## COMMITTEE TO BRIDGE THE GAP

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

> as from: Box 1186 Ben Lomond, CA 95005 (408) 336-5381

82 APR ZO PIZO

April 16, 1982

Judge John H. Frye, III Chairman Atomic Safety and Licensing Board U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, D.C. 20555

> In the Matter of The Regents of the University of California (UCLA Research Reactor) Docket No. 50-142 (Proposed Renewal of Facility License)

Dear Judge Frye:

8204280025

Attached to this letter is a sealed envelope containing identification of potential security witnesses, counsel, and representatives for CBG, as per Board Order of April 8. Before determining whether to open that envelope we call your attention to the following:

CBG has filed a motion, enclosed, to defer identification of proposed "authorized persons" until the Board has ruled on certain CBG proposals, principally whether all parties should not be required to identify, at the same time, their proposed security witnesses and other similarly involved persons. Because of the extremely short time-frame envisioned in the April 8 Order, we did not know how to request that deferral and still be in compliance with the Order should the request for deferral be denied.

The best solution we could come up with was to move for deferral while at the same time enclosing (in a sealed envelope because of potential <u>ex parte</u> considerations) the identification sought in the April 8 Order, should the deferral motion be denied. We have not served the identification material on the other parties. Should our motion for deferral be denied, we request notification by phone so that we might serve, by express mail, that material on the other parties immediately.

We know that there must be some better way of handling such a situation when there is a tight time schedule, but, as you know, we are currently appearing <u>pro se</u> and could not determine what it might be. We would appreciate guidance from the Board regarding any future similar situation.

Additionally, an arrangement was made with Judge Bowers at the February, 1981, pre-hearing conference by which express mail intended for the Board could be sent to the Chairman and s/he would distribute copies to the other Members. We would thus appreciate it if you would provide Judge Paris and Judge Luebke the enclosed materials marked for them. Judge John H. Frye, III April 16, 1982

We also request clarification as to whether the 10 CFR 2.710 method for computation of time applies to time frames such as those in your April 8 Order--in particular whether the five day time period for service by mail should be added to the times indicated in such an Order.

A copy of this letter is being served on the service list.

Respectfully submitted.

Daniel Hirsch President Committee to Bridge the Gap