

13682

WINSTON & STRAWN

FREDERICK H. WINSTON (1855-1888)
SILAS H. STRAWN (1891-1948)

1400 L STREET, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3502

(202) 371-5700

FACSIMILE (202) 371-5950

WRITER'S DIRECT DIAL NUMBER

(202) 371-5726

DOCKETED
USNRC

'93 MAR -5 P4 12

CHICAGO OFFICE
25 WEST WACKER DRIVE
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60601
(312) 558-5900

NEW YORK OFFICE
175 WATER STREET
NEW YORK, NY 10038-4881
(212) 269-2500

OFFICE OF SECRETARY
DOCKETING & SERVICE
BRANCH

March 4, 1993

BY FACSIMILE

Charles Bechhoefer, Chairman
Administrative Judge
Atomic Safety and Licensing
Board
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory
Commission
Washington, DC 20555

Frederick J. Shon
Administrative Judge
Atomic Safety and Licensing
Board
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory
Commission
Washington, DC 20555

Jerry R. Kline
Administrative Judge
Atomic Safety and Licensing
Board
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory
Commission
Washington, DC 20555

Re: Pacific Gas and Electric Co. (Diablo Canyon Nuclear
Power Plant, Units 1 and 2), Docket Nos. 50-275-
OLA, 50-323-OLA (Construction Period Recapture)

Dear Administrative Judges:

Late yesterday we received by facsimile a copy of the "San Luis Obispo Mothers for Peace Reply to PG&E's Preliminary Response and Motion for Protective Order" ("Reply"). The Reply relates to PG&E's February 12, 1993 Motion. PG&E notes that under the NRC's regulations, 10 C.F.R. § 2.730(c), PG&E does not have a right to respond to the Reply, except as may be granted by the Licensing Board. Accordingly, PG&E respectfully requests that the Licensing Board consider the following.

First, PG&E wishes to express some exasperation with the Mothers for Peace Reply. While acknowledging in the Reply, at 4, that the Mothers for Peace "may not [in this proceeding] challenge the 'generic' wisdom of the type of compensatory measures chosen by NRC as an interim substitute for an effective fire barrier," the Reply seems to argue for just that. The Mothers for Peace ignore that this issue has been previously resolved by the Licensing Board. See Memorandum and Order (Discovery and Hearing Schedules),

9303110156 930304
PDR ADOCK 05000275
G PDR

0503

March 4, 1993

Page 2

February 9, 1993, at 2 ("the adequacy of the licensee's adherence to interim measures [is] all that [is] in issue").

Second, PG&E wishes to clarify a factual misperception in the Mothers for Peace Reply. In the Reply, at 2, the Mothers for Peace imply that PG&E will not allow the requested site visit to extend to the "five representative areas" selected by the Mothers for Peace. This is not PG&E's position. The five areas selected are indeed Thermo-Lag fire areas and may be the focus of the site visit. PG&E's position is that in these areas, as in any other Thermo-Lag areas, the inspection is to be limited to implementation of the interim compensatory measures (i.e., fire watches). PG&E had communicated this clarification directly to the Mothers' technical consultants, and mutual planning for the visit has been progressing.

Very truly yours,


David A. Repka

Counsel for Pacific Gas &
Electric Company

cc: Service List