UNITED STATES OF AMERICA NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

BEFORE THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD

 \mathbf{k}^{l}

DOCKETED

CONCERNING DATE FOR PREHEARING CONFERENCE

The Atomic Bafety and Licensing Board (Board) on October 19, 1981, issued an Order asking each of the petitioners and the NRC staff to comment on a schedule proposed by Applicant, letter to Board, October 14, 1981, calling for a prehearing conference during the week of December 14. The Board set October 28 as the date for comments. CESG is submitting its response November 9, believing that it has good ause for untimely filing¹.

Before addressing the matter of schedule CESG would like to note that the meeting between some petitioners and Applicant on October 6, 1981, referred to in Applicant's letter of October 14, was not, at the time it was proposed by Applicant, represented as concerned with stipulation. A phone call from Mr. Porter to Mr. Riley in the week of September 25 suggested a talk about the forthcoming Catawba proceeding. There was no mention of develop-

Meetings between Applicant and other petitioners in the matter of stipulating contentions, a procedure this Board favors, have taken place as recently as October 29 and 30. A letter dated November 6, 1981, from Applicant to Mr. Presler of CMEC and of November 2, 1981, from Applicant to Mr. Guild, counsel for the Palmetto Alliance, show the stipulation process to be ongoing between Duke and CMEC. It is our view that these post October 28 developments, of which CESG had intimations, had not sufficiently ripened until November 6 to make an appropriate response possible.

8111180274 811109 PDR ADOCK 0500041

PDZ

ing a stipulation of contentions. At the commencement of the October 6 meeting Messrs. Carr and McGarry, for Applicant, indicated that it was their concern to determine precisely what it was that each of the petitioners, CMEC, SEA, and CESG regarded as the issues. These matters were articulated by the several representatives with queries and exchanges with Messrs. Carr and McGarry. It was only after this identification and clarification of the issues that Mr. McGarry suggested entering into a stipulation of contentions. CESG then indicated that it was not interested. If, at the time of proposing the meeting, Applicant had indicated its interest in a stipulation of contentions it is unlikely that CESG would have participated².

As to schedule, we see merit in the Staff's suggestion that three weeks be allowed between the time of filing contentions and the parties' responses, and holding the prehearing conference approximately a week after responses have been received. To enable Mr. Guild to meet the legal obligations he refers to in his response and to work no unnecessary hardship on those preparing responses during the holiday season, there clearly being no urgency as to the timing of the conference, the need for the

-2-

^{2/} CESG is cognizant that the Board "commended efforts to date to work out a stipulated set of contentions" and asks "all the petitioners and Staff to join with the Applicant in these efforts." It is CESG's view that the tryers of fact have an obligation which is best served by an active role in the determination of issues including introducing, sua sponte, matters of importance which have been neglected by the petitioners. It is our belief that an appropriate definition of issues is more likely to result from a procedure in which the contentions of the petitioners are aired before the Board, rnd accepted, rejected, amended or added to by the Board rather than arrived at by dealings between the petitioners and the parties.

Catawba plant being a CESG issue, we suggest December 7 as the date for filing contentions, January 4, 1982, as the date for filing responses to the contentions, and the week of January 18, mail delivery time being what it is, as the time for the prehearing conference.

Respectfully submitted,

Jesse L. Riley, President Carolina Environmental Study Group 854 Henley Place Charlotte, NC 28207 704-375-4342

November 9, 1981

ì

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

BEFORE THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD

181 NOV 12 P5:56

DOCKETED

In the Matter of

DUKE POWER COMPANY, et al.,

(Catawba Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2) Docket Nogocheding & SERVICE

AFFIRMATION OF SERVICE

I hereby affirm that copies of "CESG'S RESPONSE TO BOARD'S ORDER CONCERNING DATE FOR PREHEARING CONFERENCE" in the above captioned matter have been served on the following in the U.S. mail, first class, this 9th day of November, 1981:

James L. Kelley, Chairman Atomic Safety & Licensing Board U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, D.C. 20555

Dr. Dixon Callihan Union Carbide Corporation P.O. Box Y Oak Ridge, Tennessee

Dr. Richard F. Foster F.O. Box 4263 Sunriver, Oregon 97701

Atomic Safety & Licensing Appeal Panel Washington, D.C. 20555 U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, D.C. 20555 Robert Guild, Esq.

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

Docketing and Service Section U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, D.C. 20555

Richard P. Wilson, Esq. Assistant Attorney General 2600 Bull Street Columbia, SC 29201 Michael McGarry, III, Esq. Debevoise and Liberman 1200 17th Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036

William L. Porter, Esq. Albert V. Carr, Esq. Duke Power Company P.O. Box 33189 Charlotte, NC 28242

Edward G. Ketchen, Esq. Counsel for NRC Staff U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, D.C. 20555

Robert Guild, Esq. Attorney-at-Law 314 Pall Mall Columbia, SC 29201

Palmetto Alliance 2135% Devine Street Columbia, SC 29205

Henry Presler, Chairman Charlotte Meck. Env't'l. Coalition 942 Henley Place Charlotte, NC 28207

Sise L. Riley for CESG