unnecessary hearings; LBP-82-114, 16 NRC 1911 (1982)

Statement of Policy: Further Commission Guidance for Power Reactor Operating Licenses, CLI-80-42, 12 NRC 654 (1980)
exception to prohibition against collateral attack on Commission rules; LBP-82-106, 16 NRC 1657 (1982)

Stewart v. Smith, 673 F.2d 485 (D.C. Cir., October 1, 1981)
limits on agency prerogatives to interpret policy statements; LBP-82-69, 16 NRC 753 (1982)

Sun Oil Company v. FPC, 256 F.2d 233
Commission discretion in administering its procedural rules; LBP-82-107, 16 NRC 1678 (1982)

Swift and Company v. United States, 308 F.2d 849, 851 (7th Cir. 1962)
tailoring of hearing procedures to competency of a party's legal representatives; LBP-82-107, 16 NRC 1679 (1982)

Taggart v. Weintraub's Inc., 397 U.S. 223 (1970)
Commission review of Appeal Board decision on operating license amendment improvidently granted; CLI-82-26, 16 NRC 881 (1982)

Ten Applications for Low-Enriched Uranium Exports to EURATOM Member Nations, CLI-77-24, 6 NRC 525, 531 (1977)
standing to intervene as member of general public subject to harm from accident at nuclear facility; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1032 (1982)

Tennessee Valley Authority (Browns Ferry Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2), LBP-76-10, 3 NRC 209 at 216 (1976)
use of references in support of contentions; LBP-82-52, 16 NRC 189 (1982)

Tennessee Valley Authority (Browns Ferry Nuclear Plant, Units 1, 2 and 3), ALAB-677, 15 NRC 1387 (1982)
applicant/licensee obligation to provide accurate and timely information in NRC proceeding; ALAB-691, 16 NRC 910 (1982)

application of relevance and materiality standards; LBP-82-73, 16 NRC 978 (1982)

Tennessee Valley Authority (Hartsville Nuclear Plant, Units 1A, 2A, 1B, 2B), ALAB-367, 5 NRC 92, 102-03 (1977)
circumstances requiring cost-benefit balancing for proposed nuclear plant; LBP-82-117A, 16 NRC 193 (1982)

consideration of financial costs in NEPA cost-benefit balance; LBP-82-58, 16 NRC 526 (1982)

Tennessee Valley Authority (Hartsville Nuclear Plant, Units 1A, 2A, 1B, 2B), ALAB-367, 5 NRC 92, 102-05 (1977)
inadequacy of discussion of alternatives in operating license FES; LBP-82-58, 16 NRC 526 (1982)

Tennessee Valley Authority (Hartsville Nuclear Plant, Units 1A, 2A, 1B, 2B), ALAB-367, 5 NRC 92, 104 n.59 (1977)
waiver of inadequately briefed exceptions; ALAB-696, 16 NRC 1255 (1982)

Tennessee Valley Authority (Hartsville Nuclear Plant, Units 1A, 2A, 1B, 2B), ALAB-463, 7 NRC 341, 348 (1978)
standard for consideration of issues raised for first time on appeal; ALAB-693, 16 NRC 956 (1982)
standard for considering issues raised for first time on appeal; ALAB-691, 16 NRC 907 (1982)

Tennessee Valley Authority (Hartsville Nuclear Plant, Units 1A, 2A, 1B, 2B), ALAB-463, 7 NRC 341, 355-56 (1978)
circumstances favoring disclosure of confidential information; LBP-82-59, 16 NRC 538 (1982)

Tennessee Valley Authority (Hartsville Nuclear Plant, Units 1A, 2A, 1B, and 2B), ALAB-463, 7 NRC 341, 352 (1978)
findings based on material not introduced into evidence; LBP-82-100, 16 NRC 1574 (1982)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX CASES

Tennessee Valley Authority v. Hill, 437 U.S. 153, 184-185 (1978)
applicability of appeal board immediate effectiveness review in manufacturing license cases;
ALAB-686, 16 NRC 457 (1982)

Texas Utilities Generating Company, et al. (Comanche Peak Steam Electric Station, Units 1 and 2),
ALAB-260, 1 NRC 51, 55 (1975)
Staff responsibility regarding preparation of EIS; LBP-82-78, 16 NRC 1110 (1982)

Texas Utilities Generating Company, et al. (Comanche Peak Steam Electric Station, Units 1 and 2),
ALAB-599, 12 NRC 1, 2 (1980)
circumstances appropriate for interlocutory appeals; ALAB-683, 16 NRC 161 (1982)

Texas Utilities Generating Company, et al. (Comanche Peak Steam Electric Station, Units 1 and 2),
CLI-81-36, 14 NRC 1111 (1981)
disposition of an intervenor's contentions upon its withdrawal as a party; LBP-92-91, 16 NRC 1366
(1982)

Toledo Edison Company (Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station), ALAB-157, 6 AEC 858, 859 (1973)
necessity for filing exceptions; ALAB-694, 16 NRC 960 (1982)

Toledo Edison Company (Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station), ALAB-300, 2 NRC 752, 758 (1975)
test of "finality" for appeal purposes; ALAB-690, 16 NRC 894 (1972)
test of finality of appeal purposes; ALAB-696, 16 NRC 1256 (1982)

Toledo Edison Company (Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station), ALAB-300, 2 NRC 752, 760 (1975)
application of Federal Rules of Civil Procedure to NRC proceedings; LBP-82-82, 16 NRC 1157 (1982)
use of Federal Rules in interpreting MRC discovery rules; LBP-82-82, 16 NRC 1163 (1982)

Toledo Edison Company (Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1), ALAB-314, 3 NRC 98, 99-100
(1976)
appeal board reluctance to certify questions involving scheduling; ALAB-688, 16 NRC 475 (1982)

Toledo Edison Company (Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1), ALAB-314, 3 NRC 99 (1976)
circumstances in which directed certification is warranted; LBP-82-62, 16 NRC 567 (1982)

Toledo Edison Company (Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station, Units 1, 2 and 3), ALAB-385, 5 NRC 621,
629 (1977)
appellate standard in reviewing Licensing Board decision in context of stay pending appeal;
ALAB-680, 16 NRC 133 (1982)

Trout Unlimited v. Morton, 509 F.2d 1276, 1283 (9th Cir. 1974)
need to consider full cycle contribution to radon already in the environment; ALAB-701, 16 NRC 1527
(1982)

Trustees of Columbia University in the City of New York, ALAB-50, 4 AEC 849 (1972)
potential of excluded radiation dose contention as *sua sponte* issue; LBP-82-79, 16 NRC 1119 (1982)

Turner v. FCC, 514 F.2d 1354 (D.C. Cir. 1975)
basis for award of intervenors' attorney's fees; LBP-82-81, 16 NRC 1139 (1982)

Union Electric Company (Callaway Plant, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-527, 9 NRC 126, 128-39 (1979)
circumstances allowing Licensing Board to override informer's privilege; LBP-82-87, 16 NRC 1200
(1982)

Union of Concerned Scientists v. AEC, 499 F.2d 1069, 1090 (D.C. Cir. 1974)
amount of hydrogen generation to be taken in account into containment design; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC
1064 (1982)

United Mine Workers v. Kleppe, 561 F.2d 1258, 1263 (7th Cir. 1977)
preclusion of hearing on germane issues through unlawful procedural requirements; ALAB-687, 16
NRC 469 (1982)

United Mine Workers v. Ronco, 314 F.2d 186, 188 (10th Cir. 1963)
favorability in viewing summary disposition motion; LBP-82-58, 16 NRC 519 (1982)

United States Department of Energy, Project Management Corporation, Tennessee Valley Authority
(Clinch River Breeder Reactor Plant), CLI-82-22, 16 NRC 405 (1982)
Commission dismissal of cover-up charge against NRC attorney; CLI-82-36, 16 NRC 1515 (1982)

United States Energy Research and Development Administration (Clinch River Breeder Reactor Plant),
CLI-76-13, 4 NRC 67 (1976)
history of 10 CFR 50.12; CLI-82-23, 16 NRC 437 (1982)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX CASES

United States Energy Research and Development Administration (Clinch River Breeder Reactor Plant),
CLI-76-13, 4 NRC 67, 75-76 (1976)
Commission authority to provide guidance on admissibility of contentions before Licensing Boards;
CLI-82-15, 16 NRC 34 (1982)

United States Steel Corp. v. Train, [556 F.2d 822, 837 (1977)]
disposition of unsupported briefs; ALAB-693, 16 NRC 956 (1982)

United States Sugar Corp. v. Atlantic Coast Line R.R., 196 F.2d 1015, 1016 (5th Cir. 1952)
situations giving rise to appealable order; ALAB-690, 16 NRC 895 (1982)

United States v. American Trucking Ass'n., 310 U.S. 534, 544 (1940)
determining intent of regulations; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 62 (1982)

United States v. Barnett, 376 U.S. 681, 737-739 (1964) (Goldberg, J., dissenting)
distinction between *amicus curiae* and traditional party; ALAB-679, 16 NRC 126 (1982)

United States v. Berrigan, 482 F.2d 171, 181 (3rd Cir. 1973)
purpose behind executive privilege; LBP-82-82, 16 NRC 1164 (1982)

United States v. Bollin, Joseph & Company, 144 U.S. 1, 4 (1892)
authenticity of recorded notes; LBP-82-72, 16 NRC 970 (1981)

United States v. Brown, 478 F.2d 1038, 1041 (7th Cir. 1973)
discovery of attorney's opinion work product; LBP-82-82, 16 NRC 1160 (1982)

United States v. Culbert, 435 U.S. 371 (1978)
determining intent of regulations; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 62 (1982)

United States v. Davis, 636 F.2d 1028, 1044 n.20 (5th Cir. 1981)
specificity required of claims of executive privilege; LBP-82-82, 16 NRC 1153, 1154 (1982)

United States v. Dickinson, 465 F.2d 496, 509-511 (5th Cir. 1972)
respect to be accorded a Licensing Board; LBP-82-115, 16 NRC 1931 (1982)

United States v. El Paso Company, No. 81-2484 (5th Cir. August 13, 1982)
specificity required of claims of executive privilege; LBP-82-82, 16 NRC 1153, 1158, 1161 (1982)

United States v. El Paso Company, No. 81-2484 (9th Cir. August 13, 1982)
extent of protection of attorney-client privilege; LBP-82-82, 16 NRC 1158 (1982)

United States v. Gates, 35 F.R.D. 524 (D. Colo. 1964)
material encompassed by attorney work product doctrine; LBP-82-82, 16 NRC 1161 (1982)

United States v. Leggett & Platt, Inc., 542 F.2d 655, 658-659 (6th Cir. 1976) cert. denied, 430 U.S. 945 (1977)
disclosure of documents protected by executive privilege; LBP-82-82, 16 NRC 1164 (1982)

United States v. Munsingwear, Inc., 340 U.S. 36 (1950)
remanding of case based on record that no longer represents case's actual situation; CLI-82-26, 16 NRC 881 (1982)

United States v. Munsingwear, Inc., 340 U.S. 36 (1950)
vacation of unreviewed judgments because of mootness; CLI-82-18, 16 NRC 51 (1982)

United States v. Nixon, 418 U.S. 683, 705-711 (1974)
intragovernmental documents encompassed by executive privilege; LBP-82-82, 16 NRC 1164 (1982)

United States v. Oliver, 570 F.2d 397, 401 (1st Cir. 1978)
scope of informer's privilege; LBP-82-87, 16 NRC 1198 (1982)

United States v. Pierce Auto Freight Lines, 327 U.S. 515, 527-530 (1945)
criteria for official notice of information in separate proceedings; ALAB-682, 16 NRC 154 (1982)

United States v. Ramirez, 608 F.2d 1261, 1268 n.12 (9th Cir. 1979)
communications encompassed by attorney-client privilege; LBP-82-82, 16 NRC 1158 (1982)

United States v. Storer Broadcasting Company, 351 U.S. 192, 202 (1955)
Commission authority to determine means for deciding a particular issue; LBP-82-118, 16 NRC 2038 (1982)

United States v. Taylor, 333 F.2d 633, 639-40 (5th Cir. 1964)
justification for dismissal of intervenor for failure to attend prehearing conference; LBP-82-115, 16 NRC 1935 (1982)

United States v. United Mine Workers, 330 U.S. 258, 291-94 (1947)
NRC Staff duty to obey Licensing Board orders; LBP-82-87, 16 NRC 1203 (1982)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX CASES

United States v. United Shoe Machinery Corporation, 89 F.Supp. 357, 358-359 (D. Mass. 1950)
essential elements of attorney-client privilege; LBP-82-82, 16 NRC 1157-58 (1982)

United States v. Weathers, 618 F.2d 663 (10th Cir. 1980)
approval of court for appointing its own expert witness; LBP-82-55, 16 NRC 277 (1982)

Upjohn Company v. United States, 449 U.S. 383, 389 (1981)
purpose of attorney-client privilege; LBP-82-82, 16 NRC 1157-59 (1982)

Upjohn Company v. United States, 449 U.S. 383, 397-398 (1981)
attorney's mental impressions and opinions at attorney work product doctrine; LBP-82-82, 16 NRC 1160 (1982)

Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corp. (Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station), ALAB-56, 4 AEC 930 (1972)
preclusion of consideration of fuel cycle contentions; LBP-82-118, 16 NRC 2038 (1982)

Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corp. (Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station), ALAB-73, 5 AEC 297, 298 (1972)
Appeal Board authority to review ruling regarding admission of class 9 accident contentions; ALAB-705, 16 NRC 1743 (1982)

Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corp. (Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station), ALAB-124, 6 AEC 358, 362 (1973)
authority of Board to pose questions in response to intervenor's motion to compel answers from applicant; LBP-82-102, 16 NRC 1598 (1982)

Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corp. (Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station), ALAB-138, 6 AEC 520, 523 (1973)
showing necessary in moving papers to reopen the record; LBP-82-84, 16 NRC 1185 (1982)
standards for reopening the record; LBP-82-117B, 16 NRC 2031 (1982)
test for good cause for reopening a record; ALAB-707, 16 NRC 1765 (1982)

Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corp. (Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station), ALAB-141, 6 AEC 576, 583-585 (1973)
difference between concepts of effectiveness and finality; ALAB-689, 16 NRC 891 (1982)

Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corp. (Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station), ALAB-179, 7 AEC 159, 163-64 (1974)
preclusion of consideration of fuel cycle contentions; LBP-82-118, 16 NRC 2038 (1982)

Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corp. (Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station), ALAB-179, 7 AEC 159, 177 (1974)
consideration of effect of taxes in NEPA cost basis analysis; LBP-82-103, 16 NRC 1613 (1982)
limitations on benefits to be considered in an operating license cost-benefit balance; LBP-82-95, 16 NRC 1405 (1982)

Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corp. (Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station), CLI-74-40, 8 AEC 809, 811 (1974)
demonstration of validity of regulatory guidance; ALAB-698, 16 NRC 1299 (1982)

Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corp. v. Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc. 435 U.S. 519 (1978)
issues explored in considering conduct of licensee; ALAB-691, 16 NRC 904 (1982)
need for consideration of alternatives to nuclear power plants; LBP-82-117A, 16 NRC 1992 (1982)

Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corp. v. Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc. 435 U.S. 519, 539 (1978)
content of environmental impact statement for major federal actions; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1076 (1982)

Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corp. v. Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc., 435 U.S. 519, 551 (1978)
need to evaluate environmental impact of remote and speculative possibilities; ALAB-705, 16 NRC 1744 (1982)

Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corp. v. Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc., 435 U.S. 519, 553 (1978)
obligations of intervenors in NRC proceedings; ALAB-693, 16 NRC 957 (1982)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX CASES

Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corp. v. Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc., 435 U.S. 519, 557-58 (1978)
 responsibility for judgment to use nuclear energy as a source of power; LBP-82-87, 16 NRC 1200 (1982)

Virginia Electric and Power Company (North Anna Nuclear Power Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-289, 2 NRC 395, 398 (1975)
 showing necessary on other factors when good cause for late intervention is not shown; LBP-82-117B, 16 NRC 2026 (1982)

Virginia Electric and Power Company (North Anna Nuclear Power Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-324, 3 NRC 347, 358-63 (1976)
 omissions as material false statements; ALAB-650, 14 NRC 911, 914 (1982)

Virginia Electric and Power Company (North Anna Nuclear Power Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-491, 8 NRC 245 (1978)
 basis of contention on issue not covered by a specific rule; LBP-82-116, 16 NRC 1946 (1982)
 validity of a contention based on a generic issue, in an operating license proceeding; LBP-82-103, 16 NRC 1608 (1982)

Virginia Electric and Power Company (North Anna Nuclear Power Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-491, 8 NRC 245, 247 (1978)
 appeal board disagreement with Licensing Board interpretation of an issue; ALAB-680, 16 NRC 135 (1982)
 appeal board right to review any issues contested before a Licensing Board; ALAB-685, 16 NRC 452 (1982)

Virginia Electric and Power Company (North Anna Nuclear Power Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-491, 8 NRC 245, 249 n.7 (1978)
 Staff responsibility to identify unresolved safety issues; LBP-82-100, 16 NRC 1557, 1559 (1982)

Virginia Electric and Power Company (North Anna Nuclear Power Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-491, 8 NRC 245, 249-50 (1978)
 extent of Appeal Board sua sponte review authority; ALAB-689, 16 NRC 890-91 (1982)

Virginia Electric and Power Company (North Anna Nuclear Power Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-522, 9 NRC 54, 56, 57 n.5 (1979)
 establishment of causality for standing to intervene in materials license renewal proceeding;
 ALAB-682, 16 NRC 153-55 (1982)

Virginia Electric and Power Company (North Anna Nuclear Power Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-529, 9 NRC 153 (1979)
 Appeal Board practice when sua sponte review uncovers problems in Licensing Board decision;
 ALAB-689, 16 NRC 891 (1982)

Virginia Electric and Power Company (North Anna Nuclear Power Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-536, 9 NRC 402, 404 n.2 (1979)
 authority of an organization to represent its members, for purpose of standing to intervene;
 ALAB-700, 16 NRC 1334 (1982)

Virginia Electric and Power Company (North Anna Nuclear Power Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-584, 11 NRC 451, 458 (1980)
 interpretation of the term "available resources"; LBP-82-78, 16 NRC 1112 (1982)

Virginia Electric and Power Company (North Anna Nuclear Power Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-584, 11 NRC 451, 465 (1980)
 preclusion of contentions by pendency of waste confidence rulemaking; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2081 (1982)

Virginia Electric and Power Company (North Anna Nuclear Power Station, Units 1 and 2), CLI-74-16, 7 AEC 313, 314 (1974)
 Commission policy regarding withholding of information; LBP-82-59, 16 NRC 538 (1982)

Virginia Electric and Power Company (North Anna Nuclear Power Station, Units 1 and 2), CLI-74-17, 7 AEC 313 (1974)
 disclosure of material protected by executive privilege; LBP-82-82, 16 NRC 1163 (1982)
 application of Exemption 5 of Freedom of Information Act to intragovernmental Communications;
 LBP-82-82, 16 NRC 1163 (1982)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX CASES

Virginia Electric and Power Company (North Anna Nuclear Power Station, Units 1 and 2), CLI-76-22, 4 NRC 480, 486 (1976), aff'd sub nom. *Virginia Electric and Power Company v. Nuclear Regulatory Commission*, 571 F.2d 1289 (4th Cir. 1978)
liability of applicant/licensee for material false statement; ALAB-691, 16 NRC 910 (1982)

Virginia Electric and Power Company (North Anna Nuclear Power Station, Units 1 and 2), CLI-76-22, 4 NRC 480, 487-88, 491 (1976), aff'd sub nom. *Virginia Electric and Power Company v. Nuclear Regulatory Commission*, 571 F.2d 1289 (4th Cir. 1978)
test for materiality of a statement; ALAB-650, 14 NRC 910, 912, 914, 915 (1981)

Virginia Electric and Power Company (North Anna Nuclear Power Station, Units 1 and 2), CLI-76-22, 4 NRC 480, 491-92, n.11 (1976), affirmed sub nom., *Virginia Electric and Power Company v. Nuclear Regulatory Commission*, 571 F.2d 1289 (4th Cir. 1978)
seriousness of bias charge against NRC Staff attorney; CLI-82-36, 16 NRC 1512 (1982)

Virginia Electric Power Company (Surry Nuclear Power Station, Units 1 and 2), CLI-80-4, 11 NRC 405 (1980)
ability of NRC Staff to discharge its responsibility to consider 2.206 petitions; CLI-82-29, 16 NRC 1229 (1982)
use of 2.206 procedures to protect late intervention petitioner's interests; ALAB-707, 16 NRC 1768 (1982)
factors to be considered by Licensing Board in ruling on a motion for stay; LBP-82-84, 16 NRC 1184 (1982)

Virginia Petroleum Jobbers Assoc. v. FPC, 259 F.2d 921, 925 (D.C. Cir. 1958)
factors to be considered by Licensing Board in ruling on a motion for stay; LBP-82-84, 16 NRC 1184 (1982)

Walker v. City of Birmingham, 388 U.S. 307 (1967)
respect to be accorded a Licensing Board; LBP-82-115, 16 NRC 1931 (1982)

Walker v. Hutchinson, 352 U.S. 112, 115 (1956)
loss of right to hearing through lack of notice; ALAB-682, 16 NRC 158 (1982)

Warth v. Seldin, 422 U.S. 490 (1975)
satisfaction of interest test for standing; LBP-82-74, 16 NRC 983 (1982)

Warth v. Seldin, 422 U.S. 490, 511 (1975)
demonstration of an organization's standing as a representative of its members' interest; ALAB-700, 16 NRC 1334 (1982)

Washington Public Power Supply System (Hanford No. 2 Nuclear Power Plant), ALAB-113, 6 AEC 251 (1973)
extent of Appeal Board sua sponte review authority; ALAB-689, 16 NRC 890 (1982)

Washington Public Power Supply System (Nuclear Projects Nos. 1 and 4), ALAB-265, 1 NRC 374, 375 n.1 (1975)
appellate review of Licensing Board rulings on economic issues, intervention requests, or procedural matters; ALAB-650, 14 NRC 908 (1982)

Washington Public Power Supply System (WPPSS Nuclear Power Project Nos. 3 and 5), CLI-77-11, 5 NRC 719 (1977)
Commission practice for grant of exemption from 50.10; CLI-82-23, 16 NRC 426 (1982)

Washington Public Power Supply System (WPPSS Nuclear Project No. 2), ALAB-571, 10 NRC 687, 692 (1979)
scope of sua sponte review of final disposition of Licensing Board decision; ALAB-691, 16 NRC 908 (1982)
sua sponte review by Appeal Board of final disposition of licensing proceeding; ALAB-689, 16 NRC 890, (1982)

Washington Public Power Supply System (WPPSS Nuclear Project No. 2), LBP-79-7, 9 NRC 330 (1979)
failure of intervenors to meet interest requirements for intervention; CLI-82-29, 16 NRC 1223 (1982)

Washington Public Power Supply System (WPPSS Nuclear Project Nos. 1 and 2), CLI-82-29, 16 NRC 1221, 1228-29 (1982)
use of 2.206 procedure to protect late intervention petitioner's interests; ALAB-707, 16 NRC 1768 (1982)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX CASES

Washington v. Confederated Tribes of the Colville Indian Reservation, 447 U.S. 134, 149-50 (1980)
 situations giving rise to appealable order; ALAB-690, 16 NRC 895 (1982)

Washington v. Washington State Commercial Passenger Fishing Ass'n, 443 U.S. 658, 662-66 (1979)
 threats to anadromous fish; ALAB-700, 16 NRC 1332 (1982)

WATCH v. Harris, 603 F.2d 310 (2d Cir.), cert. denied sub nom. Waterburg Urban Renewal Agency v.
 WATCH, 444 U.S. 995 (1979)
 need for supplemental environmental review; ALAB-705, 16 NRC 1753 (1982)

Wisconsin Electric Power Company (Koshkonong Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2), CLI-74-45, 8 AEC 928
 (1974)
 use of draft EIS as basis for late-filed contention; LBP-82-79, 16 NRC 1118 (1982)

Wisconsin Electric Power Company (Koshkonong Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2), CLI-74-45, 8 AEC 928,
 930 (1978)
 Commission cognizance of activities before other tribunals; LBP-82-117A, 16 NRC 1991 (1982)

Wisconsin Electric Power Company (Point Beach Nuclear Plant, Unit 2), ALAB-31, 4 AEC 689, 690-91
 (1971)
 timing of discovery on contentions; ALAB-687, 16 NRC 467 (1982)

Wisconsin Electric Power Company (Point Beach Nuclear Plant, Unit 2), ALAB-78, 5 AEC 319, 322 (1972)
 Appeal Board authority to review ruling regarding admission of class 9 accident contentions;
 ALAB-705, 16 NRC 1743 (1982)

Wisconsin Electric Power Company (Point Beach Nuclear Plant, Unit 2), ALAB-85, 5 AEC 375 (1972)
 difference between concepts of effectiveness and finality; ALAB-689, 16 NRC 891 (1982)

Wisconsin Electric Power Company (Point Beach Nuclear Plant, Unit 2), ALAB-86, 5 AEC 376, 377 (1972)
 Licensing Board authority to reopen a proceeding; ALAB-699, 16 NRC 1327 (1982)

Wisconsin Electric Power Company (Point Beach Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-666, 15 NRC 277
 (1982)
 determining whether intervenor's failure to appeal is isolated event, for purpose of applying sanctions;
 LBP-82-108, 16 NRC 1815 (1982)

Wright v. Hartford Accident & Indemnity Company, 580 F.2d 809, 810 (5th Cir. 1978)
 failure of party to submit requested proposed findings of fact; ALAB-691, 16 NRC 907 (1982)

Yoffe v. Keller Indus., Inc., 580 F.2d 126, 129-30, 131 n.13 (5th Cir. 1978); petition for rehearing denied,
 582 F.2d 982, 983 (1978)
 standards for dismissal of applications without prejudice; LBP-82-81, 16 NRC 1134 (1982)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX REGULATIONS

7 CFR 47.16(f)
use of depositions for cross-examination; LBP-82-107, 16 NRC 1676 (1982)

10 CFR 1
consolidation of proceedings; DPRM-82-2, 16 NRC 1214 (1982)

10 CFR 1.3
emergency response time of NRC Region I offices; ALAB-698, 16 NRC 1306 (1982)

10 CFR 1.730(e)
right of Staff to request written opinion from Board; LBP-82-110, 16 NRC 1897 (1982)

10 CFR 2
criteria to be addressed by motions to reopen; CLI-82-39, 16 NRC 1714 (1982)
denial of petition for amendment of, to require operating license hearings for each reactor; DPRM-82-2,
16 NRC 1214 (1982)
filing deadline for response to Staff motion for protective order; LBP-82-113, 16 NRC 1908 (1982)

10 CFR 2, Subpart B
Board recommendation for proceeding to modify or suspend reactor operators' licenses; LBP-82-56, 16
NRC 309, 383 (1982)

10 CFR 2.4(e)
exceptions to requirement for public hearings on NRC proceedings; LBP-82-107, 16 NRC 1680 (1982)

10 CFR 2.4(n)
example of contested proceeding within the meaning of; LBP-82-55, 16 NRC 228 (1982); LBP-82-57, 16
NRC 480 (1982)

10 CFR 2.102
locations of meetings between NRC Staff and its consultants; CLI-82-41, 16 NRC 1722 (1982)

10 CFR 2.104
litigability of contention concerning financial qualifications of small owners; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2099
(1982)

10 CFR 2.104(a)
standard for discretionary hearing on materials license amendment; CLI-82-21, 16 NRC 402 (1982)

10 CFR 2.104(c)
NRC Staff responsibility for health and safety findings; LBP-82-100, 16 NRC 1556 (1982)

10 CFR 2.104(c)(4)
deletion of financial qualifications contention; LBP-82-103, 16 NRC 1605 (1982)
scope of contentions to be heard by a Licensing Board; LBP-82-103, 16 NRC 1618 (1982)

10 CFR 2.105
Licensing Board jurisdiction after issuance of low-power license; LBP-82-92, 16 NRC 1380 (1982)
preclusion of consideration of alternatives and need for power issues in operating license proceedings;
LBP-82-103, 16 NRC 1606 (1982)

10 CFR 2.105(a)(6)
standard for discretionary hearing on materials license amendment; CLI-82-21, 16 NRC 402 (1982)

10 CFR 2.107(a)
terms for withdrawal of construction permit application after issuance of Notice of Hearing; LBP-82-81,
16 NRC 1131, 1134 (1982)

10 CFR 2.109
continuation of licensee operation during processing of license renewal requests; ALAB-682, 16 NRC 159
(1982)

continuing validity of construction permit pending ruling on extension request; CLI-82-29, 16 NRC 1230
(1982)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX REGULATIONS

effectiveness of license pending ruling on request for renewal; CLI-82-39, 16 NRC 1715 (1982)

10 CFR 2.202

- sufficiency of show cause proceeding to evaluate intervenors' concerns over site suitability issues; CLI-82-29, 16 NRC 1227-29 (1982)
- suspension of low-power license; ALAB-681, 16 NRC 147 (1982); LBP-82-70, 16 NRC 762 (1982)

10 CFR 2.202(d)

- form of licensee's answer to show cause order; CLI-82-33, 16 NRC 1499 (1982)

10 CFR 2.205

- procedural requirements to be followed prior to imposition of civil penalties; CLI-82-31, 16 NRC 1238 (1982)

10 CFR 2.205(a)

- authority to institute civil penalty proceeding; CLI-82-31, 16 NRC 1238 (1982)

10 CFR 2.205(f)

- Licensing Board involvement in civil penalty proceedings; CLI-82-31, 16 NRC 1238 (1982)

10 CFR 2.206

- alternative to airing site suitability issue in construction permit extension proceeding; CLI-82-29, 16 NRC 1227-29 (1982)
- assistance for intervenor who cannot present his own case; LBP-82-84, 16 NRC 1186 (1982)
- avoidance of action under; LBP-82-117B, 16 NRC 2030 (1982)
- challenges to emergency planning; CLI-82-15, 16 NRC 37 (1982)
- denial of petition for review of decision relating to safe operation of Ginna plant; LBP-82-99, 16 NRC 1473 (1982)
- denial of petition requesting amendment of operating license application concerning management restructuring; DD-82-10, 16 NRC 1205 (1982)
- denial of petition requesting initiation of show-cause proceeding on basis of licensee's financial qualifications; DD-82-8, 16 NRC 394 (1982)
- denial of petition requesting suspension of operations on basis of inadequacies in emergency planning; DD-82-12, 16 NRC 1685 (1982)
- denial of petition seeking suspension of construction permit pending submission of alternative to supplemental cooling water supply system; DD-82-13, 16 NRC 2115 (1982)
- denial of petition to decommission Humboldt Bay Power Plant; DD-82-7, 16 NRC 387 (1982)
- forum for seeking more stringent enforcement actions; CLI-82-16, 16 NRC 46-47 (1982)
- means for protection of late intervention petitioner's interests; ALAB-707, 16 NRC 1767, 1768 (1982)
- partial denial of petition regarding construction deficiencies at LaSalle; DD-82-9, 16 NRC 396 (1982)
- remedy for petitioner proffering issues unrelated to license amendment; LBP-82-108, 16 NRC 1820 (1982)

10 CFR 2.500

- applicability of immediate effectiveness review to manufacturing licenses; ALAB-686, 16 NRC 456 (1982)

10 CFR 2.503

- distinction between construction permits and manufacturing licenses; ALAB-686, 16 NRC 456 (1982)

10 CFR 2.504

- applicability of immediate effectiveness review to manufacturing licenses; ALAB-686, 16 NRC 456 (1982)

- effectiveness of manufacturing license decisions relative to finality; CLI-82-37, 16 NRC 1692 (1982)

10 CFR 2.700

- conduct of special proceedings; ALAB-685, 16 NRC 451 (1982)

10 CFR 2.701 (b)

- documents required to be served on other parties; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2112 (1982)

10 CFR 2.707

- Board authority to impose sanctions for noncompliance with its orders; LBP-82-75, 16 NRC 990 (1982)
- dismissal of proceeding for failure of intervenor to attend; LBP-82-101, 16 NRC 1595 (1982)
- refusal of a party to comply with Board order; LBP-82-15, 16 NRC 1928 (1982)
- support for Licensing Board dismissal of intervenor who refused to participate in prehearing conference; LBP-82-115, 16 NRC 1935 (1982)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX REGULATIONS

10 CFR 2.707(b)
 reason for requiring a Board to consider all circumstances prior to selection of a sanction; LBP-82-115, 16 NRC 1929 (1982)

10 CFR 2.708
 rejection of handwritten contention; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2103 (1982)

10 CFR 2.710
 time limit for motions to compel; LBP-82-116, 16 NRC 1953, 1962 (1982)

10 CFR 2.711
 measures for expediting a proceeding; ALAB-696, 16 NRC 1263 (1982)

10 CFR 2.712(a)
 use of informal oral notification to trigger time for seeking appeal; ALAB-690, 16 NRC 895 (1982)

10 CFR 2.712(d)(3)
 Licensing Board jurisdiction to consider motion to reopen record mailed before Licensing Board final decision; LBP-82-86, 16 NRC 1191 (1982)

10 CFR 2.713
 forum for complaints relating to an attorney's actions; CLI-82-36, 16 NRC 1513 (1982)

10 CFR 2.713(a)
 conduct of parties to NRC proceedings; ALAB-691, 16 NRC 916 (1982)
 respect to be accorded a Licensing Board; LBP-82-115, 16 NRC 1930 (1982)

10 CFR 2.713(c)
 Licensing Board authority to censure parties to a proceeding; LBP-82-87, 16 NRC 1201 (1982)

10 CFR 2.714
 admission of contention subject to further specificity; LBP-82-75, 16 NRC 1004 (1982)
 admission of QA contention citing deficiencies in FSAR as basis; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1073 (1982)
 amendment of; ALAB-687, 16 NRC 466 (1982)
 appeal of final order; LBP-82-108, 16 NRC 1825 (1982)
 application of additional requirements for admission of contentions; CLI-82-15, 16 NRC 34, 41 (1982)
 basis with specificity standard for contentions; LBP-82-106, 16 NRC 1654 (1982)
 demonstration of good cause for late filing; LBP-82-53, 16 NRC 201 (1982)
 denial of intervention for lack of standing; ALAB-682, 16 NRC 153 (1982)
 denial, without prejudice, of beyond-design-basis accident contention; LBP-82-103, 16 NRC 1605 (1982)
 exclusion of groups as intervenors because of their opinions on nuclear power; CLI-82-15, 16 NRC 31 (1982)
 explanation of basis requirement; LBP-82-116, 16 NRC 1943 (1982)
 failure of contention alleging adverse effects associated with recreational opportunities to meet specificity requirements; LBP-82-103, 16 NRC 1613 (1982)
 failure of contentions addressing decontamination problems to meet specificity requirements; LBP-82-52, 16 NRC 188 (1982)
 failure of contentions admitted conditionally subject to specification to later meet specificity requirement; LBP-82-107A, 16 NRC 1794 (1982)
 failure of emergency planning contention to meet specificity requirement; LBP-82-75, 16 NRC 993 (1982)
 failure of intervenors to meet interest requirements for intervention; CLI-82-29, 16 NRC 1223 (1982)
 good cause for failure to file emergency planning contentions on time; LBP-82-96, 16 NRC 1430 (1982)
 intervention on enforcement actions; CLI-82-16, 16 NRC 45 (1982)
 lack of basis of transmission lines contention; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1085 (1982)
 litigability of contention charging management with responsibility for construction delays; CLI-82-29, 16 NRC 1231 (1982)
 purpose of basis with specificity requirement; LBP-82-52, 16 NRC 193 (1982); LBP-82-106, 16 NRC 1655 (1982)
 quality assurance contention seen as expedition seeking information; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1042 (1982)
 restrictions on Board authority; LBP-82-69, 16 NRC 752 (1982)
 specificity required of contention concerning qualification of safety-related equipment; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1038 (1982)
 timing of discovery on contentions; ALAB-687, 16 NRC 468 (1982)
 weak showing for acceptance of tardy contentions; LBP-82-54, 16 NRC 213 (1982)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX REGULATIONS

10 CFR 2.714(a)

admission of quality assurance contention favored by five-factor test; LBP-82-63, 16 NRC 584 (1982)
applicability to late-filed contentions based on previously unavailable documents; ALAB-687, 16 NRC
463, 469 (1982)
application of lateness factors to statements of issues offered by a State; LBP-82-103, 16 NRC 1615 (1982)
balancing of five factors favors limited admission of risk assessment contention; LBP-82-63, 16 NRC 592
(1982)
balancing of five factors weighs against late intervention; LBP-82-92, 16 NRC 1377 (1982)
clarification of requirements for late-filing, amending, expanding, and deleting contentions; ALAB-687,
16 NRC 467, 470 (1982)
conditional admission of contentions; LBP-82-107A, 16 NRC 1793 (1982)
consideration of petitioner's status as governmental entity in balancing test for late intervention;
LBP-82-92, 16 NRC 1384 (1982)
criteria for judging late petitions to intervene; LBP-82-96, 16 NRC 1429 (1982)
dismissal of intervenor for failure to cure deficiencies in standing; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1032 (1982)
establishment of four-factor test for selection of sanctions, comparable to test for late intervention;
LBP-82-115, 16 NRC 1929 (1982)
failure of intervenor to satisfy criteria for late intervention; ALAB-707, 16 NRC 1764 (1982)
five-factor test for late intervention; ALAB-704, 16 NRC 1726-27 (1982); LBP-82-54, 16 NRC 213
(1982)
importance of third and fifth factors to the granting of late intervention; ALAB-704, 16 NRC 1730 (1982)
interests encompassed by; LBP-82-52, 16 NRC 185 (1982)
means unavailable to protect late intervention petitioner's interests; LBP-82-92, 16 NRC 1382-83 (1982)
review by NRC Staff as alternative to litigation; LBP-82-96, 16 NRC 1433 (1982)
satisfaction of residency requirements for standing to intervene; LBP-82-52, 16 NRC 186 (1982)
standards for admitting late intervenor; LBP-82-63, 16 NRC 586 (1982)
standards to be satisfied by party moving to reopen a record; CLI-82-39, 16 NRC 1715 (1982)
State argument in favor of untimely intervention; LBP-82-92, 16 NRC 1379 (1982)
time for filing supplements to contentions; ALAB-687, 16 NRC 469 (1982)
weight given to late-filed contention's potential for delay of proceeding; LBP-82-98, 16 NRC 1465, 1468
(1982)

10 CFR 2.714(a)(1)

admission requirements to be met by resiled contention; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1038 (1982)
adoption of withdrawing intervenor's contentions by another party; LBP-82-91, 16 NRC 1368 (1982)
amendment of petition to intervene; ALAB-690, 16 NRC 895 (1982)
applicability of five-factor test to late-filed contentions based on previously unavailable documents;
LBP-82-107A, 16 NRC 1793 (1982); LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2071 (1982)
applicability of five-factor test to radiation monitoring contentions; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2076 (1982)
applicability of good cause factor to admissibility of late-filed petitions for intervention and late-filed
contentions; LBP-82-91, 16 NRC 1367 (1982)
application of five-factor test to abandoned contentions being adopted by another intervenor; LBP-82-91,
16 NRC 1367 (1982)
balancing of factors weighs against nontimely intervention; LBP-82-92, 16 NRC 1378 (1982)
balancing of five-factor test favors admission of cost-benefit contentions; LBP-82-63, 16 NRC 588, 589
(1982)
challenge to ECCS performance seen as untimely contention; LBP-82-118, 16 NRC 2041 (1982)
criteria governing late-filed hydrogen control contentions; LBP-82-103, 16 NRC 1610 (1982)
good cause not shown for late filing of radiation dose contention, LBP-82-79, 16 NRC 1119 (1982)
interpretation of basis with specificity requirement; ALAB-706, 16 NRC 1757 (1982)
late filing criteria not met for shift rotation contention; LBP-82-104, 16 NRC 1627 (1982)
late filing factors met; LBP-82-98, 16 NRC 1463, 1468 (1982)
Licensing Board interpretation of; LBP-82-63, 16 NRC 577 (1982)
opposition to late-filed contentions based on SER and DES; LBP-82-103, 16 NRC 1606 (1982)
participation by a State; ALAB-690, 16 NRC 894 (1982)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX **REGULATIONS**

party status sought by State of Louisiana; LBP-82-92, 16 NRC 1378, 1381 (1982)
standards for admitting late intervenor; LBP-82-63, 16 NRC (586)
standards for evaluating new contentions; LBP-82-63, 16 NRC 576 (1982)

10 CFR 2.714(a)(1)(i)
standard expected of pro se intervenors in showing good cause for late filing of contentions; LBP-82-90, 16 NRC 1362 (1982)

10 CFR 2.714(a)(1)(ii)
inadequate means to protect late intervention petitioner's interests; LBP-82-90, 16 NRC 1362 (1982)

10 CFR 2.714(a)(1)(iii)
late intervention petitioner found competent to assist in developing a sound record; LBP-82-90, 16 NRC 1362 (1982)

10 CFR 2.714(a)(1)(iv)
petitioner's interest in late-filed contention not represented by other parties; LBP-82-90, 16 NRC 1362 (1982)

10 CFR 2.714(a)(1)(v)
standard found not to favor admission of late-filed contention; LBP-82-90, 16 NRC 1362 (1982)
weight given to extent that late contention will delay proceeding

10 CFR 2.714(a)(3)
admission of late-filed, clarified contention; LBP-82-51, 16 NRC 175 (1982)
authorization for submission of second amended petition to intervene; LBP-82-52, 16 NRC 184 (1982)
standards for admitting late intervenor; LBP-82-63, 16 NRC (586)

10 CFR 2.714(a), (b)
limit on number of contention to be admitted; ALAB-706, 16 NRC 1757 (1982)

10 CFR 2.714(b)
admission of late-filed contentions based on previously unavailable documents; ALAB-687, 16 NRC 467 (1982)
circumstances for admitting a late contention; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2111 (1982)
conditional admission of nonspecific contentions; ALAB-687, 16 NRC 463, 465-66 (1982)
contention requirement for intervention; ALAB-687, 16 NRC 464 (1982); LBP-82-74, 16 NRC 985 (1982)
exclusion of contentions for lack of basis; LBP-82-53, 16 NRC 198 (1982)
inconsistency between Statement of Consideration and; ALAB-687, 16 NRC 464 (1982)
interpretation of basis with specificity requirement; ALAB-706, 16 NRC 1757 (1982)
Licensing Board instructed to allow intervention petitioner to supplement its petition; ALAB-682, 16 NRC 156 (1982)
Licensing Board interpretation of; LBP-82-63, 16 NRC 577 (1982)
specific basis for turbine missile contention established; LBP-82-98, 16 NRC 1461 (1982)
specificity met on ATWS contention; LBP-82-103, 16 NRC 1618 (1982)
specificity required of radioactive releases contention; LBP-82-51, 16 NRC 175 (1982)
standards for evaluating new contentions; LBP-82-63, 16 NRC 576 (1982)

10 CFR 2.714(c)
justification for untimely response to contentions; LBP-82-63, 16 NRC 575 (1982)

10 CFR 2.714(d)
weight given to five-factor test for intervention when interest is strong; LBP-82-74, 16 NRC 984 (1982)

10 CFR 2.714(f)
standing of petitioner in decontamination proceeding to litigate related waste disposal issues; LBP-82-52, 16 NRC 191 (1982)

10 CFR 2.714a
appeal of rulings admitting intervenors; CLI-82-15, 16 NRC 30 (1982)
appealability of Licensing Board's order; ALAB-696, 16 NRC 1255 (1982)
application of finality rule; ALAB-690, 16 NRC 895 (1982)
circumstances appropriate for interlocutory appeals; ALAB-683, 16 NRC 161 (1982)
rejection of argument for dismissal of appeal; ALAB-690, 16 NRC 895 (1982)
use of informal oral notification to trigger time for seeking appeal; ALAB-690, 16 NRC 895 (1982)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX REGULATIONS

10 CFR 2.714a(c)
standard for permitting appeals of orders granting intervention; ALAB-687, 16 NRC 464 (1982)

10 CFR 2.715(c)
admission of Attorney General of State of New Mexico as interested state agency; LBP-82-117A, 16 NRC 1968, 1998 (1982)

admission of local government entity as full party; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1092 (1982)

participation by a State; ALAB-690, 16 NRC 894 (1982)

participation by Commonwealth of Massachusetts as full party; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1079 (1982)

participation by South Carolina as interested state; LBP-82-55, 16 NRC 229 (1982)

participation by State of Louisiana as full party rather than as interested state; LBP-82-92, 16 NRC 1378, 1381 (1982)

10 CFR 2.715(d)
definition of *amicus curiae*; ALAB-679, 16 NRC 125 (1982)

10 CFR 2.715a
requirement of consolidated parties; CLI-82-25, 16 NRC 868 (1982)

10 CFR 2.716
Commission authority to consolidate two or more proceedings; DPRM-82-2, 16 NRC 1215 (1982)

consolidation of hearing petitions; CLI-82-29, 16 NRC 1223 (1982)

criteria for consolidating materials license renewal and operating license proceedings; ALAB-682, 16 NRC 155 (1982)

10 CFR 2.717(a)
Licensing Board jurisdiction after issuance of low-power license; LBP-82-92, 16 NRC 1380 (1982)

termination of a Licensing Board's jurisdiction; ALAB-699, 16 NRC 1326 (1982)

termination of jurisdiction of presiding officer; LBP-82-86, 16 NRC 1191, 1193 (1982)

10 CFR 2.717(b)
Licensing Board jurisdiction to consider hearing request on operating license amendment that it is not authorized to review; ALAB-679, 16 NRC 125 (1982)

10 CFR 2.718
alteration of Board authority to conduct hearings; LBP-82-69, 16 NRC 753 (1982)

Board responsibility for fairness; LBP-82-73, 16 NRC 979 (1982)

case management powers of a Board; LBP-82-107, 16 NRC 1679 (1982)

imposition of civil penalties; CLI-82-31, 16 NRC 1238 (1982)

Licensing Board authority to impose sanctions for a default; LBP-82-115, 16 NRC 1928 (1982)

procedures encompassing a Licensing Board's regulation of a proceeding; ALAB-696, 16 NRC 1263 (1982)

result of permitting intervenors to decline to follow order they disagree with; LBP-82-115, 16 NRC 1931 (1982)

10 CFR 2.718(d)
Board authority to direct parties on the means to conduct initial examinations; LBP-82-107, 16 NRC 1677 (1982)

measures which may be taken by a Board to focus and expedite a hearing; LBP-82-107, 16 NRC 1677 (1982)

10 CFR 2.718(e)
Board discretion to conduct hearings outside 10-mile EPZ; CLI-82-15, 16 NRC 37 (1982)

measures which may be taken by a Board to focus and expedite a hearing; LBP-82-107, 16 NRC 1677 (1982)

10 CFR 2.718(i)
denial of petition for directed certification of two evidentiary rulings made during operating license proceedings; LBP-82-62, 16 NRC 566 (1982)

Licensing Board authority to certify questions to the Commission; LBP-82-62, 16 NRC 567 (1982)

petition for directed certification of unpublished order; ALAB-688, 16 NRC 473 (1982)

request for Commission review of Licensing Board order denying motion for stay or dismissal of evidentiary proceeding; CLI-82-15, 16 NRC 33 (1982)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX REGULATIONS

10 CFR 2.718(j)
authority of Licensing Board to reopen the record; CLI-82-20, 16 NRC 114 (1982); LBP-82-54, 16 NRC 214 (1982); ALAB-699, 16 NRC 1326 (1982)
termination of jurisdiction of presiding officer; LBP-82-86, 16 NRC 1191, 1193 (1982)

10 CFR 2.718(m)
jurisdiction of Licensing Board to impose fines sua sponte; CLI-82-31, 16 NRC 1238 (1982)

10 CFR 2.720(f)
Licensing Board authority to condition its rulings; LBP-82-81, 16 NRC 1140 (1982)

10 CFR 2.720(h) (2) (ii)
circumstances in which interrogatories may be addressed to NRC Staff; LBP-82-99, 16 NRC 1547 (1982)
necessity for Staff response to hydrogen generation interrogatories; LBP-82-117, 16 NRC 1957 (1982)
need for formal motion to require Staff to answer interrogatories; LBP-82-116, 16 NRC 1952 (1982)

10 CFR 2.721(b)
reconstitution of Licensing Board; CLI-82-24, 16 NRC 866 (1982)

10 CFR 2.722(a) (2)
appointment of Special Master; LBP-82-56, 16 NRC 288 (1982)

10 CFR 2.722(a) (3)
weight given to report of Special Master; LBP-82-56, 16 NRC 288 (1982)

10 CFR 2.730
right of movant to reply to answers in NRC proceedings; LBP-82-72, 16 NRC 971 (1981)
submission of formal motions; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2089 (1982)

10 CFR 2.730(c)
justification for untimely response to contentions; LBP-82-63, 16 NRC 575 (1982)
procedure for replying to responses to motions; ALAB-700, 16 NRC 1332 (1982)

10 CFR 2.730(e)
notification of absent parties of oral rulings; ALAB-690, 16 NRC 895 (1982)

10 CFR 2.730(f)
appealability of Licensing Board's order; ALAB-696, 16 NRC 1255 (1982)
appellate standard for acceptance of Licensing Board referrals; ALAB-687, 16 NRC 464 (1982)
prohibition against interlocutory appeal; LBP-82-106, 16 NRC 1652 (1982)
referral of rulings conditionally admitting nonspecific contentions; ALAB-687, 16 NRC 463 (1982)

10 CFR 2.730(g)
stay of Board decision dismissing intervenor; LBP-82-115, 15 NRC 1935 (1982)

10 CFR 2.732
burden of proof for assurance of adequacy of emergency plans; LBP-82-77, 16 NRC 1099 (1982)
burden of proof for demonstrating reliability of emergency radio communications links; ALAB-697, 16 NRC 1271 (1982)

burden of proof in show cause order; LBP-82-64, 16 NRC 655 (1982)
relevancy of availability of evacuation drivers to contention addressing adequacy of procedures for evacuating special populations; LBP-82-112, 16 NRC 1904 (1982)

10 CFR 2.740
requirement for NRC Staff to compile list of criticisms of document at issue in a proceeding; LBP-82-113, 16 NRC 1907 (1982)
timing of discovery on contentions; ALAB-687, 16 NRC 467 (1982)

10 CFR 2.740(a) (1)
beginning of discovery on admitted contentions; LBP-82-116, 16 NRC 1945 (1982)

10 CFR 2.740(b) (1)
exclusion of financial qualifications issues from operating license proceedings; LBP-82-67, 16 NRC 738 (1982)

matters on which discovery may be obtained; LBP-82-82, 16 NRC 1156 (1982)

10 CFR 2.740(b) (2)
materials encompassed by work product doctrine; LBP-82-82, 16 NRC 1159, 1162 (1982)
matters which are privileged from discovery; LBP-82-82, 16 NRC 1157 (1982)

10 CFR 2.740(c)
claims of privilege improperly raised; LBP-82-82, 16 NRC 1152 (1982)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX REGULATIONS

10 CFR 2.740(c)(6)
standards for showing good cause for a protective order; LBP-82-82, 16 NRC 1153 (1982)

10 CFR 2.740(f)
bases for motions to compel; LBP-82-116, 16 NRC 1950 (1982)
motion for order compelling government intervenor to produce emergency planning documents; LBP-82-82, 16 NRC 1149 (1982)
need for intervenor to seek protective order when responding negatively to discovery request; LBP-82-82, 16 NRC 1151, 1152 (1982)

10 CFR 2.740(f)(1)
timeliness of motion to compel; LBP-82-82, 16 NRC 1151 (1982)

10 CFR 2.740(p)
time limit for motions to compel; LBP-82-116, 16 NRC 1953, 1962 (1982)

10 CFR 2.740b(b)
form of objections; LBP-82-116, 16 NRC 1944 (1982)
need for Staff response to hydrogen generation interrogatories; LBP-82-117, 16 NRC 1958 (1982)

10 CFR 2.741
requirement for NRC Staff to compile list of criticisms of document at issue in a proceeding; LBP-82-113, 16 NRC 1907 (1982)

10 CFR 2.741(d)
responses to motions to compel; LBP-82-82, 16 NRC 1151, 1152 (1982)

10 CFR 2.743(a)
requirement for method of conducting cross-examination; LBP-82-107, 16 NRC 1677 (1982)

10 CFR 2.743(b)
evidentiary use of examination by deposition; LBP-82-107, 16 NRC 1671-72, 1675 (1982)

10 CFR 2.743(g)
admission of Staff EIA as evidence; LBP-82-78, 16 NRC 1110 (1982)

10 CFR 2.743(i)
criteria for official notice of information in separate proceedings; ALAB-682, 16 NRC 154 (1982)

10 CFR 2.744
executive privilege for intragovernmental communications; LBP-82-82, 16 NRC 1162 (1982)
limitations on discovery against NRC Staff; LBP-82-99, 16 NRC 1544 (1982)
necessity for Staff response to hydrogen generation interrogatories; LBP-82-117, 16 NRC 1957 (1982)

10 CFR 2.744(e)
criteria for release of security plans to intervenors; LBP-82-80, 16 NRC 1125 (1982)
restrictions on disclosure of safeguards information; LBP-82-51, 16 NRC 177 (1982)

10 CFR 2.749
burdens met in Staff's and applicants' statements of material facts regarding ATWS contention; LBP-82-57, 16 NRC 482, 483 (1982)
conformance of intervenor's response with; LBP-82-57, 16 NRC 481 (1982)
denial of summary disposition motions occurring shortly before a hearing; LBP-82-93, 16 NRC 1393 (1982)
filing time for summary disposition motions; LBP-82-116, 16 NRC 1945 (1982)
relationship between Motion for Litigable Issues and summary disposition motion; LBP-82-88, 16 NRC 1339 (1982)
requirements for filing genuine issues of fact; LBP-82-88, 16 NRC 1340 (1982)
requirements met by applicants' motion for summary disposition; LBP-82-57, 16 NRC 484 (1982)
Staff satisfaction of the requirements of; LBP-82-57, 16 NRC 483 (1982)
summary disposition of unconditionally admitted contentions; ALAB-687, 16 NRC 464 (1982)
use of affidavits in answers to summary disposition motions; LBP-82-88, 16 NRC 1345 (1982)

10 CFR 2.749(a)
admission of material facts set forth by summary disposition movant; LBP-82-114, 16 NRC 1912 (1982)
standard for demonstrating genuine issue of material fact; ALAB-696, 16 NRC 1258 (1982)
submission of statement of material facts with summary disposition motion; LBP-82-58, 16 NRC 520 (1982)
time for filing summary disposition motions; ALAB-696, 16 NRC 1263 (1982)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX REGULATIONS

use of summary disposition procedures before hearing has been scheduled; LBP-82-93, 16 NRC 1394 (1982)

10 CFR 2.749(a), (b)
content of affidavit replying to summary disposition motions; ALAB-696, 16 NRC 1259 (1982)

10 CFR 2.749(b)
burden of party opposing summary disposition motion; LBP-82-114, 16 NRC 1912 (1982)
limitations on response to new material in filing in support of summary disposition motion; LBP-82-114, 16 NRC 1916 (1982)

10 CFR 2.749(c)
Board authority to grant summary disposition before discovery is completed; ALAB-696, 16 NRC 1263 (1982)
standard for demonstrating genuine issue of material fact; ALAB-696, 16 NRC 1258-59 (1982)

10 CFR 2.749(d)
showing required for grant of summary disposition; LBP-82-114, 16 NRC 1911 (1982)
standards for summary disposition; LBP-82-58, 16 NRC 519 (1982)

10 CFR 2.751
exceptions to requirement for public hearings on NRC proceedings; LBP-82-107, 16 NRC 1680 (1982)

10 CFR 2.751a
failure of intervenor to meet filing time for objections; LBP-82-72, 16 NRC 971 (1981)
lack of specificity of contention not grounds for rejection; LBP-82-51, 16 NRC 169 (1982)

10 CFR 2.751a(d)
Board authority to simplify and consolidate contentions; LBP-82-88, 16 NRC 1340 (1982)
denial of certification of emergency planning contentions; LBP-82-51, 16 NRC 174 (1982)
objections to order authorizing discovery; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2113 (1982)

10 CFR 2.752(a)(1)
Board authority to simplify and clarify issues; LBP-82-88, 16 NRC 1340 (1982)

10 CFR 2.754
Board authority to vary scheduling procedures; LBP-82-51A, 16 NRC 181 (1982)
Licensing Board treatment of contention not supported by proposed findings; ALAB-697, 16 NRC 1280 (1982)

10 CFR 2.754(a)
alteration of regulatory schedule for filing findings of fact; LBP-82-51A, 16 NRC 181 (1982)

10 CFR 2.754(c)
reason for requirement to cite to the record and to identify purpose of exhibits; LBP-82-109, 16 NRC 1832 (1982)

10 CFR 2.756
measures which may be taken by a Board to focus and expedite a hearing; LBP-82-107, 16 NRC 1677 (1982)

10 CFR 2.757(c)
measures which may be taken by a Board to focus and expedite a hearing; LBP-82-107, 16 NRC 1677 (1982)

10 CFR 2.758
admission of contentions challenging Commission regulations; CLI-82-15, 16 NRC 35 (1982)
Commission authority to determine applicability of; CLI-82-15, 16 NRC 34 (1982)
consideration of challenges to Table S-3; LBP-82-92, 16 NRC 1377, 1385 (1982)
example of special circumstances necessary for considering need-for-power issues in operating license proceedings; LBP-82-58, 16 NRC 528 (1982)

interpretation of "special circumstances"; LBP-82-58, 16 NRC 532 (1982)

petition to exception to numerical limitation on size of design basis threat; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 71 (1982)

procedural requirements for petitions for waiver of a rule; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2073, 2080 (1982)

rejection of contention advocating stricter-than-regulatory requirements; LBP-82-106, 16 NRC 1656 (1982)

showing necessary for considering need for power and alternative energy source issues at operating license stage for review; LBP-82-95, 16 NRC 1404 (1982)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX REGULATIONS

10 CFR 2.758(a)
challenges to regulations; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 71 (1982)
claim of greater-than-zero radioactive releases as excessive; LBP-82-58, 16 NRC 522, 523 (1982)

10 CFR 2.758(b)
exceptions to regulations; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 71 (1982)
lack of showing for certification of emergency planning contentions; LBP-82-51, 16 NRC 174 (1982)
unsupported petitions for exceptions to regulation; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 72 (1982)

10 CFR 2.758(c)
challenges to regulations; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 71 (1982)

10 CFR 2.758(d)
denial of certification of emergency planning contentions; LBP-82-51, 16 NRC 174 (1982)
treatment of exceptions to regulations where grounds are shown; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 71 (1982)

10 CFR 2.760(a)
application to manufacturing license proceedings; ALAB-689, 16 NRC 889 (1982)
certification of record of special proceeding to the Commission; ALAB-685, 16 NRC 451 (1982)
discretion of Board to take up important safety issues; LBP-82-60, 16 NRC 547 (1982)
finality of a Licensing Board's initial decision in a licensing proceeding; ALAB-699, 16 NRC 1326 (1982)
nature of cases subject to *sua sponte* review by Appeal Board; ALAB-689, 16 NRC 890-91 (1982)

10 CFR 2.760(b)
evidentiary use of depositions for examination; LBP-82-107, 16 NRC 1672 (1982)

10 CFR 2, App. A,V
Board authority to direct parties on the means to conduct initial examinations; LBP-82-107, 16 NRC 1677 (1982)

10 CFR 2.760a
authority of Licensing Board to reopen the record; CLI-82-20, 16 NRC 114 (1982); LBP-82-54, 16 NRC 214 (1982)
Commission review of Licensing Board decisions to exercise *sua sponte* authority; CLI-82-20, 16 NRC 115 (1982)
definition of *sua sponte* issue; LBP-82-117, 16 NRC 1962 (1982)
findings to be made prior to issuance of operating license; LBP-82-109, 16 NRC 1885 (1982)
limitation on matters to be resolved in operating license proceedings; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1086 (1982)
limitations on Licensing Board jurisdiction in ruling on contentions; LBP-82-96, 16 NRC 1436 (1982)
matters to be litigated in an operating license proceeding; LBP-82-115, 16 NRC 1933 (1982)
NRC Staff responsibility for health and safety findings; LBP-82-100, 16 NRC 1556 (1982)
responsibilities of presiding officers in initial decision in contested proceeding; DPRM-82-2, 16 NRC 1216 (1982)
sua sponte adoption by Licensing Board of contentions advanced by intervenor; CLI-82-20, 16 NRC 115 (1982)
sua sponte adoption of late-filed, excluded contention; LBP-82-79, 16 NRC 1119 (1982)
sua sponte adoption of quality assurance and management competence contentions; CLI-82-20, 16 NRC 109 (1982)

10 CFR 2.761a
preclusion of evidentiary hearings on limited work authorization request; ALAB-688, 16 NRC 473, 474 (1982)

10 CFR 2.762
application of finality rule; ALAB-690, 16 NRC 895 (1982)
requirements for filing appellate briefs; LBP-82-78, 16 NRC 1115 (1982)

10 CFR 2.762(a)
appeal of rejection of contention; ALAB-683, 16 NRC 161 (1982)
appealability of Licensing Board's order; ALAB-696, 16 NRC 1255 (1982)
contents of briefs on appeal; ALAB-693, 16 NRC 956 (1982)
rejection of argument for dismissal of appeal; ALAB-690, 16 NRC 895 (1982)
use of informal oral notification to trigger time for seeking appeal; ALAB-690, 16 NRC 895 (1982)

10 CFR 2.762(a), (c), and (d)
failure of appeal to conform to the requirements of; ALAB-684, 16 NRC 166 (1982)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX REGULATIONS

10CFR 2.762(a), (f)
consequence of intervenor's failure to brief exceptions; ALAB-696, 16 NRC 1255 (1982)

10CFR 2.762(f)
failure of appeal to conform to the requirements of; ALAB-684, 16 NRC 166 (1982)

10CFR 2.764
amendment of; ALAB-686, 16 NRC 457, 458 (1982)
Appeal Board obligation to conduct immediate effectiveness review in manufacturing license proceedings; ALAB-689, 16 NRC 889, 891 (1982)

10CFR 2.764 (1982)
applicability of immediate effectiveness review to manufacturing license case; ALAB-686, 16 NRC 456, 457 (1982); CLI-82-37, 16 NRC 1692 (1982)

10CFR 2.764(a)
effectiveness of Board's authorization of license amendment; ALAB-696, 16 NRC 1249 (1982)

10CFR 2.764(e)
applicability to manufacturing licenses; CLI-82-37, 16 NRC 1692 (1982)

10CFR 2.764(e) (1) (ii), (3) (iii) (1982)
amendment of; ALAB-686, 16 NRC 457, 458 (1982)

10CFR 2.764(e) (2)
immediate effectiveness reviews by appeal board; ALAB-686, 16 NRC 456 (1982)

10CFR 2.764(f)
applicability of, to order converting provisional operating license to full term; LBP-82-58, 16 NRC 532 (1982)
deficiencies in emergency offsite medical arrangements for public not a deterrent to full-power operation of San Onofre; CLI-82-14, 16 NRC 25 (1982)
effectiveness of full-power licenses for San Onofre; CLI-82-27, 16 NRC 884 (1982)
effectiveness of license amendment pending Commission review; LBP-82-60A, 16 NRC 556 (1982)

10CFR 2.764(f) (1982)
results of Commission immediate effectiveness review; ALAB-693, 16 NRC 954 (1982)

10CFR 2.764(f) (2)
Commission and Staff responsibilities before full-power license issues; ALAB-680, 16 NRC 144 (1982)

10CFR 2.767(d)
measures which may be taken by a Board to focus and expedite a hearing; LBP-82-107, 16 NRC 1677 (1982)

10CFR 2.770(a)
appeal board authority to review entire record *sua sponte*; ALAB-685, 16 NRC 451 (1982)

10CFR 2.771
specificity required of motion for reconsideration; LBP-82-68, 16 NRC 749 (1982)
time for filing objections to nonfinal decisions; LBP-82-72, 16 NRC 971 (1981)
time limit for filing motions for reconsideration; LBP-82-110, 16 NRC 1896 (1982)

10CFR 2.780
conversations among parties in a licensing proceeding; ALAB-680, 16 NRC 144 (1982)

10CFR 2.785
Commission delegation of responsibilities to Appeal Board; ALAB-699, 16 NRC 1326 (1982)
exercise of Commission review functions with respect to ensuing proceedings on extension of construction completion dates; CLI-82-29, 16 NRC 1231 (1982)

10CFR 2.785(a)
appeal board authority to review entire record *sua sponte*; ALAB-685, 16 NRC 451 (1982)
nature of cases subject to *sua sponte* review by Appeal Board; ALAB-689, 16 NRC 890-91 (1982)

10CFR 2.785(b) (1)
petition for directed certification of unpublished order; ALAB-688, 16 NRC 473 (1982)

10CFR 2.785(b) (2)
authority for appeal board to hear safety issues it has raised *sua sponte*; CLI-82-12, 16 NRC 3 (1982)
distinction between appellate review of record and *sua sponte* authority; ALAB-685, 16 NRC 452 (1982)

10CFR 2.785(d)
certification of questions to Commission concerning adjudicatory board's jurisdiction to consider quality assurance issues; ALAB-681, 16 NRC 148 (1982)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX REGULATIONS

certification of questions to Commission regarding reopening record on QA/QC issues; LBP-82-70, 16 NRC 763 (1982)

10 CFR 2.786(b)
 reasons for Commission review of appeal board decision; CLI-82-12A, 16 NRC 18 (1982)

10 CFR 2.786(b)(5)
 declaration of review by Commission

10 CFR 2.787(b)
 authority of Appeal Panel Chairman; ALAB-683, 16 NRC 161 (1982)

10 CFR 2.788
 stay of Board decision dismissing intervenor; LBP-82-115, 15 NRC 1935 (1982)

10 CFR 2.788(e)
 factors determining stay of effectiveness of a permit; ALAB-686, 16 NRC 456 (1982)
 factors to be considered by Licensing Board in ruling on a motion for stay; LBP-82-84, 16 NRC 1184 (1982)

10 CFR 2.788(e)(2)
 application of "irreparable injury" criterion to manufacturing license case; ALAB-686, 16 NRC 458 (1982)

 satisfaction of criterion, in manufacturing license case; ALAB-689, 16 NRC 891 (1982)

10 CFR 2.790
 classification of security plans as commercial or financial information; LBP-82-80, 16 NRC 1124 (1982)
 executive privilege for intragovernmental communications; LBP-82-82, 16 NRC 1162 (1982)

10 CFR 2.790(b)(6)
 reason for resolution of proprietary disputes after the merits are resolved; ALAB-696, 16 NRC 1261 (1982)

10 CFR 2.790(d)
 release of sensitive information to intervenors in NRC proceedings; LBP-82-80, 16 NRC 1124, 1125 (1982)

10 CFR 2.800-2.809
 publication of petition for rulemaking for comment; DPRM-82-2, 16 NRC 1215 (1982)

10 CFR 2.802
 eligibility to petition for rulemaking; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 74 (1982)
 raising general health and safety concerns; LBP-82-52, 16 NRC 185 (1982)

10 CFR 2.913
 expunction of classified material from the record of a proceeding; CLI-82-30, 16 NRC 1235 (1982)

10 CFR 2, App. A
 procedures encompassing a Licensing Board's regulation of a proceeding; ALAB-696, 16 NRC 1263 (1982)

10 CFR 2, App. A, V(f)(4)
 standards for determining whether directed certification is appropriate; LBP-82-62, 16 NRC 566-67 (1982)

10 CFR 2, App. A, VIII(b)
 NRC Staff responsibility for health and safety findings; LBP-82-100, 16 NRC 1556 (1982)

10 CFR 2, App. A, VIII(b)(1)
 conducting operating license proceeding while substantial amounts of construction remain to be done; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2111 (1982)

10 CFR 2, App. A, VIII(b)(3)
 health effects of transmission lines; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1085 (1982)

10 CFR 2, App. A, IX(d)(3)
 acceptance of untimely appeals; ALAB-684, 16 NRC 165 (1982)

10 CFR 2, App. C
 definition of material false statement; ALAB-691, 16 NRC 911, 915 (1982)

10 CFR 9
 basis for Staff claim of privilege; LBP-82-87, 16 NRC 1202 (1982)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX REGULATIONS

10 CFR 9.103
request for Commission review of Board order ruling on contentions to be litigated; CLI-82-15, 16 NRC 33 (1982)
source of guidance on Commission's intent; CLI-82-25, 16 NRC 877 (1982)

10 CFR 19
retaliation against QA/QC personnel in violation of; LBP-82-54, 16 NRC 220 (1982)

10 CFR 20
Staff position on risks to individuals from radiation doses; LBP-82-57, 16 NRC 501 (1982)
summary disposition of contention alleging off-gas emissions fail to comply with radiation protection standards of; LBP-82-58, 16 NRC 522-24 (1982)

10 CFR 20.1
rejection of contention asserting equipment repairs will cause failure to meet exposure requirements of; LBP-82-51, 16 NRC 173 (1982)

10 CFR 20.1(c)
detection of loose parts; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1066 (1982)
showing necessary to establish conformance with as-low-as-reasonably achievable requirement for radioactive; LBP-82-58, 16 NRC 522 (1982)

10 CFR 21.2
basis for Staff claim of privilege; LBP-82-87, 16 NRC 1202 (1982)

10 CFR 30
consolidation of materials license and operating license proceedings; ALAB-682, 16 NRC 151-52 (1982)

10 CFR 40
appropriate forum for considering uranium milling methods and impacts; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2100 (1982)

10 CFR 40
license amendment sought for water collection and retention system at inactive thorium ore mill; CLI-82-21, 16 NRC 402 (1982)

10 CFR 50
amendment of, to impose additional licensing requirements; ALAB-686, 16 NRC 457 (1982)
consolidation of materials license and operating license proceedings; ALAB-682, 16 NRC 152 (1982)
detection of loose parts; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1066 (1982)
interaction between safety and non-safety systems at Seabrook; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1082 (1982)
performance of pre-construction permit, safety-related activities; CLI-82-23, 16 NRC 417 (1982)
preclusion of consideration of alternatives and need for power in operating license proceedings; LBP-82-103, 16 NRC 1606 (1982)
TMI compliance with reactor operator requalification program; LBP-82-56, 16 NRC 349 (1982)

10 CFR 50.10
exemption from, granted in part for experimental reactor; CLI-82-23, 16 NRC 415 (1982)
grant of partial exemption from, for breeder reactor project; ALAB-688, 16 NRC 473 (1982)
public interest considerations in granting exemption from; CLI-82-23, 16 NRC 422, 425 (1982)

10 CFR 50.10(b)(2)
distinction between construction permits and manufacturing licenses; ALAB-686, 16 NRC 456 (1982)

10 CFR 50.10(c)
limitations on construction activities prior to issuance of LWA or construction permit; CLI-82-23, 16 NRC 416, 418 (1982)

10 CFR 50.10(e)(1)
activities allowed under limited work authorization; ALAB-688, 16 NRC 473 (1982)

10 CFR 50.10(e)(2)
requirements for grant of limited work authorization; ALAB-688, 16 NRC 473 (1982)

10 CFR 50.10(e)(3)(i)-(ii)
foreclosure of consideration of site suitability issues through grant of exemption to 50.10; CLI-82-23, 16 NRC 423 (1982)

10 CFR 50.11(b)
application of licensing provisions of Atomic Energy Act to Department of Energy; ALAB-679, 16 NRC 125 (1982)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX REGULATIONS

10 CFR 50.12
application of, to first-of-a-kind project; CLI-82-23, 16 NRC 419 (1982)
history of; CLI-82-23, 16 NRC 446 (1982)
public interest factors favoring grant of exemption under; CLI-82-23, 16 NRC 439 (1982)

10 CFR 50.12(a)
discussion of criteria for granting exemption from 50.10; CLI-82-23, 16 NRC 418, 419, 422 (1982)

10 CFR 50.12(b)
Commission interpretation of; CLI-82-23, 16 NRC 423 (1982)
discussion of criteria to be met for granting of exemption from 50.10(c); CLI-82-23, 16 NRC 416, 418-19, 422, 423, 426 (1982)

10 CFR 50.12(b)(1)
environmental impacts considered in allowing pre-construction permit site preparation activities; CLI-82-23, 16 NRC 426, 437 (1982)

10 CFR 50.12(b)(2)
redressability of pre-construction permit site activities; CLI-82-23, 16 NRC 427 (1982)

10 CFR 50.12(b)(3)
foreclosure of consideration of alternatives through initiation of site preparation activities; CLI-82-23, 16 NRC 428 (1982)

10 CFR 50.12(b)(4)
effects of delay in initiating breeder reactor project; CLI-82-23, 16 NRC 429, 438 (1982)

10 CFR 50.13
conflict of contention with; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2099 (1982)
consideration of heavy military weapons attacks on spent fuel shipments; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2094 (1982)
design basis threat against which commercial power reactors are required to be protected; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2098 (1982)

NEPA consideration of effects of terrorism; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2096 (1982)
providing design features for particularized threats of sabotage; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 73 (1982)
rejection of electromagnetic pulse contention as challenge to; LBP-82-51, 16 NRC 174 (1982)

10 CFR 50.20(e)
assessment of health effects of Table S-3 releases; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2090-91 (1982)

10 CFR 50.31
consolidation of proceedings; DPRM-82-2, 16 NRC 1214 (1982)

10 CFR 50.33(f)
contention alleges inadequacy of sum allotted for decommissioning; LBP-82-57, 16 NRC 481 (1982)
dismissal of previously accepted financial qualifications contention; LBP-82-103, 16 NRC 1618 (1982)
preclusion of financial qualifications considerations in operating license proceedings; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1045, 1081 (1982)

10 CFR 50.33(f)(1)
litigability of financial qualifications issues; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2079 (1982)

10 CFR 50.33(g)
compliance of Diablo Canyon onsite State and local emergency response plans and preparedness; LBP-82-70, 16 NRC 763 (1982)
compliance of Diablo Canyon's emergency plans with; LBP-82-70, 16 NRC 760, 798 799, 855 (1982)
deficiencies in boundaries for EPZs at Seabrook; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1077 (1982)
failure of applicant to submit emergency response plans of State and local governments; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1077 (1982)
responsibility for preparation of radiological response plan; LBP-82-82, 16 NRC 1162 (1982)

10 CFR 50.34(a)(3)(i)
inapplicability to test reactors; LBP-82-64, 16 NRC 698 (1982)

10 CFR 50.34(a)(7)
amendment of construction permits; DD-82-1207

10 CFR 50.34(b)
adequacy of Clinton facility management and technical qualifications; LBP-82-103, 16 NRC 1623 (1982)
adequacy of Clinton management and technical qualifications; LBP-82-103, 16 NRC 1614 (1982)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX REGULATIONS

10 CFR 50.34(b) (6) (i) and (ii)
information to be submitted in FSAR on management structure and organization; DD-82-1207

10 CFR 50.34(b) (6) (ii)
deficiencies in FSAR, on quality assurance for operations; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1073 (1982)

10 CFR 50.34(b) (6) (v)
failure of Seabrook emergency plan to address requirements of; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1074 (1982)

10 CFR 50.34(c)
criteria for protection of nuclear reactors; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 62 (1982)

10 CFR 50.34(f)
consideration of TMI issues for manufacturing licenses; CLI-82-37, 16 NRC 1697 (1982)

10 CFR 50.34a
showing necessary to establish conformance with as-low-as-reasonably achievable requirement for radioactive releases; LBP-82-58, 16 NRC 522 (1982)

10 CFR 50.36
detection of loose parts; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1066 (1982)

10 CFR 50.36a
showing necessary to establish conformance with as-low-as-reasonably achievable requirement for radioactive; LBP-82-58, 16 NRC 522 (1982)

10 CFR 50.40
applicability to proceeding involving steam generator tube repair through sleeving; LBP-82-88, 16 NRC 1341 (1982)
consideration of liquid pathway accident impacts; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1037 (1982)

10 CFR 50.40(b) (1982)
elimination of financial qualifications issues from operating license proceedings; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1081 (1982)

10 CFR 50.40(d)
findings on NEPA compliance, to be made by Director prior to issuance of operating license; ALAB-693, 16 NRC 956 (1982)

10 CFR 50.44
adequacy of Seabrook design to withstand excessive hydrogen generation; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1039
admissibility of accident scenario contentions concerning hydrogen control; LBP-82-107A, 16 NRC 1809 (1982)
amount of hydrogen generation to be taken in account in containment design; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1064 (1982)
differences between hydrogen control requirements and hydrogen release assumptions for purpose of environmental qualification; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1049 (1982)
hydrogen production at TMI; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1063 (1982)
removal of noncondensable gases; ALAB-708, 16 NRC 1779 (1982)
revision of, for Mark I, II, and III boiling water reactors; LBP-82-103, 16 NRC 1609 (1982)
Staff response to hydrogen generation interrogatories; LBP-82-117, 16 NRC 1959 (1982)

10 CFR 50.46
acceptability of Clinton emergency core cooling system; LBP-82-103, 16 NRC 1624-25 (1982)
demonstration of adequacy of boiler-condenser mode of circulation to prevent regulatory limits from being exceeded; ALAB-708, 16 NRC 1785 (1982)
necessity for risk assessment; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1033 (1982)
smallest breaks in cooling system to be analyzed for purposes of verifying regulatory compliance; ALAB-708, 16 NRC 1783 (1982)

10 CFR 50.47
adequacy of emergency command decision structure at Waterford plant; LBP-82-100, 16 NRC 1579 (1982)
adequacy of Waterford emergency plans; LBP-82-100, 16 NRC 1592 (1982)
appropriateness of evacuation as protective action; LBP-82-96, 16 NRC 1427 (1982)
assurance of adequacy of protective measures to be taken in radiological emergency; LBP-82-70, 16 NRC 761 (1982)
basic requirements for structure of an emergency response organization; ALAB-698, 16 NRC 1303 (1982)
conformance of Summer facility's emergency information brochure with; LBP-82-57, 16 NRC 490 (1982)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX REGULATIONS

division of responsibility for emergency planning; LBP-82-77, 16 NRC 1099 (1982)
emergency planning standards for evacuation of persons without vehicles; LBP-82-77, 16 NRC 1100 (1982)
emergency response plans for radiation-injured in the general public; ALAB-680, 16 NRC 135 (1982)
enforcement of requirements of; LBP-82-70, 16 NRC 802 (1982)
failure of Seabrook emergency plan to address requirements of; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1074 (1982)
guidance for implementing emergency planning requirements; ALAB-707, 16 NRC 1763 (1982)
location of emergency public alerting system
necessity for FEMA findings on State emergency plan; LBP-82-85, 16 NRC 1188 (1982)
NRC Staff-required emergency preparedness findings as means of protecting petitioner's interests; LBP-82-96, 16 NRC 1430 (1982)
operating license conditioned on resolution of emergency preparedness matters under; CLI-82-14, 16 NRC 25 (1982)
proof of adequacy of offsite emergency plans; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2101 (1982)
responsibility for onsite radiation monitoring during radiological emergency; LBP-82-70, 16 NRC 827 (1982)
responsibility for preparation of radiological response plan; LBP-82-82, 16 NRC 1162 (1982)
standard of Board review of emergency planning; LBP-82-70, 16 NRC 802 (1982)
status required of emergency plans in order for full-power operation to be authorized; LBP-82-100, 16 NRC 1563 (1982)
use of NUREG-0654 as means of complying with standards in; ALAB-698, 16 NRC 1298 (1982)

10 CFR 50.47(a)
basis for determination that emergency plans are adequate; LBP-82-100, 16 NRC 1574 (1982)
FEMA review of emergency planning pamphlet in license amendment proceeding; LBP-82-60, 16 NRC 547 (1982)
requirement for Staff issuance of supplement to Safety Evaluation Report; LBP-82-68, 16 NRC 749 (1982)
sufficiency of plans for evacuation warning system at Waterford plant; LBP-82-100, 16 NRC 1563 (1982)

10 CFR 50.47(a) and (b)
protective action contention limited to onsite measures; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1046 (1982)

10 CFR 50.47(a)(1)
emergency planning findings required prior to issuance of full-power license; LBP-82-68, 16 NRC 745 (1982)
NRC emergency preparedness findings required for issuance of operating license; LBP-82-57, 16 NRC 484 (1982)
requirement for agreement for evacuation vehicles and drivers; LBP-82-112, 16 NRC 1903 (1982)

10 CFR 50.47(a)(1), (a)(2) and (b)
failure of emergency plan to take local conditions into account; LBP-82-75, 16 NRC 991 (1982)

10 CFR 50.47(a)(2)
admissibility of shift supervisor training contention; LBP-82-106, 16 NRC 1661 (1982)
basis for NRC findings on adequacy of offsite emergency plans; LBP-82-112, 16 NRC 1903, 1905 (1982)
basis of Commission findings that emergency plans are adequate; LBP-82-68, 16 NRC 745-46 (1982)
basis of NRC findings on adequacy of offsite emergency plans; LBP-82-57, 16 NRC 485 (1982)

10 CFR 50.47(b)
adequacy of Summer facility's emergency response planning; LBP-82-57, 16 NRC 495 (1982)
admission of contention contesting compliance of iodine monitors with; LBP-82-75, 16 NRC 1010 (1982)
failure of applicant to meet standards of; LBP-82-57, 16 NRC 509 (1982)
FEMA review of emergency planning pamphlet in license amendment proceeding; LBP-82-60, 16 NRC 547 (1982)
relation of emergency preparedness deficiencies, noted by FEMA at Indian Point, to regulatory requirements; CLI-82-38, 16 NRC 1707 (1982)
requirement for specific identification or radiation monitors; LBP-82-75, 16 NRC 1010 (1982)
requirements for compliance with emergency planning standards of NUREG-0654/FEMA-REP-1; CLI-82-38, 16 NRC 1700 (1982)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX REGULATIONS

satisfaction of requirements for radiological emergency response training; LBP-82-57, 16 NRC 495 (1982)
standards for emergency preparedness addressed by NUREG-0654 criteria; DD-82-12, 16 NRC 1687
(1982)

10 CFR 50.47(b)(1)
assurance that Diablo Canyon meets planning standard of; LBP-82-70, 16 NRC 763, 768, 799 (1982)
inadequacy of plan for assigning emergency communications and notification responsibility; LBP-82-75,
16 NRC 1027 (1982)

inadequate delineation of responsibilities of onsite emergency personnel; LBP-82-75, 16 NRC 1024
(1982)

lack of assurance of assistance from offsite agencies during radiological emergency; LBP-82-75, 16 NRC
1023 (1982)

10 CFR 50.47(b)(1), (2) and (3)
lack of incorporation of federal response capabilities in Shoreham's emergency plans; LBP-82-75, 16 NRC
1022 (1982)

10 CFR 50.47(b)(2)
adequacy and continuity of staffing at Seabrook; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1046 (1982)
inadequacy of Shoreham's accident assessment and monitoring abilities; LBP-82-75, 16 NRC 1025 (1982)
inadequate delineation of responsibilities of onsite emergency personnel; LBP-82-75, 16 NRC 1024
(1982)

interfacing between onsite and offsite emergency response organizations; ALAB-698, 16 NRC 1304
(1982)

lack of assurance of assistance from offsite agencies during radiological emergency; LBP-82-75, 16 NRC
1023 (1982)

lack of incorporation of federal response capabilities in Shoreham's emergency plans; LBP-82-75, 16
NRC 1022 (1982)

requirement for specific identification of radiation monitors; LBP-82-75, 16 NRC 1010 (1982)

10 CFR 50.47(b)(3)
adequacy of Diablo Canyon's emergency response support and resources; LBP-82-70, 16 NRC 771, 808,
810 (1982)

inadequate delineation of responsibilities of onsite emergency personnel; LBP-82-75, 16 NRC 1024
(1982)

lack of assurance of assistance from offsite agencies during radiological emergency; LBP-82-75, 16 NRC
1023 (1982)

lack of incorporation of federal response capabilities in Shoreham's emergency plans; LBP-82-75, 16
NRC 1022 (1982)

licensee accommodations for State and local emergency response staff; ALAB-698, 16 NRC 1304 (1982)

10 CFR 50.47(b)(4)
adequacy of Diablo Canyon's emergency classification system; LBP-82-70, 16 NRC 772, 810-811 (1982)
adequacy of specificity of contention dealing with emergency action levels; LBP-82-105, 16 NRC 1631
(1982)

classification of emergencies; ALAB-697, 16 NRC 1270 (1982)

inadequacies cited in emergency classification and action scheme at Seabrook; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1045
(1982)

inadequacy of Shoreham interim safety parameter display system; LBP-82-75, 16 NRC 1028 (1982)
inadequacy of Shoreham's accident assessment and monitoring abilities; LBP-82-75, 16 NRC 1025 (1982)
regulatory basis of emergency classification contention; LBP-82-106, 16 NRC 1660 (1982)
requirement for specific identification of radiation monitors; LBP-82-75, 16 NRC 1010 (1982)

10 CFR 50.47(b)(5)
adequacy of Diablo Canyon's emergency public altering system; LBP-82-70, 16 NRC 775, 811, 816 (1982)
adequacy of San Onofre emergency public notification system; CLI-82-14, 16 NRC 25 (1982)
adequacy of Waterford evacuation warning system; LBP-82-100, 16 NRC 1576 (1982)
burden of demonstrating existence of satisfactory prompt notification system for plume exposure pathway
EPZ populace; LBP-82-60, 16 NRC 550 (1982)

relevancy of applicant's public information emergency planning pamphlet; LBP-82-60, 16 NRC 542
(1982)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX **REGULATIONS**

requirements for licensee notification of State and local emergency response organizations; ALAB-697, 16 NRC 1269 (1982)

scope of regulations for altering plume exposure pathway EPZ populace of radiological emergency; LBP-82-57, 16 NRC 495 (1982)

size and configuration of plume exposure emergency planning zone; ALAB-680, 16 NRC 132 (1982)

10 CFR 50.47(b)(5) and (6)

adequacy of Shoreham prompt notification system; LBP-82-75, 16 NRC 1021 (1982)

10 CFR 50.47(b)(6)

adequacy of offsite communications system at Diablo Canyon to cope with radiological emergency; LBP-82-70, 16 NRC 776, 816, 820 (1982)

adequacy of Shoreham prompt notification system; LBP-82-75, 16 NRC 1021 (1982)

requirements for communications among emergency response organizations; ALAB-697, 16 NRC 1270 (1982)

10 CFR 50.47(b)(7)

adequacy of Diablo Canyon public notification program; LBP-82-70, 16 NRC 780, 820 (1982)

inadequacy of plan for assigning emergency communications and notification responsibility; LBP-82-75, 16 NRC 1027 (1982)

lack of dissemination of emergency planning information to public; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1046 (1982)

licensee responsibility for informing public of actions to take during a radiological emergency; ALAB-697, 16 NRC 1272-73 (1982)

satification of requirement for notification and education of public on what action they should take in radiological emergency; LBP-82-57, 16 NRC 495 (1982)

unavailability of emergency planning brochure; LBP-82-100, 16 NRC 1555, 1573 (1982)

10 CFR 50.47(b)(8)

adequacy of Diablo Canyon equipment for implementing emergency plans; LBP-82-70, 16 NRC 782, 825, 828 (1982)

admission of contention contesting compliance of iodine monitors with; LBP-82-75, 16 NRC 1010 (1982)

inadequacy of Shoreham interim safety parameter display system; LBP-82-75, 16 NRC 1028 (1982)

inadequacy of Shoreham's accident assessment and monitoring abilities; LBP-82-75, 16 NRC 1025 (1982)

inadequate delineation of responsibilities of onsite emergency personnel; LBP-82-75, 16 NRC 1024 (1982)

lack of assurance of assistance from offsite agencies during radiological emergency; LBP-82-75, 16 NRC 1023 (1982)

nonconformance of Shoreham plan and procedures for operation of Emergency Operations Facility; LBP-82-75, 16 NRC 1025 (1982)

requirement for specific identification of radiation monitors; LBP-82-75, 16 NRC 1010 (1982)

10 CFR 50.47(b)(9)

requirement for availability of equipment for monitoring radiological exposures to emergency workers; ALAB-698, 16 NRC 1294 (1982)

10 CFR 50.47(b)(9)

capability for assessing and monitoring radioactive releases at Diablo Canyon; LBP-82-70, 16 NRC 785, 828, 833 (1982)

inadequacy of accident and dose assessment models; LBP-82-75, 16 NRC 1028 (1982)

inadequacy of Shoreham interim safety parameter display system; LBP-82-75, 16 NRC 1028 (1982)

inadequacy of Shoreham's accident assessment and monitoring abilities; LBP-82-75, 16 NRC 1025 (1982)

requirement for specific identification of radiation monitors; LBP-82-75, 16 NRC 1010 (1982)

types of radiological hazards; ALAB-680, 16 NRC 139 (1982)

10 CFR 50.47(b)(10)

adequacy of Shoreham plans for implementation of protective actions during radiological emergency; LBP-82-75, 16 NRC 1023 (1982)

adequacy of Waterford procedures for evacuation of special persons during radiological emergency; LBP-82-100, 16 NRC 1583 (1982)

description of plume exposure emergency planning zone; ALAB-698, 16 NRC 1294 (1982)

protective actions to be taken during a radiological emergency; ALAB-697, 16 NRC 1275, 1280 (1982)

reliability of evacuation time estimates at Diablo Canyon; LBP-82-70, 16 NRC 786, 833, 836 (1982)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX REGULATIONS

10 CFR 50.47(b) (11)
adequacy of means for controlling radiological exposures of emergency workers at Diablo Canyon;
LBP-82-70, 16 NRC 786, 836 (1982)
failure of applicant to meet training requirements for emergency response personnel; LBP-82-75, 16 NRC 1024 (1982)
lack of means to control radiological exposures to emergency workers; LBP-82-75, 16 NRC 1025 (1982)
standards for controlling radiological exposure to emergency workers; ALAB-698, 16 NRC 1294 (1982)

10 CFR 50.47(b) (12)
adequacy of medical and public health support during radiological emergency at Diablo Canyon;
LBP-82-70, 16 NRC 787, 837 (1982)
Appeal Board and Licensing Board differences in interpretation; CLI-82-27, 16 NRC 884 (1982)
certification of questions on interpretation of; CLI-82-35, 16 NRC 1510-11 (1982)
inadequacies in Shoreham's emergency plans for medical and public health support; LBP-82-75, 16 NRC 1022 (1982)
interpretation of "contaminated injured individuals"; ALAB-680, 16 NRC 135, 136 (1982)
interpretation of "contaminated injured individuals"; LBP-82-75, 16 NRC 997 (1982)
lack of assurance of assistance from offsite agencies during radiological emergency; LBP-82-75, 16 NRC 1023 (1982)
obligation of licensee to make emergency medical services arrangements; LBP-82-60A, 16 NRC 556 (1982)

10 CFR 50.47(b) (13)
adequacy of plans for recovery and reentry operation at Diablo Canyon; LBP-82-70, 16 NRC 788, 839 (1982)
adequacy of recovery and reentry plans for Catawba facility; LBP-82-107A, 16 NRC 1805 (1982)
failure of intervenor to revise recovery and reentry contention; LBP-82-75, 16 NRC 1016 (1982)

10 CFR 50.47(b) (14)
adequacy of Diablo Canyon's plans for emergency exercises and drills; LBP-82-70, 16 NRC 790, 841 (1982)
need for public participation in evacuation drills; LBP-82-100, 16 NRC 1582 (1982)

10 CFR 50.47(b) (15)
adequacy of radiological emergency response training at Diablo Canyon; LBP-82-70, 16 NRC 792, 845 (1982)
education of public officials on problems of radiation exposure; LBP-82-77, 16 NRC 1098 (1982)
failure of applicant to meet training requirements of emergency response personal; LBP-82-75, 16 NRC 1024 (1982)
lack of assurance of assistance from offsite agencies during radiological emergency; LBP-82-75, 16 NRC 1023 (1982)
lack of means to control radiological exposures to emergency workers; LBP-82-75, 16 NRC 1025 (1982)

10 CFR 50.47(b) (16)
adequacy of planning for review and distribution of emergency plans at Diablo Canyon; LBP-82-70, 16 NRC 792, 847, 849 (1982)

10 CFR 50.47(c)
rejection of contention attacking size requirement for plume exposure pathway EPZ; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2082 (1982)

10 CFR 50.47(c) (1)
alternative means of notifying public of an emergency; ALAB-680, 16 NRC 132 (1982)
compensations for emergency planning deficiencies; ALAB-680, 16 NRC 142 (1982)
criteria for determining merits of emergency planning issue; ALAB-680, 16 NRC 131 (1982)
distribution of emergency planning pamphlet to transients; LBP-82-60, 16 NRC 552 (1982)
factors to be considered by Licensing Boards in allowing full-power operation prior to resolution of emergency planning issues; ALAB-680, 16 NRC 136, 138 (1982)
immediate effectiveness review of decision to issue conditioned full-power operating license; CLI-82-14, 16 NRC 25 (1982)
intervenors challenge Licensing Board's conclusions concerning radiation assessment capabilities of local jurisdictions; ALAB-680, 16 NRC 140 (1982)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX REGULATIONS

means for applicants to meet local emergency preparedness requirements; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2101 (1982)

significance of deficiencies in emergency plan; LBP-82-57, 16 NRC 486-87 (1982)

significance of deficiencies in Summer facility emergency plans; LBP-82-57, 16 NRC 509 (1982)

10 CFR 50.47(c) (2)

adjustment of emergency planning zone to correct deficiency; LBP-82-57, 16 NRC 486-87 (1982)

challenges to; CLI-82-36, 16 NRC 36 (1982)

deficiencies in boundaries for emergency planning zones at Seabrook; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1077 (1982)

determination of EPZs; LBP-82-106, 16 NRC 1661 (1982)

difference between California EPZs and federally defined EPZs; LBP-82-70, 16 NRC 764-66, 801, 802 (1982)

extent of testimony to be allowed on emergency planning beyond 10-mile plume exposure EPZ; CLI-82-25, 16 NRC 872 (1982)

factors determining size and configuration of plume exposure EPZ; ALAB-680, 16 NRC 132 (1982); ALAB-698, 16 NRC 1294 (1982)

factors used to determine size and configuration of ingestion emergency planning zone; ALAB-697, 16 NRC 1280 (1982)

protective actions to be taken in agricultural areas during a radiological emergency; ALAB-697, 16 NRC 1275 (1982)

regions to be used for emergency planning purposes; ALAB-697, 16 NRC 1270 (1982)

rejection of contention attacking size requirement for plume exposure pathway EPZ; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2084 (1982)

significance of deficiencies in emergency plan; LBP-82-57, 16 NRC 486-87 (1982)

10 CFR 50.47(d)

satisfaction of conditions prior to issuance of operating license; LBP-82-112, 16 NRC 1902 (1982)

verification of adequacy of siren system to alert public of radiological emergency; LBP-82-100, 16 NRC 1578 (1982)

10 CFR 50.54(a) (1), (2)

failure of Seabrook emergency plan to address requirements of; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1074 (1982)

10 CFR 50.54(f)

means for providing assurance that Zimmer has been constructed in conformance with its construction permit; CLI-82-33, 16 NRC 1500 (1982)

10 CFR 50.54(p)

licensee's responsibilities prior to implementing safeguards contingency plan; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 79, 80 (1982)

10 CFR 50.54(q)

relevancy of applicant's public information emergency planning pamphlet; LBP-82-60, 16 NRC 542 (1982)

requirements for compliance with emergency planning standards of NUREG-0654/FEMA-REP-1; CLI-82-38, 16 NRC 1700 (1982)

10 CFR 50.54(s)

Commission findings in review of emergency preparedness with respect to Indian Point; CLI-82-38, 16 NRC 1699 (1982)

10 CFR 50.54(s) (2) (ii)

deadline for correction of emergency planning deficiencies at Indian Point; CLI-82-25, 16 NRC 869 (1982)

distribution of emergency planning pamphlet to transients; LBP-82-60, 16 NRC 552 (1982)

division of responsibility for emergency planning; LBP-82-77, 16 NRC 1099 (1982)

enforcement action required for emergency preparedness deficiencies; CLI-82-38, 16 NRC 1703, 1709 (1982)

formal notification of period within which emergency planning deficiencies must be remedied; DD-82-12, 16 NRC 1686 (1982)

period for correction of emergency planning deficiencies in operating nuclear power plants; ALAB-680, 16 NRC 131 (1982)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX REGULATIONS

relevancy of applicant's public information emergency planning pamphlet; LBP-82-60, 16 NRC 542 (1982)

time limit on correction of emergency planning deficiencies; LBP-82-61, 16 NRC 563 (1982)

10 CFR 50.54(w)
showing of financial resources necessary to decontaminate nuclear plant following serious accident; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2101 (1982)

10 CFR 50.55
test for admissibility of contentions in construction permit extension proceeding; CLI-82-29, 16 NRC 1228 (1982)

10 CFR 50.55(b)
demonstration of good cause for extension of construction completion date; CLI-82-29, 16 NRC 1224, 1233 (1982)

extension of construction permit completion dates; CLI-82-29, 16 NRC 1225 (1982)

scope of a construction permit extension proceeding; CLI-82-29, 16 NRC 1226 (1982)

10 CFR 50.55(e)
failure of applicant to notify NRC of manual embed deficiencies; LBP-82-109, 16 NRC 1842-43 (1982)

reporting of Zimmer construction deficiencies to NRC; CLI-82-33, 16 NRC 1491, 1492 (1982)

10 CFR 50.55a
applicability to proceeding involving steam generator tube repair through sleeving; LBP-82-88, 16 NRC 1341 (1982)

compliance of Seabrook safety-related equipment; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1037 (1982)

reliability of Seabrook safety-related equipment in accident environment; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1082 (1982)

10 CFR 50.55a(b) (2) (iii), (d) and (g)
applicability to proceeding involving steam generator tube repair through sleeving; LBP-82-88, 16 NRC 1341 (1982)

10 CFR 50.57
findings, on NEPA compliance, to be made by Director prior to issuance of operating license; ALAB-693, 16 NRC 956 (1982)

NRC Staff duty to make health and safety findings; LBP-82-92, 16 NRC 1383 (1982)

responsibility for making findings on uncontested issues prior to operating license issuance; LBP-82-109, 16 NRC 1885 (1982)

10 CFR 50.57(a) (3)
basis for contentions on issues not covered by a specific rule; LBP-82-116, 16 NRC 1946 (1982)

10 CFR 50.57(a)(3) and (6)
test for basis with specificity requirement for contentions, LBP-82-106, 16 NRC 1654 (1982)

10 CFR 50.57(a)(3)(i)
inability of Licensing Board to make findings on issues in contention; LBP-82-118, 16 NRC 2050-55 (1982)

need for administrative controls to prevent cask drop; LBP-82-77, 16 NRC 1104 (1982)

10 CFR 50.57(a)(6)
inability of Licensing Board to make findings on issues in contention; LBP-82-118, 16 NRC 2050-55 (1982)

10 CFR 50.57(c)
consideration of authorization for fuel loading and low power operation in full-power proceeding; LBP-82-112, 16 NRC 1903 (1982)

means of raising question of low-power operation; LBP-82-68, 16 NRC 741 (1982)

10 CFR 50.58(a)
referral of applications for construction permit and operating license amendments to ACRS for review; LBP-82-64, 16 NRC 602 (1982)

10 CFR 50.59
application for amendment to allow sleeving of steam generator tubes; ALAB-696, 16 NRC 1250 (1982)

10 CFR 50.59(a)
right of a licensee to make changes in a facility without prior Commission approval; ALAB-696, 16 NRC 1249 (1982)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX REGULATIONS

10 CFR 50.59(a)(1)
need for Commission approval prior to secondary side work on steam generator repairs; LBP-82-88, 16 NRC 1349 (1982)

10 CFR 50.109
backfitting of facilities; LBP-82-64, 16 NRC 698 (1982)

10 CFR 50, App. A
admission of contention on protection of Seabrook safety systems from turbine missiles; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1067 (1982)
application to test reactor; LBP-82-64, 16 NRC 653, 697-99 (1982)
compliance of Seabrook safety-related equipment; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1037 (1982)
consideration of class 9 accident contentions; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2096 (1982)
deficiencies in FSAR, on quality assurance for operations; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1073 (1982)
inadequacy of interim safety parameter display system; LBP-82-75, 16 NRC 1028 (1982)
modification of ATWS standards; LBP-82-118, 16 NRC 2039 (1982)
necessity of analysis of systems interaction to assess ability of system's design; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1034 (1982)
reliability of Seabrook safety-related equipment in accident environment; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1082 (1982)
satisfaction of single-failure criterion by emergency feedwater system; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1059 (1982)
standard for meeting Commission regulations concerning single failure assumption; ALAB-708, 16 NRC 1777, 1785 (1982)
use of single failure approach in nuclear plant design; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2090 (1982)

10 CFR 50, App. A, GDC 2
applicability to test reactor; LBP-82-64, 16 NRC 646 (1982)
consideration of design basis event in connection with seismic event for test reactor; LBP-82-64, 16 NRC 697 (1982)
standard for determining most severe hurricane at a nuclear power reactor site; LBP-82-91, 16 NRC 1372 (1982)

10 CFR 50, App. A, GDC 4
environmental qualifications contention seen as challenge to regulations; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1048 (1982)

10 CFR 50, App. A, GDC 13
compliance of Seabrook instrumentation

10 CFR 50, App. A, GDC 14
applicability to proceeding involving steam generator tube repair through sleeving; LBP-82-88, 16 NRC 1341 (1982)

10 CFR 50, App. A, GDC 14, 15, 31, 32
compliance of in-service inspection of steam generator tubes; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1067 (1982)
compliance of applicants with requirements for inspection of steam generator tubes; LBP-82-106, 16 NRC 1659 (1982)

10 CFR 50, App. A, GDC 19, 20, 22, 29
adequacy of consideration of adverse systems interaction at Clinton plant; LBP-82-103, 16 NRC 1612 (1982)

10 CFR 50, App. A, GDC 19-22
adequacy of Seabrook design to minimize operator error at Seabrook; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1040 (1982)

10 CFR 50, App. A, GDC 62
requirements for fuel storage and handling; LBP-82-97, 16 NRC 1443 (1982)

10 CFR 50, App. A, GDC 63, 64
adequacy of monitoring of routine releases of radioactivity from Seabrook; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1040 (1982)

10 CFR 50, App. A, IV.E.5-7
inadequacies in Shoreham's emergency plans for medical and public health support; LBP-82-75, 16 NRC 1022 (1982)

10 CFR 50, App. B
adequacy of Clinton facility management and technical qualifications; LBP-82-103, 16 NRC 1614, 1623 (1982)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX REGULATIONS

alteration of weld radiograph as a violation of regulations; LBP-82-118, 16 NRC 2048 (1982)

compliance of Seabrook's method for seismic qualification of electrical equipment; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1068 (1982)

deficiencies in embedded plate cited as quality assurance infractions; LBP-82-109, 16 NRC 1830-31 (1982)

deficiencies in regulations on which Seabrook QA program is based; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1069 (1982)

extent of quality assurance programs required by; LBP-82-56, 16 NRC 380 (1982)

noncompliance of Zimmer facility with quality assurance criteria of; CLI-82-33, 16 NRC 1490, 1496 (1982); LBP-82-54, 16 NRC 217 (1982)

purpose and scope of quality assurance programs; LBP-82-118, 16 NRC 2057 (1982)

quality control of licensed operator training; LBP-82-56, 16 NRC 300 (1982)

violation of requirement for nonconformance report; LBP-82-54, 16 NRC 220 (1982)

10 CFR 50, App. B, II

 requirements of adequacy of quality assurance program; LBP-82-114, 16 NRC 1914 (1982)

10 CFR 50, App. B, III

 use of embedded plates as a quality assurance failure; LBP-82-109, 16 NRC 1842 (1982)

10 CFR 50, App. B, III and XI

 compliance of Seabrook safety-related equipment; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1037 (1982)

10 CFR 50, App. B, VII

 contention challenges quality assurance for vendor purchases; LBP-82-54, 16 NRC 218 (1982)

10 CFR 50, App. B, VIII

 contention cites failure of applicant to maintain material traceability as required by; LBP-82-54, 16 NRC 218 (1982)

10 CFR 50, App. B, X

 nonconformance of Fermi quality assurance program with; LBP-82-96, 16 NRC 1411, 1417 (1982)

10 CFR 50, App. B, XVI

 applicant's lack of knowledge of contractor's inspection data as serious quality assurance failure; LBP-82-109, 16 NRC 1842 (1982)

 failure of applicant to identify and correct construction deficiencies; LBP-82-54, 16 NRC 219 (1982)

10 CFR 50, App. B, XVII

 compliance of Fermi quality assurance records with; LBP-82-96, 16 NRC 1411 (1982)

10 CFR 50, App. C

 dismissal of previously accepted financial qualifications contention; LBP-82-103, 16 NRC 1618 (1982)

10 CFR 50, App. D

 socioeconomic issues considered at construction permit stage; LBP-82-103, 16 NRC 1612 (1982)

 special circumstances necessary for consideration of class 9 accidents in environmental review; LBP-82-58, 16 NRC 529 (1982)

10 CFR 50, App. E

 adequacy of Summer facility onsite emergency plan; LBP-82-57, 16 NRC 485 (1982)

 assurance of adequacy of protective measures to be taken in radiological emergency; LBP-82-70, 16 NRC 761

 basic requirements for structure of an emergency response organization; ALAB-698, 16 NRC 1303 (1982)

 compliance of Diablo Canyon's emergency plans with; LBP-82-70, 16 NRC 760, 798 799, 855 (1982)

 failure of Seabrook emergency plan to address requirements of; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1074 (1982)

 guidance implementing emergency planning requirements; ALAB-707, 16 NRC 1763 (1982)

 inadequacy of Shoreham's accident assessment and monitoring abilities; LBP-82-75, 16 NRC 1025 (1982)

 lack of means to control radiological exposures to emergency workers; LBP-82-75, 16 NRC 1025 (1982)

 protective action contention limited to onsite measures; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1046 (1982)

 rejection of contention attacking size requirement for plume exposure pathway EPZ; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2084 (1982)

 relevancy of applicant's public information emergency planning pamphlet; LBP-82-60, 16 NRC 542 (1982)

 requirement for emergency plan prior to operation of a facility; LBP-83-103, 16 NRC 1621 (1982)

 standard of Board review of emergency planning; LBP-82-70, 16 NRC 802 (1982)

 verification of adequacy of siren system to alert public of radiological emergency; LBP-82-100, 16 NRC 1578 (1982)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX REGULATIONS

10 CFR 50, App. E, fn. 2
consideration of beyond-design-basis accidents in establishing EPZs; LBP-82-106, 16 NRC 1661 (1982)
effect of population density on size and configuration of plume exposure pathway EPZ; CLI-82-15, 16
NRC 36 (1982)

10 CFR 50, App. E, IV
requirements for evacuation time estimates and road conditions; LBP-82-100, 16 NRC 1574 (1982)

10 CFR 50, App. E, IV.A
adequacy of Diablo Canyon's emergency classification system; LBP-82-70, 16 NRC 772, 810-811 (1982)
adequacy of Diablo Canyon's emergency response support and resources; LBP-82-70, 16 NRC 771, 808,
810 (1982)

adequacy of emergency command decision structure at Waterford plant; LBP-82-100, 16 NRC 1581
(1982)

lack of assurance of assistance from offsite agencies during radiological emergency; LBP-82-75, 16 NRC
1023 (1982)

10 CFR 50, App. E, IV.A and C
inadequate delineation of responsibilities of onsite emergency personnel; LBP-82-75, 16 NRC 1024
(1982)

10 CFR 50, App. E, IV.A.7
lack of incorporation of federal response capabilities in Shoreham's emergency plans; LBP-82-75, 16 NRC
1022 (1982)

10 CFR 50, App. E, IV.B
adequacy of Shoreham plans for implementation of protective actions during radiological emergency;
LBP-82-75, 16 NRC 1023 (1982)

10 CFR 50, App. E, IV.B.8
nonconformance of Shoreham plan and procedures for operation of Emergency Operations Facility;
LBP-82-75, 16 NRC 1025 (1982)

10 CFR 50, App. E, IV.C
classification of emergencies; ALAB-697, 16 NRC 1270 (1982)

10 CFR 50, App. E, IV.D.2
adequacy of Shoreham prompt notification system; LBP-82-75, 16 NRC 1021 (1982)
types of emergency planning information to be disseminated to the public; ALAB-697, 16 NRC 1272-73
(1982)

10 CFR 50, App. E, IV.D.3
adequacy of San Onofre emergency public notification system; CLI-82-14, 16 NRC 25 (1982)
adequacy of Waterford evacuation warning system; LBP-82-100, 16 NRC 1577 (1982)
capabilities required of licensee for notifying State and local government agencies of an emergency;
ALAB-697, 16 NRC 1270 (1982)

necessity of compliance with FEMA findings; ALAB-698, 16 NRC 1299 (1982)
objective of areawide alert signal for notifying public during radiological emergency; ALAB-680, 16 NRC
134 (1982)

size and configuration of plume exposure emergency planning zone; ALAB-680, 16 NRC 132 (1982)
time limit on correction of deficiencies in requirements of; LBP-82-61, 16 NRC 563 (1982)

10 CFR 50, App. E, IV.E
adequacy of means for controlling radiological exposures of emergency workers at Diablo Canyon;
LBP-82-70, 16 NRC 836 (1982)

10 CFR 50, App. E, IV.E.1
requirement for availability of equipment for monitoring radiological exposures to emergency workers;
ALAB-698, 16 NRC 1294 (1982)

10 CFR 50, App. E, IV.E.2 and 8
inadequacy of interim safety parameter display system; LBP-82-75, 16 NRC 1028 (1982)

10 CFR 50, App. E, IV.F
education of public officials on problems of radiation exposure; LBP-82-77, 16 NRC 1099 (1982)
failure of applicant to meet training requirements for emergency response personnel; LBP-82-75, 16 NRC
1024 (1982)

need for public participation in evacuation drills; LBP-82-100, 16 NRC 1582 (1982)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX REGULATIONS

10 CFR 50, App. E, IV.F.1
amount of public participation required in evacuation drills; LBP-82-100, 16 NRC 1565 (1982)
public participation in emergency planning exercises; LBP-82-70, 16 NRC 843 (1982)

10 CFR 50, App. E, IV.F.1.b
status required of emergency plans in order for full-power operation to be authorized; LBP-82-100, 16 NRC 1563 (1982)

10 CFR 50, App. G
compliance of Seabrook safety-related equipment; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1037 (1982)

10 CFR 50, App. G and H
compliance of end-of-life value for weldment; LBP-82-63, 16 NRC 588 (1982)

10 CFR 50, App. I
basis for calculations of radioactive dose from Waterford plant effluents; LBP-82-100, 16 NRC 1569 (1982)

conformance of La Crosse Plant off-gas emissions with; LBP-82-58, 16 NRC 521-22 (1982)

litigability of residual radiation health effects in individual proceedings; LBP-82-105, 16 NRC 1641 (1982)

10 CFR 50, App. I, Section I.C
limitations on radioiodine release contentions; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2095 (1982)

10 CFR 50, App. K
acceptability of Clinton emergency core cooling system; LBP-82-103, 16 NRC 1624-25 (1982)

challenges to emergency core cooling system evaluation model; ALAB-708, 16 NRC 1782 (1982)

compliance of Seabrook safety-related equipment; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1037 (1982)

10 CFR 50, App. M
Commission authority to license offsite manufacture of nuclear power reactors; ALAB-686, 16 NRC 455 (1982)

distinction between construction permits and manufacturing licenses; ALAB-686, 16 NRC 456 (1982)

10 CFR 50, App. M, para. 1
effectiveness of manufacturing license decisions relative to finality; CLI-82-37, 16 NRC 1692 (1982)

10 CFR 50, App. N
simultaneous review of safety-related parameters for duplicate plants; LBP-82-109, 16 NRC 1829 (1982)

10 CFR 51
amendment of; DPRM-82-2, 16 NRC 1216 (1982); LBP-82-58, 16 NRC 527 (1982)

limitations on cost-benefit comparisons; LBP-82-117A, 16 NRC 1993 (1982)

necessity for environmental impact statement for spent fuel pool modification; LBP-82-65, 16 NRC 727 (1982)

10 CFR 51, Table S-3
error in radon release values; ALAB-701, 16 NRC 1519 (1982)

10 CFR 51.5
automatic invocation of EIS process; ALAB-705, 16 NRC 1746 (1982)

10 CFR 51.5(d)(4)
preparation of environmental impact statement for construction extension not required; CLI-82-29, 16 NRC 1224 (1982)

10 CFR 51.7
automatic invocation of EIS process; ALAB-705, 16 NRC 1746 (1982)

10 CFR 51.7(b)
content of EIA; ALAB-705, 16 NRC 1737 (1982)

10 CFR 51.20(a)
accuracy of assessment of risks posed by operation of Three Mile Island, Unit 1; ALAB-705, 16 NRC 1734 (1982)

10 CFR 51.20(a), (d)
failure of applicant to assess risk of class 9 accidents at Seabrook; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1035 (1982)

10 CFR 51.20(d)
accuracy of assessment of risks posed by operation of Three Mile Island, Unit 1; ALAB-705, 16 NRC 1734 (1982)

10 CFR 51.20(e)
assessment of health effects of Table S-3 releases; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2091, 2099 (1982)

codification of S-3 rule; ALAB-704, 16 NRC 1728 (1982)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX REGULATIONS

data base to be used in evaluating environmental effects of uranium fuel cycle; LBP-82-100, 16 NRC 1556 (1982)
quantification of fuel cycle emissions; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2086 (1982)

10 CFR 51.20(g)(1)
application of Table S-4 to transportation of spent fuel to and storage at Catawba facility; LBP-82-51, 16 NRC 171 (1982)

10 CFR 51.21
assessment of health effects of Table S-3 releases; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2091, 2099 (1982)
consideration of effects of radon in applicant's environmental report; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2084 (1982)
consideration of liquid pathway accident impacts; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1037 (1982)
preclusion of need for power issues; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2092 (1982)

10 CFR 51.21(g)(2)(v)
application of Table S-4 to transportation of spent fuel to and storage at Catawba facility; LBP-82-51, 16 NRC 171 (1982)

10 CFR 51.23(c)
assessment of health effects of Table S-3 releases; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2091, 2099 (1982)
challenges to Commission's fuel cycle rule; LBP-82-118, 16 NRC 2038, 2045 (1982)
codification of S-3 rule; ALAB-704, 16 NRC 1728 (1982)
consideration of McGuire risks in Catawba risk analysis; LBP-82-107A, 16 NRC 1802-03 (1982)

10 CFR 51.23, n.1
consideration of impact of radon in Staff environmental impact statement; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2084 (1982)

10 CFR 51.52
Licensing Board authority to consider need for and content of an EIS; ALAB-705, 16 NRC 1738 (1982)
test for basis with specificity requirement for contentions, LBP-82-106, 16 NRC 1654 (1982)

10 CFR 51.52(a)
evidentiary hearings on issues prior to issuance of final environmental impact statements; ALAB-688, 16 NRC 474 (1982)

10 CFR 51.52(b)(1)
introduction of Staff EIA into evidence; LBP-82-78, 16 NRC 1111 (1982)

10 CFR 51.52(b)(3)
amendment of environmental statement to include Board findings and conclusions; LBP-82-100, 16 NRC 1571 (1982)
modification of operating license FES, regarding energy alternative, ordered; LBP-82-58, 16 NRC 531 (1982)

10 CFR 51.53
consideration of need for power and alternative energy source issues in operating license proceedings; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2080, 2085, 2099 (1982)
litigation of need-for-power issues; LBP-82-63, 16 NRC 589 (1982)

10 CFR 51.53(c)
consideration, in operating license proceeding, of alternative energy sources; LBP-82-58, 16 NRC 527 (1982)
dismissal of need-for-power contention on basis of; LBP-82-58, 16 NRC 528 (1982)
litigability of need for power contention; LBP-82-107A, 16 NRC 1801 (1982)

10 CFR 54.57(a)(3)(i)
NRC requirements for the conduct of all license activities; LBP-82-97, 16 NRC 1443 (1982)

10 CFR 55
admission of contention challenging operator qualifications; LBP-82-51, 16 NRC 170 (1982)
Staff's implementation of; LBP-82-56, 16 NRC 369 (1982)
TMI compliance with reactor operator requalification program; LBP-82-56, 16 NRC 349 (1982)

10 CFR 55.10
TMI licensee's program for certification of competency of operator candidates; LBP-82-56, 16 NRC 365 (1982)

10 CFR 55.10(a)(6)
reasons for certification of reactor operators; LBP-82-56, 16 NRC 353 (1982)
redundancy required in training and testing reactor operators; LBP-82-56, 16 NRC 364 (1982)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX REGULATIONS

10 CFR 55.20
Licensing Board jurisdiction over scope of reactor operator exams; LBP-82-56, 16 NRC 372 (1982)
NRC Staff role in auditing operator training and testing; LBP-82-56, 16 NRC 364 (1982)

10 CFR 55.20-55.23
grading of site-specific reactor operator exams; LBP-82-56, 16 NRC 372 (1982)

10 CFR 55.33
material false statement in connection with recertification of reactor operator; LBP-82-56, 16 NRC 348 (1982)

TMI licensee's program for certification of competency of operator candidates; LBP-82-56, 16 NRC 365 (1982)

10 CFR 55.33(4)
redundancy required in training and testing reactor operators; LBP-82-56, 16 NRC 364 (1982)

10 CFR 55.40
Board recommendation for proceeding to modify or suspend reactor operators' licenses; LBP-82-56, 16 NRC 309 (1982)

Licensing Board jurisdiction over revocation of reactor operator's license; LBP-82-56, 16 NRC 309 (1982)

Licensing Board recommendation for proceeding to consider penalties against reactor operators; LBP-82-56, 16 NRC 383 (1982)

10 CFR 55, App. A
material false statement in connection with recertification of reactor operator; LBP-82-56, 16 NRC 348 (1982)

redundancy required in training and testing reactor operators; LBP-82-56, 16 NRC 364 (1982)

10 CFR 55, App. A(5)
NRC Staff role in auditing operator training and testing; LBP-82-56, 16 NRC 364 (1982)

10 CFR 71 and 73
exclusion of portion of contention concerning transportation of irradiated fuel assemblies; LBP-82-51, 16 NRC 172 (1982)

10 CFR 73
purpose of; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 72 (1982)

10 CFR 73.1(a)(1)
adequacy of power reactor security force training based on Regulatory Guides; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 86 (1982)

adequacy of training of Diablo Canyon security force; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 106 (1982)

definition of design basis threat of radiological sabotage; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 59 (1982)

description of design basis insider threat; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 102 (1982)

design basis threat against which commercial power reactors are required to be protected; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2098 (1982)

efficacy of provisions for training security forces at nuclear power plants; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 84 (1982)

interpretation of numerical size of external assault force characterized in design basis threat as "several"; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 54 (1982)

limitations on design basis threat; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 74 (1982)

proper response to generic challenges to; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 74 (1982)

threat to nuclear reactors from terrorist groups; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 73 (1982)

10 CFR 73.1(a)(1) and (2)
comparison of external attack components applicable to commercial power reactors and fuel cycle facilities; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 62 (1982)

10 CFR 73.2(h) and (i)
definition of vital area and equipment; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 96 (1982)

10 CFR 73.2(k)
security measures for building intrusion into isolation zone; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 97 (1982)

10 CFR 73.2(p)
definition of radiological sabotage; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 58 (1982)

10 CFR 73.2(y)
definition of power reactor fuel as special nuclear material; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 59 (1982)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX REGULATIONS

10 CFR 73.20
characterization of size of attack force; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 68 (1982)

10 CFR 73.21
deletion of safeguards information; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 61 (1982)

10 CFR 73.21(b) (2)
secrecy requirement for security plans; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2094 (1982)

10 CFR 73.21(c) (vi)
access to restricted documents; CLI-82-17, 16 NRC 49 (1982)
criteria for granting access to security plan; LBP-82-80, 16 NRC 1123, 1125 (1982)

10 CFR 73.37
training of local police and fire personnel as regards spent fuel shipments; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2101 (1982)
treatment of contentions postulating conventional weapons attack on spent fuel shipments; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2094 (1982)

10 CFR 73.40 (1974)
criteria for protection of nuclear reactors; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 62 (1982)

10 CFR 73.40(c)
licensee's responsibilities prior to implementing safeguards contingency plan; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 79, 80 (1982)

10 CFR 73.40(d)
licensee's responsibilities after preparing safeguards contingency plan; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 79 (1982)

10 CFR 73.46(h) (2)
liaison between security forces of fuel reprocessing facilities and local law enforcement authorities; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 91 (1982)

10 CFR 73.50(g) (2)
difference in levels of coordination with local law enforcement agencies between fuel storage facilities and power reactors; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 91 (1982)

10 CFR 73.55
implementation of applicant's safeguards contingency plan; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 79 (1982)
size of adversary force against which safeguards performance is evaluated; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 68 (1982)

10 CFR 73.55(a)
meeting high-assurance objective of; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 86 (1982)
objectives of reactor security system; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 59 (1982)
protection of vital equipment; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 96 (1982)
satisfaction of general performance objectives of; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 101 (1982)
standards for safeguarding special nuclear materials; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 76 (1982)
substitution of security measures in lieu of regulatory requirements; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 97 (1982)
sufficiency of Diablo Canyon's safeguards system; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 98 (1982)
use of security measures other than those required by Commission regulations; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 60 (1982)

10 CFR 73.55(b) (1)
employment of contract guard force in physical security organization; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 82 (1982)
licensee's responsibility to establish a physical security organization; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 81 (1982)

10 CFR 73.55(b) (2) and (3)
management criteria for licensee's physical security organization; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 81, 83 (1982)

10 CFR 73.55(b) (4)
implementation of guard training at Diablo Canyon; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 86 (1982)
implementation of security force training; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 87 (1982)
training requirements for members of licensee's physical security organization; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 81, 83 (1982)

10 CFR 73.55(b) - (h)
number of armed responders required to counter design basis threat of radiological sabotage; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 104 (1982)

10 CFR 73.55(c) (1) and (2)
security measures beyond requirements of; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 59 (1982)

10 CFR 73.55(c) (1) and (2)
protection of vital equipment; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 96 (1982)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX **REGULATIONS**

10 CFR 73.55(c)(3)
 security measures for building intrusion into isolation zone; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 97 (1982)

10 CFR 73.55(c)(4)
 inspection of protected areas; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 94 (1982)

10 CFR 73.55(c)(5)
 illumination of protected areas; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 94 (1982)

10 CFR 73.55(d)
 detection function of access requirements of; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 94 (1982)

10 CFR 73.55(d)(1)-(4)
 control of access into protected areas; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 94 (1982)

10 CFR 73.55(d)(1)-(6)
 exceptions to controlled access to protected areas; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 98 (1982)

10 CFR 73.55(d)(2)-(6)
 function of badging and escort requirements of; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 94 (1982)

10 CFR 73.55(d)(7)
 control of access into vital areas; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 94 (1982)

10 CFR 73.55(d)(8)
 access to security containment; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 94 (1982)

10 CFR 73.55(e)(1)-(3)
 description of detection aids in reactor security systems; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 93 (1982)

10 CFR 73.55(f)
 maintenance of communications between security forces and alarm stations; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 88 (1982)

10 CFR 73.55(f)(1)-(4)
 testing and maintenance of security communications system; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 88 (1982)

10 CFR 73.55(g)(3)
 testing and maintenance of security communications system; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 88 (1982)

10 CFR 73.55(h)
 goals of safeguards contingency plan; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 78 (1982)
 size of force responding to external assault on nuclear power plant; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 67 (1982)

10 CFR 73.55(h)(1)
 criteria for safeguards contingency plan; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 64 (1982)

10 CFR 73.55(h)(2) and (4)
 safeguards contingency plans for liaison between licensee's security force and local law enforcement authorities; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 89 (1982)

10 CFR 73.55(h)(3)
 authority to determine number of armed responders to design basis threat to power reactor; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 105 (1982)

10 CFR 73.55(h)(6)
 factors determining size of security force at nuclear power plants; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 103 (1982)

10 CFR 73, App. B
 purpose of observation of isolation zones and protected areas; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 94 (1982)

10 CFR 73, App. B
 training requirements for members of licensee's physical security organization; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 81, 83 (1982)

10 CFR 73, App. B, II.D
 training requirements for security forces for power reactors not covered by Regulatory Guides; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 85 (1982)

10 CFR 73, App. B, V
 equipment to be used by Diablo Canyon security force; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 86 (1982)

10 CFR 73, App. C
 criteria for safeguards contingency plans; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 64 (1982)

 Diablo Canyon's compliance with security communications requirements of; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 89 (1982)

10 CFR 73, App. C, 1-5
 goals of safeguards contingency plan; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 78 (1982)

10 CFR 73, App. C, 1-5
 contents of safeguards contingency plan; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 79 (1982)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX REGULATIONS

10 CFR 73, App. C, 1.a
criteria for safeguards contingency plans; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 64 (1982)

10 CFR 73, App. C, 3b
safeguards contingency plans for liaison between licensee's security force and local law enforcement authorities; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 89 (1982)

10 CFR 95, App. A, sub-topic 112
denial of petition for rulemaking to amend Classification Guide for Safeguards Information

10 CFR 100
adequacy of investigations regarding landslides near GE test reactor site; LBP-82-64, 16 NRC 631 (1982)
adequacy of Seabrook design to withstand excessive hydrogen generation; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1039
amount of hydrogen generation to be taken into account in containment design; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1064 (1982)
basis for establishing exclusion area and low population zone; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2106 (1982)
capability of Verona Fault; LBP-82-64, 16 NRC 600 (1982)
components required to be safety grade; LBP-82-70, 16 NRC 794, 850 (1982)
litigation of hydrogen control contentions; LBP-82-103, 16 NRC 1609 (1982)
litigation of hydrogen control issues under; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1065 (1982)
radiological consequences of postulated design basis events at GE test reactor; LBP-82-64, 16 NRC 646 (1982)
reevaluation of offsite doses from primary to secondary coolant leakage; DD-82-11, 16 NRC 1482, 1985 (1982)
showing required for hydrogen generation contention; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1064 (1982)

10 CFR 100, App. A
adoption of; LBP-82-64, 16 NRC 698 (1982)
application to test reactors; LBP-82-64, 16 NRC 653 (1982)
determination of safe shutdown earthquake at Diablo Canyon facility; CLI-82-12A, 16 NRC 10 (1982)

10 CFR 100, App. A, III(a)
qualification of pressurizer heaters and block and power-operated relief valves as safety-grade; LBP-82-70, 16 NRC 761 (1982)

10 CFR 100, App. A, III(c)
need to qualify pressurizer heaters as safety grade; LBP-82-70, 16 NRC 793-95, 850 (1982)
qualification of relief and block valves as safety grade; LBP-82-70, 16 NRC 797, 853 (1982)

10 CFR 100, App. A, V(a)
failure of station blackout contention to satisfy nexus requirement; LBP-82-63, 16 NRC 591 (1982)

10 CFR 100, App. A, V(a)(1) (iii)
localization of 1886 Charleston earthquake relative to Summer facility; LBP-82-55, 16 NRC 231 (1982)

10 CFR 100, App. A, VI
adequacy of testing and inspection of embedded plates to determine their resistance to earthquakes; LBP-82-109, 16 NRC 1890 (1982)

10 CFR 100, App. A, VI(b)(3)
reason for not requiring test facility structure to withstand full postulated design basis; LBP-82-64, 16 NRC 684 (1982)

10 CFR 100, App. B
deficiencies in FSAR, on quality assurance for operations; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1073 (1982)

10 CFR 100.10(c)(1)
inapplicability to test reactors; LBP-82-64, 16 NRC 698 (1982)

10 CFR 100.11
amount of hydrogen generation to be taken in account in containment design; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1064 (1982)
criteria for determining vital areas; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 97 (1982)
purpose of offsite radiological doses set forth in; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 58 (1982)
standards for radioactive releases from acts of sabotage; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 76 (1982)

10 CFR 110.70(a), (c)
means for providing notice of export license applications; ALAB-682, 16 NRC 158 (1982)

10 CFR 110.70(b)
means for providing notice of export license applications; ALAB-682, 16 NRC 158 (1982)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX REGULATIONS

- 10 CFR 110.82
 - means for providing notice of export license applications; ALAB-682, 16 NRC 158 (1982)
- 10 CFR 170
 - basis for award of intervenors' attorney's fees; LBP-82-81, 16 NRC 1139 (1982)
- 10 CFR 305.76-5
 - limits on agency prerogatives to interpret policy statements; LBP-82-69, 16 NRC 753 (1982)
- 40 CFR 81.350
 - consideration of radiation emissions from nuclear power plant in developing air quality standards for coal-fired power plant; LBP-82-58, 16 NRC 526 (1982)
- 40 CFR 1502.6, 1507.2 (1981)
 - consideration of psychological stress issues under NEPA; LBP-82-53, 16 NRC 203 (1982)
- 41 CFR 20
 - conflict of interest by an entity working for both the NRC and a licensee; LBP-82-99, 16 NRC 1548 (1982)
- 44 CFR 20-1.5410 and 20-1.5404-1(f)
 - conflict of interest consideration in NRC's review of its contracts; LBP-82-73, 16 NRC 977 (1982)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX STATUTES

Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. 551(9)
definition of licensing; ALAB-705; 16 NRC 1748 (1982)

Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. 553(b)(A)
binding nature of policy statements LBP-82-69, 16 NRC 753 (1982)

Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. 553(e) and 555(e)
publication of petition for rulemaking for comment; DPRM-82-2, 16 NRC 1216 (1982)

Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. 556 and 557
right of intervenors to reopen record on quality assurance issues; ALAB-681, 16 NRC 148 (1982)

Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. 556(c)
Board authority to direct parties on means to conduct initial examinations; LBP-82-107, 16 NRC 1677 (1982)

Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. 556(c)(7)
discretion of Licensing Board to regulate the course of a hearing; LBP-82-107, 16 NRC 1679 (1982)

Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. 556(d)
burden of proof in show cause order; LBP-82-64, 16 NRC 655 (1982)

Administrative Procedure Act, 5(a), 5 U.S.C. 544(a)
circumstances requiring formal adjudicatory hearing; LBP-82-107, 16 NRC 1674 (1982)

Administrative Procedure Act, 7(c), 5 U.S.C. 556(d)
limitation on cross-examination of a witness by a party to an administrative adjudicatory hearing; LBP-82-107, 16 NRC 1674 (1982)

Administrative Procedure Act, 9(b), 5 U.S.C. 558
continuation of licensee operation during processing of license renewal requests; ALAB-682, 16 NRC 159 (1982)

criteria for immediately effective suspension of construction activities; CLI-82-33, 16 NRC 1500 (1982)

Atomic Energy Act, 103, 42 U.S.C. 2133
Commission authority to license offsite manufacture of nuclear power reactors; ALAB-686, 16 NRC 455 (1982)

issuance of construction permit for a utilization facility; DD-82-13, 16 NRC 2128 (1982)

suspension of safety-related construction activities at Zimmer; CLI-82-33, 16 NRC 1497 (1982)

Atomic Energy Act, 103b, 42 U.S.C. 2133b
cause for consideration of applicant's/licensee's character; ALAB-650, 14 NRC 915 (1982)

Atomic Energy Act, 104c
reason for defining GE reactor as testing reactor; LBP-82-64, 16 NRC 698 (1982)

Atomic Energy Act, 104(d), 42 U.S.C. 2134(d) (1980)
test for basis with specificity requirement for admission of contentions; LBP-82-106, 16 NRC 1654 (1982)

Atomic Energy Act, 11(e)(2), 42 U.S.C. 2014(c)
definition of uranium mill tailings; CLI-82-34, 16 NRC 1504 (1982)

use of NRC appropriations for implementing UMTRCA; CLI-82-34, 16 NRC 1505 (1982)

Atomic Energy Act, 147
interpretation of "several" as used in design basis threat; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 54 (1982)

Atomic Energy Act, 161
consolidation of proceedings for power reactor units; DPRM-82-2, 16 NRC 1215 (1982)

Atomic Energy Act, 161i
suspension of safety-related construction activities at Zimmer; CLI-82-33, 16 NRC 1497 (1982)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX STATUTES

Atomic Energy Act, 170A, 42 U.S.C. 2210a(b)
conflict of interest by entity working for both the NRC and a licensee; LBP-82-99, 16 NRC 1548 (1982)
on-the-record disclosure of potential conflicts of interest; LBP-82-73, 16 NRC 978 (1982)

Atomic Energy Act, 181, 42 U.S.C. 2231
application of provisions of Administrative Procedure Act to NRC proceedings; LBP-82-107, 16 NRC 1674 (1982)
burden of proof in show cause order; LBP-82-64, 16 NRC 655 (1982)
circumstances favoring disclosure of confidential information; LBP-82-59, 16 NRC 538 (1982)
delegation of authority to rule on requests for hearing on seismic design issues; LBP-82-64, 16 NRC 601 (1982)

Atomic Energy Act, 182, 42 U.S.C. 2232
suspension of safety-related construction activities at Zimmer; CLI-82-33, 16 NRC 1497 (1982)

Atomic Energy Act, 182a, 42 U.S.C. 2232a
cause for consideration of applicant's/ licensee's character; ALAB-650, 14 NRC 915 (1982)

Atomic Energy Act, 182(b), 42 U.S.C. 2232(b)
ACRS review of restart of GE training reactor; LBP-82-64, 16 NRC 602 (1982)

Atomic Energy Act, 185, 42 U.S.C. 2235
extension of construction permit completion dates; CLI-82-29, 16 NRC 1225, 1232 (1982)
scope of litigable issues in construction permit extension proceeding; CLI-82-29, 16 NRC 1228, 1229 (1982)
test for admissibility of contentions in construction permit extension proceeding; CLI-82-29, 16 NRC 1228 (1982)

Atomic Energy Act, 186, 42 U.S.C. 2236
suspension of safety-related construction activities at Zimmer; CLI-82-33, 16 NRC 1497 (1982)

Atomic Energy Act, 186a, 42 U.S.C. 2236a
applicant/ licensee obligation to provide accurate and timely information in NRC proceeding; ALAB-650, 14 NRC 910 (1982)

Atomic Energy Act, 189, 42 U.S.C. 2239
hearing requirement for contested issues in operating license proceeding; LBP-82-68, 16 NRC 748 (1982)
persons who may request hearings; LBP-82-87, 16 NRC 1201 (1982)
right of intervenors to reopen record on quality assurance issues; ALAB-681, 16 NRC 148 (1982)

Atomic Energy Act, 189a, 42 U.S.C. 2239(a)
adjudication of evidentiary disputes in public hearings; LBP-82-107, 16 NRC 1671 (1982)
conditions to the right to a hearing; ALAB-687, 16 NRC 469 (1982)
contravention of hearing rights; ALAB-687, 16 NRC 467 (1982); LBP-82-87, 16 NRC 1200 (1982)
effectiveness of license pending ruling on request for renewal; CLI-82-39, 16 NRC 1715 (1982)
need for hearing on request for exemption from regulations; CLI-82-23, 16 NRC 421, 422, 435, 445 (1982)
need for hearing on safety-related activities; CLI-82-23, 16 NRC 429, 430 (1982)
nondiscretionary right to hearing on enforcement action; CLI-82-16, 16 NRC 45 (1982)
point of intervention process; LBP-82-81, 16 NRC 1137 (1982)
propriety of Board proposal to conduct pre-hearing examinations by deposition; LBP-82-107, 16 NRC 1671 (1982)
relevancy of contentions to construction permit extension proceeding; CLI-82-29, 16 NRC 1230 (1982)
timing of discovery on contentions; ALAB-687, 16 NRC 468 (1982)
type of hearing required for materials licensing action; ALAB-682, 16 NRC 155, 157-59 (1982)

Atomic Energy Act, 191, 42 U.S.C. 2241
appointment of Board members from private life; LBP-82-99, 16 NRC 1547 (1982)
purpose and composition of Licensing Boards; LBP-82-87, 16 NRC 1201 (1982)

Atomic Energy Act, 191a
jurisdiction of Licensing Boards; LBP-82-69, 16 NRC 752 (1982)

Atomic Energy Act, 234, 42 U.S.C. 2282(b)
procedural requirements to be followed prior to imposition of civil penalties; CLI-82-31, 16 NRC 1238 (1982)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX

STATUTES

Atomic Energy Act, 274(o)(3)(A)(iii), 42 U.S.C. 2021(o)(3)
requirements under State law for judicial review of uranium licensing decisions; CLI-82-34, 16 NRC 1507 (1982)

Atomic Energy Act, 274b
Commission authority to enter into agreements with States concerning regulation of special nuclear materials; CLI-82-34, 16 NRC 1503 (1982)

Atomic Energy Act, 274j
authority of NRC to suspend or terminate an agreement with a State; CLI-82-34, 16 NRC 1508 (1982)

Atomic Energy Act, 274o
inadequacies in Colorado Radiation Control Program; CLI-82-34, 16 NRC 1506 (1982)

Atomic Energy Act, 92 Stat. 3037, 42 U.S.C. 2021(2)
stringency of State standards for regulation of mill tailings; CLI-82-34, 16 NRC 1504 (1982)

Clayton Act, 4, 15 U.S.C. 15
basis for award of intervenors' attorney's fee; LBP-82-81, 16 NRC 1139 (1982)

Colo. Rev. Stat. 1973, 21-1-113 (Supp. 1981)
right of judicial review of source material licensing decisions; CLI-82-34, 16 NRC 1507 (1982)

Colo. Rev. Stat. 1973, 24-4-102(1)
extent of agency action; CLI-82-34, 16 NRC 1507 (1982)

Colo. Rev. Stat. 1973, 24-4-106
judicial review of uranium licensing decisions; CLI-82-34, 16 NRC 1507 (1982)

Colorado Administrative Procedure Act, 24-4-101, et seq., Colo. Rev. Stat. 1973
standing of plaintiffs to bring private action to enforce Colorado Radiation Control Act; CLI-82-34, 16 NRC 1507 (1982)

Colorado Administrative Procedure Act, Colo. Rev. Stat. 25-11-103(5), 25-11-106, 25-11-107(3)
State enforcement of uranium licensing decisions; CLI-82-34, 16 NRC 1506 (1982)

Colorado Rule and Regulations Pertaining to Radiation Control, 3.22.2
State enforcement of uranium licensing decisions; CLI-82-34, 16 NRC 1506 (1982)

Colorado Rules and Regulations Pertaining to Radiation Control, 3.9.9.3.4
appeals of State uranium licensing actions; CLI-82-34, 16 NRC 1507 (1982)

Continuing Appropriations Resolution for FY 1983, Pub. L. 97-276, 101(g), 96 Stat. 1135 (October 2, 1982)
limitations on NRC expenditures for implementing UMTRCA; CLI-82-24, 16 NRC 1504 (1982)

Delaware River Basin Compact, 15.1(s)(1), Pub. L. No. 87-328, 75 Stat 688 (1961)
preclusion of Licensing Board jurisdiction over impacts of water allocation; LBP-82-72, 16 NRC 969 (1982)

Energy Reorganization Act of 1974, 210
identification of unresolved safety issues to be addressed in spent fuel pool modification proceeding;
LBP-82-65, 16 NRC 717 (1982)

Federal Water Pollution Control Act, 401, 404
environmental assessment of Point Pleasant Diversion project; DD-82-13, 16 NRC 2125, 2133 (1982)

Federal Water Pollution Control Act, 404, 86 Stat. 816, Pub. L. 95-500
construction of water intake structure at Point Pleasant; DD-82-13, 16 NRC 2125 (1982)

N.Y. Executive Law 20, et seq. (McKinney)
responsibility for preparation of radiological response plan; LBP-82-82, 16 NRC 1162 (1982)

National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), 102(2)(E), 42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(E)
compliance of EIA for Big Rock Point spent fuel pool expansion; LBP-82-78, 16 NRC 1108, 1112-13 (1982)

National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), 42 U.S.C. 4321
preparation of EIA on plan for solidification of high-level radioactive wastes; ALAB-679, 16 NRC 123 (1982)

reason for, and history of, Commission's consideration of environmental impact of nuclear fuel cycle;
ALAB-704, 16 NRC 1728 (1982)

National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), 42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.
limitations on matters to be resolved in operating license proceedings; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1087 (1982)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX

STATUTES

necessity for environmental impact statement for spent fuel pool modification; LBP-82-65, 16 NRC 727 (1982)

timing for litigation of contentions involving; ALAB-688, 16 NRC 473 (1982)

National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), 42 U.S.C 4332

NEPA consideration of use of spent fuel for nuclear weapons; LBP-82-53, 16 NRC 199 (1982)

National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), 42 U.S.C. 4332(C)

content of environmental impact statement for major federal actions; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1076 (1982)

Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, Pub. L. No. 97-25

national policy favoring expeditious completion of breeder reactor; CLI-82-23, 16 NRC 429, 430 (1982)

Pub. L. 97-276, 101 (g), 96 Stat. 1135 (1982)

use of NRC funds to pay fees for consultants to intervenors; CLI-82-40, 16 NRC 1718 (1982)

Pub. L. 97-88, Title V, 502, 95 Stat. 1148 (1981)

use of NRC funds to pay fees for consultants to intervenors; CLI-82-40, 16 NRC 1718 (1982)

Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899, 10, 33 U.S.C. 403

construction of water intake structure at Point Pleasant; DD-82-13, 16 NRC 2125 (1982)

Uranium Mill Tailings Radiation Control Act, Pub. L. 95-604, 204(e)(1)

State procedures governing uranium licensing actions; CLI-82-34, 16 NRC 1504 (1982)

stringency of State standards for regulation of mill tailings; CLI-82-34, 16 NRC 1504 (1982)

Uranium Mill Tailings Radiation Control Act, Pub. L. 95-604, 204(e)(2) and (h), as amended by Pub. L. 96-106 (93 Stat. 800) Section 22 (1979)

jurisdiction over mill tailings; CLI-82-34, 16 NRC 1504 (1982)

West Valley Demonstration Project Act, 2(c)

review of plan for solidification of high-level radioactive wastes; ALAB-679, 16 NRC 123 (1982)

West Valley Demonstration Project Act, Pub. L. No. 96-368, 94 Stat. 1347 (1980)

purpose of; ALAB-679, 16 NRC 123 (1982)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX OTHERS

Asimow, "Public Participation in the Adoption of Interpretive Rules and Policy Statements," 75 Mich. L. Rev. 521 (1976)
limits on agency prerogatives to interpret policy statements LBP-82-69, 16 NRC 753 (1982)

3 K. Davis, *Administrative Law Treatise* 17:13 at 319-20 (2d Ed. 1980)
alteration of Board authority to conduct hearings; LBP-82-69, 16 NRC 753 (1982)

4 J. Moore's *Federal Practice* ¶26.68 (2d ed. 1982)
good cause for issuance of protective orders; LBP-82-82, 16 NRC 1153 (1982)

4A Moore's *Federal Practice* ¶33.25(1) at 33-129-130 (2d ed. 1981)
application of NEPA "rule of reason" to applicant's responses to interrogatories; LBP-82-67, 16 NRC 736 (1982)

5 Moore's *Federal Practice* ¶41.05[1] at 41-58
Licensing Board discretion to prescribe terms for withdrawal of construction permit application; LBP-82-81, 16 NRC 1134 (1982)

5 Moore's *Federal Practice* ¶41.05[1] at 41-72 to 41-73 (2d ed. 1981)
basis for departing from rule of dismissal of applications without prejudice; LBP-82-81, 16 NRC 1135 (1982)

5 Moore's *Federal Practice* ¶41.05[2], at 71-75 (2d ed. 1981)
denial of motions for withdrawal without prejudice; LBP-82-81, 16 NRC 1135 (1982)

5 Moore's *Federal Practice* ¶41.06, at 41-83, 41-86 1081-1083 (2d ed. 1975)
denial of motions for withdrawal without prejudice; LBP-82-81, 16 NRC 1135 (1982)

6 A. J. Moore, *Moore's Federal Practice* ¶59.09[5] (2d ed. 1979)
Appeal Board jurisdiction to rule on a motion to reopen filed after exceptions have been taken; ALAB-699, 16 NRC 1327 (1982)

8 J. Wigmore, *Evidence* §2290 (McNaughten rev. 1961)
purpose of attorney-client privilege; LBP-82-82, 16 NRC 1157 (1982)

8 J. Wigmore, *Evidence* §2992, at 554 (McNaughten rev. 1961)
essential elements of attorney-client privilege; LBP-82-82, 16 NRC 1157 (1982)

9 Wright and Miller, *Federal Practice and Procedure: Civil* §2364 (1971)
denial of motions for withdrawal without prejudice; LBP-82-81, 16 NRC 1135, 1142 (1982)

Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Rule 26(b)
application to NRC proceedings; LBP-82-82, 16 NRC 1157 (1982)

Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Rule 26(b)(3)
adaptation of NRC discovery rules from; LBP-82-82, 16 NRC 1159 (1982)
clarification of qualified work product doctrine

Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Rule 41(a)(1), (2)
circumstances favoring dismissal of applications without prejudice; LBP-82-81, 16 NRC 1134 (1982)

Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Rule 56
analogy between summary disposition procedures and; LBP-82-58, 16 NRC 519 (1982)

Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Rule 56(c), (e)
standard for opposing motion for summary disposition; ALAB-696, 16 NRC 1258 (1982)

Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Rule 56(f)
Board authority to grant summary disposition motion before discovery is completed; ALAB-696, 16 NRC 1263 (1982)
use of affidavits to defer action on summary disposition motions; ALAB-696, 16 NRC 1258 (1982)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX

OTHERS

Federal Rules of Evidence, Rule 702
standard for qualification of expert witnesses; ALAB-701, 16 NRC 1524 (1982)

Federal Rules of Evidence, Rule 706
compliance of licensing board with, in appointing its own expert witness; LBP-82-55, 16 NRC 277 (1982)

Gelhorn, Public Participation in Administrative Proceedings, 81 YALE L.J. 359, 376-77 (1972)
admissibility of contentions not alleging noncompliance with a specified regulation; LBP-82-106, 16 NRC 1655 (1982)

M. Frankel, The Search for Truth: An Umpireal View, 123 U.Pa.L.Rev. 1031, 1037 (1975)
value of formal legal procedures in reviewing technical issues; CLI-82-20, 16 NRC 115 (1982)

Manual for Administrative Law Judges (revised ed. 1982)
definition of a complex case; LBP-82-107, 16 NRC 1678 (1982)

Rules of Appellate Procedure, Rule 41(b)
Licensing Board authority to consider contentions challenging NRC Rules or Regulations; LBP-82-92, 16 NRC 1385 (1982)

Shapiro, "The Choice of Rulemaking or Adjudication in the Development of Administrative Policy," 78 Harv. L. Rev. 921, 947-950 (1965)
limits on agency prerogatives to interpret policy statements LBP-82-69, 16 NRC 753 (1982)

U.S. Department of Justice, Attorney General's Manual on the Administrative Procedure Act, at 41 (1947)
circumstances requiring formal adjudicatory hearing; LBP-82-107, 16 NRC 1674 (1982)

Wright and Miller, Federal Practice and Procedure: Civil §2024, at 198 (1970)
documents prepared in contemplation of litigation as attorney work product; LBP-82-82, 16 NRC 1161 (1982)

SUBJECT INDEX

ACCIDENT(S)

assessment and monitoring at Diablo Canyon, capabilities for; LBP-82-70, 16 NRC 756 (1982)
beyond design basis at Shearon Harris, failure of applicant to assess; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2069 (1982)
class 9, assessment of risk of, at Seabrook; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1029 (1982)
class 9, criteria for admission of contentions on; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2069 (1982)
class 9, need for analysis of environmental effects of; ALAB-705, 16 NRC 1733 (1982)
class 9, showing required for consideration of, in operating license proceedings; LBP-82-58, 16 NRC 512 (1982)
consequences and probabilities, *scope of testimony on*; CLI-82-25, 16 NRC 867 (1982)
core-disruptive, Staff position on classification of; CLI-82-22, 16 NRC 405 (1982)
good cause for late filing of challenge to treatment of economic costs of; LBP-82-90, 16 NRC 1359 (1982)
greater-than-design-basis, adequacy of Summer facility emergency plans to cope with; LBP-82-57, 16 NRC 477 (1982)
loss-of-coolant, analysis for Rancho Seco, technical discussion of; ALAB-703, 16 NRC 1533 (1982)
serious, consideration of economic effects of; LBP-82-119, 16 NRC 2063 (1982)
serious, credibility of and scenarios for, at Catawba facility; LBP-82-107A, 16 NRC 1791 (1982)
small-break, loss-of-coolant, processes for decay heat removal in case of; ALAB-708, 16 NRC 1770 (1982)

ADJUDICATORY BOARDS

binding nature of NRC policy statements on; ALAB-704, 16 NRC 1725 (1982)
jurisdiction of, to reopen record on quality assurance issues; ALAB-681, 16 NRC 146 (1982)

AIRCRAFT

crash hazard analysis at Shearon Harris, need for; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2069 (1982)
crash probability at Three Mile Island; ALAB-692, 16 NRC 921 (1982)
hazard analysis at Shearon Harris, need for; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2069 (1982)

ALERTING

of public during radiological emergency, through siren system; LBP-82-57, 16 NRC 477 (1982)
of public near Diablo Canyon of radiological emergency, methods and procedures for; LBP-82-70, 16 NRC 756 (1982)
the public of radiological emergency, rejection of contentions alleging inadequacies in tone system for; LBP-82-75, 16 NRC 986 (1982)

See also Notification

ALTERNATIVE ENERGY SOURCES

consideration of, in operating license proceedings; LBP-82-58, 16 NRC 512 (1982); LBP-82-103, 16 NRC 1603 (1982); LBP-82-117A, 16 NRC 1964 (1982)

ALTERNATIVES

to reracking in spent fuel pool, technical discussion of; LBP-82-65, 16 NRC 714 (1982)
to spent fuel pool expansion, need for discussion of, in EIA; LBP-82-79, 16 NRC 1116 (1982)

AMENDMENT

of agreement with State of Colorado concerning regulation of nuclear materials, denial of petition for reconsideration of; CLI-82-34, 16 NRC 1502 (1982)
of Final Environmental Statement to include Board findings and conclusions; LBP-82-100, 16 NRC 1550 (1982)
of Rules of Practice to require operating license hearings for each nuclear power reactor, denial of petition for; DPRM-82-2, 16 NRC 1209 (1982)
of Susquehanna technical specifications to restrict leakage in reactor coolant system; ALAB-702, 16 NRC 1530 (1982)
to materials license, authorizing work at inactive thorium ore mill; CLI-82-21, 16 NRC 401 (1982)

SUBJECT INDEX

AMICUS CURIAE

participation in appellate hearings; ALAB-679, 16 NRC 121 (1982)

ANTICIPATED TRANSIENTS WITHOUT SCRAM

at Seabrook, reduction of risk of, through interim measures; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1029 (1982)
litigability of contentions on; LBP-82-118, 16 NRC 2034 (1982); LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2069 (1982)
precursor events calling for activation of standby liquid control system at Perry, Board-phrased questions
on; LBP-82-102, 16 NRC 1597 (1982)

scope of interrogatories on; LBP-82-67, 16 NRC 734 (1982)

summary disposition of contention asserting inadequate assurance of small probability of occurrence of,
LBP-82-57, 16 NRC 477 (1982)

APPEAL BOARD

authority to decline Licensing Board referrals; ALAB-687, 16 NRC 460 (1982)

decision, Commission dismissal of grant of review of; CLI-82-26, 16 NRC 880 (1982)

directed not to concern itself with current status of licensee's compliance with restart requirements;
CLI-82-32, 16 NRC 1243 (1982)

directed to certify questions on interpretation of 10 CFR 50.47(b)(12) to the Commission; CLI-82-27,
16 NRC 883 (1982)

disagreement with Licensing Board interpretation of emergency planning issue; ALAB-680, 16 NRC
127 (1982)

obligation to conduct immediate effectiveness review in manufacturing license proceeding; ALAB-686,
16 NRC 454 (1982)

policy concerning enforcement of time limits for filing exceptions; ALAB-684, 16 NRC 162 (1982)

portions of the record addressed in sua sponte review by; ALAB-691, 16 NRC 897 (1982)

request for authority to hear sua sponte safety issues, denial of; CLI-82-12, 16 NRC 1 (1982)

reversal of Licensing Board's scheduling of hearings; ALAB-696, 16 NRC 1245 (1982)

review of Licensing Board decision concerned with integrity of hearing process; ALAB-691, 16 NRC
897 (1982)

review of Licensing Board rulings on economic issues, intervention requests, or procedural matters,
scope of; ALAB-691, 16 NRC 897 (1982)

scope of sua sponte review by; ALAB-696, 16 NRC 1245 (1982)

standard in reviewing Licensing Board decision in context of motion for stay pending appeal;
ALAB-680, 16 NRC 127 (1982)

sua sponte review authority, nature of, and relationship to effectiveness of Licensing Board decisions;
ALAB-689, 16 NRC 887 (1982)

See also Certification

APPEAL PANEL CHAIRMAN

authority of, to summarily dismiss interlocutory appeal; ALAB-683, 16 NRC 160 (1982)

APPEAL(S)

acceptance of; LBP-82-106, 16 NRC 1649 (1982)

by licensees of order admitting intervenors to discretionary hearing on possible suspension of Units 2
and 3 denied; CLI-82-15, 16 NRC 27 (1982)

construed as complaint against Staff compliance with and implementation of Board order; ALAB-684,
16 NRC 162 (1982)

interlocutory, burden on party invoking; ALAB-706, 16 NRC 1754 (1982)

interlocutory, circumstances appropriate for; ALAB-683, 16 NRC 160 (1982)

interlocutory, exception to Commission's rule against; LBP-82-62, 16 NRC 565 (1982)

interlocutory, factors providing unusual delay in proceeding warranting; ALAB-706, 16 NRC 1754
(1982)

interlocutory, involving the scheduling of hearings or timing of admission of evidence; ALAB-688, 16
NRC 471 (1982)

standard for considering contention raised for first time on; ALAB-680, 16 NRC 127 (1982)

treatment of issues raised for first time on; ALAB-691, 16 NRC 897 (1982)

See also Briefs, Finality

APPLICANT

consideration of character of; ALAB-691, 16 NRC 897 (1982)

liability of, for material false statement; ALAB-691, 16 NRC 897 (1982)

obligation of, in NRC proceeding, to provide timely and accurate information; ALAB-691, 16 NRC 897
(1982)

SUBJECT INDEX

ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD

reconstitution of; CLI-82-24, 16 NRC 865 (1982)
sua sponte authority of; CLI-82-20, 16 NRC 109 (1982)
See also Licensing Board(s)

ATTORNEY'S FEES

intervenors', payment of, as condition of withdrawal of construction permit application; LBP-82-81, 16 NRC 1128 (1982)

AUXILIARY FEEDWATER SYSTEM

at TMI-1, sua sponte issues raised on reliability of spargers in; CLI-82-12, 16 NRC 1 (1982)
flow, delay in, loss-of-coolant accident analysis of; ALAB-703, 16 NRC 1533 (1982)
See also Emergency Feedwater System

BAYESIAN THEORY

use of, for calculation of aircraft crash probability at Three Mile Island; ALAB-692, 16 NRC 921 (1982)

BIAS

by NRC Staff attorney, denial of intervenor's petition alleging; CLI-82-36, 16 NRC 1512 (1982)
See also Disqualification

BIOACCUMULATION

acceptance of contention alleging inadequate treatment of; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2069 (1982)

BRIEFS

for appeals, contents of; ALAB-693, 16 NRC 952 (1982)
for exceptions, standards for; ALAB-696, 16 NRC 1245 (1982)

BURDEN OF PROOF

for demonstrating compliance of offsite emergency plans; LBP-82-77, 16 NRC 1096 (1982)
for summary disposition motions; LBP-82-58, 16 NRC 512 (1982)
in NRC licensing proceedings; ALAB-697, 16 NRC 1265 (1982)

BYPRODUCT MATERIALS LICENSE

renewal proceeding, standing to intervene in; ALAB-682, 16 NRC 150 (1982)
See also Materials License

CALIFORNIA

comparison of slip rates of faults in; LBP-82-64, 16 NRC 596 (1982)

CANCER

resulting from radiation from normal nuclear power plant operation, risk of; LBP-82-57, 16 NRC 477 (1982)

CAVEAT

decision on full-power operating license issued with; LBP-82-70, 16 NRC 756 (1982)

CERTIFICATION

of Appeal Board questions concerning jurisdiction of adjudicatory boards to reopen record on quality assurance issues; ALAB-681, 16 NRC 146 (1982)
of contentions to Commission or Appeal Board, burden not met for; LBP-82-51, 16 NRC 167 (1982)
of questions asking clarification of scope of testimony on emergency planning issues; CLI-82-25, 16 NRC 867 (1982)

standard for obtaining; LBP-82-69, 16 NRC 751 (1982)

where subject of interlocutory appeal is rejection of contentions; LBP-82-106, 16 NRC 1649 (1982)

See also Directed Certification

CHEMICAL RELEASES

from Shearon Harris, consideration of environmental impact of; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2069 (1982)

CHLORINE

use of, to clean condenser cooling system at Seabrook; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1029 (1982)

CIRCULATION

natural processes, to remove decay heat from reactor core, reopening of record for testimony on;
ALAB-708, 16 NRC 1770 (1982)

natural, in Big Rock Point spent fuel pool, potential for blockage of; LBP-82-97, 16 NRC 1439 (1982)

CLAMS, ASIATIC

burden of clarification and specificity of contention on; LBP-82-51, 16 NRC 167 (1982)

fouling of safety-related cooling systems at Perry plant by; LBP-82-114, 16 NRC 1909 (1982)

CLARIFICATION

by Licensing Board of FEMA findings on, and standard operating procedures of, emergency plans;
LBP-82-85, 16 NRC 1187 (1982)

SUBJECT INDEX

CLASSIFIED INFORMATION

expunction of, from NRC security proceeding and underlying record; CLI-82-30, 16 NRC 1234 (1982)
COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL

application of, to NRC proceedings; CLI-82-23, 16 NRC 412 (1982)
application of, to relitigation of environmental issues; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1029 (1982)
contention barred by; LBP-82-107A, 16 NRC 1791 (1982)

COMMUNICATIONS

emergency, at Diablo Canyon, adequacy of; LBP-82-70, 16 NRC 756 (1982)
with outside agencies during radiological emergency, applicant required to respond to interrogatories
on; LBP-82-67, 16 NRC 734 (1982)

CONCRETE

density at Callaway plant, deficiencies in; LBP-82-109, 16 NRC 1826 (1982)

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

potential, responsibility of parties to disclose; LBP-82-73, 16 NRC 974 (1982)

CONSOLIDATION

of hearings on power reactor units; DPRM-82-2, 16 NRC 1209 (1982)
of materials license renewal and operating license proceedings; ALAB-682, 16 NRC 150 (1982)

CONSTRUCTION

activities prior to issuance of construction permit or LWA, limitations on; CLI-82-23, 16 NRC 412 (1982)
allegations of specific flaws in, at Fermi plant; LBP-82-96, 16 NRC 1408 (1982)
at La Salle plant, partial denial of 2.206 petition regarding deficiencies in; DD-82-9, 16 NRC 396 (1982)
at Zimmer, issuance of immediately effective order suspending; CLI-82-33, 16 NRC 1489 (1982)
costs, consideration of, in operating license proceeding; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2069 (1982)
deficiencies in materials and safety, concrete density, welding, piping, radiographic techniques, and
code enforcement at Callaway Plant, technical discussion of; LBP-82-109, 16 NRC 1826 (1982)
quality assurance/quality control program at Midland, inadequacies in; LBP-82-118, 16 NRC 2034 (1982)

schedule, jurisdiction of Licensing Board in operating license proceeding over; LBP-82-92A, 16 NRC 1387 (1982)

CONSTRUCTION PERMIT

application, withdrawal without prejudice; LBP-82-81, 16 NRC 1128 (1982)

extension, scope of proceeding on; CLI-82-29, 16 NRC 1221 (1982)

good cause for extension of completion date of; CLI-82-29, 16 NRC 1221 (1982)

CONTAINMENT

admission of contention calling for ultrasonic analysis of; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2069 (1982)
concerns of former lead systems engineer for containment at Perry facility; LBP-82-98, 16 NRC 1459, 16 NRC 1459 (1982)

GE test reactor, integrity of; LBP-82-64, 16 NRC 596 (1982)

integrity, rejection of contention alleging compromise of; LBP-82-63, 16 NRC 571 (1982)

CONTAMINATION

of liquid pathway during nuclear accident, rejection of contention alleging inadequate analysis of;
LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1029 (1982)

CONTENTION(S)

about matters not covered by a specific rule; LBP-82-116, 16 NRC 1937 (1982)
admission of, pending effectiveness of Commission rule; LBP-82-53, 16 NRC 196 (1982)
barred by collateral estoppel; LBP-82-107A, 16 NRC 1791 (1982)
based on new information, burden on proponent of; LBP-82-107A, 16 NRC 1791 (1982)
based on unavailable documents, procedures for considering; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2069 (1982)
basis with specificity requirement for; LBP-82-106, 16 NRC 1649 (1982)
change of Staff position on an issue as good cause for late filing of; LBP-82-98, 16 NRC 1459, 16 NRC 1459 (1982)

concerning safety parts of plant not involved in amendment, admissibility of; LBP-82-108, 16 NRC 1811 (1982)

conditional admission of; ALAB-696, 16 NRC 1245 (1982)

consideration of merits of, in determining admissibility; LBP-82-118, 16 NRC 2034 (1982)

deferral of rulings on; LBP-82-107A, 16 NRC 1791 (1982)

SUBJECT INDEX

discovery on subject matter of; ALAB-696, 16 NRC 1245 (1982)
failure or refusal to prosecute; LBP-82-115, 16 NRC 1923 (1982)
good cause for acceptance of late-filed; LBP-82-63, 16 NRC 571 (1982)
handwritten, admissibility of; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2069 (1982)
interpretation of basis requirement for; LBP-82-116, 16 NRC 1937 (1982)
intervenors excused for lateness in filing of; LBP-82-53, 16 NRC 196 (1982)
late-filed, acceptance of, where factor (i) has not been satisfied; LBP-82-63, 16 NRC 571 (1982)
late-filed, admission of; LBP-82-91, 16 NRC 1364 (1982)
late-filed, affect on structure of licensing proceeding of; ALAB-706, 16 NRC 1754 (1982)
late-filed, on quality assurance and management competence, adopted sua sponte by Licensing Board; LBP-82-54, 16 NRC 210 (1982)
late-filed, responses to objections to; LBP-82-89, 16 NRC 1355 (1982)
late-filed, special rule on replies concerning; LBP-82-98, 16 NRC 1459, 16 NRC 1459 (1982)
Licensing Board declination to rewrite; LBP-82-106, 16 NRC 1649 (1982)
new, on quality assurance and management competence, insufficient justification to reopen record to hear; CLI-82-20, 16 NRC 109 (1982)
nonspecific, admissibility of; ALAB-687, 16 NRC 460 (1982)
of party who has withdrawn from operating license proceeding, disposition of; LBP-82-91, 16 NRC 1364 (1982)
raised for first time on appeal, standard for considering; ALAB-680, 16 NRC 127 (1982)
reasons for requiring specificity of; LBP-82-52, 16 NRC 183 (1982)
requirements for intervention; ALAB-696, 16 NRC 1245 (1982)
resolution of factual questions in considering admissibility of; LBP-82-63, 16 NRC 571 (1982)
summary disposition of; ALAB-696, 16 NRC 1245 (1982)
threshold showing of basis and specificity for admission of; LBP-82-75, 16 NRC 986 (1982)
untimely, arising from TMI-2 accident, standards for admission of; LBP-82-63, 16 NRC 571 (1982)
untimely, standard for admission of; ALAB-687, 16 NRC 460 (1982)
See also Certification

CONTROL ROOM
design at Shearon Harris, human engineering discrepancies in; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2069 (1982)
design, adequacy of, to minimize operator error at Seabrook; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1029 (1982)
fire suppression systems at Perry, need for evaluation of; LBP-82-98, 16 NRC 1459, 16 NRC 1459 (1982)

CONTROL SYSTEMS
automatic standby liquid, scope of interrogatories on; LBP-82-67, 16 NRC 734 (1982)
See also Chlorine, Emergency Core Cooling System, Standby Liquid Control Systems

COOLING POND
performance, admission of contention questioning basis for data on; LBP-82-63, 16 NRC 571 (1982)

COOLING SYSTEMS
at Perry plant, fouling of, by Asiatic clams; LBP-82-114, 16 NRC 1909 (1982)
See also Supplemental Cooling Water Systems

COOLING TOWER
blowdown, admission of contention questioning environmental effects of; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2069 (1982)

CORROSION
of steam generator tubes at TMI-1; CLI-82-12, 16 NRC 1 (1982)

COST-BENEFIT ANALYSIS
admission of contention alleging low fuel cost estimates in; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2069 (1982)
in Shearon Harris environmental report, revision of, to reflect new need for power rule; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2069 (1982)

COST-BENEFIT BALANCE
contention, denial of, because of continued validity of Table S-3; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1029 (1982)
contentions, burden not met for certification of; LBP-82-51, 16 NRC 167 (1982)
in Final Environmental Statement, as new information; LBP-82-96, 16 NRC 1408 (1982)
limitations on, in licensing proceedings; LBP-82-117A, 16 NRC 1964 (1982)
operating license, consideration of sunk costs in; LBP-82-96, 16 NRC 1408 (1982)
under NEPA, relevance of financial costs to; LBP-82-58, 16 NRC 512 (1982)

SUBJECT INDEX

COSTS

of nuclear accidents, input-output analysis of; LBP-82-90, 16 NRC 1359 (1982)

COUNSEL

conduct of, before a Licensing Board; LBP-82-87, 16 NRC 1195 (1982)

CRIMINAL PROSECUTION

of NRC examination cheaters; LBP-82-56, 16 NRC 281 (1982)

CRITICALITY

analysis of spent fuel racks under boiling pool conditions at Big Rock Point plant; LBP-82-97, 16 NRC 1439 (1982)

See also Supercriticality

CROSS-EXAMINATION

by means of prehearing examinations in the nature of depositions; LBP-82-107, 16 NRC 1667 (1982)

DECAY HEAT

adequacy of Seabrook's capacity for removal of; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1029 (1982)

removal methods, reopening of record to hear testimony on; ALAB-708, 16 NRC 1770 (1982)

removal, criteria for admission of contention on; LBP-82-106, 16 NRC 1649 (1982)

DECISION

concerning holding of hearing on order restricting licensed operator overtime, vacation of; CLI-82-18, 16 NRC 50 (1982)

Licensing Board, grounds for defense of; ALAB-691, 16 NRC 897 (1982)

DECOMMISSIONING

cost estimates for Shearon Harris, accuracy of; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2069 (1982)

of Humboldt Bay Plant, denial of 2.206 petition requesting; DD-82-7, 16 NRC 387 (1982)

of Seabrook Plant, negative impacts of; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1029 (1982)

DECONTAMINATION

consideration of impacts of, under NEPA; LBP-82-52, 16 NRC 183 (1982)

in event of radiological emergency at Summer facility, availability of facilities for; LBP-82-57, 16 NRC 477 (1982)

requirement for financial resources for; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2069 (1982)

DEFAULT

appropriate sanctions for; LBP-82-115, 16 NRC 1923 (1982)

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

NRC authority to review demonstration waste solidification plan of; ALAB-679, 16 NRC 121 (1982)

DESIGN

adequacy and construction quality, admission of contention seeking independent assessment of; LBP-82-63, 16 NRC 571 (1982)

objectives of 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix I, compliance with; LBP-82-58, 16 NRC 512 (1982)

See also Control Room, Seismic Design

DESIGN BASIS

seismic and geologic, of GE test reactor, technical discussion of; LBP-82-64, 16 NRC 596 (1982)

DESIGN BASIS EVENT

at GE test reactor, postulated accident following; LBP-82-64, 16 NRC 596 (1982)

DESIGN BASIS THREAT

at Diablo Canyon, release of restricted documents dealing with definition of; CLI-82-17, 16 NRC 48 (1982)

of radiological sabotage at Diablo Canyon, physical security plan for countering; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 53 (1982)

DETECTION SYSTEMS

leakage, admission of contention alleging inadequate testing of; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1029 (1982)

loose parts, requirement for; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1029 (1982)

DIESEL GENERATORS

at Midland plant, rejection of contention questioning reliability of; LBP-82-118, 16 NRC 2034 (1982)

reliability of, at Seabrook; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1029 (1982)

DIRECTED CERTIFICATION

of licensee's request for stay or dismissal of evidentiary proceeding on possible suspension of Units 2 and 3 denied; CLI-82-15, 16 NRC 27 (1982)

of question involving scheduling of hearings or timing of admission of evidence, denial of request for; ALAB-688, 16 NRC 471 (1982)

SUBJECT INDEX

of questions addressing Licensing Board's refusal to admit evidence on effluent contract lawsuit, denial of; LBP-82-62, 16 NRC 565 (1982)

See also Certification

DISCOVERY

against NRC Staff, scope of; LBP-82-113, 16 NRC 1907 (1982); LBP-82-117, 16 NRC 1955 (1982)

mandatory, suspension of; LBP-82-51, 16 NRC 167 (1982)

obligations of parties objecting to; LBP-82-82, 16 NRC 1144 (1982)

on nuclear power plant security plans; LBP-82-80, 16 NRC 1121 (1982)

on subject matter of a contention in a licensing proceeding; ALAB-696, 16 NRC 1245 (1982)

scope of, concerning professional associations of authors of a reactor study; LBP-82-99, 16 NRC 1541 (1982)

to obtain information about other plants; LBP-82-102, 16 NRC 1597 (1982)

See also Privilege

DISQUALIFICATION

of Staff consultant's opinion on ground of bias; LBP-82-99, 16 NRC 1541 (1982)

DOCUMENTATION

of Seabrook deviations from current regulatory practice, requirement for; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1029 (1982)

DOCUMENTS

applicant- and Staff-generated, denial of intervenor's request for copies of; LBP-82-51, 16 NRC 167 (1982)

intragovernmental, privilege against discovery of; LBP-82-82, 16 NRC 1144 (1982)

responses to requests for production of; LBP-82-82, 16 NRC 1144 (1982)

See also Restricted Documents, Service of Documents

DOSIMETERS

thermoluminescent, emergency plans for distribution of, to emergency workers; ALAB-698, 16 NRC 1290 (1982)

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT

application of lateness factors to new and revised contentions based on previously unavailable; LBP-82-107A, 16 NRC 1791 (1982)

as basis for late-filed radiation dose contention; LBP-82-79, 16 NRC 1116 (1982)

DUE PROCESS

administrative, for licensed operators caught cheating on exams; LBP-82-56, 16 NRC 281 (1982)

NRC methods for ensuring; LBP-82-87, 16 NRC 1195 (1982)

See also Restricted Documents, Service of Documents

EARTHQUAKE(S)

Charleston, localization of, relative to Summer facility; LBP-82-55, 16 NRC 225 (1982)

design basis for GE test reactor, determination of; LBP-82-64, 16 NRC 596 (1982)

maximum magnitude, danger to nuclear plant structures at Summer site from; LBP-82-55, 16 NRC 225 (1982)

shallow and near-source, potential for, at Summer site; LBP-82-55, 16 NRC 225 (1982)

use of Brune Model to calculate maximum magnitude and peak acceleration of; LBP-82-55, 16 NRC 225 (1982)

See also Fault(s), Ground faulting, Ground Motion, Seismicity

ECONOMICS

of decommissioning Humboldt Bay facility; DD-82-7, 16 NRC 387 (1982)

EDDY CURRENT TESTING

of sleeved steam generator tubes; LBP-82-88, 16 NRC 1335 (1982)

of steam generator tubes at Point Beach, difficulties with; LBP-82-108, 16 NRC 1811 (1982)

See also Testing

EFFECTIVENESS

of full-power operating license not stayed pending resolution of offsite medical arrangements issue; CLI-82-14, 16 NRC 24 (1982)

of manufacturing license pending review of initial decision; CLI-82-37, 16 NRC 1691 (1982)

See also Regulations, Review

EFFLUENT

contract lawsuit, denial of directed certification of Licensing Board's ruling on inadmissibility of evidence on; LBP-82-62, 16 NRC 565 (1982)

SUBJECT INDEX

ELECTRICAL EQUIPMENT

at Shearon Harris, compliance with NRC regulations for environmental qualification of; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2069 (1982)
seismic qualification of; LBP-82-106, 16 NRC 1649 (1982)

See also Transmission Lines

ELECTRICAL SYSTEM

at Midland plant, limitation on contention questioning adequacy of, to fire protection; LBP-82-118, 16 NRC 2034 (1982)

ELECTRICAL WIRING

environmental qualification of; LBP-82-53, 16 NRC 196 (1982)

ELECTROMAGNETIC PULSE

contention considered challenge to regulations; LBP-82-51, 16 NRC 167 (1982)

EMBRITTLEMENT

admission of previously rejected contention on; LBP-82-51, 16 NRC 167 (1982)
of electrical insulation; LBP-82-53, 16 NRC 196 (1982)

EMERGENCY CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM

at Diablo Canyon, adequacy of; LBP-82-70, 16 NRC 756 (1982)

litigation of contentions on, prior to fuel loading; LBP-82-75, 16 NRC 986 (1982)

EMERGENCY CORE COOLING SYSTEM

at Catawba, reaffirmation of rejection of contention concerning postulated malfunctioning of;
LBP-82-51, 16 NRC 167 (1982)

at Perry plant, testing of; LBP-82-119, 16 NRC 2063 (1982)

See also Cooling Systems

EMERGENCY EXERCISES

and drills, adequacy of Diablo Canyon's plans for; LBP-82-70, 16 NRC 756 (1982)
public participation in; LBP-82-100, 16 NRC 1550 (1982)

EMERGENCY FEEDWATER SYSTEM

need to be single-failure proof; LBP-82-106, 16 NRC 1649 (1982)

satisfaction of single-failure criterion by; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1029 (1982)

See also Auxiliary Feedwater Systems

EMERGENCY OPERATIONS FACILITY

requirements for establishment of; ALAB-698, 16 NRC 1290 (1982)

scope of applicant's response to interrogatories on; LBP-82-67, 16 NRC 734 (1982)

EMERGENCY PLANNING

brochures, form and content of; LBP-82-66, 16 NRC 730 (1982)

by San Onofre to provide medical assistance for radiation-injured in the general public; ALAB-680, 16 NRC 127 (1982)

certification of Board questions asking clarification of scope of testimony on; CLI-82-25, 16 NRC 867 (1982)

circumstances appropriate for reopening the record on; LBP-82-68, 16 NRC 741 (1982)

conditions, need to address prior to issuance of low-power license; LBP-82-112, 16 NRC 1901 (1982)

contention subparts addressed as separate contentions; LBP-82-106, 16 NRC 1649 (1982)

contentions, denial of, as premature; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1029 (1982)

denial of certification of rejected contentions on; LBP-82-51, 16 NRC 167 (1982)

evacuation routes going toward the reactor, adequacy of; LBP-82-96, 16 NRC 1408 (1982)

findings necessary for issuance of low-power license; LBP-82-68, 16 NRC 741 (1982)

for medical services for contaminated injured individuals; LBP-82-75, 16 NRC 986 (1982)

for protective actions to be taken in Shoreham Plant vicinity, admission of contention questioning

adequacy of; LBP-82-75, 16 NRC 986 (1982)

geographical regions designated to be used for; ALAB-697, 16 NRC 1265 (1982)

guidance issued by FEMA; ALAB-698, 16 NRC 1290 (1982)

issues, post-hearing resolution of; LBP-82-100, 16 NRC 1550 (1982)

offsite, requirement for FEMA findings on adequacy of; LBP-82-70, 16 NRC 756 (1982)

pamphlet for Big Rock Point Plant, attributes, content, purposes, and adequacy of; LBP-82-60, 16 NRC 540 (1982)

pamphlet for Big Rock Point Plant, order for changes in and distribution of; LBP-82-60, 16 NRC 540 (1982)

SUBJECT INDEX

procedures and capabilities for licensee to notify emergency response organizations of an emergency; ALAB-697, 16 NRC 1265 (1982)

protective measures for livestock; ALAB-697, 16 NRC 1265 (1982)

public education requirements for; ALAB-697, 16 NRC 1265 (1982)

regulations, means of implementing; ALAB-698, 16 NRC 1290 (1982)

time period in which licensees must correct deficiencies in; DD-82-12, 16 NRC 1685 (1982)

See also Evacuation

EMERGENCY PLANNING ZONE(S)

around nuclear power plants, responsibility for setting; LBP-82-70, 16 NRC 756 (1982)

at Summer facility, shape of; LBP-82-57, 16 NRC 477 (1982)

description of; ALAB-697, 16 NRC 1265 (1982)

ingestion exposure pathway, determination of size and configuration of; ALAB-697, 16 NRC 1265 (1982)

See also Zones

EMERGENCY PLANS

admission of contention relating to federal assistance for implementation of; LBP-82-75, 16 NRC 986 (1982)

at Diablo Canyon, assignment of responsibilities for; LBP-82-70, 16 NRC 756 (1982)

at Diablo Canyon, onsite emergency organization for implementing; LBP-82-70, 16 NRC 756 (1982)

Board clarification of FEMA findings on, and standard operating procedures under; LBP-82-85, 16 NRC 1187 (1982)

content of, regarding onsite and offsite preparedness, distribution of dosimeters to emergency workers,

Emergency Operations Facility, and protective measures; ALAB-698, 16 NRC 1290 (1982)

enforcement action for deficiencies in; CLI-82-38, 16 NRC 1698 (1982)

estimating training needs for purpose of; LBP-82-77, 16 NRC 1096 (1982)

for evacuating special populations, adequacy of assurance of; LBP-82-112, 16 NRC 1901 (1982)

for farmers in vicinity of Three Mile Island, adequacy of; ALAB-697, 16 NRC 1265 (1982)

for notifying transients of steps to take during radiological emergency; LBP-82-60, 16 NRC 540 (1982)

for offsite medical arrangements for public, license conditioned on resolution of; CLI-82-14, 16 NRC 24 (1982)

implementation of; LBP-82-100, 16 NRC 1550 (1982)

issuance of operating license prior to resolution of deficiencies in; ALAB-680, 16 NRC 127 (1982)

offsite, burden of proof for demonstrating compliance of; LBP-82-77, 16 NRC 1096 (1982)

procedures for correcting deficiencies in; LBP-82-77, 16 NRC 1096 (1982)

purpose of public information program under; LBP-82-66, 16 NRC 730 (1982)

rebuttable presumption on question of adequacy of; LBP-82-68, 16 NRC 741 (1982)

review and distribution of, at Diablo Canyon, assignment of responsibility for; LBP-82-70, 16 NRC 756 (1982)

standards for evacuation routes and times; LBP-82-100, 16 NRC 1550 (1982)

to cope with greater-than-design-basis accident at Summer facility, adequacy of; LBP-82-57, 16 NRC 477 (1982)

See also Clarification

EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS

at Indian Point, adequacy of; CLI-82-38, 16 NRC 1698 (1982)

basis of Licensing Board's findings on; LBP-82-68, 16 NRC 741 (1982)

onsite and offsite, findings necessary regarding state of; ALAB-698, 16 NRC 1290 (1982)

EMERGENCY RESPONSE PLANS

at Diablo Canyon, adequacy of equipment and facilities for implementing and support and resources for; LBP-82-70, 16 NRC 756 (1982)

of NRC Staff for TMI, adequacy of; ALAB-698, 16 NRC 1290 (1982)

ENDANGERED SPECIES

impact of construction of Shearon Harris facility on; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2069 (1982)

ENFORCEMENT ACTION

for deficiencies in emergency plans at Indian Point, need for; CLI-82-38, 16 NRC 1698 (1982)

for emergency planning deficiencies; DD-82-12, 16 NRC 1685 (1982)

scope of proceedings on; CLI-82-16, 16 NRC 44 (1982)

ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

consideration of synergistic effects of radiation in; LBP-82-100, 16 NRC 1550 (1982)

SUBJECT INDEX

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

of health effects of military use of plutonium derived from spent fuel, need for; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2069 (1982)

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

of plant operation, showing required for consideration of, at evidentiary hearing; LBP-82-58, 16 NRC 512 (1982)

remote and speculative, NRC need to consider, before proceeding with a project; LBP-82-117A, 16 NRC 1964 (1982)

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT APPRAISAL

adequacy of, with respect to spent fuel pool expansion at Big Rock Point Plant; LBP-82-79, 16 NRC 1116 (1982)

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

improper consideration of local employment and tax levels in; LBP-82-119, 16 NRC 2063 (1982)

preparation of, for pre-construction permit activities; CLI-82-23, 16 NRC 412 (1982)

scheduling of hearing on limited environmental issues prior to issuance of; LBP-82-92A, 16 NRC 1387 (1982)

prepared by other agencies, NRC Staff use of; DD-82-13, 16 NRC 2115 (1982)

supplemental, on psychological health effects of operation of TMI, denial of licensee's motion asking about preparation of; CLI-82-13, 16 NRC 21 (1982)

See also Draft Environmental Statement, Final Environmental Statement

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

application of collateral estoppel to relitigation of; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1029 (1982)

before other tribunals, consideration of, in operating license proceedings; LBP-82-117A, 16 NRC 1964 (1982)

scheduling of hearing on, prior to issuance of EIS; LBP-82-92A, 16 NRC 1387 (1982)

ENVIRONMENTAL QUALIFICATION

of emergency feedwater pumphouse HVAC, admission of contention asserting need for; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1029 (1982)

of safety-related equipment, lack of specificity of contention on; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1029 (1982)

suspension of licensee's obligation to answer Board question on; ALAB-685, 16 NRC 449 (1982)

See also Qualification

ENVIRONMENTAL REPORT

applicant's, need to consider psychological stress issues in; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2069 (1982)

consideration of health effects of radon in; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2069 (1982)

required by NEPA, segmentation of; DD-82-13, 16 NRC 2115 (1982)

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

scope of, under NEPA; ALAB-705, 16 NRC 1733 (1982)

EVACUATION

during radiological emergency at Summer facility, defects in transportation planning for; LBP-82-57, 16 NRC 477 (1982)

of persons without vehicles, invalids, and schoolchildren during radiological emergency at Big Rock Point Plant, adequacy of plans for; LBP-82-77, 16 NRC 1096 (1982)

of special populations during radiological emergency, need for plans for; LBP-82-100, 16 NRC 1550 (1982)

routes going toward the reactor, adequacy of; LBP-82-96, 16 NRC 1408 (1982)

routes, standard for judging adequacy of; LBP-82-100, 16 NRC 1550 (1982)

time estimates at Diablo Canyon, reliability of; LBP-82-70, 16 NRC 756 (1982)

EVIDENCE

drawing unfavorable inferences from; LBP-82-56, 16 NRC 281 (1982)

hearsay, in TMI cheating proceeding, Licensing Board treatment of; LBP-82-56, 16 NRC 281 (1982)

on accident risk, Licensing Board request for Commission guidance on treatment of; LBP-82-61, 16 NRC 560 (1982)

on effluent contract lawsuit, denial of directed certification of Licensing Board's ruling on inadmissibility of; LBP-82-62, 16 NRC 565 (1982)

See also Appeals

SUBJECT INDEX

EXAMINATIONS

NRC reactor operator licensing, site-specific validation of, and proctoring and grading of; LBP-82-56, 16 NRC 281 (1982)

EXCEPTIONS

Appeal Board policy concerning enforcement of time limits for filing; ALAB-684, 16 NRC 162 (1982)
necessity of filing; ALAB-694, 16 NRC 958 (1982)
standards for briefs for; ALAB-696, 16 NRC 1245 (1982)

EXEMPTIONS

from 10 CFR 50.10(c) for first-of-a-kind project; CLI-82-23, 16 NRC 412 (1982)
See also Hearing(s)

FAULT(S)

Calaveras, characteristics of, relative to GE test reactor; LBP-82-64, 16 NRC 596 (1982)
deflection, technical discussions of; LBP-82-64, 16 NRC 596 (1982)

Hosgri, changes in seismic design bases of Diablo Canyon due to proximity of; LBP-82-12A, 16 NRC 7 (1982)

in California, characteristics of, relative to GE test reactor; LBP-82-64, 16 NRC 596 (1982)
in vicinity of GE test reactor, activity of; LBP-82-64, 16 NRC 596 (1982)

San Fernando, seismicity of, relative to GE test reactor; LBP-82-64, 16 NRC 596 (1982)

Verona, characteristics of, relative to GE test reactor; LBP-82-64, 16 NRC 596 (1982)

Wateree Creek, near Summer facility, seismicity of; LBP-82-55, 16 NRC 225 (1982)

See also Ground Faulting

FEDERAL RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE

application of, to NRC proceedings; LBP-82-82, 16 NRC 1144 (1982)

FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT

amendment of, to include Board findings and conclusions; LBP-82-100, 16 NRC 1550 (1982)
cost-benefit balance in, as new information; LBP-82-96, 16 NRC 1408 (1982)

FINALITY

test of, for appeal purposes; ALAB-690, 16 NRC 893 (1982); ALAB-696, 16 NRC 1245 (1982)

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

to participants in licensing proceedings, denial of request for; CLI-82-40, 16 NRC 1717 (1982)

See also Funding

FINANCIAL QUALIFICATIONS

amendment of regulations to preclude consideration of; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1029 (1982)
denial of 2.206 petition requesting initiation of show-cause proceeding on basis of licensee's lack of;

DD-82-8, 16 NRC 394 (1982)

issues, elimination of, from NRC proceedings; DPRM-82-2, 16 NRC 1209 (1982)

litigability of, in operating license proceedings; LBP-82-63, 16 NRC 571 (1982); LBP-82-103, 16 NRC 1603 (1982)

of applicant for fulfilling emergency planning responsibilities, consideration of; LBP-82-67, 16 NRC 734 (1982)

of applicants, elimination of consideration of; LBP-82-57, 16 NRC 477 (1982)

of small power companies, litigability of contention on; LBP-82-51, 16 NRC 167 (1982); LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2069 (1982)

FINDINGS OF FACT

content of; LBP-82-88, 16 NRC 1335 (1982)

proposed, consequences of failure to file; ALAB-691, 16 NRC 897 (1982)

proposed, significance of requirement to file; ALAB-691, 16 NRC 897 (1982)

simultaneous, denial of Staff motion to reconsider scheduling for; LBP-82-51A, 16 NRC 180 (1982)

FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM

admission of contention listing inadequacies in, at Seabrook; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1029 (1982)

at Shearon Harris, adequacy of; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2069 (1982)

FISH

minimum standard for NEPA consideration of impingement and entrainment of; LBP-82-53, 16 NRC 196 (1982)

FUNDING

of intervenors, Board authority to approve; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2069 (1982)

See also Financial Assistance

SUBJECT INDEX

GROUND FAULTING

technical discussions of evidence, probability and estimates of offsets and deflection relevant to; LBP-82-64, 16 NRC 596 (1982)

GROUND MOTION

at Summer facility, calculation of; LBP-82-55, 16 NRC 225 (1982)

combined with surface offset, technical discussion; LBP-82-64, 16 NRC 596 (1982)

technical discussions of peak and vertical acceleration; LBP-82-64, 16 NRC 596 (1982)

HEALTH

effects of combined effluents from coal and nuclear power plants; LBP-82-58, 16 NRC 512 (1982)

effects of radiation releases accompanying normal operation, admission of contention on;

LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2069 (1982)

effects of radiation releases from uranium fuel cycle, denial of summary disposition of contention alleging underestimation of; LBP-82-57, 16 NRC 477 (1982)

effects of radiation, litigability of contentions on; LBP-82-105, 16 NRC 1629 (1982)

effects of radon, need to consider, in environmental report; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2069 (1982)

effects of radon releases from nuclear fuel cycle, failure of intervenors to demonstrate need for further hearings on; ALAB-701, 16 NRC 1517 (1982)

psychological, of residents of TMI area, preparation of supplemental EIS on; CLI-82-13, 16 NRC 21 (1982)

See also Psychological Stress, Hypothyroidism

HEARING(S)

amicus participation in; ALAB-679, 16 NRC 121 (1982)

obligations of parties with limited resources; ALAB-696, 16 NRC 1245 (1982)

on grant of exemption, right to, under Atomic Energy Act; CLI-82-23, 16 NRC 412 (1982)

on issues related to enforcement action; CLI-82-16, 16 NRC 44 (1982)

on power reactor units, consolidation of; DPRM-82-2, 16 NRC 1209 (1982)

on site preparation activities, requirement for, under Atomic Energy Act; CLI-82-23, 16 NRC 412 (1982)

persons who may request; LBP-82-87, 16 NRC 1195 (1982)

right to, under Atomic Energy Act; ALAB-687, 16 NRC 460 (1982)

to be held pursuant to 189(a) of Atomic Energy Act, nature of; LBP-82-107, 16 NRC 1667 (1982)

type required for materials license amendment; CLI-82-21, 16 NRC 401 (1982)

See also Appeal Board, Appeal(s), Consolidation

HIGH PRESSURE INJECTION NOZZLES

at Rancho Seco, effect of thermal stress on; ALAB-703, 16 NRC 1533 (1982)

See also Nozzle Cracking

HUMAN ENGINEERING

location of multi-point recorder as flaw in; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1029 (1982)

HURRICANES

adequacy of South Texas Project design to withstand; LBP-82-91, 16 NRC 1364 (1982)

HYDRILLA VERTICILLATA

effects of, on Shearon Harris reservoir; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2069 (1982)

HYDROGEN CONTROL

at Perry facility, discovery against NRC Staff concerning; LBP-82-117, 16 NRC 1955 (1982)

contentions, specificity required for admissibility of; LBP-82-103, 16 NRC 1603 (1982); LBP-82-110, 16 NRC 1895 (1982); LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2069 (1982)

systems at Seabrook, rejection of contention questioning adequacy of; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1029 (1982)

HYPOTHYROIDISM

neonatal, after TMI-2 accident; ALAB-697, 16 NRC 1265 (1982)

INFORMANTS

NRC Staff refusal to name; LBP-82-59, 16 NRC 533 (1982)

INFORMATION

materiality of; ALAB-691, 16 NRC 897 (1982)

INFORMER'S PRIVILEGE

application of and yielding of, in NRC practice; LBP-82-59, 16 NRC 533 (1982); LBP-82-87, 16 NRC 1195 (1982)

SUBJECT INDEX

INSTRUMENTATION

at Seabrook, regulatory compliance of; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1029 (1982)

INTERESTED STATE

obligations of, as a full party to a proceeding; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1029 (1982)

INTERROGATORIES

asked by non-lawyer representative of an intervenor, interpretation of; LBP-82-117, 16 NRC 1955 (1982)

form and specificity of objections to; LBP-82-116, 16 NRC 1937 (1982)

scope of applicant's response to; LBP-82-67, 16 NRC 734 (1982)

INTERSTATE COMPACT

preclusion of Licensing Board jurisdiction by; LBP-82-72, 16 NRC 968 (1982)

INTERVENOR(S)

financial assistance to; CLI-82-40, 16 NRC 1717 (1982)

funding, Board authority to provide; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2069 (1982)

in NRC proceedings, structure of participation of; ALAB-693, 16 NRC 952 (1982)

pro se, showing required of, for admission of late-filed contentions; LBP-82-63, 16 NRC 571 (1982)

pro se, standard for briefs of; ALAB-693, 16 NRC 952 (1982)

unreasonable expectations of; LBP-82-63, 16 NRC 571 (1982)

views, purposes, and conduct of, outside of NRC proceedings; CLI-82-15, 16 NRC 27 (1982)

who cannot present their own cases, assistance for; LBP-82-84, 16 NRC 1183 (1982)

INTERVENTION

by an organization, requirements for; LBP-82-74, 16 NRC 981 (1982)

by groups opposing nuclear power; CLI-82-15, 16 NRC 27 (1982)

by interested state, criteria for; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1029 (1982)

contention requirement for; ALAB-687, 16 NRC 460 (1982); LBP-82-74, 16 NRC 981 (1982)

discretionary, by petitioners without a valid contention; LBP-82-52, 16 NRC 183 (1982)

in materials license proceedings, establishing interest for; ALAB-682, 16 NRC 150 (1982)

late, discussion of standards for; LBP-82-117B, 16 NRC 2024 (1982)

late, reason for reversal of Licensing Board's denial of late intervention petition; ALAB-707, 16 NRC 1760 (1982)

nontimely, justification for; LBP-82-74, 16 NRC 981 (1982)

petitions, unopposed, Licensing Board obligation to grant; LBP-82-88, 16 NRC 1335 (1982)

petitions, untimely, showing necessary absent good cause; ALAB-704, 16 NRC 1725 (1982)

requirements for; ALAB-696, 16 NRC 1245 (1982)

standards for evaluating admissibility of untimely petition for; LBP-82-63, 16 NRC 571 (1982)

untimely, application of good cause factors of 2.714(a)(1) to; LBP-82-91, 16 NRC 1364 (1982)

untimely, by a State; LBP-82-92, 16 NRC 1376 (1982)

INVESTIGATION

of concealment of safety information, denial of intervenors' petition for; CLI-82-22, 16 NRC 405 (1982)

IODINE

monitors, in-plant, admission of contention alleging insufficiency of; LBP-82-75, 16 NRC 986 (1982)

radioactive, environmental detection of, following accidental releases of radioactivity; ALAB-697, 16 NRC 1265 (1982)

JURISDICTION

delegated to Special Master; LBP-82-56, 16 NRC 281 (1982)

of adjudicatory boards to reopen record on quality assurance issues at Diablo Canyon; ALAB-681, 16 NRC 146 (1982)

of Licensing Board in operating license proceeding over construction schedule; LBP-82-92A, 16 NRC 1387 (1982)

of Licensing Board over psychological stress contentions, following issuance of policy statement; LBP-82-69, 16 NRC 751 (1982)

of Licensing Board to hear evidence on Commission-posed emergency planning questions; LBP-82-61, 16 NRC 560 (1982)

of Licensing Board to impose monetary penalty; LBP-82-56, 16 NRC 281 (1982)

of Licensing Board to order NRC Staff to investigate alleged false material statement; LBP-82-56, 16 NRC 281 (1982)

SUBJECT INDEX

- of Licensing Board to reassess impacts of water allocations from Delaware River for cooling a nuclear plant; LBP-82-72, 16 NRC 968 (1982)
- of Licensing Board to reopen a proceeding; ALAB-699, 16 NRC 1324 (1982)
- of Licensing Board to reopen record on issue pending before Appeal Board; LBP-82-111, 16 NRC 1898 (1982)
- of Licensing Board to rule on motion to reopen the record; LBP-82-86, 16 NRC 1190 (1982)
- of Licensing Board to rule on untimely petition to intervene even though low-power license has been issued; LBP-82-92, 16 NRC 1376 (1982)
- of Licensing Boards to impose civil penalties, *sua sponte*; CLI-82-31, 16 NRC 1236 (1982)
- over issues relating to compliance with and implementation of Board orders; ALAB-684, 16 NRC 162 (1982)
- over TMI cheating decision retained by Licensing Board; LBP-82-56, 16 NRC 281 (1982)
- to rule on a motion to reopen filed after exceptions have been taken; ALAB-699, 16 NRC 1324 (1982)

LIABILITY

- of applicant or licensee for material false statement; ALAB-691, 16 NRC 897 (1982)

LICENSE

- amendment to permit reracking in spent fuel pool; LBP-82-65, 16 NRC 714 (1982)
- See also Byproduct Materials License, Manufacturing License, Materials License, Operating License

LICENSEE

- consideration of character of; ALAB-691, 16 NRC 897 (1982)
- liability of, for material false statement; ALAB-691, 16 NRC 897 (1982)
- obligation of, in NRC proceeding, to provide timely and accurate information; ALAB-691, 16 NRC 897 (1982)

LICENSING BOARD(S)

- appointment of Special Master by; LBP-82-56, 16 NRC 281 (1982)
- authority of, to regulate proceedings; ALAB-696, 16 NRC 1245 (1982); LBP-82-115, 16 NRC 1923 (1982)
- authority regarding withdrawal of construction permit application; LBP-82-81, 16 NRC 1128 (1982)
- authority to impose sanctions on NRC Staff; LBP-82-87, 16 NRC 1195 (1982)
- authority to phrase questions to fill gaps in intervenor's interrogatories; LBP-82-102, 16 NRC 1597 (1982)
- authority, delegation of, to NRC Staff; LBP-82-68, 16 NRC 741 (1982)
- discretion in managing proceedings, imposition of sanctions; LBP-82-75, 16 NRC 986 (1982)
- discretion in managing proceedings; LBP-82-107, 16 NRC 1667 (1982)
- discretion to defer rulings on contentions; LBP-82-107A, 16 NRC 1791 (1982)
- extent of scrutiny of SER explanations justifying operation of a plant; LBP-82-100, 16 NRC 1550 (1982)
- judgment, substitution of Staff judgment for; LBP-82-114, 16 NRC 1909 (1982)
- jurisdiction in admission of contentions; CLI-82-15, 16 NRC 27 (1982)
- jurisdiction to impose civil penalties, *sua sponte*; CLI-82-31, 16 NRC 1236 (1982)
- jurisdiction to order NRC Staff to investigate alleged false material statement; LBP-82-56, 16 NRC 281 (1982)
- jurisdiction to refer NRC examination cheaters for criminal prosecution; LBP-82-56, 16 NRC 281 (1982)
- jurisdiction over psychological stress contentions, following issuance of policy statement; LBP-82-69, 16 NRC 751 (1982)
- jurisdiction to hear evidence on Commission-posed emergency planning questions; LBP-82-61, 16 NRC 560 (1982)
- jurisdiction to impose monetary penalty; LBP-82-56, 16 NRC 281 (1982)
- jurisdiction to reassess impacts of water allocation covered by interstate compact; LBP-82-72, 16 NRC 968 (1982)
- jurisdiction to reopen a proceeding; ALAB-699, 16 NRC 1324 (1982)
- jurisdiction to reopen record on issue pending before Appeal Board; LBP-82-111, 16 NRC 1898 (1982)
- jurisdiction to rule on motion to reopen the record; LBP-82-86, 16 NRC 1190 (1982)
- jurisdiction to rule on untimely petition to intervene even though low-power license has been issued; LBP-82-92, 16 NRC 1376 (1982)
- limitations on providing assistance to intervenors; LBP-82-84, 16 NRC 1183 (1982)

SUBJECT INDEX

need to notify Commission that it is asking questions relevant to admitted contentions; LBP-82-117, 16 NRC 1955 (1982)

respect to be accorded to; LBP-82-115, 16 NRC 1923 (1982)

responsibility to develop a full record; LBP-82-87, 16 NRC 1195 (1982)

review of intervention petition, scope of; LBP-82-88, 16 NRC 1335 (1982)

sua sponte authority to examine uncontested issues; LBP-82-100, 16 NRC 1550 (1982)

See also Atomic Safety and Licensing Board, Decision

LICENSING PROCEEDINGS

motion to reopen, related to previously uncontested issue; CLI-82-39, 16 NRC 1712 (1982)

procedures to be used in; ALAB-696, 16 NRC 1245 (1982)

reopening of, for consideration of newly recognized contention; ALAB-707, 16 NRC 1760 (1982)

See also Operating License Proceedings

LIMITED WORK AUTHORIZATIONS

required determinations for granting of; ALAB-688, 16 NRC 471 (1982)

MAINTENANCE

performed during plant operation, limits on type of; LBP-82-63, 16 NRC 571 (1982)

MANAGEMENT CAPABILITY

admission of "track record" contention questioning; LBP-82-107A, 16 NRC 1791 (1982)

at Shearon Harris, admission of contention questioning adequacy of; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2069 (1982)

at Zimmer, dismissal of sua sponte contentions on; CLI-82-20, 16 NRC 109 (1982)

to operate Zimmer facility, sua sponte adoption of untimely contentions challenging; LBP-82-54, 16 NRC 210 (1982)

use of safety record at other plants to assess; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2069 (1982)

MANUFACTURING LICENSE

effectiveness pending review of initial decision; CLI-82-37, 16 NRC 1691 (1982)

proceeding, regulatory obligation to conduct immediate effectiveness review of; ALAB-686, 16 NRC 454 (1982)

MATERIAL FALSE STATEMENT(S)

certification of licensed operator who has requalified through improper assistance as; LBP-82-56, 16 NRC 281 (1982)

concerning certification of licensed reactor operator; CLI-82-31, 16 NRC 1236 (1982)

liability of applicant or licensee for; ALAB-691, 16 NRC 897 (1982)

NRC Staff investigation of; LBP-82-56, 16 NRC 281 (1982)

omissions as; ALAB-691, 16 NRC 897 (1982)

relevance of intent to deceive through; ALAB-691, 16 NRC 897 (1982)

test for; ALAB-691, 16 NRC 897 (1982)

MATERIALS LICENSE

amendment authorizing work at inactive thorium ore mill, authorization of hearing on; CLI-82-21, 16 NRC 401 (1982)

See also Byproduct Materials License, Notice

MEDICAL SERVICES

arrangements for contaminated injured individuals, emergency planning requirements for; LBP-82-75, 16 NRC 986 (1982)

arrangements, suspension of operating license proceeding concerning adequacy of; CLI-82-35, 16 NRC 1510 (1982)

for "contaminated injured individuals," interpretation of; CLI-82-27, 16 NRC 883 (1982)

for treating contaminated injured individuals during radiological emergency at Diablo Canyon, assurance

in event of radiological emergency at Summer facility, availability of facilities for; LBP-82-57, 16 NRC 477 (1982)

need for further litigation on adequacy of offsite emergency plans for; LBP-82-60A, 16 NRC 555 (1982)

MISSILES

reactor coolant pump flywheel as potential source of; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1029 (1982)

See also Turbine Missiles

SUBJECT INDEX

MONITORING

and assessing radiological emergencies, ability of offsite jurisdictions of San Onofre for; ALAB-680, 16 NRC 127 (1982)
meteorological, and dose projections, applicant required to respond to interrogatories on emergency planning for; LBP-82-67, 16 NRC 734 (1982)
of routine releases of radioactivity from Seabrook, adequacy of; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1029 (1982)
of site seismicity, license conditioned for continued; LBP-82-57, 16 NRC 477 (1982)
radiation with thermoluminescent dosimeters; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2069 (1982)
radioactivity, use of vole thyroids for; ALAB-697, 16 NRC 1265 (1982)
radiological environmental, at La Crosse facility, methodology and adequacy of; LBP-82-58, 16 NRC 512 (1982)
radiological, at fixed sample points on or near Shearon Harris site, adequacy of; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2069 (1982)
seismic, at Summer facility, as a license condition; LBP-82-55, 16 NRC 225 (1982)
system for radionuclides at Shearon Harris, adequacy of; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2069 (1982)
See also Accident(s), Iodine

MONITORS

pressurized ionization, at discharge points, need for; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2069 (1982)

MONTICELLO RESERVOIR

seismic history of, following impoundment of; LBP-82-55, 16 NRC 225 (1982)

MOOTNESS

vacation of unreviewed judgments because of; CLI-82-18, 16 NRC 50 (1982)

MORTALITY

infant, after TMI-2 accident; ALAB-697, 16 NRC 1265 (1982)

MOTION

for litigable issues, procedural rules governing; LBP-82-88, 16 NRC 1335 (1982)
to reopen, factors controlling disposition of; ALAB-699, 16 NRC 1324 (1982)

NEED FOR POWER

considerations in operating license proceedings, justification for raising; LBP-82-58, 16 NRC 512 (1982)
issues, litigability of, in operating license proceedings; LBP-82-103, 16 NRC 1603 (1982);
LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2069 (1982)

NEUTRON MULTIPLICATION FACTOR

in spent fuel pool, limit on; LBP-82-97, 16 NRC 1439 (1982)

NOTICE

of information in separate proceedings, criteria for providing; ALAB-682, 16 NRC 150 (1982)
of materials license actions, recommendation for rulemaking on; ALAB-682, 16 NRC 150 (1982)

NOTIFICATION

of emergency response organizations of an emergency, procedures and capabilities for; ALAB-697, 16 NRC 1265 (1982)
of public of radiological emergency at San Onofre; ALAB-680, 16 NRC 127 (1982)
of the public of a radiological emergency at Summer facility, sufficiency of plan for; LBP-82-57, 16 NRC 477 (1982)

program to inform public of steps to take during radiological emergency, status of, at Diablo Canyon;
LBP-82-70, 16 NRC 756 (1982)

NOZZLE CRACKING

in high pressure injection system at TMI-1, sua sponte issue raised on; CLI-82-12, 16 NRC 1 (1982)
See also High Pressure Injection Nozzles

NRC STAFF

attorney, denial of petition for disqualification of; CLI-82-36, 16 NRC 1512 (1982)

delegation of Licensing Board authority to; LBP-82-68, 16 NRC 741 (1982)

directed to respond to relevant interrogatories concerning hydrogen release; LBP-82-117, 16 NRC 1955 (1982)

meetings with parties, scheduling and location of; CLI-82-41, 16 NRC 1721 (1982)

need to compile criticisms of a document at issue in a proceeding; LBP-82-113, 16 NRC 1907 (1982)

ordered to show cause why sanctions should not be imposed for its refusal to name informants;
LBP-82-59, 16 NRC 533 (1982)

SUBJECT INDEX

oversight of construction activities at Midland Plant; ALAB-684, 16 NRC 162 (1982)
responsibility concerning uncontested safety issues; ALAB-680, 16 NRC 127 (1982)
responsibility of, regarding compliance with NEPA; ALAB-693, 16 NRC 952 (1982)
responsibility to comply with Licensing Board orders; LBP-82-87, 16 NRC 1195 (1982)
role in adjudicatory process; LBP-82-64, 16 NRC 596 (1982)

NUCLEAR FUEL CYCLE

application of Table S-3 to matters pertaining to; LBP-82-118, 16 NRC 2034 (1982)
contention considered impermissible challenge to Table S-3; LBP-82-63, 16 NRC 571 (1982)
health effects of radon releases from; ALAB-701, 16 NRC 1517 (1982)
values of Table S-3, validity of; LBP-82-92, 16 NRC 1376 (1982)

See also Uranium Fuel Cycle

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

agreement with State of Colorado concerning regulation of nuclear materials, denial of petition for reconsideration of; CLI-82-34, 16 NRC 1502 (1982)
authority to provide guidance on admissibility of contentions before Licensing Boards; CLI-82-15, 16 NRC 27 (1982)
authority to require threshold showing of basis and specificity for admission of contention; LBP-82-75, 16 NRC 986 (1982)

authority to review DOE's demonstration waste solidification plan; ALAB-679, 16 NRC 121 (1982)
authority to terminate or suspend agreements with States; CLI-82-34, 16 NRC 1502 (1982)

dismissal of grant of review of Appeal Board decision; CLI-82-26, 16 NRC 880 (1982)
personnel, considering sufficiency of, in operating license proceeding; DPRM-82-2, 16 NRC 1209 (1982)

policy statements, binding nature of, on adjudicatory boards; ALAB-704, 16 NRC 1725 (1982)
rulemaking authority of; ALAB-707, 16 NRC 1760 (1982)

See also Federal Rules of Civil Procedure

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION PROCEEDINGS

application of res judicata/collateral estoppel to; CLI-82-23, 16 NRC 412 (1982)

conduct of parties to; ALAB-691, 16 NRC 897 (1982)

obligation of applicant or licensee to provide timely and accurate information in; ALAB-691, 16 NRC 897 (1982)

standard for judging lawyer conduct in; ALAB-691, 16 NRC 897 (1982)

standard for preparation of; ALAB-691, 16 NRC 897 (1982)

NUCLEAR WEAPONS

considerations of contentions on use of spent fuel to manufacture; LBP-82-53, 16 NRC 196 (1982)

OBJECTIONS

to late-filed contentions, responses to; LBP-82-89, 16 NRC 1355 (1982)

OPERATING HISTORY

of Humboldt Bay facility; DD-82-7, 16 NRC 387 (1982)

OPERATING LICENSE

amendment for spent fuel reprocessing and waste disposal center, denial of intervenor's request for hearing on; ALAB-679, 16 NRC 121 (1982)

amendment proceeding, discussion of show cause procedure and litigation standard used to expedite; ALAB-696, 16 NRC 1245 (1982)

amendment to allow operation with sleeved steam generator tubes, affirmation of order authorizing; ALAB-696, 16 NRC 1245 (1982)

at Summer facility subject to seismic monitoring and design confirmation conditions; LBP-82-55, 16 NRC 225 (1982)

conditions, post-hearing resolution of, by NRC Staff; LBP-82-100, 16 NRC 1550 (1982)

cost-benefit balance, consideration of sunk costs in; LBP-82-63, 16 NRC 571 (1982); LBP-82-96, 16 NRC 1408 (1982)

full-term, authorized subject to conditions relating to seismic safety, emergency preparedness, and steam generator tube problems; LBP-82-57, 16 NRC 477 (1982)

hearings, limitation on issues to be examined in; DPRM-82-2, 16 NRC 1209 (1982)

hearings, requirement for FEMA findings on adequacy of offsite emergency planning; LBP-82-70, 16 NRC 756 (1982)

procedures, responsibility of NRC Staff regarding compliance with NEPA and AEA; ALAB-693, 16 NRC 952 (1982)

SUBJECT INDEX

OPERATING LICENSE AMENDMENT PROCEEDING

scope of; LBP-82-108, 16 NRC 1811 (1982)

OPERATING LICENSE PROCEEDING(S)

commencement of, when construction is only five percent complete; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2069 (1982)

concerning adequacy of emergency medical services arrangements, suspension of; CLI-82-35, 16 NRC 1510 (1982)

consideration of environmental issues before other tribunals in; LBP-82-117A, 16 NRC 1964 (1982)

curve in defect in fairness of, through discovery and disclosure on potential conflict of interest; LBP-82-73, 16 NRC 974 (1982)

issues for consideration in; LBP-82-91, 16 NRC 1364 (1982); LBP-82-100, 16 NRC 1550 (1982)

justification to reopen; CLI-82-20, 16 NRC 109 (1982)

limitations on matters to be resolved in; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1029 (1982)

litigability of financial qualifications in; LBP-82-63, 16 NRC 571 (1982)

low-power and full-power, separation of; CLI-82-39, 16 NRC 1712 (1982)

See also Accident(s), Alternative Energy Sources, Licensing Proceeding, Record

OPERATING LICENSE, FULL-POWER

authorization of, in spite of pendency of low-power suspension and independent design verification program; LBP-82-70, 16 NRC 756 (1982)

continuation of, beyond 6 months, conditioned on resolution of offsite medical arrangements issue; CLI-82-14, 16 NRC 24 (1982)

emergency planning findings necessary for issuance of; LBP-82-68, 16 NRC 741 (1982)

suspension of, pending appellate review; ALAB-680, 16 NRC 127 (1982)

OPERATING LICENSE, LOW-POWER

need to meet conditions addressing emergency planning issues prior to issuance of; LBP-82-112, 16 NRC 1901 (1982)

procedures for authorization of issuance of; LBP-82-68, 16 NRC 741 (1982)

OPERATOR TRAINING

and examination, utility's responsibility for; LBP-82-56, 16 NRC 281 (1982)

ORDER

sanctions for refusal to comply with; LBP-82-115, 16 NRC 1923 (1982)

PENALTY

civil jurisdiction of Licensing Boards to impose, *sua sponte*; CLI-82-31, 16 NRC 1236 (1982)

monetary, Licensing Board jurisdiction to impose; LBP-82-56, 16 NRC 281 (1982)

PHYSICAL SECURITY

at Fermi site during construction, rejection of contention alleging inadequacies in; LBP-82-96, 16 NRC 1408 (1982)

PHYSICAL SECURITY PLAN(S)

for Diablo Canyon, publication of, with protected information deleted; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 53 (1982)

for Diablo Canyon, release to intervenor's counsel of portions of; CLI-82-17, 16 NRC 48 (1982)

POLICY STATEMENTS

NRC, binding nature of, on adjudicatory boards; ALAB-704, 16 NRC 1725 (1982)

on psychological stress contentions, effect of, on Board's jurisdiction over; LBP-82-69, 16 NRC 751 (1982)

POLYETHYLENE

insulation for safety-related cable, use of, at Shearon Harris; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2069 (1982)

POPULATION DENSITY

around shutdown facility, NRC Staff consideration of; DD-82-7, 16 NRC 387 (1982)

at Indian Point, consideration of; CLI-82-25, 16 NRC 867 (1982)

PRESIDING OFFICER

over informal materials license amendment hearing, representatives and responsibilities of; CLI-82-21, 16 NRC 401 (1982)

PRESSURIZER HEATERS

safety standards for qualification of; LBP-82-70, 16 NRC 756 (1982)

SUBJECT INDEX

PRIVILEGE

attorney-client, purpose and scope of; LBP-82-82, 16 NRC 1144 (1982)
executive, in NRC proceedings, related to discovery guidance in resolving claims of; LBP-82-82, 16 NRC 1144 (1982)

to avoid discovery, burden on party asserting; LBP-82-82, 16 NRC 1144 (1982)

See also Informer's Privilege, Work Product Doctrine

PROBABILISTIC RISK ASSESSMENT

rejection of contention asserting necessity for; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1029 (1982)

PROTECTIVE ORDER

automatic grant of; LBP-82-116, 16 NRC 1937 (1982)

to avoid disclosure of documents, good cause for issuance of; LBP-82-82, 16 NRC 1144 (1982)

PSYCHOLOGICAL STRESS

caused by viewing cooling tower plume, rejection of contention concerning; LBP-82-71, 16 NRC 965 (1982)

consideration of, as an environmental cost; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2069 (1982)

considerations in applicant's environmental report, need for; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2069 (1982)

contentions, effect of policy statement on litigation of; LBP-82-69, 16 NRC 751 (1982)

context for considering contentions on; LBP-82-71, 16 NRC 965 (1982)

from Commission-licensed activities, criteria to be met by contentions alleging; LBP-82-103, 16 NRC 1603 (1982)

legal standard for NEPA consideration of; LBP-82-53, 16 NRC 196 (1982)

reversal of decision accepting contention on; LBP-82-53A, 16 NRC 208 (1982)

QUALIFICATION

environmental, of electrical equipment, denial of contention on; LBP-82-106, 16 NRC 1649 (1982)

methods for safety-related equipment at Midland, adequacy of; LBP-82-118, 16 NRC 2034 (1982)

of power-operated relief valves and pressurizer heaters, safety standards for; LBP-82-70, 16 NRC 756 (1982)

seismic, of Waterford equipment, justification for interim operation pending resolution of; LBP-82-100, 16 NRC 1550 (1982)

See also Environmental Qualification

QUALIFICATION TESTING

of equipment, admission of contention questioning applicant's compliance with interim requirement for; LBP-82-63, 16 NRC 571 (1982)

See also Testing

QUALITY ASSURANCE

at Diablo Canyon, jurisdiction of Boards to reopen record on; ALAB-681, 16 NRC 146 (1982)

at Fermi plant, rejection of contention alleging inadequacies in; LBP-82-96, 16 NRC 1408 (1982)

at Summer Plant, history and acceptability of; LBP-82-57, 16 NRC 477 (1982)

at Zimmer, dismissal of *sua sponte* contentions on; CLI-82-20, 16 NRC 109 (1982)

at Zimmer, *sua sponte* adoption of untimely contentions challenging; LBP-82-54, 16 NRC 210 (1982)
construction contractor's lack of knowledge of deficiencies as failure to meet regulatory requirements

for; LBP-82-109, 16 NRC 1826 (1982)

contention seen as an expedition seeking information; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1029 (1982)

deficiencies at in construction at Perry plant; LBP-82-114, 16 NRC 1909 (1982)

for operation at Seabrook, admission of contentions on; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1029 (1982)

of design of Seabrook, litigation of, in operating license proceeding; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1029 (1982)

of heating, ventilating and air conditioning system, admission of contentions bearing on; LBP-82-63, 16 NRC 571 (1982)

program at Midland, inadequacies in; LBP-82-118, 16 NRC 2034 (1982)

proof of adequacy of; LBP-82-109, 16 NRC 1826 (1982)

requirement for records of; LBP-82-109, 16 NRC 1826 (1982)

suspension of construction at Zimmer because of breakdown in; CLI-82-33, 16 NRC 1489 (1982)

RADIATION

collecting and sharing information about exposure of rescue personnel to; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2069 (1982)

consideration of synergistic effects of, in environmental analysis; LBP-82-100, 16 NRC 1550 (1982)

effects on polymers; LBP-82-53, 16 NRC 196 (1982)

SUBJECT INDEX

from normal nuclear power plant operation, estimation of health effects of; LBP-82-57, 16 NRC 477 (1982)

health effects contentions, admissibility of, in individual licensing proceedings; LBP-82-105, 16 NRC 1629 (1982)

monitoring with thermoluminescent dosimeters, adequacy of; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2069 (1982)

RADIATION HAZARDS

adequacy of Big Rock Point Plant's emergency planning pamphlet with regard to; LBP-82-60, 16 NRC 540 (1982)

RADIOACTIVE CONTAMINATION

of crops and livestock during radiological emergency, license conditioned by requirement for plan to protect consumers from; LBP-82-57, 16 NRC 477 (1982)

RADIOACTIVE EMISSIONS

off-gas, at La Crosse plant, summary disposition of contentions alleging excessive; LBP-82-58, 16 NRC 512 (1982)

routine, calculation of dose levels to humans from; LBP-82-79, 16 NRC 1116 (1982)

RADIOACTIVE RELEASES

denial of summary disposition of contention alleging underestimation of health effects of; LBP-82-57, 16 NRC 477 (1982)

from shutdown plant into Humboldt Bay, significance of; DD-82-7, 16 NRC 387 (1982)

routine, admission of contention questioning health effects of; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2069 (1982) to Lake Wylie from Catawba, specificity required of contentions on; LBP-82-51, 16 NRC 167 (1982)

RADIOACTIVE WASTE

disposal and spent fuel reprocessing center, denial of intervenor's request for hearing on; ALAB-679, 16 NRC 121 (1982)

high-level, responsibility for disposal of; DD-82-7, 16 NRC 387 (1982)

low-level, material alteration of application to store; CLI-82-26, 16 NRC 880 (1982)

See also Waste, Waste Disposal

RADIOACTIVITY

environmental detection of radioactive iodine following accidental releases of; ALAB-697, 16 NRC 1265 (1982)

RADIOIODINE

releases from Shearon Harris, underestimation of; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2069 (1982)

RADON

health effects, need to consider, in environmental report; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2069 (1982)

natural release of; ALAB-701, 16 NRC 1517 (1982)

REACTOR

at Perry plant, safety of, from pipe break in scram discharge volume; LBP-82-114, 16 NRC 1909 (1982)

demonstration liquid metal fast breeder, project history of; CLI-82-23, 16 NRC 412 (1982)

GE test, description of; LBP-82-64, 16 NRC 596 (1982)

REACTOR COOLANT

pump flywheel integrity, denial of contention on; LBP-82-106, 16 NRC 1649 (1982)

REACTOR COOLANT SYSTEMS

at Susquehanna, limitation on operation to restrict unidentified leakage in; ALAB-702, 16 NRC 1530 (1982)

at Vallecitos Nuclear Center, operation of, following scram/shutdown; LBP-82-64, 16 NRC 596 (1982)

contamination of, at TMI-1; CLI-82-12, 16 NRC 1 (1982)

REACTOR CORE

thermohydraulics, seismic evaluation of, at Perry facility; LBP-82-98, 16 NRC 1459, 16 NRC 1459 (1982)

REACTOR OPERATOR(S)

qualifications, admission of contention challenging; LBP-82-51, 16 NRC 167 (1982)

utility's responsibility for training, examination, and certification of; LBP-82-56, 16 NRC 281 (1982)

performance, adverse effects of shift rotation on; LBP-82-104, 16 NRC 1626 (1982)

REACTOR VESSEL

at Shearon Harris, resistance of, to fast fracture; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2069 (1982)

fabrication and potential embrittlement and pressurized thermal shock at Midland, admission of contention on; LBP-82-118, 16 NRC 2034 (1982)

SUBJECT INDEX

REBUTTABLE PRESUMPTION

- on question of adequacy of emergency plans, FEMA findings on status of offsite emergency preparedness as; LBP-82-68, 16 NRC 741 (1982)
- where intervenor demonstrates serious deficiencies in management of quality assurance program; LBP-82-114, 16 NRC 1909 (1982)

RECONSIDERATION

- filings time for motions for; LBP-82-110, 16 NRC 1895 (1982)
- of approval of amended agreement with State of Colorado concerning regulation of nuclear materials, denial of petition for; CLI-82-34, 16 NRC 1502 (1982)
- specificity required of motion for; LBP-82-68, 16 NRC 741 (1982)
- treatment of interlocutory appeal as motion for; LBP-82-106, 16 NRC 1649 (1982)

RECORD

- in operating license proceedings, justification for reopening of; CLI-82-20, 16 NRC 109 (1982)
- on emergency planning, reopening after final FEMA findings filed; LBP-82-68, 16 NRC 741 (1982)
- on quality assurance issues at Diablo Canyon, jurisdiction of Boards to reopen; ALAB-681, 16 NRC 146 (1982)
- reopening of, in view of Applicant's failure to submit emergency planning informational brochure as evidence; LBP-82-66, 16 NRC 730 (1982)
- reopening, on the basis of untimely contentions; LBP-82-54, 16 NRC 210 (1982)
- test for meeting burden of reopening; LBP-82-117B, 16 NRC 2024 (1982)

See also Appeal Board

REENTRY AND RECOVERY

- post-accident, adequacy of Diablo Canyon plans for; LBP-82-70, 16 NRC 756 (1982)

REGULATIONS

- challenges to; LBP-82-118, 16 NRC 2034 (1982)
- difference in Appeal Board and Licensing Board interpretations of; CLI-82-27, 16 NRC 883 (1982)
- exemptions from, for first-of-a-kind projects; CLI-82-23, 16 NRC 412 (1982)
- immediate effectiveness, application of, to manufacturing license proceeding; ALAB-686, 16 NRC 454 (1982)
- interpretation of 10 CFR 50.47(a) (2); LBP-82-106, 16 NRC 1649 (1982)
- interpretation of; ALAB-686, 16 NRC 454 (1982); ALAB-687, 16 NRC 460 (1982)
- pre-construction permit/limited work authorization activities allowed by; CLI-82-23, 16 NRC 412 (1982)

REGULATORY GUIDES

- demonstration of compliance with regulatory requirements by adherence to; ALAB-698, 16 NRC 1290 (1982)
- requirements for compliance with; LBP-82-105, 16 NRC 1629 (1982)

RES JUDICATA

- application of, to NRC proceedings; CLI-82-23, 16 NRC 412 (1982)

RESTART

- Appeal Board directed not to concern itself with current status of licensee's compliance with; CLI-82-32, 16 NRC 1243 (1982)

RESTRICTED DOCUMENTS

- on physical security plans, publication of, with protected information deleted; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 53 (1982)

See also Documents

REVIEW

- discretionary interlocutory, failure of intervenor's petition to meet standards for; LBP-82-62, 16 NRC 565 (1982)
- immediate effectiveness, of decision authorizing issuance of full power license; ALAB-680, 16 NRC 127 (1982)
- immediate effectiveness, of manufacturing license proceeding; ALAB-686, 16 NRC 454 (1982)
- of Appeal Board decision on bases of seismic design at Diablo Canyon declined; CLI-82-12A, 16 NRC 7 (1982)
- of Appeal Board decision, Commission dismissal of grant of; CLI-82-26, 16 NRC 880 (1982)
- of Licensing Board decision in context of motion for stay pending appeal, standard of; ALAB-680, 16 NRC 127 (1982)

SUBJECT INDEX

sua sponte, by Appeal Board, scope of; ALAB-696, 16 NRC 1245 (1982)
sua sponte, of final disposition of licensing proceeding, scope of; ALAB-691, 16 NRC 897 (1982)
sua sponte, of Licensing Board initial decisions; ALAB-689, 16 NRC 887 (1982)

See also Environmental Review

REVIEW, APPELLATE

of Licensing Board decision concerning integrity of hearing process; ALAB-691, 16 NRC 897 (1982)
of Licensing Board denial of intervention petition, scope of; LBP-82-88, 16 NRC 1335 (1982)
of Licensing Board rulings on economic issues, intervention requests, or procedural matters, scope of;
ALAB-691, 16 NRC 897 (1982)
of Licensing Board scheduling rulings, standard of; ALAB-696, 16 NRC 1245 (1982)
of special proceedings, scope of; ALAB-685, 16 NRC 449 (1982)
portions of the record addressed during; ALAB-691, 16 NRC 897 (1982)

RISK

assessment in DES, of permanent dewatering on groundwater relationships; LBP-82-63, 16 NRC 571
(1982)
estimators used in calculating health effects from radiation resulting from normal nuclear power plant
operation; LBP-82-57, 16 NRC 477 (1982)
Licensing Board request for Commission guidance on treatment of testimony on; LBP-82-61, 16 NRC
560 (1982)
seismic, to GE test reactor; LBP-82-64, 16 NRC 596 (1982)

See also Accident(s), Anticipated Transients Without Scram, Cancer, Probabilistic Risk Assessment

RULEMAKING

adjudicatory consideration of issues involved in; LBP-82-53, 16 NRC 196 (1982); LBP-82-63, 16 NRC
571 (1982); LBP-82-118, 16 NRC 2034 (1982)
authority of Nuclear Regulatory Commission; ALAB-707, 16 NRC 1760 (1982)
to amend Classification Guide for Safeguards Information, denial of petition for; DPRM-82-1, 16 NRC
861 (1982)

RULES OF PRACTICE

acceptance of interlocutory appeals; LBP-82-106, 16 NRC 1649 (1982)
adequacy of excuse for intervenor's nonattendance at special prehearing conference; LBP-82-108, 16
NRC 1811 (1982)
adjudicatory consideration of issues involved in rulemaking; LBP-82-118, 16 NRC 2034 (1982)
administrative fairness relative to conflict of interest; LBP-82-73, 16 NRC 974 (1982)
admissibility of contentions concerning safety parts of plant not involved in amendment; LBP-82-108,
16 NRC 1811 (1982)
admissibility of contentions on generic safety issues; LBP-82-106, 16 NRC 1649 (1982)
admissibility of late-filed contentions; LBP-82-53, 16 NRC 196 (1982); LBP-82-54, 16 NRC 210
(1982); LBP-82-91, 16 NRC 1364 (1982)
admissibility of radiation health effects contentions in individual licensing proceedings; LBP-82-105, 16
NRC 1629 (1982)
admission of untimely contentions where factor (i) has not been satisfied; LBP-82-63, 16 NRC 571
(1982)
amendment of Final Environmental Statement to include Board findings and conclusions; LBP-82-100,
16 NRC 1550 (1982)
analogy between Commission's summary disposition procedures and Federal Rules of Civil Procedure;
LBP-82-58, 16 NRC 512 (1982)
Appeal Board acceptance of Licensing Board referrals; ALAB-687, 16 NRC 460 (1982)
appealability of a Licensing Board order; ALAB-696, 16 NRC 1245 (1982)
appellate procedure for filing of exceptions; ALAB-694, 16 NRC 958 (1982)
appellate standard for undertaking interlocutory review; ALAB-687, 16 NRC 460 (1982)
application of informer's privilege to NRC practice; LBP-82-59, 16 NRC 533 (1982); LBP-82-87, 16
NRC 1195 (1982)
assertion of claims of privilege to avoid discovery; LBP-82-82, 16 NRC 1144 (1982)
authorization of an organization to act as its members' representative in an NRC proceeding;
LBP-82-88, 16 NRC 1335 (1982)
automatic grant of protective order; LBP-82-116, 16 NRC 1937 (1982)

SUBJECT INDEX

balancing of lateness factors for admission of withdrawing intervenor's contentions; LBP-82-91, 16 NRC 1364 (1982)

basis for establishing existence of genuine issue of fact for purpose of summary disposition; LBP-82-88, 16 NRC 1335 (1982)

basis with specificity requirement for contentions; LBP-82-106, 16 NRC 1649 (1982)

Board interpretation of "necessary" as related to discovery; LBP-82-117, 16 NRC 1955 (1982)

Board questions interpreting intervenor's intent; LBP-82-102, 16 NRC 1597 (1982)

Board questions to fill gaps in intervenor's interrogatories; LBP-82-117, 16 NRC 1955 (1982)

briefing of exceptions; ALAB-696, 16 NRC 1245 (1982)

burden of proof for demonstrating compliance of offsite emergency plan; LBP-82-77, 16 NRC 1096 (1982)

burden of proof for summary disposition motions; LBP-82-58, 16 NRC 512 (1982)

burden of proof in NRC licensing proceedings; ALAB-697, 16 NRC 1265 (1982)

burden of proof on adequacy of applicant's emergency planning public information brochure; LBP-82-66, 16 NRC 730 (1982)

burden of proof to demonstrate existence of satisfactory public notification system; LBP-82-60, 16 NRC 540 (1982)

burden on late intervention petitioner to demonstrate inadequacy of other remedies; ALAB-707, 16 NRC 1760 (1982)

burden on party invoking interlocutory appeal via directed certification; ALAB-706, 16 NRC 1754 (1982)

burden on proponent of contention based on new information; LBP-82-107A, 16 NRC 1791 (1982)

cause for dismissal of summary disposition motions; LBP-82-58, 16 NRC 512 (1982)

certification of issues; LBP-82-69, 16 NRC 751 (1982)

challenges to Commission regulations; LBP-82-118, 16 NRC 2034 (1982)

challenges to security plans; LBP-82-51, 16 NRC 167 (1982)

change of Staff position on an issue as good cause for late filing of contention; LBP-82-98, 16 NRC 1459, 16 NRC 1459 (1982)

circumstances appropriate for interlocutory appeals; ALAB-683, 16 NRC 160 (1982)

conditional admission of nonspecific contentions; ALAB-687, 16 NRC 460 (1982); ALAB-696, 16 NRC 1245 (1982)

conduct of counsel; LBP-82-87, 16 NRC 1195 (1982)

conduct of parties to NRC proceedings; ALAB-691, 16 NRC 897 (1982)

consequences of failure to file proposed findings; ALAB-691, 16 NRC 897 (1982)

consideration of applicant's financial qualifications in operating license proceeding; LBP-82-67, 16 NRC 734 (1982)

consideration of issues involved in rulemaking; LBP-82-63, 16 NRC 571 (1982)

consideration of merits of a contention in determining its admissibility; LBP-82-118, 16 NRC 2034 (1982)

consolidation of hearings on power reactor units; DPRM-82-2, 16 NRC 1209 (1982)

content of findings of fact; LBP-82-88, 16 NRC 1335 (1982)

contention barred by collateral estoppel; LBP-82-107A, 16 NRC 1791 (1982)

contention requirements for intervention; ALAB-687, 16 NRC 460 (1982); ALAB-696, 16 NRC 1245 (1982); LBP-82-74, 16 NRC 981 (1982)

contents of briefs for appeals; ALAB-693, 16 NRC 952 (1982)

criteria for acceptance of untimely contentions; ALAB-687, 16 NRC 460 (1982)

criteria for determining whether to grant stay pending appeal; ALAB-680, 16 NRC 127 (1982)

cross-examination by means of prehearing examinations in the nature of depositions; LBP-82-107, 16 NRC 1667 (1982)

deferral of rulings on contentions; LBP-82-107A, 16 NRC 1791 (1982)

determination of whether a document is privileged; LBP-82-82, 16 NRC 1144 (1982)

discovery against NRC Staff; LBP-82-113, 16 NRC 1907 (1982); LBP-82-117, 16 NRC 1955 (1982)

discovery on subject matter of a contention in a licensing proceeding; ALAB-696, 16 NRC 1245 (1982)

discovery to obtain information about other plants; LBP-82-102, 16 NRC 1597 (1982)

discussion of issue in draft EIS as good cause for filing contention late; LBP-82-79, 16 NRC 1116 (1982)

dismissal of irrelevant contentions in course of decision on summary disposition; LBP-82-88, 16 NRC 1335 (1982)

SUBJECT INDEX

disqualification of a specified attorney; CLI-82-36, 16 NRC 1512 (1982)
disqualification of Staff consultant's opinion on ground of bias; LBP-82-99, 16 NRC 1541 (1982)
effect of Statement of Policy on Board jurisdiction; LBP-82-69, 16 NRC 751 (1982)
establishing interest for standing to intervene in materials license proceedings; ALAB-682, 16 NRC 150 (1982)
exception to Commission's rule against interlocutory appeal; LBP-82-62, 16 NRC 565 (1982)
expunction of classified information from a proceeding; CLI-82-30, 16 NRC 1234 (1982)
factors providing unusual delay warranting interlocutory appeal board review; ALAB-706, 16 NRC 1754 (1982)
filing time for motions for reconsideration; LBP-82-110, 16 NRC 1895 (1982)
financial assistance to participants in licensing proceedings; CLI-82-40, 16 NRC 1717 (1982)
form and specificity of objections to interrogatories; LBP-82-116, 16 NRC 1937 (1982)
fulfillment of standing, injury in fact, and interests requirements by an organization; LBP-82-74, 16 NRC 981 (1982)
function of summary disposition motions; LBP-82-93, 16 NRC 1391 (1982)
good cause for acceptance of late-filed contentions; LBP-82-63, 16 NRC 571 (1982)
good cause for late filing of challenge to treatment of economic costs of accidents; LBP-82-90, 16 NRC 1359 (1982)
good cause for late filing of contention; LBP-82-104, 16 NRC 1626 (1982)
grounds for defense of Licensing Board decision; ALAB-691, 16 NRC 897 (1982)
guidance in resolving claims of executive privilege related to discovery; LBP-82-82, 16 NRC 1144 (1982)
hearing obligations of parties having limited resources; ALAB-696, 16 NRC 1245 (1982)
immediate effectiveness review of decision authorizing issuance of full-power license; ALAB-680, 16 NRC 127 (1982)
immediate effectiveness review of manufacturing license proceeding; ALAB-686, 16 NRC 454 (1982)
interests encompassed by 10 CFR 2.714; LBP-82-52, 16 NRC 183 (1982)
interlocutory appeals involving the scheduling of hearings or timing of admission of evidence; ALAB-688, 16 NRC 471 (1982)
interpretation of basis requirement for contentions; LBP-82-116, 16 NRC 1937 (1982)
interpretation of the term "reasonable assurance"; LBP-82-66, 16 NRC 730 (1982)
intervention by a State; LBP-82-92, 16 NRC 1376 (1982)
intervention by groups opposing nuclear power; CLI-82-15, 16 NRC 27 (1982)
introduction of new material into a filing; LBP-82-89, 16 NRC 1355 (1982)
jurisdiction of Boards over issues relating to compliance with and implementation of Board orders; ALAB-684, 16 NRC 162 (1982)
justification for nontimely intervention; LBP-82-74, 16 NRC 981 (1982)
limitations on 2.206 petitions; DD-82-13, 16 NRC 2115 (1982)
litigability of hydrogen control, financial qualifications, need for power, alternative energy source, psychological stress issues; LBP-82-103, 16 NRC 1603 (1982)
litigation of generic issues in individual licensing proceedings; LBP-82-107A, 16 NRC 1791 (1982)
management of proceedings where summary disposition motions are filed against most contentions; LBP-82-93, 16 NRC 1391 (1982)
method by which NRC ensures due process; LBP-82-87, 16 NRC 1195 (1982)
motion to dismiss summary disposition motions; LBP-82-93, 16 NRC 1391 (1982)
need for discussion of alternatives in EIA with respect to spent fuel pool expansion; LBP-82-79, 16 NRC 1116 (1982)
objections to discovery requests; LBP-82-82, 16 NRC 1144 (1982)
obligations of intervenors in NRC licensing proceedings; ALAB-693, 16 NRC 952 (1982)
official notice of information in separate proceedings; ALAB-682, 16 NRC 150 (1982)
participation of amicus curiae in hearings; ALAB-679, 16 NRC 121 (1982)
particularity necessary for claims of privilege from disclosure; LBP-82-116, 16 NRC 1937 (1982)
post-hearing resolution of emergency planning issues; LBP-82-66, 16 NRC 730 (1982); LBP-82-100, 16 NRC 1550 (1982)
preparation of environmental impact statement for spent fuel pool expansion; LBP-82-79, 16 NRC 1116 (1982)
principles affecting appropriate sanctions for default; LBP-82-108, 16 NRC 1811 (1982)

SUBJECT INDEX

procedural rules governing motion for litigable issues; LBP-82-88, 16 NRC 1335 (1982)
procedures for correcting deficiencies in emergency plans; LBP-82-77, 16 NRC 1096 (1982)
procedures to be used in licensing proceedings; ALAB-696, 16 NRC 1245 (1982)
provisions for expediting proceedings; ALAB-696, 16 NRC 1245 (1982)
reason for instituting show cause proceedings; DD-82-13, 16 NRC 2115 (1982)
reason for reversal of Licensing Board's denial of late intervention petition; ALAB-707, 16 NRC 1760 (1982)
rejection of untimely petitions to intervene even though petitioner's interests will not be represented; LBP-82-96, 16 NRC 1408 (1982)
release of portions of security plans for nuclear plants; LBP-82-80, 16 NRC 1121 (1982)
remedy for parties' failure to provide separate listing for genuine issues of fact; LBP-82-88, 16 NRC 1335 (1982)
remedy for petitioner unable to gain admittance to construction permit or operating license proceeding; ALAB-707, 16 NRC 1760 (1982)
reopening of proceedings; ALAB-699, 16 NRC 1324 (1982); CLI-82-39, 16 NRC 1712 (1982)
reopening the record; LBP-82-54, 16 NRC 210 (1982)
resolution of factual questions in considering admissibility of contentions; LBP-82-63, 16 NRC 571 (1982)
responses to objections to late-filed contentions; LBP-82-89, 16 NRC 1355 (1982)
responses to requests for production of documents; LBP-82-82, 16 NRC 1144 (1982)
responsibility of parties to disclose potential conflicts of interest; LBP-82-73, 16 NRC 974 (1982)
result of intervenor's refusal or failure to prosecute contentions; LBP-82-115, 16 NRC 1923 (1982)
right of first discovery by intervenors; LBP-82-116, 16 NRC 1937 (1982)
right to hearing on contentions; ALAB-696, 16 NRC 1245 (1982)
sanctions for refusal to comply with Board order; LBP-82-115, 16 NRC 1923 (1982)
scheduling and location of Staff meetings with parties; CLI-82-41, 16 NRC 1721 (1982)
scheduling findings of fact and conclusions of law; LBP-82-51A, 16 NRC 180 (1982)
scheduling of hearing on limited environmental issues prior to issuance of EIS; LBP-82-92A, 16 NRC 1387 (1982)
scope of appellate review of Licensing Board denial of intervention petition; LBP-82-88, 16 NRC 1335 (1982)
scope of applicant's response to interrogatories; LBP-82-67, 16 NRC 734 (1982)
scope of sua sponte review of final disposition of licensing proceeding; ALAB-691, 16 NRC 897 (1982)
showing necessary to justify late intervention; ALAB-707, 16 NRC 1760 (1982)
showing required of pro se intervenor, for admission of late-filed contentions; LBP-82-63, 16 NRC 571 (1982)
significance of requirement to file proposed finding of fact; ALAB-691, 16 NRC 897 (1982)
special rule on replies concerning late contentions; LBP-82-98, 16 NRC 1459, 16 NRC 1459 (1982)
specificity required of motion for reconsideration; LBP-82-68, 16 NRC 741 (1982)
standard for briefs of pro se intervenors; ALAB-693, 16 NRC 952 (1982)
standard for discretionary interlocutory review; LBP-82-62, 16 NRC 565 (1982)
standard for judging lawyer conduct in; ALAB-691, 16 NRC 897 (1982)
standard for motion of pro se intervenor to adopt late-filed contentions; LBP-82-91, 16 NRC 1364 (1982)
standards for admission of nontimely contentions arising from TMI-2 accident; LBP-82-63, 16 NRC 571 (1982)
standards for evaluating admissibility of untimely petition for intervention; LBP-82-63, 16 NRC 571 (1982)
standards for summary disposition; LBP-82-114, 16 NRC 1909 (1982)
standing of an organization to intervene as representative of its members; LBP-82-52, 16 NRC 183 (1982); LBP-82-88, 16 NRC 1335 (1982)
stay to reopen proceeding; LBP-82-84, 16 NRC 1183 (1982)
sua sponte adoption of excluded contentions; LBP-82-79, 16 NRC 1116 (1982)
test for meeting burden of reopening the record; LBP-82-117B, 16 NRC 2024 (1982)
test of "finality" for appeal purposes; ALAB-690, 16 NRC 893 (1982); ALAB-696, 16 NRC 1245 (1982)
threshold showing of basis and specificity for admission of contention; LBP-82-75, 16 NRC 986 (1982)
time for filing summary disposition motions; ALAB-696, 16 NRC 1245 (1982)

SUBJECT INDEX

time limits for filing exceptions; ALAB-684, 16 NRC 162 (1982)
treatment of interlocutory appeal as motion for reconsideration; LBP-82-106, 16 NRC 1649 (1982)
treatment of issues raised for first time on appeal; ALAB-691, 16 NRC 897 (1982)
treatment of issues surviving summary disposition; LBP-82-88, 16 NRC 1335 (1982)
unreasonable expectations of intervenors; LBP-82-63, 16 NRC 571 (1982)
untimely intervention petitions; ALAB-704, 16 NRC 1725 (1982)
use of Federal Rules of Civil Procedure to interpret NRC rules; LBP-82-82, 16 NRC 1144 (1982)
use of protective orders to avoid disclosure of documents; LBP-82-82, 16 NRC 1144 (1982)
vacation of unreviewed judgments because of mootness; CLI-82-18, 16 NRC 50 (1982)
validity of Commission rules; LBP-82-53, 16 NRC 196 (1982)
weight given to untimely intervention petition's ability to assist in developing a sound record;
ALAB-704, 16 NRC 1725 (1982); ALAB-707, 16 NRC 1760 (1982)

RUMORS
evidentiary weight of; LBP-82-56, 16 NRC 281 (1982)

SABOTAGE
clam and barnacle scenario for; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2069 (1982)
radiological, interpretation of "several" as used in 10 CFR 73.1 (a) (1) to describe design basis threat of;
CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 53 (1982)

SAFEGUARDS INFORMATION
denial of petition for rulemaking to amend classification guide for; DPRM-82-1, 16 NRC 861 (1982)
interpretation of "several" as used in design basis threat as; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 53 (1982)

SAFETY
analysis, single-failure, at Shearon Harris, adequacy of; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2069 (1982)
information, denial of intervenors' petition for investigation of concealment of; CLI-82-22, 16 NRC 405
(1982)
of GE test reactor, structures, systems, and components important to; LBP-82-64, 16 NRC 596 (1982)
of Humboldt Bay facility during shutdown; DD-82-7, 16 NRC 387 (1982)

SAFETY ANALYSIS
scope of, for Shearon Harris facility; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2069 (1982)

SAFETY EVALUATION REPORT
consideration of shutdown decay heat removal and seismic qualification of equipment in; LBP-82-100,
16 NRC 1550 (1982)

SAFETY ISSUES
Commission request for Licensing Board estimate of time for providing its recommendations on;
CLI-82-28, 16 NRC 1219 (1982)
generic, standard for admissibility of contention on; LBP-82-106, 16 NRC 1649 (1982)
uncontested, NRC Staff responsibility regarding findings on; ALAB-680, 16 NRC 127 (1982)
uncontested, sua sponte authority of Licensing Boards to examine
unresolved, relevance of, to spent fuel pool modification; LBP-82-65, 16 NRC 714 (1982)

SAFETY STANDARDS
for qualification of equipment; LBP-82-70, 16 NRC 756 (1982)

SANCTIONS
available to Licensing Boards to assist in management of proceedings; LBP-82-115, 16 NRC 1923 (1982)
for failure of party to comply with prehearing conference order; LBP-82-75, 16 NRC 986 (1982)
for intervenor's failure to appear at special prehearing conference; LBP-82-108, 16 NRC 1811 (1982)
for NRC Staff refusal to obey Licensing Board order; LBP-82-87, 16 NRC 1195 (1982)
imposition of, on NRC Staff, for refusal to name informants; LBP-82-59, 16 NRC 533 (1982)

SCHEDULE
for discovery, summary disposition motions, answers and Board rulings, direct testimony, and hearings;
LBP-82-88, 16 NRC 1335 (1982)
for hearings, Appeal Board reversal of Licensing Board's rulings on; ALAB-696, 16 NRC 1245 (1982)
phased, for findings of fact and conclusions of law, denial of Staff motion to reconsider; LBP-82-51A, 16
NRC 180 (1982)

SECURITY
nuclear power plant, qualifications of expert in; LBP-82-51, 16 NRC 167 (1982)

SECURITY PLAN
expert, need of intervenors to obtain services of, for testimony on contentions; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC
2069 (1982)

SUBJECT INDEX

for Shoreham, release of portions to intervenors; LBP-82-80, 16 NRC 1121 (1982)
intervenor's responsibilities in challenging; LBP-82-51, 16 NRC 167 (1982)

See also Directed Certification, Discovery, Physical Security Plan(s)

SEGMENTATION

of major federal actions, under NEPA; CLI-82-23, 16 NRC 412 (1982)

SEISMIC ANALYSIS

of core thermohydraulics at Perry facility, adequacy of; LBP-82-98, 16 NRC 1459, 16 NRC 1459 (1982)

SEISMIC DESIGN

of Diablo Canyon, declination of review of Appeal Board Decision on bases of; LBP-82-12A, 16 NRC 7 (1982)

of Humboldt Bay Plant, adequacy of; DD-82-7, 16 NRC 387 (1982)

See also Tau Effect

SEISMICITY

in area of GE test reactor; LBP-82-64, 16 NRC 596 (1982)

reservoir-induced, license conditioned for continued monitoring of; LBP-82-57, 16 NRC 477 (1982)

reservoir-induced, occurrence of, after impoundment; LBP-82-55, 16 NRC 225 (1982)

See also Earthquakes, Fault(s) Ground Faulting, Ground Motion

SERVICE OF DOCUMENTS

between applicant and Staff during review process, need for; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2069 (1982)

rejection of applicant's objection to; LBP-82-51, 16 NRC 167 (1982)

SHIFT ROTATION

consideration of adverse effects on reactor operator performance caused by; LBP-82-104, 16 NRC 1626 (1982)

SHOW CAUSE

procedure and litigation standard used to expedite operating license amendment proceeding;
ALAB-696, 16 NRC 1245 (1982)

SHOW CAUSE ORDER

concerning suspension of all construction at Zimmer facility; CLI-82-33, 16 NRC 1489 (1982)

SHOW CAUSE PROCEEDING

as a remedy for petitioner unable to gain admittance to construction permit or operating license proceeding; ALAB-707, 16 NRC 1760 (1982)

institution of, to suspend or revoke construction permits on environmental matters; DD-82-13, 16 NRC 2115 (1982)

regarding construction deficiencies at La Salle, denial of 2.206 petition requesting; DD-82-9, 16 NRC 396 (1982)

to consider licensee's alleged lack of financial qualifications, denial of 2.206 petition requesting;
DD-82-8, 16 NRC 394 (1982)

to contest extension of construction completion date, forum for; CLI-82-29, 16 NRC 1221 (1982)

SHUTDOWN

cold, at Seabrook, adequacy of provisions for achieving; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1029 (1982)

SHUTDOWN DECAY HEAT REMOVAL

system for Waterford plant, adequacy of; LBP-82-100, 16 NRC 1550 (1982)

See also Decay Heat

SOUTH CAROLINA

reservoir-induced seismicity in; LBP-82-55, 16 NRC 225 (1982)

SPECIAL MASTER

authority of, adoption of report of, results of hearing before, weight given to reported direct
observations of witness demeanor by, weight given to report of; LBP-82-56, 16 NRC 281 (1982)

SPECIAL NUCLEAR MATERIALS

NRC agreement with State of Colorado transferring regulatory authority for; CLI-82-34, 16 NRC 1502 (1982)

SPENT FUEL

reprocessing and waste disposal center, denial of intervenor's request for hearing on operating license
amendment for; ALAB-679, 16 NRC 121 (1982)

shipments, deferral of contention postulating terrorist attacks on; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2069 (1982)

storage and transportation, consideration of environmental impacts of; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2069 (1982)

SUBJECT INDEX

storage capacity, withdrawal of application to increase; LBP-82-83, 16 NRC 1181 (1982)
transportation and storage conditions, reaffirmation of rejection of; LBP-82-51, 16 NRC 167 (1982)
use of, to manufacture nuclear weapons, consideration of contentions on; LBP-82-53, 16 NRC 196 (1982)

SPENT FUEL CASKS
adequacy of administrative controls on handling; LBP-82-77, 16 NRC 1096 (1982)

SPENT FUEL POOL
affirmation of decision permitting modification of; ALAB-685, 16 NRC 962 (1982)
amendment of license to permit reracking in; LBP-82-65, 16 NRC 714 (1982)
amendment to increase number of fuel assemblies to be stored in; LBP-82-60, 16 NRC 540 (1982)
expansion, limit on neutron multiplication factor where pool is within containment; LBP-82-97, 16 NRC 1439 (1982)
floor, loads imparted to, during seismic events; LBP-82-65, 16 NRC 714 (1982)
modification, adequacy of environmental impact appraisal on; LBP-82-79, 16 NRC 1116 (1982)
See also Alternatives

SPENT FUEL RACKS
at Big Rock Point plant, possibility of distortion of; LBP-82-97, 16 NRC 1439 (1982)

STANDBY LIQUID CONTROL SYSTEM
automated, Perry facility need for; LBP-82-102, 16 NRC 1597 (1982)

STANDING
of an organization and one of its constituent members to intervene in same proceeding; LBP-82-88, 16 NRC 1335 (1982)
of an organization, representational requirement for; LBP-82-54, 16 NRC 210 (1982); LBP-82-74, 16 NRC 981 (1982)
of intervenor in decontamination proceeding to litigate waste disposal issues; LBP-82-52, 16 NRC 183 (1982)
of organizations representing members residing near a nuclear facility; LBP-82-52, 16 NRC 183 (1982)
to intervene in materials license proceedings; ALAB-682, 16 NRC 150 (1982)

STATION BLACKOUT
as a design basis event; LBP-82-63, 16 NRC 571 (1982)
at Midland plant, admission of contention postulating scenarios for; LBP-82-118, 16 NRC 2034 (1982)

STAY
pending appeal of decision authorizing issuance of full-power license, denial of motion for; ALAB-680, 16 NRC 127 (1982)
to reopen proceeding, factors considered in determining whether to grant; LBP-82-84, 16 NRC 1183 (1982)

STEAM EROSION
of components at Perry plant, mitigation of; LBP-82-98, 16 NRC 1459, 16 NRC 1459 (1982)

STEAM GENERATOR TUBES
at TMI-1, sua sponte issue raised on corrosion of; CLI-82-12, 16 NRC 1 (1982)
failure under LOCA conditions and under normal operation conditions; LBP-82-108, 16 NRC 1811 (1982)
inadequacy of in-service inspection of; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1029 (1982); LBP-82-106, 16 NRC 1649 (1982)
reliability of sleeving process for; LBP-82-88, 16 NRC 1335 (1982)
safety of expansion joint in corroded area of; LBP-82-88, 16 NRC 1335 (1982)
sleeved, affirmation of order authorizing operating license amendment to allow operation with; ALAB-696, 16 NRC 1245 (1982)
stress corrosion cracking of; LBP-82-108, 16 NRC 1811 (1982)

STEAM GENERATOR(S)
at Point Beach, water chemistry treatment of; LBP-82-108, 16 NRC 1811 (1982)
at Seabrook, resistance of, to degradation; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1029 (1982)
at Shearon Harris, adequacy of design of; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2069 (1982)
loose parts from repair of; LBP-82-88, 16 NRC 1335 (1982)
tube rupture events and repairs, technical discussion of; DD-82-11, 16 NRC 1473 (1982)

SUA SPONTE ISSUES
Commission dismissal of QA and management competence contentions adopted by Licensing Board as; CLI-82-20, 16 NRC 109 (1982)

SUBJECT INDEX

denial of Appeal Board request to hear; CLI-82-12, 16 NRC 1 (1982)
raising excluded contention as; LBP-82-79, 16 NRC 1116 (1982)
scope of appellate review of; ALAB-685, 16 NRC 449 (1982)

See also Review

SUMMARY DISPOSITION

analogy between Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and; LBP-82-58, 16 NRC 512 (1982)
basis for establishing existence of genuine issue of fact for purpose of; LBP-82-88, 16 NRC 1335 (1982)
cause for dismissal of motion for; LBP-82-58, 16 NRC 512 (1982)
motions, Licensing Board authority to summarily dismiss; LBP-82-93, 16 NRC 1391 (1982)
standards for; LBP-82-114, 16 NRC 1909 (1982)
time for filing motions for; ALAB-696, 16 NRC 1245 (1982)
treatment of issues surviving; LBP-82-88, 16 NRC 1335 (1982)

See also Burden of Proof

SUPERCriticality

nexus between new information on, and applicant's criticality safety analysis at Shearon Harris;
LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2069 (1982)
of spent fuel pool at very low water densities, potential at Big Rock Point plant for; LBP-82-97, 16 NRC
1439 (1982)

See also Criticality

SUPPLEMENTAL COOLING WATER SYSTEM

at Limerick Station, consideration of alternatives to; DD-82-13, 16 NRC 2115 (1982)
See also Cooling System

SUSPENSION

of licensee's obligation to answer Board question on environmental qualification; ALAB-685, 16 NRC
449 (1982)
of low-power license, authorization of full-power license in spite of pendency of; LBP-82-70, 16 NRC
756 (1982)

SYNERGISM

between airborne effluents from coal and nuclear power plants; LBP-82-58, 16 NRC 512 (1982)

SYSTEMS INTERACTION

at Midland Plant, admission of contention raising concerns with; LBP-82-118, 16 NRC 2034 (1982)
contention, intervenors plead lack of technical qualifications in objection to rejection of; LBP-82-51, 16
NRC 167 (1982)
need to perform comprehensive analysis of, at Seabrook; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1029 (1982)
pleading requirement for contention on; LBP-82-106, 16 NRC 1649 (1982)

TAU EFFECT

use of, in seismic design of nuclear power plants; LBP-82-12A, 16 NRC 7 (1982)

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS

for Susquehanna, amendment of, to restrict leakage in reactor coolant system; ALAB-702, 16 NRC
1530 (1982)

TEMPERATURE

effect on neutron multiplication factor in spent fuel pool; LBP-82-97, 16 NRC 1439 (1982)

TERMINATION

of proceeding, grant of motion for; LBP-82-94, 16 NRC 1399 (1982)

TERRORISM

consideration of threat of, to Shearon Harris facility; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2069 (1982)

TESTIMONY

certification of Board questions asking clarification of scope of; CLI-82-25, 16 NRC 867 (1982)
in NRC proceedings, standard for preparation of; ALAB-691, 16 NRC 897 (1982)
See also Accident(s)

TESTING

of protection systems and actuation devices, admission of contention on; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1029
(1982)

See also Eddy Current Testing, Qualification Testing

THERMOCOUPLES

in-core, at Perry plant, conformance of, with Regulatory Guides; LBP-82-98, 16 NRC 1459, 16 NRC
1459 (1982)

SUBJECT INDEX

THORIUM

ore mill, inactive, license amendment sought to establish water collection and retention system at; CLI-82-21, 16 NRC 401 (1982)

THREE MILE ISLAND

infant mortality and neonatal hypothyroidism following Unit 2 accident; ALAB-697, 16 NRC 1265 (1982)

preparation of supplemental EIS on psychological health of residents in area of; CLI-82-13, 16 NRC 21 (1982)

probability of aircraft crash at; ALAB-692, 16 NRC 921 (1982)

TRAINING

needs for emergency planning, estimating; LBP-82-77, 16 NRC 1096 (1982)

of emergency response personnel, admission of contention citing inadequacies in plans for; LBP-82-75, 16 NRC 986 (1982)

of operations personnel at Seabrook, contention admitted with limitations on categories of personnel; LBP-82-75, 16 NRC 1029 (1982)

radiological emergency response, at Diablo Canyon, adequacy of; LBP-82-70, 16 NRC 756 (1982)

See also Operator Training

TRANSMISSION LINES

from Seabrook, aesthetic and health and safety effects of; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1029 (1982)

TRANSPORTATION

during evacuation because of radiological emergency at Summer facility, defects in planning for; LBP-82-57, 16 NRC 477 (1982)

TURBINE MISSILES

potential for, at Perry facility; LBP-82-98, 16 NRC 1459, 16 NRC 1459 (1982)

protection of Seabrook safety systems from; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1029 (1982)

See also Missiles

URANIUM FUEL CYCLE

denial of summary disposition of contention alleging underestimation of health effects of; LBP-82-57, 16 NRC 477 (1982)

See also Nuclear Fuel Cycle

VALVES

power-operated relief, safety standards for qualification of; LBP-82-70, 16 NRC 756 (1982)

VOID FORMATION

effect on neutron multiplication factor in spent fuel pool; LBP-82-97, 16 NRC 1439 (1982)

WASTE

generated by decontamination, consideration of; LBP-82-52, 16 NRC 183 (1982)

See also Radioactive Waste

WASTE DISPOSAL

consideration of, in NEPA analyses; LBP-82-53, 16 NRC 196 (1982)

litigability of issues on, pending completion of waste confidence proceeding; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2069 (1982)

low-level, for Shearon Harris facility, need for specific provision for; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2069 (1982)

solid, radioactive, produced during normal operations at Seabrook, means to control; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1029 (1982)

WATER

borated, possibility of stud bolt failure due to corrosive effect of; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2069 (1982)

supply for Palo Verde reactor units, adequacy of; LBP-82-117A, 16 NRC 1964 (1982)

supply for Shearon Harris plant, adequacy of; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2069 (1982)

WATER DENSITY

effect on neutron multiplication factor in spent fuel pool; LBP-82-97, 16 NRC 1439 (1982)

WELDING

defects at Callaway plant, deficiencies in; LBP-82-109, 16 NRC 1826 (1982)

WELDS

reactor vessel, admission of contention asserting need for ultrasonic testing of; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1029 (1982)

SUBJECT INDEX

WILDLIFE HABITATS

environmental impact of Shearon Harris facility on; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2069 (1982)

WITHDRAWAL

of construction permit application, conditions on; LBP-82-81, 16 NRC 1128 (1982)

WITNESSES

demonstration of expertise of; ALAB-701, 16 NRC 1517 (1982)

expert, in nuclear power plant security, demonstration of credentials of; LBP-82-51, 16 NRC 167 (1982)

procedural context of Licensing Board's calling of independent experts as; LBP-82-55, 16 NRC 225 (1982)

WORK PRODUCT DOCTRINE

documents privileged from discovery by; LBP-82-82, 16 NRC 1144 (1982)

ZONES

low population, basis for establishing; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2069 (1982)

See also Emergency Planning Zones

FACILITY INDEX

ALLENS CREEK NUCLEAR GENERATING STATION, Unit 1; Docket No. 50-466-CP
CONSTRUCTION PERMIT; October 28, 1982; ORDER; LBP-82-94, 16 NRC 1399 (1982)

BIG ROCK POINT PLANT; Docket No. 50-155
SPENT FUEL POOL AMENDMENT; September 14, 1982; INITIAL DECISION; LBP-82-77, 16
NRC 1096 (1982)

SPENT FUEL POOL AMENDMENT; September 15, 1982; INITIAL DECISION; LBP-82-78, 16
NRC 1107 (1982)

SPENT FUEL POOL AMENDMENT; October 29, 1982; INITIAL DECISION; LBP-82-97, 16 NRC
1439 (1982)

SPENT FUEL POOL AMENDMENT; December 14, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER;
LBP-82-111, 16 NRC 1898 (1982)

BIG ROCK POINT PLANT; Docket No. 50-155-OLA
SCHEDULING; July 8, 1982; MEMORANDUM; LBP-82-51A, 16 NRC 180 (1982)

SPENT FUEL POOL AMENDMENT; August 6, 1982; INITIAL DECISION; LBP-82-60, 16 NRC
540 (1982)

BROWNS FERRY NUCLEAR PLANT, Units 1, 2 and 3; Docket Nos. 50-259-OLA, 50-260-OLA,
50-296-OLA
OPERATING LICENSE AMENDMENT; September 15, 1982; ORDER; CLI-82-26, 16 NRC 880
(1982)

CALLAWAY PLANT, Unit 1; Docket No. STN 50-483-OL
OPERATING LICENSE; December 13, 1982; PARTIAL INITIAL DECISION; LBP-82-109, 16
NRC 1826 (1982)

CATAWBA NUCLEAR STATION, Units 1 and 2; Docket Nos. 50-413, 50-414
LIMITED WORK AUTHORIZATION; August 19, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER;
ALAB-687, 16 NRC 460 (1982)

SPECIAL PROCEEDING; July 8, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; LBP-82-51, 16 NRC 167
(1982)

CATAWBA NUCLEAR STATION, Units 1 and 2; Docket Nos. 50-413, 50-414 (ASLBP No.
81-463-01-OL)
OPERATING LICENSE; December 1, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; LBP-82-107A, 16
NRC 1791 (1982)

OPERATING LICENSE; December 22, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; LBP-82-116, 16
NRC 1937 (1982)

CLINCH RIVER BREEDER REACTOR PLANT; Docket No. 50-537
LIMITED WORK AUTHORIZATION; August 25, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER;
ALAB-688, 16 NRC 471 (1982)

CLINCH RIVER BREEDER REACTOR PLANT; Docket No. 50-537 (Exemption request under 10 CFR
50.12)
CONSTRUCTION PERMIT EXEMPTION; August 12, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER;
CLI-82-22, 16 NRC 405 (1982)

CONSTRUCTION PERMIT EXEMPTION; August 17, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER;
CLI-82-23, 16 NRC 412 (1982)

CLINTON POWER STATION, Unit No. 1; Docket No. 50-461-OL
OPERATING LICENSE; November 10, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; LBP-82-103, 16
NRC 1603 (1982)

COBALT-60 STORAGE FACILITY; Docket No. 30-6931 (Renewal of Byproduct Materials License No.
19-08330-03)
BYPRODUCT MATERIALS LICENSE RENEWAL; July 16, 1982; DECISION; ALAB-682, 16
NRC 150 (1982)

FACILITY INDEX

COMANCHE PEAK STEAM ELECTRIC STATION, Units 1 and 2; Docket Nos. 50-445, 50-446
OPERATING LICENSE; September 30, 1982; ORDER DENYING RECONSIDERATION;
LBP-82-87, 16 NRC 1195 (1982)

SHOW CAUSE; August 4, 1982; ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE; LBP-82-59, 16 NRC 553 (1982)

DIABLO CANYON NUCLEAR POWER PLANT, Units 1 and 2; Docket Nos. 50-275, 50-276
OPERATING LICENSE; September 22, 1982; DIRECTOR'S DECISION UNDER 10 CFR 2.206;
DD-82-10, 16 NRC 1205 (1982)

DIABLO CANYON NUCLEAR POWER PLANT, Units 1 and 2; Docket Nos. 50-275-OL 50-323-OL
OPERATING LICENSE; March 18, 1982; DECLINATION OF REVIEW; CLI-82-12A, 16 NRC 7
(1982)

OPERATING LICENSE; July 16, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND CERTIFICATION TO THE
COMMISSION; ALAB-681, 16 NRC 146 (1982)

OPERATING LICENSE; August 31, 1982; INITIAL DECISION; LBP-82-70, 16 NRC 756 (1982)

OPERATING LICENSE; September 27, 1982; MEMORANDUM IN RESPONSE TO NRC
STAFF'S MOTION FOR CLARIFICATION OF THE LICENSING BOARD'S INITIAL
DECISION DATED AUGUST 31, 1982; LBP-82-85, 16 NRC 1187 (1982)

OPERATING LICENSE; December 23, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; CLI-82-39, 16
NRC 1712 (1982)

PHYSICAL SECURITY; July 30, 1982; ORDER; CLI-82-19, 16 NRC 53 (1982)

SECURITY; October 8, 1982; ORDER; CLI-82-30, 16 NRC 1234 (1982)

DRESDEN NUCLEAR POWER STATION, Unit No. 1; Docket No. 50-10-OLA
OPERATING LICENSE AMENDMENT; July 12, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER;
LBP-82-52, 16 NRC 183 (1982)

DRESDEN NUCLEAR POWER STATION, Units 2 and 3; Docket Nos. 50-237, 50-249
SPENT FUEL POOL MODIFICATION; September 29, 1982; DECISION; ALAB-695, 16 NRC 962
(1982)

DRESDEN NUCLEAR POWER STATION, Units 2 and 3; Docket Nos. 50-237-SP, 50-249-SP
SPENT FUEL POOL AMENDMENT; August 17, 1982; FINAL INITIAL DECISION; LBP-82-65,
16 NRC 714 (1982)

ENRICO FERMI ATOMIC POWER PLANT, Unit 2; Docket No. 50-341
OPERATING LICENSE; October 29, 1982; INITIAL DECISION; LBP-82-96, 16 NRC 1408 (1982)

ENRICO FERMI ATOMIC POWER PLANT, Unit 2; Docket No. 50-341-OL
OPERATING LICENSE; December 21, 1982; DECISION; ALAB-707, 16 NRC 1760 (1982)

FLOATING NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS; Docket No. STN 50-437-ML
MANUFACTURING LICENSE; August 11, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; ALAB-686,
16 NRC 454 (1982)

MANUFACTURING LICENSE; September 1, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER;
ALAB-689, 16 NRC 887 (1982)

MANUFACTURING LICENSE; December 6, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; CLI-82-37,
16 NRC 1691 (1982)

GENERAL ELECTRIC MORRIS OPERATION; Docket No. 70-1308 (Application to Modify License No.
SNM-1265 to Increase Spent Fuel Storage Capacity)
OPERATING LICENSE AMENDMENT; September 21, 1982; ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO
WITHDRAW APPLICATION AND DISMISSING PROCEEDING WITHOUT PREJUDICE;
LBP-82-83, 16 NRC 1181 (1982)

GRAND GULF NUCLEAR STATION, Units 1 and 2; Docket Nos. 50-416, 50-417
OPERATING LICENSE; December 8, 1982; DECISION; ALAB-704, 16 NRC 1725 (1982)

GRAND GULF NUCLEAR STATION, Units 1 and 2; Docket Nos. 50-416-OL, 50-417-OL (ASLBP No.
82-476-04-OL)
OPERATING LICENSE; October 20, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER DENYING STATE
OF LOUISIANA'S PETITION FOR INTERVENTION; LBP-82-92, 16 NRC 1376 (1982)

HOPE CREEK GENERATING STATION, Units 1 and 2; Docket Nos. 50-354, 50-355
OPERATING LICENSE; November 19, 1982; DECISION; ALAB-701, 16 NRC 1517 (1982)

HUMBOLDT BAY POWER PLANT, Unit 3; Docket No. 50-133
DECOMMISSIONING; July 7, 1982; DIRECTOR'S DECISION UNDER 10 CFR 2.206; DD-82-7,
16 NRC 387 (1982)

INDIAN POINT, Unit 2; Docket No. 50-247
ENFORCEMENT ACTION; December 22, 1982; DECISION; CLI-82-38, 16 NRC 1698 (1982)

FACILITY INDEX

INDIAN POINT, Unit 2; Docket No. 50-247

SCHEDULING; December 23, 1982; ORDER GRANTING IN PART AND DENYING IN PART
MOTION TO DIRECT STAFF TO RESCHEDULE MEETING; CLI-82-41, 16 NRC 1721 (1982)
SPECIAL PROCEEDING; July 27, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; CLI-82-15, 16 NRC 27
(1982)
SPECIAL PROCEEDING; September 15, 1982; ORDER; CLI-82-24, 16 NRC 865 (1982)
SPECIAL PROCEEDING; September 17, 1982; ORDER; CLI-82-25, 16 NRC 867 (1982)
SPECIAL PROCEEDING; October 1, 1982; ORDER; CLI-82-28, 16 NRC 1219 (1982)
SUSPENSION OF OPERATION; November 26, 1982; DIRECTOR'S DECISION UNDER 10 CFR
2.206; DD-82-12, 16 NRC 1685 (1982)

INDIAN POINT, Unit 2; Docket No. 50-247-SP

SPECIAL PROCEEDING; August 9, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND CERTIFICATION;
LBP-82-61, 16 NRC 560 (1982)
SPECIAL PROCEEDING; November 15, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; LBP-82-105, 16
NRC 1629 (1982)
SPECIAL PROCEEDING; December 15, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; LBP-82-113, 16
NRC 1907 (1982)

INDIAN POINT, Unit 3; Docket No. 50-286

ENFORCEMENT ACTION; December 22, 1982; DECISION; CLI-82-38, 16 NRC 1698 (1982)
SCHEDULING; December 23, 1982; ORDER GRANTING IN PART AND DENYING IN PART
MOTION TO DIRECT STAFF TO RESCHEDULE MEETING; CLI-82-41, 16 NRC 1721 (1982)
SPECIAL PROCEEDING; July 27, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; CLI-82-15, 16 NRC 27
(1982)
SPECIAL PROCEEDING; September 15, 1982; ORDER; CLI-82-24, 16 NRC 865 (1982)
SPECIAL PROCEEDING; September 17, 1982; ORDER; CLI-82-25, 16 NRC 867 (1982)
SPECIAL PROCEEDING; October 1, 1982; ORDER; CLI-82-28, 16 NRC 1219 (1982)
SUSPENSION OF OPERATION; November 26, 1982; DIRECTOR'S DECISION UNDER 10 CFR
2.206; DD-82-12, 16 NRC 1685 (1982)
SPECIAL PROCEEDING; August 9, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND CERTIFICATION;
LBP-82-61, 16 NRC 560 (1982)
SPECIAL PROCEEDING; November 15, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; LBP-82-105, 16
NRC 1629 (1982)
SPECIAL PROCEEDING; December 15, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; LBP-82-113, 16
NRC 1907 (1982)

LA CROSSE BOILING WATER REACTOR; Docket Nos. 50-409-FTOL, 50-409-SC

OPERATING LICENSE; August 2, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; LBP-82-58, 16 NRC
512 (1982)

LASALLE COUNTY GENERATING STATION, Units 1 and 2; Docket Nos. 50-373, 50-374

SHOW CAUSE; July 19, 1982; DIRECTOR'S DECISION UNDER 10 CFR 2.206; DD-82-9, 16 NRC
396 (1982)

LIMERICK GENERATING STATION, Units 1 and 2; Docket Nos. 50-352, 50-353

CONSTRUCTION PERMIT SUSPENSION; December 7, 1982; DIRECTOR'S DECISION UNDER
10 CFR 2.206; DD-82-13, 16 NRC 2115 (1982)

LIMERICK GENERATING STATION, UNITS 1 and 2; Docket Nos. 50-352, 50-353

OPERATING LICENSE; September 2, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; LBP-82-71, 16
NRC 965 (1982)

OPERATING LICENSE; September 3, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; LBP-82-72, 16
NRC 968 (1982)

OPERATING LICENSE; October 20, 1982; CONFIRMATORY MEMORANDUM AND ORDER;
LBP-82-92A, 16 NRC 1387 (1982)

MIDLAND PLANT, Units 1 and 2; Docket Nos. 50-329-CP, 50-330-CP

REMAND; September 9, 1982; DECISION; ALAB-691, 16 NRC 897 (1982)

MIDLAND PLANT, Units 1 and 2; Docket Nos. 50-329-OM&OL, 50-330-OM&OL

MODIFICATION ORDER AND OPERATING LICENSE; July 27, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND
ORDER; ALAB-684, 16 NRC 162 (1982)

MODIFICATION ORDER AND OPERATING LICENSE; August 14, 1982; PREHEARING
CONFERENCE ORDER; LBP-82-63, 16 NRC 571 (1982)

FACILITY INDEX

OPERATING LICENSE AND CONSTRUCTION PERMIT MODIFICATION ORDER; October 29, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; LBP-82-95, 16 NRC 1401 (1982)

MIDLAND PLANT, Units 1 and 2; Docket Nos. 50-329-OM&OL, 50-330-OM&OL (ASLBP Nos. 78-389-03-OL, 80-429-02-SP)

OPERATING LICENSE AND CONSTRUCTION PERMIT MODIFICATION ORDER; December 30, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; LBP-82-118, 16 NRC 2034 (1982)

PALISADES NUCLEAR POWER FACILITY; Docket No. 50-255-OLA

OPERATING LICENSE AMENDMENT; November 8, 1982; ORDER OF DISMISSAL; LBP-82-101, 16 NRC 1594 (1982)

PALISADES NUCLEAR POWER FACILITY; Docket No. 50-255-SP

VACATION OF DECISION; July 30, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; CLI-82-18, 16 NRC 50 (1982)

PALO VERDE NUCLEAR GENERATING STATION, Units 1, 2 and 3; Docket Nos. STN-50-528-OL, STN-50-529-OL, STN-50-530-OL

OPERATING LICENSE; August 12, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; LBP-82-62, 16 NRC 565 (1982)

OPERATING LICENSE; December 30, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; LBP-82-117B, 16 NRC 2024 (1982)

PALO VERDE NUCLEAR GENERATING STATION, Units 1, 2 and 3; Docket Nos. STN-50-528-OL, STN-50-529-OL, STN-50-530-OL (ASLBP No. 80-447-01-OL)

OPERATING LICENSE; December 30, 1982; INITIAL DECISION; LBP-82-117A, 16 NRC 1964 (1982)

PEACH BOTTOM ATOMIC POWER STATION, Units 2 and 3; Docket Nos. 50-277, 50-278

OPERATING LICENSE; November 19, 1982; DECISION; ALAB-701, 16 NRC 1517 (1982)

PERKINS NUCLEAR STATION, Units 1, 2 and 3; Docket Nos. STN-50-488, STN-50-489, STN-50-490

CONSTRUCTION PERMIT; September 20, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

AUTHORIZING WITHDRAWAL OF APPLICATION FOR CONSTRUCTION PERMIT WITHOUT PREJUDICE; LBP-82-81, 16 NRC 1128 (1982)

PERRY NUCLEAR POWER PLANT, Units 1 & 2; Docket Nos. 50-440-OL, 50-441-OL

OPERATING LICENSE; July 12, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; LBP-82-53, 16 NRC 196 (1982)

PERRY NUCLEAR POWER PLANT, Units 1 & 2; Docket Nos. 50-440-OL, 50-441-OL

OPERATING LICENSE; July 19, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; LBP-82-53A, 16 NRC 208 (1982)

OPERATING LICENSE; August 18, 1981; ORDER; LBP-82-67, 16 NRC 734 (1982)

OPERATING LICENSE; August 30, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; LBP-82-69, 16 NRC 751 (1982)

OPERATING LICENSE; September 15, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; LBP-82-79, 16 NRC 1116 (1982)

OPERATING LICENSE; October 6, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; LBP-82-89, 16 NRC 1355 (1982)

OPERATING LICENSE; October 8, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; LBP-82-90, 16 NRC 1359 (1982)

OPERATING LICENSE; October 29, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; LBP-82-98, 16 NRC 1459 (1982)

OPERATING LICENSE; November 8, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; LBP-82-102, 16 NRC 1597 (1982)

OPERATING LICENSE; November 15, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; LBP-82-104, 16 NRC 1626 (1982)

OPERATING LICENSE; December 13, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; LBP-82-110, 16 NRC 1895 (1982)

OPERATING LICENSE; December 15, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; ALAB-706, 16 NRC 1754 (1982)

OPERATING LICENSE; December 22, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; LBP-82-114, 16 NRC 1909 (1982)

OPERATING LICENSE; December 23, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; LBP-82-117, 16 NRC 1955 (1982)

FACILITY INDEX

OPERATING LICENSE; December 30, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; LBP-82-119, 16 NRC 2063 (1982)

PILGRIM NUCLEAR POWER STATION; Docket No. 50-293 (EA-81-63)

OPERATING LICENSE MODIFICATION; July 30, 1982; ORDER; CLI-82-16, 16 NRC 44 (1982)

POINT BEACH NUCLEAR PLANT, Unit 1; Docket No. 50-266-OLA

OPERATING LICENSE AMENDMENT; October 1, 1982; DECISION; ALAB-696, 16 NRC 1245 (1982)

POINT BEACH NUCLEAR PLANT, Unit 1; Docket No. 50-266-OLA-2

OPERATING LICENSE AMENDMENT; December 10, 1982; SPECIAL PREHEARING CONFERENCE ORDER; LBP-82-108, 16 NRC 1811 (1982)

POINT BEACH NUCLEAR PLANT, Units 1 and 2; Docket Nos. 50-266-OLA, 50-301-OLA

OPERATING LICENSE AMENDMENT; October 1, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; LBP-82-88, 16 NRC 1335 (1982)

R. E. GINNA NUCLEAR POWER PLANT; Docket No. 50-244 (10 CFR 2.206)

OPERATING LICENSE; October 8, 1982; DIRECTOR'S DECISION UNDER 10 CFR 2.206; DD-82-11, 16 NRC 1473 (1982)

RANCHO SECO NUCLEAR GENERATING STATION; Docket No. 50-312-SP

SPECIAL PROCEEDING; November 23, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; ALAB-703, 16 NRC 1533 (1982)

SAN ONOFRE NUCLEAR GENERATING STATION, Units 2 and 3; Docket Nos. 50-361-OL, 50-362-OL

OPERATING LICENSE; July 16, 1982; DECISION; ALAB-680, 16 NRC 127 (1982)

SAN ONOFRE NUCLEAR GENERATING STATION, Units 2 and 3; Docket Nos. 50-361-OL, 50-362-OL

OPERATING LICENSE; July 16, 1982; ORDER; CLI-82-14, 16 NRC 24 (1982)

OPERATING LICENSE; August 6, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; LBP-82-60A, 16 NRC 555 (1982)

OPERATING LICENSE; September 24, 1982; ORDER; CLI-82-27, 16 NRC 883 (1982)

OPERATING LICENSE; November 19, 1982; CORRECTED MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; CLI-82-35, 16 NRC 1510 (1982)

SEABROOK NUCLEAR STATION, Units 1 and 2; Docket Nos. 50-443, 50-444

SHOW CAUSE; July 6, 1982; DIRECTOR'S DECISION UNDER 10 CFR 2.206; DD-82-8, 16 NRC 394 (1982)

SEABROOK NUCLEAR STATION, Units 1 and 2; Docket Nos. 50-443-OL, 50-444-OL (ASLBP No. 82-471-02-OL)

OPERATING LICENSE; September 13, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; LBP-82-76, 16 NRC 1029 (1982)

OPERATING LICENSE; November 17, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; LBP-82-106, 16 NRC 1649 (1982)

SHEARON HARRIS NUCLEAR POWER PLANT, Units 1 and 2; Docket Nos. 50-400-OL, 50-401-OL (ASLBP No. 82-468-01-OL)

OPERATING LICENSE; September 22, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; LBP-82-119A, 16 NRC 2069 (1982)

SHOREHAM NUCLEAR POWER STATION, Unit 1; Docket No. 50-322-OL

OPERATING LICENSE; July 30, 1982; ORDER; CLI-82-17, 16 NRC 48 (1982)

OPERATING LICENSE; September 3, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; LBP-82-73, 16 NRC 974 (1982)

OPERATING LICENSE; September 7, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; LBP-82-75, 16 NRC 986 (1982)

SHOREHAM NUCLEAR POWER STATION, Unit 1; Docket No. 50-322-OL (Emergency Planning)

OPERATING LICENSE; September 22, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; LBP-82-82, 16 NRC 1144 (1982)

OPERATING LICENSE; November 19, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER RULING ON LICENSING BOARD AUTHORITY TO DIRECT THAT INITIAL EXAMINATION OF THE PRE-FILED TESTIMONY BE CONDUCTED BY MEANS OF PREHEARING EXAMINATIONS; LBP-82-107, 16 NRC 1667 (1982)

OPERATING LICENSE; December 22, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER CONFIRMING RULING ON SANCTIONS FOR INTERVENORS' REFUSAL TO COMPLY WITH ORDER TO PARTICIPATE IN PREHEARING EXAMINATIONS; LBP-82-115, 16 NRC 1923 (1982)

FACILITY INDEX

SHOREHAM NUCLEAR POWER STATION, Unit 1; Docket No. 50-322-OL-2 (ASLBP No. 82-478-05-OL)
SECURITY; September 16, 1982; MEMORANDUM, ORDER AND NOTICE OF SECOND IN CAMERA CONFERENCE OF COUNSEL; LBP-82-80, 16 NRC 1121 (1982)

SKAGIT/HANFORD NUCLEAR POWER PROJECT, Units 1 and 2; Docket Nos. 50-522, 50-523
CONSTRUCTION PERMIT; July 27, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; ALAB-683, 16 NRC 160 (1982)

CONSTRUCTION PERMIT; September 3, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; LBP-82-74, 16 NRC 981 (1982)

CONSTRUCTION PERMIT; October 29, 1982; DECISION; ALAB-700, 16 NRC 1329 (1982)

SOUTH TEXAS PROJECT Units 1 and 2; Docket Nos. STN 50-498-OL, STN 50-499-OL
OPERATING LICENSE; October 15, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; LBP-82-91, 16 NRC 1364 (1982)

SUSQUEHANNA STEAM ELECTRIC STATION, Units 1 and 2); Docket Nos. 50-387-OL, 50-388-OL
OPERATING LICENSE; September 28, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; ALAB-693, 16 NRC 952 (1982)

OPERATING LICENSE; November 22, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; ALAB-702, 16 NRC 1530 (1982)

THREE MILE ISLAND NUCLEAR STATION, Unit No. 1; Docket No. 50-289
RESTART; July 16, 1982; ORDER; CLI-82-12, 16 NRC 1 (1982); CLI-82-13, 16 NRC 21 (1982)

RESTART; July 27, 1982; PARTIAL INITIAL DECISION; LBP-82-56, 16 NRC 281 (1982)

RESTART; September 29, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; LBP-82-86, 16 NRC 1190 (1982)

THREE MILE ISLAND NUCLEAR STATION, Unit No. 1; Docket No. 50-289 (Design Issues)
RESTART; December 29, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; ALAB-708, 16 NRC 1770 (1982)

THREE MILE ISLAND NUCLEAR STATION, Unit No. 1; Docket No. 50-289 (Environmental Issues)
RESTART; December 10, 1982; DECISION; ALAB-705, 16 NRC 1733 (1982)

THREE MILE ISLAND NUCLEAR STATION, Unit No. 1; Docket No. 50-289-SP
RESTART; August 2, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; ALAB-685, 16 NRC 449 (1982)

RESTART; October 14, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; CLI-82-31, 16 NRC 1236 (1982)

RESTART; October 22, 1982; ORDER; CLI-82-32, 16 NRC 1243 (1982)

THREE MILE ISLAND NUCLEAR STATION, Unit No. 1; Docket No. 50-289-SP (Emergency Planning)
SPECIAL PROCEEDING; October 22, 1982; DECISION; ALAB-697, 16 NRC 1265 (1982);
ALAB-698, 16 NRC 1290 (1982)

THREE MILE ISLAND NUCLEAR STATION, Unit No. 1; Docket No. 50-289-SP (Management Phase)
RESTART; October 27, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; ALAB-699, 16 NRC 1324 (1982)

THREE MILE ISLAND NUCLEAR STATION, Unit No. 2; Docket No. 50-320
OPERATING LICENSE; November 19, 1982; DECISION; ALAB-701, 16 NRC 1517 (1982)

THREE MILE ISLAND NUCLEAR STATION, Unit No. 2; Docket No. 50-320-OLA
OPERATING LICENSE AMENDMENT; September 14, 1982; DECISION; ALAB-692, 16 NRC 921 (1982)

UCLA RESEARCH REACTOR; Docket No. 50-142-OL
OPERATING LICENSE RENEWAL; October 22, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER;
LBP-82-93, 16 NRC 1391 (1982)

OPERATING LICENSE RENEWAL; November 1, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER;
LBP-82-99, 16 NRC 1541 (1982)

VALLECITOS NUCLEAR CENTER - GENERAL ELECTRIC TEST REACTOR; Docket No. 50-70-SC
SHOW CAUSE; August 16, 1982; INITIAL DECISION; LBP-82-64, 16 NRC 596 (1982)

VIRGIL C. SUMMER NUCLEAR STATION, Unit 1; Docket No. 50-395-OL
OPERATING LICENSE; July 20, 1982; PARTIAL INITIAL DECISION; LBP-82-55, 16 NRC 225 (1982)

OPERATING LICENSE; August 4, 1982; SUPPLEMENTAL PARTIAL INITIAL DECISION;
LBP-82-57, 16 NRC 477 (1982)

OPERATING LICENSE; September 24, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; LBP-82-84, 16 NRC 1183 (1982)

OPERATING LICENSE; September 28, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; ALAB-694, 16 NRC 958 (1982)

FACILITY INDEX

WATERFORD STEAM ELECTRIC STATION, Unit 3; Docket No. 50-382-OL
OPERATING LICENSE; August 17, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; LBP-82-66, 16 NRC
730 (1982)

WATERFORD STEAM ELECTRIC STATION, Unit 3; Docket No. 50-382-OL
OPERATING LICENSE; November 3, 1982; PARTIAL INITIAL DECISION; LBP-82-100, 16 NRC
1550 (1982)

OPERATING LICENSE; December 14, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; LBP-82-112, 16
NRC 1901 (1982)

REMAND; September 7, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; ALAB-690, 16 NRC 893 (1982)

WEST CHICAGO RARE EARTHS FACILITY; Docket No. 40-2061
MATERIALS LICENSE AMENDMENT; August 6, 1982; ORDER; CLI-82-21, 16 NRC 401 (1982)

WESTERN NEW YORK NUCLEAR SERVICE CENTER; Docket No. 50-201-OLA
OPERATING LICENSE AMENDMENT; July 8, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER;
ALAB-679, 16 NRC 121 (1982)

WILLIAM H. ZIMMER NUCLEAR POWER STATION, Unit No. 1; Docket No. 50-358
DISQUALIFICATION; November 24, 1982; ORDER; CLI-82-36, 16 NRC 1512 (1982)

OPERATING LICENSE; July 30, 1982; ORDER; CLI-82-20, 16 NRC 109 (1982)

OPERATING LICENSE; December 23, 1982; ORDER; CLI-82-40, 16 NRC 1717 (1982)

WILLIAM H. ZIMMER NUCLEAR POWER STATION; Docket No. 50-358 (EA 82-129)
SHOW CAUSE; November 12, 1982; ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE AND ORDER IMMEDIATELY
SUSPENDING CONSTRUCTION; CLI-82-33, 16 NRC 1489 (1982)

WILLIAM H. ZIMMER NUCLEAR POWER STATION, Unit 1; Docket No. 50-358-OL
OPERATING LICENSE; July 15, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; LBP-82-54, 16 NRC 210
(1982)

OPERATING LICENSE; August 24, 1982; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; LBP-82-68, 16 NRC
741 (1982)

WPPSS NUCLEAR PROJECT Nos. 1 & 2; Docket Nos. 50-397, 50-460
CONSTRUCTION PERMIT EXTENSION; October 8, 1982; ORDER; CLI-82-29, 16 NRC 1221
(1982)