

'82 AUG 19 P3:04



OFFICE OF THE CHANCELLOR
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90024
OFFICE OF SECRETARY
COORDINATING & SERVICE
BRANCH

August 16, 1982

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

Dr. Emmeth A. Luebke
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

In the Matter of
The Regents of the University of California
(UCLA Research Reactor)
(Proposed Renewal of Facility License)

Dear Administrative Judges:

In accordance with the Board's Order of July 26, 1982,
we are advising the Board of the following:

1. University intends to move for summary disposition of all contentions admitted to this proceeding with the exception of Contention XX (Physical Security), which is currently under consideration, and Contention XXI, which has been deferred. In the event that prior to the time that University must file its motion University receives the NRC Staff motion on any or all of the same contentions, University may reconsider its motion to eliminate any needless repetition.

2. In University's view, the transcript of the in camera portion of the Prehearing Conference does not contain any sensitive security information that need be withheld from public disclosure.

Very truly yours,

William H. Cormier
UCLA Representative

cc: Service List

8208240249 G

DS03



OFFICE OF THE CHANCELLOR
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90024

August 16, 1982

Mr. Daniel Hirsch
Box 1186
Ben Lomond, California 95005

Re: Docket No. 50-142; Your Letter of August 6, 1982

Dear Mr. Hirsch:

This letter is in response to your letter of August 6, 1982, complaining of "service irregularities".

You are mistaken in asserting that you have received incomplete service of documents. The University serves all documents that are required to be served in this proceeding, that is, pleadings and Board-directed submissions, on each individual whose name appears on the service list together with any referenced attachments or exhibits to such documents. Documents that are required to be served have an appropriate proof of service annexed to them.

However, in transmitting other documents to parties such as copies of applicant-staff correspondence or copies of documents requested during discovery, the University does not send copies of the documents being transmitted to everyone on the service list. The same holds for other routine correspondence between parties. Usually, though not always, the University sends copies of such correspondence or transmittal letters, but not the enclosures, to those on the service list in order to keep everyone informed. No proof of service is required for such correspondence.

Concerning the emergency response plan which you complain about not receiving (in Ben Lomond) in your August 6th letter to the Board, please note that a copy of the plan was sent to your Los Angeles office address. Only one copy of the plan was sent to the Board and each party that had received a copy of the application. No one else on the service list was sent a copy. Of course, you are free to make whatever extra number of copies of the plan you or your attorneys require. In that regard, we note that your attorneys have yet to enter notices of appearance on any of the issues in this proceeding, although you informed the Board at the prehearing conference that notices of appearance for your attorneys on Contention XX would be forthcoming.

Mr. Daniel Hirsch
August 16, 1982

2

For your convenience we are enclosing another copy of the emergency response plan, which is being sent to you at your Ben Lomond address. In addition, we are enclosing two other items of recent applicant-staff correspondence (a July 8, 1982, letter reporting a reactor occurrence and an August 3, 1982, letter responding to the July 22, 1982, notice of violation).

You also complained that certain documents have been served late "in nearly a dozen instances". However, you have not identified these documents nor specified the circumstances. If you will provide us with a list of the documents and copies of the metered or cancelled envelopes we will attempt to determine if there has been any service irregularities for which we are responsible. In the future, if you discover what you think is an irregularity, notify us immediately otherwise, as a practical matter, we will be unable to determine if there is in fact a problem. Incidentally, we note that you failed to have executed the proof of service form for your August 6th pleading "CBG Objections to Certain Portions of July 26, 1982 Prehearing Conference Order," suggesting that even the best of us make mistakes.

Very truly yours,



William H. Cormier
UCLA Representative

Enclosures

cc: Service List (w/o enclosures)