\*82 OCT 12 A10:28

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD

Before Administrative Judges: Charles Bechhoefer, Chairman Dr. Frederick P. Cowan Dr. Jerry Harbour OFFICE OF SECRETARY DOCKETING & SERVICE BRANCH

SERVED OCT 121982

In the Matter of
CONSUMERS POWER COMPANY
(Midland Plant, Units 1 and 2)

Docket Nos. 50-329 OM 50-330 OM

Docket Nos. 50-329 OL 50-329 OL

October 8, 1982

## MEMORANDUM (Telephone Conference Call of October 6, 1982)

On October 6, 1982, the NRC Staff initiated a telephone conference call. Participating were the Board members (Messrs. Bechhoefer, Cowan and Harbour); Messrs. William Paton and Michael Wilcove, for the NRC Staff; Messrs. Michael Miller and James Brunner, for the Applicant; Mr. Lee Bishop, for Ms. Mary Sinclair; Ms. Barbara Stamiris, pro se; and Mr. Wendell H. Marshall, pro se.

1. The Staff advised that it was that day issuing and sending to the Board and parties Supplement 2 to its Safety Evaluation Report (SSER-2), dealing in particular with various soils issues. That document was earlier scheduled to be issued by October 4, and our hearings scheduled to begin on October 26 were predicated on issuance of the SSER-2 by October 4. The Applicant and Staff each indicated that, notwithstanding the two-day delay in the issuance of the SSER-2, they could provide testimony on the dates

which we had previously scheduled (October 12 and 18, respectively) and were prepared to begin hearings on the date scheduled. After discussion with the parties, and taking into account the dates when various witnesses could appear, we postponed the restart of the hearings one day, to October 27, 1982.

Hearings during the period October 27-29 (and 30 if necessary) will consider soil bearing capacity, underground piping (including corrosion) and possibly seismic shakedown. Hearings during the week of November 1-5 will consider remedial measures for the service water pump structure and permanent dewatering, as well as matters left over from the earlier week.

The Applicant and Staff identified most of the wilnesses whom they each plan to present on these subjects. In response to inquiries from the Applicant, Staff, and Ms. Stamiris, the Board indicated that it might have questions regarding the QA program for the service water pump structure and that, although there need be no prepared testimony on that subject, it would be useful for witnesses who could address such questions to be present. (Detailed consideration of the QA program, including its implementation, is to be addressed at later hearing sessions.)

2. Hearings have previously been scheduled for November 16-20, 22-23, and November 30-December 3. The Applicant and Staff were unable to identify any issues they could address during the November 16-23 period but agreed to advise the Board within the next few days whether there were any issues which could be heard during all or a portion of those days. At the

suggestion of the Applicant, to which no party objected, we agreed to schedule hearings for December 4 (if necessary) and December 6-10, 1982.

- 3. Ms. Stamiris inquired whether we had established a period for second-round discovery with respect to recently-accepted OL contentions. We indicated that we had not done so but that such discovery should be undertaken promptly and that the principles we had followed in our earlier orders on this subject (distinguishing between discovery arising out of earlier responses and new discovery) would govern. See, e.g., our Memorandum and Order (Ruling Upon Intervenor's Motions To Compel Discovery Against Applicant), dated May 8, 1981.
- 4. Ms. Stamiris and Mr. Brunner related a question which had arisen with respect to the Applicant's response to Ms. Stamiris' interrogatory 17. Apparently the Applicant viewed certain terms in the interrogatory as overly general, and it limited its response to what it viewed as the proper scope of the interrogatory. When Ms. Stamiris explained exactly what additional informtion she was seeking, Mr. Brunner stated that he believed he could resolve his disagreement with Ms. Stamiris, who agreed to narrow and resubmit the interrogatory. We encouraged that resolution but noted that Ms. Stamiris had the option of filing a motion to compel discovery if she believed that to be necessary.
- 5. By letter dated September 10, 1982 (postmarked September 16), Mr. Marshall had requested us to accept eight new contentions. Because the letter did not indicate that it had been served on other parties, we inquired whether they had received it. The Applicant and Staff had not received it, although Mr. Marshall indicated that he had mailed it to all

parties. We advised the parties that they need not respond since we intended to reject all of the contentions for various reasons (not related to any lack of proper service). We will issue a Memorandum and Order ruling on those proposed contentions in the near future.

6 The hearings to be held on October 27, 29-30 and November 1-5 will be held at the Midland County Courtnouse Auditorium, 301 W. Main, Midland, Michigan. Because of the unavailability of the Courthouse facility on October 28, 1982, the hearing on that day will be held at the Ramada Inn Central, Room E, 1815 S. Saginaw Road, Midland, Michigan.

FOR THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD

Charles Bechhoefer, Chairman ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE

Dated at Bethesda, Maryland this 8th day of October 1982.