

COMMITTEE TO BRIDGE THE GAP

DOCKETED
USNRC

1637 BUTLER AVENUE #203
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90025
(213) 478-0829

'84 JAN -9 P1:14

as from: Box 1186
Ben Lomond, CA 95005
(408) 336-5381
January 5, 1984

OFFICE OF SECRETARY
DOCKETING & SERVICE

John H. Frye III
Chairman
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

by express mail

RE: UCLA Reactor Proceeding, Docket 50-142

Dear Judge Frye:

The Board has directed CBG to conduct an independent in-depth technical analysis of the UCLA testimony on the shutdown mechanism, including the supplement thereto.

In order to perform that review, CBG requested in November that UCLA provide it with certain documents and materials, primarily related to the structure of core internals, cooling system functions, and void coefficient and water level variation data. Among the materials requested were drawings and photographs of the core internals that were first requested in your letter to UCLA of April 25 but not provided.

As you know by the correspondence exchanged, numerous disputes arose between CBG and UCLA as to the many delays in providing the requested materials. These delays extended many weeks, frustrating our ability to complete the review you had requested. For that reason, we informed UCLA that we would request a conference call with the presiding officer of the Board to attempt to resolve the disputes about the delays in providing the needed material.

We requested the conference call, but were told that Mr. Cormier had informed Ms. Kagan that he would be unavailable for the next several days. CBG was informed that all that could be done therefore was provide an extension in responding to the Shutdown Analysis of UCLA if the delays in providing us with the material necessary for completion of our review made meeting the January 9 date impossible, particularly given the difficulty of getting materials to witnesses over the holidays.

Copies of the requested materials were not finally provided until Christmas week, making completion of the review by next Monday unlikely. We therefore request a week's extension; we will serve the review by express mail, so little real delay should result.

8401100211 840105
PDR ADCK 05000142
G PDR

DS03

This remedy to the delays occasioned by the weeks of foot-dragging in providing us the needed materials provides little relief because, as has been so often repeated in this proceeding, delays reward the Applicant so long as the facility is permitted to continue to operate. You should receive shortly a motion from us requesting that that incentive for delay be removed.

Respectfully submitted,


Daniel Hirsch

cc: service list