

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Before Administrative Judges:

Peter B. Bloch, Chairman
Dr. Kenneth A. McCollom
Dr. Walter H. Jordan

DOCKETED
USNRC

'85 JUN 13 A10:39

In the Matter of

TEXAS UTILITIES ELECTRIC COMPANY, et al.

(Comanche Peak Steam Electric Station,
Units 1 and 2)

OFFICE OF SECRETARY
DOCKETING & SERVICE
Docket Nos. 50-446-OL-2
50-446-OL & OL-2

ASLBP No. 79-430-06 OL

June 12, 1984

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

SERVED JUN 13 1985

MEMORANDUM
(REQUEST FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME)

Applicants' Motion to Extend Time (for filing Current Management Views), filed June 10, 1985, has been opposed by CASE in two filings, filed on June 10 and June 11.

CASE questions whether Applicants need for additional time is based on a misrepresentation about when a two-day meeting with Staff was scheduled, whether Applicants have presented reasons for delaying their filing before the Board or whether they were more properly addressed to the Staff in order to obtain a delay of the Staff meeting, whether Applicants have sought an unfair procedural advantage by delaying filing the request until the last moment, and whether the Staff can appropriately meet with Applicants to consider a program plan that does not also include the substance of the requested Current Management Views.

However, we see little reason for CASE or the Board to be so concerned about these details under present circumstances. To the extent that the Current Management Views may be relevant to pending Staff actions, it is within the discretion of the Staff whether or not to act before reviewing those views --it is not up to the Board to direct Staff policy. We expect the Staff meeting to be transcribed and

8506170359 850612
PDR ADOCK 05000445
PDR

D502

to be of possible use in this proceeding. The discussion with Staff may help to provide a context within which to consider the Current Management Views.

The Current Management Views may be important because they will reflect management's knowledge and skill in understanding and coping with current problems. What we desire is a snapshot, supplemented as important changes in management perception occur. Although we would be distressed by a substantial delay in receiving management's first report, we sympathize with the need for a two week delay in which to incorporate a thoughtful response to SSER 11. We would, however, be very unlikely to permit further delay.

O R D E R

For all the foregoing reasons and based on consideration of the entire record in this matter, it is this 12th day of June 1985

ORDERED:

Texas Utilities Electric Company, et al. (Applicants), shall deliver their Current Management Views to the service list, in compliance with our May 24 Order, by June 28, 1985.

Applicants' Current Management Views shall be updated thereafter whenever necessary to reflect substantial changes in the facts or opinions filed before this Board.

FOR THE
ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARDS


Peter B. Bloch, Chairman
ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE

Bethesda, Maryland

416.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

DOCKETED
USNRC

85 JUN 13 10:39

Before Administrative Judges:

Peter B. Bloch, Chairman
Dr. Kenneth A. McCollom
Dr. Walter H. Jordan

OFFICE OF SECRETARY
DOCKETING & SERVICE
BRANCH

In the Matter of

TEXAS UTILITIES ELECTRIC COMPANY, et al.

(Comanche Peak Steam Electric Station,
Units 1 and 2)

Docket Nos. 50-445-OL & OL-2
50-446-OL & OL-2

ASLBP No. 79-430-06 OL

June 12, 1985

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

SERVED JUN 13 1985

MEMORANDUM
(REQUEST FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME)

Applicants' Motion to Extend Time (for filing Current Management Views), filed June 10, 1985, has been opposed by CASE in two filings, filed on June 10 and June 11.

CASE questions whether Applicants need for additional time is based on a misrepresentation about when a two-day meeting with Staff was scheduled, whether Applicants have presented reasons for delaying their filing before the Board or whether they were more properly addressed to the Staff in order to obtain a delay of the Staff meeting, whether Applicants have sought an unfair procedural advantage by delaying filing the request until the last moment, and whether the Staff can appropriately meet with Applicants to consider a program plan that does not also include the substance of the requested Current Management Views.

However, we see little reason for CASE or the Board to be so concerned about these details under present circumstances. To the extent that the Current Management Views may be relevant to pending Staff actions, it is within the discretion of the Staff whether or not to act before reviewing those views --it is not up to the Board to direct Staff policy. We expect the Staff meeting to be transcribed and

DS02