

651



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

RELATED CORRESPONDENCE

June 29, 1985

DOCKETED
USNRC

Anthony Z. Roisman, Esq.
Executive Director
Trial Lawyers for Public Justice
Suite 611
2000 P Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

'85 JUL -2 AIO:42

OFFICE OF SECRETARY
DOCKETING & SERVICE
BRANCH

In the Matter of
TEXAS UTILITIES GENERATING COMPANY
(Comanche Peak Steam Electric Station, Units 1 and 2)
Docket Nos. 50-445-2 and 50-446-2

Dear Mr. Roisman:

Our Second Reply to CASE's Request for Admissions was issued June 7, 1985, relating to matters covered SSER 10. An advance copy of SSER 10 was provided to your client, the Applicants and to the Board on May 17, 1985 and SSER 10 was issued for general distribution during the week of May 20, 1985. Our Second Reply was filed within 20 days of May 17, 1985. The complaint in your letter of June 24, 1985 that Second Reply was "woefully behind schedule" is misplaced.


Our Third reply relates to matters covered by SSER 11. SSER 11 was issued for general distribution on June 7, 1985; your client, the Applicant and the Board were provided advance copies on June 4, 1985. This reply covers some 92 requests for admissions. When we recognized that we were not able to complete it on June 27, 1985, late in the afternoon Mr. Berry called you, as a courtesy to counsel, to inform you that we would complete all or all but five on June 28, 1985 and, if we were not able to complete all, the remaining five would be separately issued on July 1, 1985. You were not in your office at that time. Mr. Berry saw you today and indicated our probable need to extend until Monday, July 1, 1985 our Third Reply and indicated to me that you were quite cooperative and agreed. I thank you. However, it will not be necessary to delay our response to 87 of the requests for admission until Monday. Accordingly, we have today filed our response to 87 of the requests relating to QA matters.

8507030630 850629
PDR ADOCK 05000445
G PDR

DS07

I consider our commitment to use our best efforts to complete our reply to CASE's request for admissions within 20 days to be, at this stage, a matter among counsel. That does not detract from its importance. For this reason we attempted to inform you that despite our best efforts we would require an additional day. I do not consider this to be at odds with our commitment and I certainly do not consider an additional day "woefully behind schedule."

Sincerely,



Joseph Scinto
Deputy Chief Hearing Counsel
Office of the Executive Legal Director

cc: Robert Woolridge, Esq.