UNITED STATES OF AMERICA NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

DOCKETED

BLFORE	THE	ETUPITO	SHIEII	FIND	TI CEN SING	FEFFEEL	-9 -9	M1 .EE
Petter				1				
OLITAN		SON COM	PANY)	Docket	50-289	OFFICE OF SECR SPOCKETING & SE DRANCH	ETARY
Mile I)	(Ales (A1 0)		

AAMODT RESPONSE TO TMLA MOTIONS (9/1/82) (TO EXTEND TIME AND PAGE LIMITS OF BRIEF)

We stated to TMIA's representative, Louise Bradford, in response to her telephone call last week, that we have no objection to an extension of the time to file briefs until September 30, 1982. Ms. Bradford plans to initiate a conference call among the parties on Tuesday afternoon.

She stated that the only subject of this call would be the TMIA motion to extend the time to file briefs until September 30.

We could see no reason to be included in this conference call.

We take no position on TMIA's request for a waiver of the page limit. We make no such request for ourselves.

We received a call from the Appeal Board concerning a division of effort among the intervenors in order to retain the page limit and avoid repetitious arguments. We have studied THIE Proposed Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Lew on Issues Raised in Reopened TMI-1 Restart Proceeding, filed January 15, 1982. We note that TMIE took a different position than we did on the

B209130265 B20906 PDR ADDCK 05000289 G PDR

\$63

conduct of the proceeding, the extent of chesting, the conduct of the NRC investigation and Ideensee's investigation, the involvement of management in cheating, and proposed no findings on the Ross issues the TMI training program, the NRC examination, or the attitudes of the operators. Although TMIA's later position, following Judge Milhollin's report, is closer to ours (Aamodt Findings, January 18, 20 and March 4, 1982), we have no assurance that TMIA's representative would represent our interests. We would, prefer, therefore, to accommodate the Appeal Board by briefing all our exceptions within the page limitation. If, however, the Appeal Board waivers the page limitation for TMIA, we believe the opportunity for an extension should be granted to all parties.

Respectfully submitted,

Me Camoll

September 6, 1982

Parjorie M. Aamodt