UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555

22

liovember 14, 1983

OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER

MEMORANDUM FOR:	Herzel H.E. Plaine, OGC Guy H. Cunninghan, ELD			
FROM:	James K. Asselstine			
SUBJECT:	DIABLO CANYON - SECY 83-377			

In Secy 83-377, OGC stated that OGC and ELD were going to work out informally the issue of what the Commission should do to deal with "complicating effects of earthquakes on emergency planning." I agreed with that approach but asked for a status report from OGC and ELD. I would like to know by November 30, 1983 what you intend to recommend.

cc: Chairman Palladino Commissioner Gilinsky Commissioner Roberts Commissioner Bernthal SECY -OPE

8502090507 840717 PDR FOIA BELL84-378 PD PDR

NOTATION VOTE

RESPONSE SHEET

TO: SAMUEL J. CHILK, SECRETARY OF THE COMMISSION

FROM: COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE

SUBJECT: SECY-83-377 - REVIEW OF ALAB-728 (PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY, DOCKET NOS. 50-275, 50-323 OL)

APPROVED XXXXX	DISAPPROVED	ABSTAIN
NOT PARTICIPATING	REQUEST	DISCUSSION

COMMENTS:

. .

I would like a report from OGC and ELD by September 15 on what approach the Commission should take to deal with the issue of "complicating effects of earthquakes on emergency planning."

RE 83

3 21

SECRETARIAT NOTE:

PLEASE ALSO RESPOND TO AND/OR COMMENT ON OGC/OPE MEMORANDUM IF ONE HAS BEEN ISSUED ON THIS PAPER.

NRC-SECY FORM DEC. 80

NOTATION VOTE

RESPONSE SHEET

AMENDED

23 3

TO: SAMUEL J. CHILK, SECRETARY OF THE COMMISSION

FROM: COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE

SUBJECT: SECY 83-377 - REVIEW OF ALAB-728 (PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY, DOCKET NOS. 50-275,50-323 OL)

APPR	ROVED_	SEE	BELOW	I	DISAPPROVE	D_SEE B	FLOW	ABSTAIN	
NOT	PARTI	CIP!	ATING_		R	EQUEST	DISCUS	SION	

COMMENTS: Approved in part, disapproved in part.

I AGREE WITH COMMISSIONER GILINSKY'S SEPARATE VIEWS ON THE CLASS 9 ACCIDENTS.ISSUE. THE LICENSING BOARD HAS DEFINED "SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES" OUT OF EXISTENCE, AND THE COMMISSION SHOULD HAVE CORRECTED THIS MISTAKEN INTERPRETATION OF COMMISSION POLICY.

I ALSO AGREE THAT WE MUST DO SOMETHING ABOUT THE "COMPLICATING EFFECTS OF EARTH-QUAKES ON EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS." I AM STILL AWAITING OGC & ELD'S RECOMMENDATION ON THIS ISSUE.

SIGNATURE. 11-29-83 DATE

SECRETARIAT NOTE:

PLEASE ALSO RESPOND TO AND/OR COMMENT ON OGC/OPE MEMORANDUM IF ONE HAS BEEN ISSUED ON THIS PAPER.

NRC-SECY FORM DEC. 80



UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

November 30, 1983

MEMORANDUM FOR:

Commissioner Asselstine

Guy H. Cunningham, III FROM: Executive Legal Director

THRU:

William J. Dircks Executive Director for Operations

SUBJECT: CONSIDERATION OF COMPLICATING EFFECTS OF EARTHQUAKES ON EMERGENCY PLANNING

In your Memorandum of November 14, 1983, you inquired about the ongoing efforts concerning consideration of the complicating effects of earthquakes on emergency planning.

The Staff is presently developing a Memorandum for the Commission which will provide an analysis of the matter supplemental to the Memorandum from Mr. Dircks to the Commissioners, dated June 22, 1982. Completion of this paper is anticipated within the rext few weeks. It is expected that the Staff will continue to recommend that consideration of the potentially complicating effects of earthquakes in the context of emergency planning is not necessary given the level of planning already required by the Commission's regulations and, thus, no change to the regulations is warranted.

Guy H. Cunningham, III Executive Legal Director

cc: Chairman Palladino Commissioner Gilinsky Commissioner Roberts Commissioner Bernthal OGC SECY OPE

AFFIRMATION

RESPONSE SHEET

TO: SAMUEL J. CHILK, SECRETARY OF THE COMMISSION

FROM: COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE

SUBJECT: SECY-84-70 - CONSIDERATION OF THE COMPLICATING EFFECTS OF EARTHQUAKES ON EMERGENCY PLANNING AT DIABLO CANYON

AS RODIFIED

APPROVED______ DISAPPROVED______ ABSTAIN______ NOT PARTICIPATING______ REQUEST DISCUSSION______

COMMENTS:

URE 28-84 DATE

34

SECRETARIAT NOTE: PLEASE ALSO RESPOND TO AND/OR COMMENT ON OGC/OPE MEMORANDUM IF ONE HAS BEEN ISSUED ON THIS PAPER.

NRC-SECY FORM DEC. 80

- if the answer to (1) or (2) is yes, then the following issues would also be relevant for this case:
 - (a) the substantive review criteria that should be employed; and
 - (b) the necessity for public participation in the review of this matter, including the scope of formal hearings, if any, that should be held.

The Commission notes that any requirement for further hearings would net necessarily require that interim operation of the plant be stayed. The stay determination, if and when it is presented, will be a matter for the equitable discretion of the Commission or Appeal Board. <u>See e.g., Public Service Company of New Hampshire</u> (Seabrook Station, Units 1 and 2), CLI-77-8, 5 NRC 503 (1977). Parties need not address the stay question at this time.

All parties must respond to the questions outlined above within 15 days of the date of this Order to ensure consideration by the Commission.

It is so ORDERED.

For the Commission

SAMUEL J. CHILK Secretary of the Commission

Dated at Washington, D.C.

this day of February, 1984.

3