

RAS 2187

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**  
**NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

**Title: TELECONFERENCE TO DISCUSS THE MATTER  
OF GRAYSTAR, INC.**

**Docket No.: SSD-99-27**

**Location: Rockville, MD**

**Date: Thursday, September 7, 2000**

**Pages: 58 - 80**

**ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, LTD.**  
1025 Connecticut Ave., N.W., Suite 1014  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
(202) 842-0034

Template = SECY-032

SECY-02



## 1 APPEARANCES:

2

3

## FOR THE NRC STAFF:

4

5

John Hull, OGC

6

John Hickey, NMSS

7

Fritz Sturz, NMSS

8

John Jankovich, NMSS

9

## 10 FOR THE APPLICANT:

11

12

Anthony Thompson, Esquire

13

David Lashaway, Esquire

14

Bill Holloway, Esquire

15

Shaw, Pittman, Potts &amp; Trowbridge

16

Washington, D.C.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, LTD.  
Court Reporters  
1025 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 1014  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
(202) 842-0034

## P R O C E E D I N G S

[10:00 a.m.]

1  
2  
3 JUDGE YOUNG: Good morning. This conference call  
4 is convened in the matter of GrayStar, Inc. Why don't we  
5 all introduce ourselves for the record?

6 I am Judge Young, and Judge Tom Murphy of the  
7 Board is also present.

8 MR. HULL: This is John Hull of the NRC staff.  
9 With me are John Hickey, Fritz Sturz and John Jankovich of  
10 NMSS.

11 MR. THOMPSON: Your Honor, this is Tony Thompson  
12 of Shaw, Pittman and with me are David Lashaway and Bill  
13 Holloway.

14 JUDGE YOUNG: Okay, Mr. Thompson, you initiated  
15 the call, so why don't you go ahead?

16 MR. THOMPSON: Thank you, Your Honor.

17 Your Honor, assuming arguendo Part 36 applies, --  
18 don't think that we aren't going to address all of the  
19 issues that are set forth in your order, because we are --  
20 we are working on that, and plan to respond to all those.  
21 But we just thought it would be, it would make more sense if  
22 both parties addressed this issue, rather than I us just  
23 putting it in and raising it without alerting NRC staff so  
24 that we can both address it and then, depending upon what we  
25 say, have the opportunity to respond to what the others have

1 filed, each other have filed.

2 JUDGE YOUNG: Okay. Let me just you, you are  
3 talking specifically about 36.21, that section? There is no  
4 other part of -- there is no other section in Part 36, or  
5 Section 36 that you are talking about, correct?

6 MR. HOLLOWAY: Judge, this is Holloway with Shaw  
7 Pittman. We are talking about two issues. One is the  
8 general applicability of Part 36, which excludes what are  
9 called Category 1 irradiators and includes Category 2, 3 and  
10 4 irradiators. That is in the statements of consideration  
11 for the final rule. And we have some question as a  
12 threshold matter as to whether Part 36 applies at all to  
13 this type of irradiator.

14 JUDGE YOUNG: Right. I understood that, but the  
15 only part of Part 36 that is at issue apart from the scope  
16 and so forth is the 36.21. There are no other sections in  
17 there that we are talking about ultimately, right?

18 MR. HOLLOWAY: I believe that that is our main  
19 focus, particular 36.21(a)(3).

20 JUDGE YOUNG: Okay. Which is sort of the  
21 threshold issue as a practical matter anyway.

22 MR. HULL: Judge Young, this is John Hull for the  
23 NRC staff. There are I think some other subsections in Part  
24 36 that we plan to say in our initial written presentation.  
25 So I don't know if it is entirely accurate to just focus on

1 36.21(a)(3).

2 MR. HOLLOWAY: Okay. And are those outside of  
3 36.21?

4 THE REPORTER: Who is that, please?

5 MR. HOLLOWAY: This is Bill Holloway.

6 MR. HULL: Well, I am not prepared right now to  
7 discuss the details of our presentation, it is still being  
8 worked on. But I do know that I think some other sections  
9 other than (a)(3) will be referenced.

10 JUDGE YOUNG: Let me just ask you, and this is  
11 sort of for everyone's benefit. I don't recall that  
12 anything other than 36.21 has come up prior to this point,  
13 any other part of Part 36, or any other section of Part 36.  
14 Am I correct?

15 MR. HULL: To date, I think you are correct, Your  
16 Honor.

17 JUDGE YOUNG: Okay. So, actually, I do want to  
18 hear what Mr. Thompson and Mr. Holloway, and Mr. Lashaway  
19 have to say about the basis for arguing that Part 36 doesn't  
20 apply. But once we get past that, I think it might be  
21 helpful, Mr. Hull, if you could give us an idea which other  
22 parts you are going to be talking about.

23 But at any rate, let's go ahead with Mr. Thompson  
24 or Mr. Holloway, whichever one of you want to continue when  
25 I interrupted earlier.

1 MR. LASHAWAY: I think, Judge -- this is David  
2 Lashaway from Shaw Pittman. I think Mr. Thompson basically  
3 characterized the issue that we would like to address as a  
4 threshold matter correctly. We are in the process, of  
5 course, of diligently preparing our responses to the order,  
6 primarily addressing issues that are addressed in 36.21.

7 We are very interested in hearing from Mr. Hull  
8 with respect to issues that may be raised outside of that,  
9 because at this point, we were prepared only to brief issues  
10 relating to that section.

11 But with respect to the threshold issue, I think,  
12 you know, our plan is to address the classification, the  
13 proper classification of the irradiator, and that is, as Mr.  
14 Holloway pointed out, whether or not the staff was correct  
15 in its assumption that this is a Class 2 or a Class 3  
16 irradiator, for that matter, and, therefore, Part 36  
17 applies.

18 We have some -- we feel that we have some very  
19 solid arguments supporting the fact that this may, in fact,  
20 properly be classified as a Class 1 irradiator, therefore,  
21 not subject to the requirements of Part 36. Not to say, of  
22 course, that the irradiator design does not incorporate all  
23 the public health and safety aspects that are discussed in  
24 Part 36. However, it is a question of law and the correct  
25 application of this section.

1           And, basically, we would like to have the  
2 opportunity to address that as a threshold matter. And we  
3 called the conference, and requested the conference, I  
4 should say, because we wanted to let the staff know, and you  
5 know, that we intended on making that presentation, because,  
6 as you know, Judge, we are doing simultaneous filings on the  
7 11th.

8           JUDGE YOUNG: Right.

9           MR. LASHAWAY: And we would like the staff to also  
10 address that issue if it has comment on that.

11           JUDGE YOUNG: Let me just ask you, Mr. Thompson I  
12 think made reference to a statement of consideration, which  
13 I don't think I have before you -- before me. What I have  
14 before me is subpart (a), the section in the actual Code of  
15 Federal Regulations. And I am looking at 36, Section 36.1,  
16 subsection (c). The regulations in this part do not apply  
17 to self-contained dry source storage irradiators, those in  
18 which both the source and the area are subject to  
19 irradiation or contained within a device and are not  
20 accessible by personnel.

21           Is that what you are referring to?

22           MR. HOLLOWAY: Judge, this is Bill Holloway. In  
23 addition to that, the statements of consideration that  
24 accompanied issuance of the final rule and, of course, we  
25 will discuss this in our filing, which came out in 1993 and

1 companion to this, the new regulations, specifically  
2 discusses that there are four categories of irradiators, and  
3 Part 36 only applies to Category 2, 3 and 4, and  
4 specifically does not apply to Category 1.

5 Therefore, we believe it is possible that this is  
6 a Category 1 irradiator. If that is, in fact, the case,  
7 then Part 36, including 36.21, doesn't apply.

8 JUDGE YOUNG: I guess the reason I asked that  
9 question is you are referring to a statement of  
10 consideration which is not before me, and I am assuming that  
11 a statement of consideration more or less fleshes out, or  
12 interprets the rule. And I am assuming from what you are  
13 saying that it would be interpreting subsection (c) of 36.1.

14 MR. HOLLOWAY: Yes, Judge, and specifically the  
15 statements of consideration I believe at 58 Federal Register  
16 7728, February 9th, 1993.

17 JUDGE YOUNG: 58 Federal Register 77 --

18 MR. HOLLOWAY: 28

19 JUDGE YOUNG: 28.

20 MR. HOLLOWAY: February 9th, 1993. And those are  
21 the statements by the Commission explaining what it is doing  
22 and what it means when it issues these regulations, because,  
23 as you know, the regulations often leave some interpretation  
24 in the way they are written, and in this case it is  
25 accompanied by quite a lengthy statement by the Commission

1 as to what its intent is.

2 JUDGE YOUNG: Okay. Thank you.

3 MR. HOLLOWAY: You're welcome.

4 MR. HICKEY: Your Honor, this is John Hickey for  
5 the technical staff. Could I add a comment, please?

6 JUDGE YOUNG: If there is no objection, sure, go  
7 ahead.

8 MR. HICKEY: I just also want to point out that it  
9 appears to me that 36.1(b) and the definitions in 36.2 are  
10 the panoramic irradiator are also relevant to what we just  
11 discussed, because they discuss what the regulation does  
12 apply to.

13 JUDGE YOUNG: Right. And thanks for bringing that  
14 out, because, obviously, I think it was Mr. Thompson, or Mr.  
15 Lashaway who said, I think it is good to get all these  
16 issues out sort of on the table at this point so they can  
17 all be addressed in the initial written presentation.

18 MR. THOMPSON: Yes, Your Honor. This is Tony  
19 Thompson. That was might thought on this, that it would be  
20 more efficient, given the fact that we are simultaneously  
21 filing, if we were all addressing all the same issues,  
22 rather than us raising this issue and then the staff  
23 responding to it. This way we get -- I think provide you  
24 and ourselves, and they, themselves, the staff, a better  
25 idea of what the views of the parties are on this issue and

1 how relevant it is.

2 JUDGE YOUNG: Right. Okay.

3 MR. HULL: Your Honor, this is John Hull for the  
4 staff. I assume that you received the letter that I  
5 e-mailed to you yesterday, it is dated September 6th, in  
6 which the staff identifies supplemental documents for the  
7 hearing file.

8 JUDGE YOUNG: Yes. And I also got the  
9 supplemental documents late yesterday as well.

10 MR. HULL: I had faxed a copy of this letter  
11 yesterday to David Lashaway, but did not have the  
12 supplemental documents in electronic form, so I don't know  
13 if they have all of these documents or not. The hard copies  
14 were mailed out to Shaw Pittman yesterday.

15 But a couple of these supplemental documents, and  
16 this is what really brought these documents to my attention,  
17 following my recent conversation with Dave Lashaway on this  
18 subject, I learned that there were some additional documents  
19 in the file that I was not aware of.

20 Some of these documents do pertain to this  
21 Category 1 versus Category 2 issue. And the staff's  
22 position on that is stated in the letter that was sent to  
23 Mr. Stein September 10 of '99, and that was in response to  
24 his --

25 JUDGE YOUNG: Hold on one second. Mr. Johnson,

1 Lashaway and Holloway, do you have the letter that Mr. Hull  
2 is referring to?

3 MR. LASHAWAY: We received Mr. Hull's fax. Thank  
4 you, John, for sending it yesterday via facsimile. As you  
5 know, it takes quite a few days to get things via mail. We  
6 do have the fax, we received it late last evening, and we do  
7 not have all the supplemental documents.

8 We have called the client this morning to ask  
9 whether or not they have copies that they can provide us  
10 with, particularly the letter that Mr. Hull is referencing,  
11 and that is the September 10th, 1999 letter.

12 THE REPORTER: Who was that, please?

13 MR. LASHAWAY: This is Mr. Lashaway.

14 JUDGE YOUNG: Let me see if I --

15 MR. HULL: Your Honor, as I was saying, --

16 JUDGE YOUNG: Hold on, Mr. Hull, I just want to  
17 get myself to the September 10th letter. And it might be  
18 fairly short, it might be helpful for you to describe it or  
19 even read it so that everyone knows what you are talking  
20 about.

21 MR. HULL: Okay. Hold on just a second.

22 JUDGE YOUNG: Actually, while you are looking for  
23 it, I will go ahead and read it.

24 MR. HULL: I have got it here, Your Honor. The  
25 second paragraph of the letter appears to address the issue.

1 I will just read it. It says -- this is a letter to Mr.  
2 Stein from John Jankovich, dated September 10 of 1999.  
3 Paragraph 2 states, "You requested that the classification  
4 of the GrayStar Model 1 irradiator be modified from Category  
5 2 to Category 1, as defined in ANSI 43.10. We continue to  
6 maintain that the design of the GrayStar Model 1 fits the  
7 definition of Category 2 in ANSI 43.10, as well as the  
8 definition of 'panoramic dry source storage irradiator' in  
9 10 CFR 36.2. Therefore, we ask you to proceed in developing  
10 your response to our questions in terms of such a  
11 classification. You may request exemptions under 10 CFR  
12 36.17 from those parts of the regulations which do not apply  
13 to your specific design."

14 The staff's position has not changed since that,  
15 and we continue to hold that both the Model GS 42 sealed  
16 source, as well as the Model 1 irradiator, would fall under  
17 Category 2 and, thus, be subject to the Part 36 regulations.

18 JUDGE YOUNG: Thank you. I guess the only real  
19 function for this conference -- now I shouldn't say only,  
20 the important function for this conference is to make sure  
21 that everything is on the table so that it can all be  
22 addressed in the written presentations.

23 If there are any other things that anyone would  
24 like to bring up, of course, that is fine, but on the  
25 specific purpose of getting everything out, so to speak, is

1 there anything else, Mr. Thompson, et al.? And then after  
2 that I would like to ask, Mr. Hull, if maybe you could  
3 address the issue of any additional sections in Part 36 that  
4 might be relevant.

5 MR. THOMPSON: Your Honor, this is Mr. Thompson.  
6 Can I -- Tony Thompson. Can I just have one second here to  
7 confer with my colleagues?

8 JUDGE YOUNG: Okay.

9 [Discussion off the record.]

10 MR. THOMPSON: Okay. Your Honor, this is Tony  
11 Thompson. I think that we, as we understand it, we are  
12 talking about raising the general applicability issue in the  
13 context of Category 1 versus 2, 3 and 4, and then the  
14 various components of the applicable sections of Part 36.  
15 And if we are all clear on that, then we are comfortable.

16 JUDGE YOUNG: Okay. Mr. Hull.

17 MR. HULL: We plan in our initial presentation,  
18 Your Honor, to discuss the applicability of Part 36.  
19 Obviously, if there are any arguments that are raised in  
20 Graystar's initial written presentation, the staff will have  
21 an opportunity to respond to those in our October filing.

22 JUDGE YOUNG: Yes, that would apply to both of  
23 you. But at this point, could you give us an idea of which  
24 other part of -- which other subsections in Part 36 you  
25 might be raising?

1 MR. HULL: Well, again, Your Honor, I feel like  
2 since our presentation is still in draft form, I should not  
3 be required to prematurely talk about things which may end  
4 up not going into the presentation. So I feel constrained  
5 about talking about it, what is still in draft form.

6 JUDGE YOUNG: Well, I can understand that in one  
7 sense, but in other sense, if you do know what issues you  
8 are going to raise, I think it would be more efficient to  
9 sort of go ahead and get them out on the table.

10 MR. HULL: Well, I think I did reference the fact  
11 just a moment ago that we do plan to talk about the  
12 applicability of Part 36. And these regulations were cited  
13 earlier in this conference today, 36 -- 10 CFR 36.1(b), 10  
14 CFR 36.2, so that is what I was thinking of, you know,  
15 additional Part 36 sections that are going to be talked  
16 about.

17 JUDGE YOUNG: But I guess -- let me just clarify  
18 then. I had the impression that you might be adding some  
19 new alleged violations of other parts of 36, or did I  
20 misunderstand that?

21 MR. HULL: Hold on for one moment, Your Honor,  
22 please.

23 [Discussion off the record.]

24 MR. HULL: Your Honor, John Hull for the staff. I  
25 have had a chance to briefly confer with the staff. There

1 was an additional section, 36.35, 10 CFR 36.35, which is  
2 regarding source rack protection. We were citing that, or  
3 planning to cite that in response to one of the items raised  
4 in the hearing request, the June 1, 2000 letter that Mr.  
5 Stein sent, specifically, Item 10 on page 10 of that letter.

6 JUDGE YOUNG: Okay.

7 MR. HULL: That would be the only other one.

8 JUDGE YOUNG: Okay. Thank you.

9 All right. Well, let me just ask all of you then,  
10 we have sort of gotten some new issues out on the table  
11 here. It sounds as though you are all pretty familiar with  
12 those, even though you are just sort of talking with each  
13 other, or at least with me and Judge Murphy about them. Am  
14 I correct in assuming you are still going to be able to meet  
15 the September 11th deadline?

16 MR. THOMPSON: This is Tony Thompson, Your Honor.  
17 I don't know about Mr. Hull, but if we could slip it a week,  
18 or 10 days, or two weeks, if it wasn't going to be a problem  
19 for the staff, I think it would be useful to us. Mr. Stein  
20 is out of the country this weekend in London and  
21 unavailable, you know, for sort of regular consultation.  
22 And the more we get into these things and the record, and  
23 whatever other letters they are sending to us that we don't  
24 have yet, I think it makes sense, from our perspective, to  
25 slip the dates a bit.

1 JUDGE YOUNG: Mr. Hull, what do you think?

2 MR. HULL: Hold on a second, please.

3 [Discussion off the record.]

4 MR. HULL: Your Honor, this is John Hull for the  
5 staff. We realize that there may be some difficulty caused  
6 by the delay in getting these additional documents out, and,  
7 again, I apologize for the oversight. We would have no  
8 objection to a delay in the September 11 filing date, but I  
9 guess we would request that a corresponding extension be  
10 made to the current October dates for filing responses to  
11 the initial written presentations.

12 JUDGE YOUNG: Let me hear some proposals from you  
13 all on times. I heard -- was it Mr. Thompson or Mr.  
14 Lashaway, who said a week or two weeks? If this will result  
15 in getting more of the issues out so that they can  
16 sufficiently be addressed, both in the responses and in  
17 general in the ultimate outcome, then I have no problem with  
18 an extension that would help us in that way.

19 MR. THOMPSON: Your Honor, this is Tony Thompson.  
20 Dave Lashaway and Bill and I were just talking, and we have  
21 one thought. Dave, why don't you --

22 MR. LASHAWAY: Your Honor, I think what we are  
23 thinking is that if we kick back the initial presentation,  
24 the joint presentation that would be due on the 11th to the  
25 25th of September, and then the October 16th responses to

1 the next week, which would be the 23rd, rather than kicking  
2 back two weeks, we would just kick that back one week.

3 JUDGE YOUNG: That would give you basically a  
4 month.

5 MR. LASHAWAY: Exactly. And then we would -- the  
6 request for further proceedings was initially due on the  
7 23rd, we would move that back to the 30th of October. And  
8 the November 6th request for information from the Judge,  
9 depending upon whether you decide you think you need more  
10 time, you could leave that date or move that date.

11 JUDGE YOUNG: We will leave it at this point, and  
12 if it needs to be moved later, based on whatever comes in  
13 the interim, we can discuss that later, or I can let you  
14 know by mail.

15 MR. LASHAWAY: Again, similarly, with the December  
16 15th date, which was the initial decision date that you had  
17 set.

18 JUDGE YOUNG: Right. Okay.

19 MR. HULL: This is John Hull for the staff. Just  
20 so I understand correctly, the proposal is to create a two  
21 week extension of the September 11 due date, but then only a  
22 one week extension of the corresponding October response  
23 dates?

24 MR. LASHAWAY: That is correct, Your Honor.

25 JUDGE YOUNG: That is the suggestion. Can you

1 live with that?

2 MR. LASHAWAY: The response date, John, was  
3 originally, I think, five weeks. This would give us four  
4 weeks rather than five.

5 MR. HULL: I need to put you on hold for a second.

6 [Discussion off the record.]

7 MR. HULL: Your Honor, John Hull for the staff.  
8 As I mentioned, I think, in the earlier telecon we had, John  
9 Jankovich, the lead, the technical lead on this, is going to  
10 be out the month of September, starting I guess next week.  
11 He would be back in town the beginning of October. Because  
12 of that, I think we would insist on a corresponding two week  
13 extension in October rather than just the one week proposed.  
14 That would make our response date October 30 rather than  
15 October 16th.

16 MR. THOMPSON: This is Tony Thompson, Your Honor.  
17 We don't object to that. We have no problem with that.

18 JUDGE YOUNG: Okay. Let me just think then. That  
19 is fine, and we will set that for October 30th. I am just  
20 thinking whether we can still keep the deadline for  
21 requesting any further proceedings.

22 I suppose you would obviously want to have an  
23 opportunity to read those. Do you think that November 1st  
24 would give enough time to read those and decide whether you  
25 want to request further proceedings?

1           And the only reason I am suggesting that is  
2 because I sort of want to keep my deadline from being right  
3 between Christmas and New Year's.

4           MR. THOMPSON: I thought might be what you were  
5 thinking, Your Honor, and I don't blame you one bit.

6           JUDGE YOUNG: I would like to sort of get to a  
7 closing point at a reasonable time to allow us, Judge Murphy  
8 and I, to finish up before the holidays, if possible.

9           MR. THOMPSON: How about the 2nd or 3rd, is that  
10 -- what is the 2nd?

11          JUDGE YOUNG: The 2nd is Thursday.

12          MR. HULL: John Hull, this is John Hull for the  
13 staff. Are we talking now about what is in the present  
14 order, the October 23 date for requesting further  
15 proceedings?

16          JUDGE YOUNG: Right.

17          MR. LASHAWAY: Your Honor, the problem -- this is  
18 David Lashaway. The problem is to digest the staff's  
19 responses. I think it would be in GrayStar's best interest  
20 to have at least two or three days to go over that to make a  
21 determination as to whether or not we feel additional  
22 briefing or further proceedings would be necessary.

23                But, you know, if the Court is willing, we would  
24 suggest either Thursday the 2nd, or Friday the 3rd for that  
25 request for further proceedings. Because in light of the

1 fact that we wouldn't want to just make a general request  
2 for further proceedings, we would want it to be fairly  
3 specific, and where we could indicate the issues that we  
4 think need to be addressed. And to do that, I think one day  
5 would be a difficult turnaround time. And I am not certain,  
6 you know, if the client would be available that afternoon or  
7 that evening, assuming that we received the briefs, you  
8 know, by 5:00.

9 JUDGE YOUNG: Well, let me suggest this, what  
10 about the end of the day on Thursday, rather than the end of  
11 the day on Friday. That would at least give a day before  
12 the weekend to sort of digest what to expect.

13 MR. THOMPSON: This is Tony Thompson. That is  
14 fine with us, Your Honor.

15 JUDGE YOUNG: Mr. Hull.

16 MR. HULL: Yeah, November 2 is good for us.

17 JUDGE YOUNG: Okay. And then at this point, I  
18 will just indicate that the November 6th and December 15th  
19 deadlines may also be extended as necessary as a result of  
20 the other extensions, and sort of wait to see what is  
21 produced by you all before finalizing those deadlines.

22 So, I will get an order out extending the  
23 deadlines to, respectively, September 25th for the written  
24 presentations, simultaneous; October 30th for the  
25 simultaneous responses; November 2nd for the request for

1 further proceedings and indicating that my November 6th and  
2 December 15th deadlines may be also be extended, as  
3 necessary, as a result.

4 Anything else that any of you would like to  
5 discuss today?

6 MR. THOMPSON: Your Honor, this is Tony Thompson.  
7 We don't have anything else.

8 MR. HULL: Nothing further from the staff, Your  
9 Honor.

10 JUDGE YOUNG: Okay. There are two things that I  
11 would like to just raise. One, Judge Murphy and I were  
12 looking at the Xerox copies of some pictures of the machine  
13 itself, and Judge Murphy suggested that it might be a good  
14 idea if they were attached to the June 4th memorandum from  
15 John Jankovich to Frederick Stein.

16 We thought it might be good if we could have a  
17 little bit clearer picture of the irradiator itself because  
18 they are a little fuzzy. That is one thing.

19 The other thing is I am wondering whether it might  
20 be a good idea to schedule a tentative time for further  
21 discussion based on whether either of you request any  
22 further proceedings in the case on November 2nd and I guess  
23 I was thinking of sometime during the week of November 6th,  
24 maybe the 8th.

25 And the only reason I am suggesting that is

1 people's schedules tend to fill up, and if anyone does  
2 request further proceedings, I might want some further  
3 clarification of exactly what those would consist of and the  
4 basis for them and so forth, if those are not -- I am sure  
5 will express those completely and fully in your written  
6 requests, but if there is anything left out, it might be a  
7 good idea for us to get on the phone together. And then if  
8 there is no request, then there would be no need for that.

9 Are you all all free on November 8th?

10 MR. THOMPSON: Yes.

11 THE REPORTER: Who is that, please?

12 MR. THOMPSON: Tony Thompson. I'm sorry, Your  
13 Honor.

14 MR. HULL: I will be available for the staff, Your  
15 Honor.

16 JUDGE YOUNG: Okay. Then let's say November 8th  
17 at the same time, 10:00. And unless we e-mail back and  
18 forth prior to that time that there is no need for it, let's  
19 go ahead and put that on our calendars. And I will look  
20 forward to talking with you then and to reading your written  
21 submissions prior to that time.

22 MR. HULL: Your Honor, John Hull for the staff.  
23 Regarding the pictures of the machine that were a bit fuzzy,  
24 the attachment was from a slide presentation that Mr. Stein  
25 gave the staff. We would probably not be able to get you

1 any clearer pictures of those, but I am wondering if perhaps  
2 when Mr. Thompson checks with Mr. Stein, maybe they could  
3 provide clearer copies of the same slides.

4 JUDGE YOUNG: Yes, I think that obviously would be  
5 easier for GrayStar to do. And that is just something that  
6 would be helpful for us. So maybe Mr. Thompson, Lashaway,  
7 and Holloway, if you can get a more clear picture and  
8 include it with your written presentation, that would be  
9 great.

10 MR. THOMPSON: This is Tony Thompson, Your Honor.  
11 We will certainly do that. We want to assure that it is as  
12 clear as it clear as it can be for you to review it.

13 JUDGE YOUNG: Okay. Well, anything else from  
14 anyone?

15 MR. THOMPSON: For Graystar, this is Tony  
16 Thompson, no, thank you, Your Honor, and we appreciate the  
17 cooperation of John and the NRC staff as well.

18 MR. HULL: Nothing from the staff, Your Honor.

19 JUDGE YOUNG: Thank you all. I look forward to  
20 hearing from you later. Bye-bye.

21 [Whereupon, at 10:35 a.m., the teleconference  
22 concluded.]

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the attached proceedings before the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission in the matter of:

NAME OF PROCEEDING: CONFERENCE CALL TO DISCUSS  
THE MATTER OF GRAYSTAR, INC.

PLACE OF PROCEEDING: Rockville, MD

were held as herein appears, and that this is the original transcript thereof for the file of the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission taken by me and thereafter reduced to typewriting by me or under the direction of the court reporting company, and that the transcript is a true and accurate record of the foregoing proceedings.



Ann Riley

Official Reporter

Ann Riley & Associates, Ltd.