UNITED STATES OF AMERICA NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

BEFORE THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD

In the Matter of
COMMONWEALTH EDISON COMPANY
(Byron Station, Units 1 and 2)

Docket Nos. 50-454 50-455

NRC STAFF RESPONSE TO APPLICANT MOTION FOR CLARIFICATION

I. INTRODUCTION

On September 28, 1982, the Applicant filed a motion for clarification of that portion of the Board's September 10, 1982

Memorandum and Order which denied Applicant and Staff motions for summary disposition of contentions 9(a) (water hammer) and 9(c) (steam generators). In the September 10 Order, the Board identified specific aspects of the subject contentions which raise contested issues of material fact but did not expressly limit future adjudication of the contentions to these outstanding issues. In its motion, Applicant seeks to have the Licensing Board clarify its rulings on contentions 9(a) and 9(c) by explicitly and specifically delineating those portions of, or issues raised by, these contentions that remain for litigation, limiting the contentions accordingly. The NRC Staff supports Applicant's motion.

Certified By DSD Selection

8210130095 821012 PDR ADOCK 05000454 PDR

II. DISCUSSION

The Commission's summary disposition rule authorizes a decision in the movant's favor "as to all or any part of the matters involved in the proceeding." 10 CFR § 2.749(a). That summary disposition rule would appear to permit the dismissal not only of entire contentions, but of portions of contentions and discrete issues raised therein as to which there is no genuine issue of material fact.

In refusing to grant in full the summary disposition motions directed to contentions 9(a) and 9(c), the Licensing Board found the need for additional information only as to certain limited aspects of these contentions. 2/ The Applicant expresses the belief, which the Staff shares, that implicit in the Board's Order on these contentions is an intention to limit the present scope of the contentions to the relevant outstanding issues identified in the Order. The Applicant requests, however, that the Board issue a clarifying order reflecting this position. The Staff supports this request in the interest of avoiding unnecessary disagreement over the proper interpretation of the Board's ruling in this regard, as well as avoiding unnecessary litigation of aspects of these contentions as to which there is no genuine issue of material fact.

See Public Service Company of Oklahoma (Black Fox Station, Units 1 and 2), LBP-77-46, 7 NRC 167 (1977); Toledo Edison Co. (Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station), LBP-73-30, 6 AEC 691, 699 (1973).

For contention 9(a), the Board identified the matter of bubble collapse water hammer events in the feedwater bypass system similar to the event which occurred at the KRSKO plant in Yugoslavia, as unresolved. For contention 9(c), the Board indicated that there is currently insufficient information on steam generator tube degradation due to flow induced vibration and on postulated tube failure concurrent with other design basis accidents.

III. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the Staff supports Applicant's motion and urges that the Licensing Board clarify and explicitly limit the scope of contentions 9(a) and 9(c) which reamin to be litigated.

Respectfully submitted,

Un Arly

Steven C. Goldberg Counsel for NRC Staff

Dated at Bethesda, Maryland this /R*day of October, 1982

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

BEFORE THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD

In the Matter of

COMMONWEALTH EDISON COMPANY

(Byron Station, Units 1 and 2)

Docket Nos. 50-454 50-455

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that copies of "NRC STAFF RESPONSE TO APPLICANT MOTION FOR CLARIFICATION", dated October 12, 1982 in the above-captioned proceeding have been served on the following by deposit in the United States mail, first class, or as indicated by an asterisk through deposit in the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's internal mail system, this 12th day of October, 1982:

*Morton B. Margulies, Chairman Administrative Judge Atomic Safety and Licensing Roard U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, DC 20555

Dr. A. Dixon Callihan Administrative Judge Union Carbide Corporation P.O. Box Y Oak Ridge, TN 37830

*Dr. Richard F. Cole
Administrative Judge
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

Paul M. Murphy, Esq. Isham, Lincoln & Beale Three First National Plaza Chicago, IL 60602

Myron M. Cherry, Esq. Cherry & Flynn Suite 3700 Three First National Plaza Chicago, IL 60602 Region III U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Office of Inspection & Enforcement 799 Roosevelt Road Glen Ellyn, IL 60137

Mrs. Phillip B. Johnson 1907 Stratford Lane Rockford, IL 61107

Ms. Diane Chavez 326 N. Avon Street Rockford, IL 61103

Dr. Bruce von Zellen c/o DAARE P.O. Box 261 DeKalb, IL 60015

Doug Cassel, Esq. Jane Whicher, Esq. 109 N. Dearborn Street Chicago, IL 60602

*Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, DC 20555 *Atomic Safety and Licensing Appeal Board Panel U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, DC 20555

*Docketing and Service Section Office of the Secretary of the Commission U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, DC 20555

Joseph Gallo, Esq. Isham, Lincoln & Beale Suite 840 1120 Connecticut Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20036

> Mu sily Steven C. Goldberg

Counsel for NRC Staff