LIC September 9, 1982 DOCKETED

# UNITED STATES OF AMERICA NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

\*82 SEP 10 A10 :50

OFFICE OF SECRETARY DOCKETING & SERVICE BRANCH

DS03

#### Before the Atomic Safety and Licensing Appeal Board

In the Matter of	)			
METROPOLITAN EDISON COMPANY	)	Docket No.	50-289	SP
(Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit No. 1)	)	(Restart)		

### LICENSEE'S ANSWER TO AAMODT MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE BRIEF

On September 7, 1982, Licensee received Aamodt Motion For Extension of Time to File Brief, dated September 3, 1982.<sup>\*/</sup> Licensee was alerted later the same day by the Appeal Board that responses to the Aamodt Motion were due by close of business, September 9. Licensee opposes the Aamodt Motion.

In a one paragraph document, the Aamodts request that the briefing of exceptions on all management issues be deferred, citing as their total basis:

A new matter, the subject of our motion of today to the Licensing Board, clouds the issues, findings and conclusions of the Reopened Proceeding on cheating.

The Aamodts request that the briefing be deferred "[u]ntil this matter is resolved."

\*/ At the same time, Licensee received two other related Aamodt pleadings -- an Addendum to earlier Aamodt comments on immediate effectiveness, filed with the Commission, and a motion filed with the Licensing Board seeking to reopen the record in this proceeding. The referenced Aamodt "motion of today to the Licensing Board" is a request to reopen the record in the reopened phase of the captioned proceeding. Licensee will be responding to that motion, and will oppose it. At this juncture, to defer all further briefing on all management exceptions pending resolution of the motion to reopen would be truly extraordinary.

Licensee in its Answers of September 8 to recent TMIA motions to defer the instant briefing schedule on exceptions and to extend that briefing schedule has emphasized the potential impact of the Appeal Board's review process on the timing of TMI-1 restart. We must assume at this juncture, absent a Commission determination on immediate effectiveness of the Licensing Board's decisions, that the Appeal Board's review controls the restart schedule. With exceptions on other matters having already been briefed and argued to the Appeal Board, the management exceptions appear to control the Appeal Board's review schedule.

Despite the extraordinary remedy they seek and the import of that remedy, the Aamodts provide no justification at all for deferring the management exceptions briefing schedule. It is particularly noteworthy that no reason is even asserted why the briefing of existing exceptions should not proceed regardless of the prospects for reopening. The Aamodts' Motion is silent as to how their ability to brief their already existing 225 management exceptions is hampered by awaiting resolution of the motion to reopen. Nor do the prospects that the record

- 2 -

actually will be reopened appear very real. The burden on a party seeking to reopen the record in a case where, as here, the initial decision has already been rendered, is heavy. See, e.g., Kansas Gas and Electric Company, et al. (Wolf Creek Generating Station, Unit No. 1), ALAB-462, 7 N.R.C. 320, 338 (1978); Public Service Company of Oklahoma, et al. (Black Fox Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-573, 10 N.R.C. 775, 804 (1979). The Aamodts' motion to reopen, Licensee will argue, falls considerably short of meeting that test. On the face of the very document upon which the Aamodts rely, it appears that their request stems from an incident attributable to a single individual's practices, detected by Licensee itself and reported by Licensee to the NRC whose subsequent inspection disclosed that the practice did not represent conditions elsewhere in Licensee's training sections and that Licensee took adequate corrective action as a result of the incident. See Attachment 1 to Aamodt Motion.

On the basis of the above, Licensee opposes the Aamodt request to defer briefing of all management-related exceptions until a pending Aamodt request to reopen the record is resolved, which request is yet to be answered or considered.

Respectfully submitted,

SHAW, PITTMAN, POTTS & TROWBRIDGE 1800 M Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036 (202) 822-1000

By: Ernest L. Blake, Jr.

Counsel for Licensee

- 3 -

# UNITED STATES OF AMERICA NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

## Before the Atomic Safety and Licensing Appeal Board

In the Matter of )			
METROPOLITAN EDISON COMPANY	Docket No. 50-289 SP		
(Three Mile Island Nuclear ) Station, Unit No. 1)	(Restart)		

#### CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing LICENSEE'S ANSWER TO AAMODT MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE BRIEF was served this 9th day of September, 1982, by hand delivery to those persons on the attached Service List designated by an asterisk (\*) preceding their names, and by deposit in the United States mail, postage prepaid, addressed to all other persons on the attached Service List.

Ernest L. Blake, Jr.

## UNITED STATES OF AMERICA NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

### Before the Atomic Safety and Licensing Appeal Board

In the Matter of METROPOLITAN EDISON COMPANY (Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit No. 1)

Docket No. 50-289 SP (Restart)

### SERVICE LIST

\* Administrative Judge Gary J. Edles, Chairman Atomic Safety & Licensing Appeal Board U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, D.C. 20555

\* Administrative Judge John H. Buck Atomic Safety & Licensing Appeal Board U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, D.C. 20555

\* Administrative Judge Christine N. Kohl Atomic Safety & Licensing Appeal Board U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, D.C. 20555

Jack R. Goldberg, Esquire (4) Office of the Executive Legal Director U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, D.C. 20555

Docketing & Service Section (3) Robert Adler, Esquire Office of the Secretary U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, D.C. 20555

Administrative Judge Ivan W. Smith, Chairman Atomic Safety & Licensing Board U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, D.C. 20555

Administrative Judge Walter H. Jordan Atomic Safety & Licensing Board 881 West Outer Drive Oak Ridge, TN 37830

Administrative Judge Linda W. Little Atomic Safety & Licensing Board 5000 Hermitage Drive Raleigh, NC 27612

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

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

Karin W. Carter, Esquire Assistant Attorneys General 505 Executive House Post Office Box 2357 Harrisburg, PA 17120

John A. Levin, Esquire Assistant Counsel Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission Post Office Box 3265 Harrisburg, PA 17120

Mr. Henry D. Hukill Vice President GPU Nuclear Corporation Post Office Box 480 Middletown, PA 17057

Michael F. McBride, Esquire LeBouef, Lamb, Leiby & MacRae 1333 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W. Suite 1100 Washington, D.C. 20036

Ms. Louise Bradford TMI ALERT 1011 Green Street Harrisburg, PA 17102

Mr. Norman Aamodt R. D. 5 Coatesville, PA 19320

John Clewett, Esquire The Christic Institute 1324 North Capitol Street Washington, D.C. 20002

Michael W. Maupin, Esquire Hunton & Williams 707 East Main Street Post Office Box 1535 Richmond, VA 23212 Ms. Gail Phelps ANGRY/TMI PIRC 1037 Maclay Street Harrisburg, PA 17103

Jordan D. Cunningham, Esquire Fox, Farr & Cunningham 2320 North Second Street Harrisburg, PA 17110

Ellyn R. Weiss, Esquire (1) William S. Jordan, III, Esquire(1) Harmon & Weiss 1725 Eye Street, N.W., Suite 506 Washington, D.C. 20006

Mr. Steven C. Sholly Union of Concerned Scientists 1346 Connecticut Avenue, N.W. Dupont Circle Bldg., Suite 1101 Washington, D.C. 20036

Chauncey Kepford Judith H. Johnsrud Environmental Coalition on Nuclear Power 433 Orlando Avenue State College, PA 16801

David E. Cole, Esquire Smith & Smith, P.C. 2931 Front Street Harrisburg, PA 17110