

(2)

DOCKETED  
USNRC

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

'83 August 31 1983  
SEP -6 AM 10:07

OFFICE OF SECRETARY  
DOCKETING & SERVICE  
BRANCH

BEFORE THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD

Glenn O. Bright  
Dr. James H. Carpenter  
James L. Kelley, Chairman

In the Matter of

CAROLINA POWER AND LIGHT CO. et al.  
(Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant,  
Units 1 and 2)

Dockets 50-400 OL  
50-401 OL

ASLBP No. 82-468-01  
OL

Wells Eddleman's Request for Clarification  
and Reconsideration of 8-18-83 Order

This request is filed under an extension of time OK'd by Staff,  
Applicants and the Board orally.

Re SF3 and 85B (8-18 Order at 6,14) I request clarification as  
to whether I will have any opportunity to examine the FES and withdraw,  
modify, or make new contentions on these subjects when it issues.  
Such has been the Board's past practice on deferred contentions, e.g.  
in 9-22-82 Order at 8, 3-10-83 Order, 5-27-83 Order.

Please clarify why the allegation of underestimate of probability  
of serious nuclear accidents, detailed at pp 16-17 of my 6-20-83  
filing, which allege probabilities of severe accidents as high as  
1 in 1000 per reactor-year (meltdowns), are not considered specific  
enough basis for contradicting the Staff analysis (DES at 5-58 thru  
5-83) which states at p. 5-78 that the core-melt probability is  
assumed as high as  $10^{-4}$  (only 1/10 as much) per year. See top  
paragraph of my 7-29 response at 28 also.

Please clarify why Eddleman 34 (see revised version 6-20-83  
at 21, middle) referencing pages 5-58,59 and 5-55 of the DES,

8309070121 830831  
PDR ADDCK 05000400  
PDR  
6

does not support "specification of any particular deficiency" when coupled with the specific citations given 6-20-83 at pp 20-21 beginning (last line p.20) "For a critique ..." and going on to give page citations from Perils of the Peaceful Atom. (See also "WHAT'S NEW, 6-20-83 at 22, for Eddleman 34 revised.)

My question here is how, if at all, the specifics given on pp 20-21 were considered re Eddleman 34 revised, given the wording (6 - 20- 83 at 21, above the revised version)(of 34), "I think this omission (referring to the contribution to accidents described on pp 20-21) gives sufficient basis to renew Eddleman 34 in a revised form, as follows:". I understand how the order of things might have been confusing there (especially in such a long pleading), but I think the basis and specificity are there, as I tried to point out 7-29-83 at 38. I ask your consideration, given this 2-page pleading, to please review the above-cited information re Eddleman 34 and clarify your 8-18-83 Order as you may think appropriate.

#### REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

To the extent that the Board, in reviewing or clarifying the matters inquired about above, finds good cause to modify its 8-18-83 Order with respect to either the admission of contentions 22C and/or 34, or with respect to allowing further response by me to the FES on '8F3' and/or 85B (as you have in the past re deferred contentions), I request you to do so.



Wells Eddleman

Written 29 August 1983  
Served 8-31 per oral extension of time