

COMMITTEE TO BRIDGE THE GAP

1637 BUTLER AVENUE #203  
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90025  
(213) 478-0829

DOCKETED  
USNRC

October 27, 1981

'81 OCT 30 P1:06

*UP*

Elizabeth S. Bowers, Chairman  
Administrative Judge  
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20555

Dr. Oscar H. Paris  
Administrative Judge  
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20555

OFFICE OF SECRETARY  
DOCKETING & SERVICE  
BRANCH

Dr. Emmeth A. Luebke  
Administrative Judge  
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20555

RE: LANGUAGE OF CONTENTIONS, AS ADMITTED BY THE BOARD  
(DOCKET 50-142, PROPOSED RENEWAL--UCLA REACTOR)


Dear Administrative Judges:

By Order of August 27, 1981, the Board requested Staff to prepare a compilation of the contentions admitted to date, with the language revisions contained in the Board's March 20, 1981 Order. On September 2, the Staff responded.

Intervenor has noticed in the September 2 compilation a few typographical or editorial errors. Please find enclosed a list of the relevant corrections.

Should Staff view any of these items differently from Intervenor, Intervenor suggests the matter be discussed at the upcoming meet-and-confer session.

Respectfully submitted,



Daniel Hirsch  
President  
COMMITTEE TO BRIDGE THE GAP

enclosure: "CORRECTIONS TO NRC STAFF COMPILATION  
OF ADMITTED CONTENTIONS, SUBMITTED 9/2/81"

cc w/ enclosure: service list

811040349 811027  
PDR ADOCK 05000142  
G PDR

13124.00  
CORRECTIONS TO NRC STAFF COMPILATION  
OF ADMITTED CONTENTIONS, SUBMITTED 9/2/81

- 20 19 08 139 18
- I.1 should read "...experimental vibration of the reactor is misleading."
- V.11 should read "...the current licensed limit( $\pm 2.3\%$  delta k/k)..."
- XIII should read "The information which Applicant has provided regarding the special nuclear materials license is inadequate to meet the requirements of 10 CFR 70.22(a)(7) and (a)(8) and 70.24(a)(1), (2), and (3). Furthermore, the enrichment level..."
- X should read "The Application's Safety Analysis is flawed because it does not include an analysis of the 'maximum credible accident' or a 'design basis accident'. In providing such an analysis the following hazard scenarios..."
- XXI.5 should read "Applicant does not have adequate radiation measuring devices to accurately determine the extent and seriousness of an accident which would make the University initiate its emergency response plan."

By Board Order of March 20, 1981, the following contentions were deferred:

X.3a-c; X.4a-f; XXIII.1a-b, 2a-b, 3a-b.