

UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD PANEL WASHINGTON D.C. 20555

July 12, 1984

'84 JUL 13 P1:33

DOCKETING & SERVICE BRANCH

USNRC

Robert G. Perlis, Esq. Counsel for NRC Staff Office of the Executive Legal Director U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, P.C. 20555

SERVED JUL 1.3 1984

Re: . Georgia Power Company, et al. (Vogtle Electric Generating Plant, Units 1 and 2) Docket Nos. 50-424 and 50-425 02

Dear Mr. Perlis:

We are in the process of reviewing the proposed contentions in the captioned proceeding. Our particular concern is with Joint Contention 5, which challenges the seismic design adequacy of the Vogtle facility. We note in your filed response of May 14, 1984, to the proposed contentions, at page 11 you state, "No substantial new information to lead to a redetermination of the seismic design is provided."

To date no one in the proceeding has mentioned Board Notification -USGS Position On The Charleston Earthquake (Board Notification 82-122A). of December 30, 1982, which recommended follow-up action. A study resulted entitled NUREG/CR-3756, Seismic Hazard Clarification of the Eastern United States: Methodology and Interim Results for Ten Sites (April 1984). One of the ten sites discussed is the Vogtle Site (NUREG/3756, page 168 et seq.). We are unaware of any other action that has resulted from the Board Notification.

The Board Notification and the follow-up report and the possibility of further action raises the question as to whether this constitutes "substantial new information" and what affect, if any, it has on the position Staff takes on the proposed contention.

We would appreciate any explanatory response you wish to make. within the next ten days. Other participants to the proceeding will receive a copy of this letter and are being given the opportunity to comment within the same time frame.

math B Magelos

Morton B. Margulies, Chairman ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE

cc: All Parties on Service List

