March 11, 1985

USNAC

#### UNITED STATES OF AMERICA NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

785 MIR 13 ATO:17

OFFICE OF SECRETARY DOCKETING & SERVICE

BEFORE THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD

In the Matter of	
THE CLEVELAND ELECTRIC  ILLUMINATING COMPANY, ET AL.	Docket Nos. 50-440 0 2 50-441 0 2
(Perry Nuclear Power Plant, ) Units 1 and 2)	

APPLICANTS' ANSWER TO OCRE MOTION FOR LEAVE TO RESPOND TO APPLICANTS' ANSWER TO OCRE'S MOTION FOR THE APPOINTMENT OF BOARD WITNESS

On March 4, 1985, Ohio Citizens for Responsible Energy ("OCRE") filed a motion requesting that the Licensing Board allow it to respond to Applicants' Answer to OCRE's Motion for the Appointment of Board Witness which Applicants filed on February 26, 1985. OCRE's Motion is accompanied by its proposed Response. OCRE's request is based on the assertion that "Applicants have raised new arguments and cited cases which were not addressed in OCRE's Motion." Applicants oppose OCRE's Motion and request that it be denied.

Section 2.730(c) of the NRC Rules of Practice provides as follows:

Within ten (10) days after service of a written motion, or such other period as the Secretary or the Assistant Secretary or presiding officer may prescribe, a party

D503

may file an answer in support of or in opposition to the motion, accompanied by affidavits or other evidence. However, the staff may file such an answer within fifteen (15) days after service of a written motion. The moving party shall have no right to reply, except as permitted by the presiding officer or the Secretary or the Assistant Secretary (emphasis added).

Thus, as the moving party, OCRE has no <u>right</u> of reply under the NRC Rules of Practice.

By Order of August 4, 1981, the Licensing Board required that any intervenor in this proceeding who moves to add a late contention must reply to Applicants' and the NRC staff's responses. 1/No similar requirement has been issued by the Board as to any other type of motion.

It was, therefore, incumbent upon OCRE to make its best argument in its Motion. OCRE knew it had no right of reply following Applicants' and the NRC staff's Responses concerning a contention which has already been admitted. In any event, OCRE's Response does not add to the arguments or applicable precedent before the Licensing Board. Nor does OCRE present any new information or arguments that could not have been made in its initial filing.

<sup>1/</sup> In its Memorandum and Order of October 6, 1982, LBP-82-89, 16 NRC 1355 (1982), the Board then stated that it would permit Applicants to respond when an intervenor made new factual or legal arguments in their response to Applicants' or the NRC staff's answer to a proposed late-filed contention.

If the Licensing Board grants OCRE leave to respond, then both the Applicants and the NRC staff may, in turn, seek leave to respond to OCRE's response. The initiation of any further filings will only dilute the relevant issues and make the entire process more cumbersome for both the Board and the parties involved. 2/ Applicants, therefore, respectfully request that the Board deny OCRE's Motion for Leave to Respond.

Respectfully submitted,
SHAW, PITTMAN, POTTS & TROWBRIDGE

By: Rose Cenn Sullwan

Jay E. Silberg, P.C. Rose Ann Sullivan Counsel for Applicants

1800 M Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036 (202) 822-1000

DATED: March 11, 1985

Z/ The "NRC Staff Response in Opposition to OCRE Motion for Appointment of Board Witness on Issue 16" was filed on the same date as OCRE's Motion for Leave to Respond. There is, therefore, the possibility that OCRE will be filing yet another motion for leave to respond to the NRC staff's Response on this issue.

### UNITED STATES OF AMERICA NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

## BEFORE THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD

In the Matter of		
THE CLEVELAND ELECTRIC  ILLUMINATING COMPANY, ET AL.	Docket Nos.	50-440 50-441
(Perry Nuclear Power Plant, ) Units 1 and 2)		

# CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

This is to certify that copies of the foregoing APPLICANTS' ANSWER TO OCRE MOTION FOR LEAVE TO RESPOND TO APPLICANTS' ANSWER TO OCRE'S MOTION FOR THE APPOINTMENT OF BOARD WITNESS was served by deposit in the United States Mail, first class, postage prepaid, this 11th day of March, 1985, to all those on the attached Service List.

Rose Ann Sullivan

### UNITED STATES OF AMERICA NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

## BEFORE THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD

In the Matter of			
THE CLEVELAND ELECTRIC  ILLUMINATING COMPANY, ET AL.	Docket	Nos.	50-440 50-441
(Perry Nuclear Power Plant, ) Units 1 and 2)			

## SERVICE LIST

James P. Gleason, Chairman 513 Gilmoure Drive Silver Spring, Maryland 20901

Mr. Jerry R. Kline
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

Mr. Glenn O. Bright
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

Alan S. Rosenthal, Chairman Atomic Safety and Licensing Appeal Board U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, D.C. 20555

Dr. W. Reed Johnson
Atomic Safety and Licensing
Appeal Board
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

Gary J. Edles, Esquire
Atomic Safety and Licensing
Appeal Board
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

John G. Cardinal, Esquire Prosecuting Attorney Ashtabula County Courthouse Jefferson, Ohio 44047 Atomic Safety and Licensing
Appeal Board Panel
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

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

Colleen P. Woodhead, Esquire
Office of the Executive Legal
Director
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

Terry Lodge, Esquire Suite 105 618 N. Michigan Street Toledo, Ohio 43624

Donald T. Ezzone, Esquire
Assistant Prosecuting Attorney
Lake County Administration
Center
105 Center Street
Painesville, Ohio 44077

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

Ms. Sue Hiatt 8275 Munson Avenue Mentor, Ohio 44060