


3/25/81

RELATED CORRESPONDENCE

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
BEFORE THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD




In the Matter of)

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY,)
ET AL.)

(San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station,)
Units 2 and 3))

Docket Nos. 50-361 OL
50-362 OL

MOTION TO COMPEL ANSWERS TO INTERVENOR
F.O.E. ET AL.'S FIFTH SET OF INTERROGATORIES
AND MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES
IN SUPPORT THEREOF



Intervenor F.O.E. et al. hereby move for an order by the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board for an Order pursuant to 10 C.F.R. § 2.740(f) compelling Applicants to answer further, Intervenor's Fifth Set of Interrogatories filed by Applicants on February 19, 1981.

The grounds for the motion which are more fully set forth in the Points and Authorities below are that Applicants have failed to respond to and have responded evasively to Interrogatory No. 24(b), (c), (d), (i), and (ii).

POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN
SUPPORT OF MOTION

Intervenor F.O.E. et al. Interrogatory No. 24 states: "Do you contend that the Cristianitos Zone of Deformation's structural relationship with the OZD is not the controlling geologic structure for the seismic design of SONGS 2 and 3? If so:

(a) State each and every fact upon which you base this contention;

810 4070464

G

DS03
50/1

(b) Identify each and every document or communication upon which you base this contention;

(c) Identify each and every person with knowledge of the factual basis or bases for this contention, or on whose writings, opinions or testimony you base this contention; and

(d) Identify each and every person, expert or otherwise, whom you expect to call as a witness at the hearing before the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board in support of this contention, and as to each potential witness so identified provide the following information:

(i) State the substance of the facts and opinions to which you expect the witness to testify;

(ii) Summarize the factual and theoretical basis, as well as any other grounds, for each opinion to which the witness is expected to testify."

Applicants response states: "(a) Applicants contend there is no structural relationship between the postulated Cristianitos Zone of Deformations and the OZD, as described in the responses to numerous of the previous Interrogatories. Applicants also contend that the postulated Cristianitos Zone of Deformation is not the controlling geologic structure for the seismic design of SONGS 2 and 3, as described in responses to previous Interrogatories. The OZD is the controlling structure."

Applicants have totally failed to respond to Interrogatory No. 24 (a),(b),(c),(d),(i),(ii) in that they have denied the contentions stated in the interrogatory but have totally failed to identify:

1. the facts upon which the denial is based;

2. the documents or communication upon which they base the denial;

3. the persons on whom they rely; and

4. the witnesses they expect to call to support their position.

Under 10 C.F.R. § 2.740(f) an evasive or incomplete answer shall be treated as a failure to answer and the Board may order the answering party to supplement any answer it determines is inadequate.

Since Applicants have failed to completely answer the question the Board should order that they supplement their answers to fully answer Interrogatory No. 24.

DATED: March 25, 1981

Respectfully submitted,

By



RICHARD J. WHARTON

Attorney for Intervenors

F.O.E. ET AL.