DOCKETED

LOWENSTEIN, NEWMAN, REIS & AXELRAD

1025 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, N. W.

WASHINGTON, D. C. 20036

'81 NOV -2 P4:13

JACK R. NEWMAN
HAROLD F. REIS
MAURICE AXELRAD
KATHLEEN H SHEA
J. A. BOUKNI IHT, JR.
MICHAEL A. BAUSER

ROBERT LOWENSTEIN

DOUGLAS G. GREEN DAVID G. POWELL E. GREGORY BARNES ANNE W. COTTINGHAM ROBERT H. CULP PETER G. FLYNN

STEVEN P. FRANTZ FREDERIC S. GRAY ALVIN H. GUTTERMAN DAVID B. RASK:N

DONALD J. SILVERMAN

202-862-8400

OFFICE OF SECRETARY DOCKETING & SERVICE BRANCH

October 30, 1981

Charles Bechhoefer, Esquire
Chief Administrative Judge
Atomic Safety and Licensing
Board Panel
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D. C. 20555

Dr. James C. Lamb, III Administrative Judge 313 Woodhaven Road Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27514

Ernest E. Hill Administrative Judge Lawrence Livermore Laboratory Post Office Box 808, L-123 Livermore, California 94550

> Re: Houston Lighting & Power Co. et al. South Texas Project, Units 1 & 2, Docket Nos. STN 50-498, STN 50-499

Gentlemen:

In a telephone call to each of the parties yesterday, Chairman Bechhoefer stated that the Board was meeting in Bethesda today to consider issuing an Order to schedule a hearing for December 8-10. Such hearing would be convened to hear testimony responding to questions the Board would identify in the Order concerning Attachment A to the letter of October 16, 1981, from Houston Lighting & Power to the Director of NRC Region IV.

Applicants respectfully urge the Board not to schedule



DS03

Charles Bechhoefer, Esquire Dr. James D. Lamb, III Ernest E. Hill Octo',er 30, 1981 Page Two

such a hearing at this time. As we will elaborate in our response to CEU's Motion to halt construction (which we are filing today), if the Board's concern stems from a continuation of work at the STP site pending an analysis of the findings in the Quadrex Report, the convening of a hearing on that matter would be wholly inappropriate. Since, as pointed out in our response, the Board does not have the jurisdiction to halt construction, particularly when the same matter is presently pending before the Commission in CEU's "Petition to Suspend Construction," no hearing on Quadrex-related matters should be held by the Board.*/
Moreover, even apart from jurisdictional deficiencies, a hearing on Quadrex-related matters by December 8-10 prior to the completion of the ongoing reviews could not possibly be productive.

It may be that the Board's concern with respect to this matter is based on a misunderstanding of the Applicants' plans for continuing limited construction activities until Bechtel can assume responsibility as architect/engineer and construction manager. Lest there be any misunderstanding the activities of Bechtel during the "transition" phase do not include the construction work described in Appendix A to the letter of October 16 from HL&P to Region IV. Bechtel's activities now consist of "benchmarking" the status of design, engineering and construction; the conduct of ongoing work at the site remains solely with Brown & Root.

Finally, preparation for a hearing on December 8-10 would be seriously counterproductive in the following respects:

(1) the ability of the Applicant to respond to the Commission's request for information on transition matters by December 11 (copy attached) would be seriously impeded;

^{*/} We would also emphasize that Region IV currently has under consideration the matter of the extent to which construction should continue at the site. In an orderly regulatory framework, prior review by the NRC regulatory staff is the appropriate mechanism for determining technical matters.

Charles Bechhoefer, Esquire Dr. James D. Lamb, III Ernest E. Hill October 30, 1981 Page Three

- (2) the efforts of the parties to meet and make joint recommendations to the Board by November 23 (in accordance with the Board's Order of October 8) regarding matters to be heard at the resumption of the hearings on January 18 would be seriously impaired; and
- (3) to the extent that the purpose of the hearing relates to transition matters, the NRC Staff will be in no position to furnish useful testimony on transition matters since the essential information in that regard will not be submitted to the Commission until December 11.

Accordingly, we urge the Board not to schedule an additional hearing but to allow the parties to proceed in the manner described in our conference call of October 7, the results of which are reflected in the Board's Order of October 8, 1981.

If notwithstanding the foregoing, the Board continues to entertain the idea of holding a hearing on December 8-10, we urge that before issuing any such order the Board initiate a conference call to hear the view of the parties as to whether a hearing would be appropriate or counter productive and even more importantly, whether the subject matter of such a hearing is properly before the Board at this time. Alternatively, we suggest that the Board by order request the expedited written views of the parties on this question. The Board could require such filings by November 6 leaving enough time to schedule a hearing if it were not convinced otherwise by the responses of the parties.

The possibility that the Board's concerns stem from a misunderstanding as to what is transpiring appears to highlight the desirability of an early prehearing conference after the pleadings to be submitted by the parties on November 23. We would again suggest that the Board schedule such a conference, and not a premature hearing. We can see

Charles Bechhoefer, Esquire Dr. James D. Lamb, III Ernest E. Hill October 30, 1981 Page Four

no benefit to the public interest from a hearing held without appropriate opportunity for all parties to consider in advance the basic matters to be heard.

Respectfully,

Jack R. Newman

Of Counsel:

Lowenstein, Newman, Reis & Axelrad 1025 Connecticut Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036

Baker & Botts 3000 One Shell Plaza Houston, Texas 77002

Attorneys for HOUSTON LIGHTING & POWER COMPANY, Project Manager of the South Texas Project, acting herein on behalf of itself and the other Applicants, CITY OF SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS, acting by and through the City Public Service Board of the City of San Antonio, CENTRAL POWER AND LIGHT COMPANY and CITY OF AUSTIN, TEXAS.

cc: Certificate of Service



NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION WASHINGTON, D. C. 10050

OCT 2 0 1981

ST-AE-HL-851 SFN: V-0100/C-0530 C-0550

Date Received: 10/26

Docket Nos.: 50-498/499

Mr. G. W. Oprea, Jr. Executive Vice President Houston Lighting and Power Company P. O. Box 1700 Houston, Texas 77001

Dear Mr. Oprea:

Subject: Request for information under the provisions of 10 CFR 50.54(f)

By letter of September 24, 1981, your counsel informed the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission that Houston Lighting & Power Company (HL&F) has decided to reallocate certain responsibilities for the commistion of the South Texas Project. In the letter it was further indicated that specific information will be supplied concerning the qualifications of Bechtel Power Corporation, its QA/QC program, and the ultimate relation of Brown & Root, HL&P and Bechtel on this project in the future.

Under the provisions of 10 CFR 50.54(f) we request you to supply this information, as well as information on the transition plans you develop to put these changes into effect. As it is recognized that it will take about 6 to 8 weeks to develop the details concerning this change, it is requested that you supply this information by December 11, 1981, or by such earlier date as it becomes available.

Sincerely,

Robert L. Tedesco, Assistant Director

for Licensing Division of Licensing

cc: See next page.

RECEIVED

OCT 2 6 198

G. W. CPRE

DUPE OF 8111030146

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

BEFORE THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD

In the Matter of HOUSTON LIGHTING AND POWER) Docket Nos. 50-498 OL 50-499 OL COMPANY, ET AL. (South Texas Project, Units 1 and 2)

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that copies of Applicants' letter signed by Jack R. Newman to the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board dated October 30, 1981, have been served on the following individuals and entities by deposit in the United States mail, first class, postage prepaid, or hand delivered as indicated by asterisk, on this 30th day of October, 1981

Charles Bechhoefer, Esq.*

Chief Administrative Judge
Atomic Safety and Licensing

Assistant Attorney General
for the State of Texas Board Panel U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, D.C. 20555

Dr. James C. Lamb, III Administrative Judge 313 Woodhaven Road Chapel Hill, NC 27514

Ernest E. Hill Administrative Judge Lawrence Livermore Laboratory University of California P.O. Box 808, L-123 Livermore, CA 94550

Mrs. Peggy Buchorn Executive Director Citizens for Equitable Utilities, Inc. Route 1, Box 1684 Brazoria, TX 77422

Environmental Protection Division P.O. Box 12548, Capitol Station Austin, TX 78711

William S. Jordan, III Esq.* Harmon & Weiss 1725 I Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20006

Kim Eas' man, Co-coordinator Barbara A. Miller Pat Coy Citizens Concerned About Nuclear Power 5106 Casa Oro San Antonio, TX 78233

Lanny Sinkin 2207-D Nueces Austin, TX 78705 Jay M. Gutierrez, Esq.*
Office of the Executive
Legal Lirector
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

Atomic Safety and Licensing
Appeal Board
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

Atomic Safety and Licensing Board U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, D.C. 20555

Docketing and Service Section Office of the Secretary U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, D.C. 20555 Paul B. Cotter, Jr.*
Chairman
Atomic Safety and Licensing
Board Panel
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory
Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

Jack K. 9/erm