

RAS 3545

# Official Transcript of Proceedings

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: Dominion Nuclear Connecticut, Inc.  
Millstone Nuclear Power Station, Unit 3

Docket Number: ASLBP No. 50-423-LA-3

DOCKETED  
USNRC

November 6, 2001 (9:53AM)

Location: (telephone conference)

OFFICE OF SECRETARY  
RULEMAKINGS AND  
ADJUDICATIONS STAFF

Date: Wednesday, October 31, 2001

Work Order No.: NRC-088

Pages 644-669

NEAL R. GROSS AND CO., INC.  
Court Reporters and Transcribers  
1323 Rhode Island Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
(202) 234-4433

Template = SECY-032

SECY-02



1     APPEARANCES:2     On Behalf of the Intervenor:

3             NANCY BURTON, Esq.  
4             147 Cross Highway  
5             Redding Ridge, CT 06876

6  
7     On Behalf of Dominion Nuclear Connecticut, Inc.:

8             DAVID REPKA, Esq.  
9             DONALD FERRARO, Esq.  
10            Winston & Strawn  
11            1400 L Street, N.W.  
12            Washington, DC 20005  
13  
14            LILLIAN CUOCO, Esq.  
15            Dominion Nuclear Connecticut, Inc.  
16            Millstone Nuclear Power Station  
17            Building 475/5  
18            Rope Ferry Road (Route 156)  
19            Waterford, CT 06385

20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25



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

(9:30 a.m.)

JUDGE BECHHOEFER: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. I hope you can hear me. This is Charles Bechhoefer, chairman of the Licensing Board. With me is the remainder of the Licensing Board.

Could you introduce yourselves?

JUDGE COLE: Yeah. This is Judge Richard F. Cole, C-o-l-e.

JUDGE KELBER: This is Judge Kelber, K-e-l-b-e-r.

JUDGE BECHHOEFER: We've called this conference call. Well, let's have the various parties introduce themselves as well so that the court reporter can hear your voices and know who it is. And actually, before making various statements, we would appreciate your identifying yourself for the benefit of the court reporter. So various parties may introduce themselves.

Ms. Burton, may you want to start?

MS. BURTON: Yes, certainly. I'm Nancy Burton, B-u-r-t-o-n, and I represent the intervenors, Connecticut Coalition Against Millstone and the Long Island Coalition Against Millstone.

MR. BESADE: Okay. Joe Besade from

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 Waterford, Connecticut. I'm also a member of the  
2 Connecticut Coalition Against Millstone. The name is  
3 spelled B-e-s-a-d-e. Thank you.

4 MR. REYNOLDS: Pete Reynolds, Coalition  
5 Against Millstone.

6 JUDGE BECHHOEFER: Next? Mr. Repka?

7 MR. REPKA: Yes. This is David Repka with  
8 Winston & Strawn for Dominion Nuclear Connecticut.  
9 With me here in Washington, D.C. is my associate,  
10 Donald Ferraro. And on a separate line from  
11 Connecticut are Lillian Cuoco, C-u-o-c-o, and Peter  
12 Hyde, H-y-d-e. Mr. Hyde is with the company's  
13 Corporate Communications department.

14 MS. HODGDON: Ann Hodgdon for the NRC  
15 staff, and with me is Victor Nerses, N-e-r-s-e-s, who  
16 is the project manager for Millstone 3.

17 JUDGE BECHHOEFER: Thank you.

18 With us here at the moment is Lee Dewey,  
19 who is chief counsel to the ASLPB, Atomic Safety and  
20 Licensing Board Panel. I'd like to start by inquiring  
21 whether the documents that we're expecting have been  
22 prepared, and whether they can be or will be  
23 circulated.

24 The root-cause analysis, first. Is that  
25 completed, and has anyone tried to circulate it?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Because with the various problems with the mail  
2 service, the routers might not be adequately  
3 circulated, at least by mail.

4 MR. REPKA: This is Mr. Repka for  
5 Dominion. The root-cause analysis is completed and  
6 was circulated from my office on Monday. That was  
7 sent by hand to the board, and I'm surprised if the  
8 board didn't receive that. And it was sent to Federal  
9 Express to Ms. Burton on Monday.

10 JUDGE BECHHOEFER: No, we haven't received  
11 it.

12 MS. BURTON: The staff has also, at least  
13 OGC, has not yet received a copy. And I was not aware  
14 that -- I am not aware that there are copies anywhere  
15 here. And we, too, are having difficulties with the  
16 mail, and I expect that's the problem.

17 MR. REPKA: I will undertake to resend  
18 that today. I'm surprised. I thought that -- we sent  
19 that on Monday.

20 JUDGE KELBER: This is Judge Kelber.  
21 Where was the messenger instructed to go? If he went  
22 to the mailroom, we won't see that mail for quite a  
23 while.

24 MR. REPKA: I think they were instructed  
25 to go to White Flint, and they can't get beyond

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 security. So, perhaps, the mail goes immediately,  
2 even by hand-carry to the mailroom.

3 JUDGE BECHHOEFER: I suspect, sir, that  
4 you're correct.

5 MS. BURTON: This is Nancy Burton.  
6 Mr. Repka is correct. I did receive by FedEx the  
7 root-cause analysis. However, I spent a good part of  
8 yesterday in a hospital emergency room. I haven't a  
9 chance to, a) really read through it, nor b) circulate  
10 it to those folks who are on our side.

11 JUDGE KELBER: Is it possible to send it  
12 electronically?

13 MR. REPKA: I do have that electronically.  
14 I can do that. I don't have it with the signed cover  
15 letter electronically, but you'll have the report  
16 itself. I will do that today.

17 JUDGE KELBER: Thank you, sir.

18 JUDGE BECHHOEFER: Yeah, that will help.

19 And now, let me inquire. Is the OI  
20 Report -- it wasn't required to be circulated at least  
21 before today. Is this done and ready to go?

22 MS. BURTON: The OI Report is ready for  
23 release. And I have been struggling with the on and  
24 off of whether the mail goes out. Apparently, the  
25 mail will go out today, and so a paper copy will be

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 sent out today. The region puts out these reports for  
2 the licensee, and apparently it's considering doing it  
3 electronically because of the difficulty that we've  
4 had. So they won't be -- but they'll say exactly the  
5 same thing. And we've had a lot of back and forth  
6 about that. So, anyway, those reports will both go  
7 out today.

8 JUDGE KELBER: It would be best if an  
9 electronic copy were sent.

10 MS. BURTON: Excuse me?

11 JUDGE KELBER: It would be best if an  
12 electronic copy were sent.

13 MS. BURTON: I'll have to get an  
14 electronic copy. I don't have one; I have a paper  
15 copy. So I could send paper copies and also send  
16 electronic copies when I get them from the region.

17 I have the commitment to do this today.  
18 We've been having some problem, as you know, with  
19 regard to all sorts of things, because of the mail  
20 problem. In any event, it will be done today, and  
21 we'll try to get -- of course, for the board copies,  
22 we can carry them over there, but that doesn't take  
23 care of the need to get copies to others. I think I  
24 can -- I'm sure I can get it. If the region has an  
25 electronic copy, then I can get an electronic copy,

1 obviously. So we'll try to do both.

2 Is that okay?

3 JUDGE BECHHOEFER: Yes.

4 MS. BURTON: Thank you.

5 JUDGE BECHHOEFER: I understand that  
6 Ms. Burton had some problems with receiving by e-mail  
7 the order that we put out setting up this telephone  
8 conference. I'm not sure why that happened. I  
9 personally sent a copy to her as well as the other  
10 parties, and Becky did also. So I'm not sure what the  
11 difficulties were.

12 MS. BURTON: Judge Bechhoefer, Nancy  
13 Burton. When I tried to download your message, I got  
14 an access denied on the screen. And so I've been  
15 awaiting the hard copy in the mail, and it hasn't  
16 turned up yet. So that is why I had to make a call  
17 this morning to get the number for this conference.

18 JUDGE BECHHOEFER: I see. Well, I  
19 apologize. We sent out both. The hard copies went  
20 out last Friday.

21 JUDGE KELBER: No, we did not.

22 JUDGE BECHHOEFER: No, it was signed and  
23 sent over to the place which would circulate them.

24 JUDGE KELBER: But the mail has not left  
25 the establishment.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 JUDGE BECHHOEFER: Yes, that's correct.  
2 They've had various mailroom investigations, scares,  
3 whatever. Be that as it may, for the future we urge  
4 that -- although paper copies still are required by  
5 the rules to be serve, we urge parties -- I think  
6 they've been doing this in any event -- to serve  
7 various matters by e-mail where possible. It would  
8 make it easier, and we would receive it in time to act  
9 on it, or even information copies. E-mail is far  
10 preferable. So to the extent you can, we would  
11 appreciate your adding that to the server.  
12 Fortunately, or unfortunately, the official service  
13 under the commission's rule still has to be on paper.  
14 That may change, but e-mail service is not technically  
15 approved for sole service.

16 Next, we would like to establish a  
17 discovery schedule. I assume with the exclusion of  
18 the OI Report there's no further reason to defer  
19 further activities. We can start discovery, and we  
20 should set a time period for that discovery.

21 Basically, the board had thought that  
22 60 days might be adequate, which would allow two  
23 rounds, and we'd allow a few extra days for the  
24 holidays, et cetera. If we started the 60-day period,  
25 it would start, say, November 7th, which is next

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 week -- a week from now -- and run through  
2 January 11th, which is a Friday.

3 Would that type of schedule -- what do the  
4 parties think an appropriate schedule would be.

5 MS. BURTON: This is Nancy Burton. I  
6 gather that the licensee spent something like  
7 \$9 million on its own special researches into this  
8 issue, and that it took them about 10 months to round  
9 up all the information and prepare their various  
10 reports. It seems as though there is a great deal of  
11 information here and many, many documents that were  
12 assembled. And in light of that, I would like to  
13 request an additional period of time. Since we have  
14 that information now as to the depth of the  
15 information that's involved here, I think that it  
16 would be reasonable to ask for more time, 90 days  
17 let's say.

18 MR. REPKA: This is Mr. Repka.

19 JUDGE BECHHOEFER: The subpart has a  
20 maximum of 90 days -- or not a maximum, but  
21 beyond -- absent good cause, 90 days is -- but that's  
22 discovery for all the issues. And we've already had  
23 at least one 90-day period. But if this issue is  
24 sufficiently different, then I think a new discovery  
25 period should start.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Mr. Repka, you had comments?

2 MR. REPKA: Yes. First, I certainly agree  
3 with the board that any discovery schedule could not  
4 exceed 90 days because that's the maximum under  
5 subpart K. But having said that, we are in the second  
6 round of the discovery and second round of the  
7 proceeding.

8 The issue here is a fairly narrow one  
9 related to whether there's any commonality between the  
10 events at Unit 1 and the fuel-handling procedures at  
11 issue with respect to the Unit 3 license amendment.  
12 The scope of the discovery, therefore, has to be  
13 appropriately tailored to what the issue is in that  
14 proceeding.

15 And the issue is certainly not the Unit 1  
16 FRAP investigation; the issue is certainly not one of  
17 recreating the entire FRAP investigation. So,  
18 therefore, to compare the scope of discovery to the  
19 scope of the investigation itself I think is  
20 inappropriate right at the outset. Beyond that, I  
21 think our reaction is, the 60-day discovery proposed  
22 by the board should be sufficient.

23 JUDGE BECHHOEFER: Of course, in a  
24 schedule-like outline, we've allowed a few days to  
25 make up for a bunch of holidays coming in and that

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 type of thing.

2 MR. REPKA: Judge Bechhoefer, this is Dave  
3 Repka again. The only thing I would request on the  
4 discovery schedule, though, is that the schedule be  
5 clear as to the dates for when any requests for  
6 discovery be filed. I think that we had a problem in  
7 the last round in which we had a 90-day window in  
8 which we received request for discovery on about  
9 Day 88. It's a specific request up front, and then  
10 that we'll allow responses within the 60-day schedule.

11 MS. BURTON: Judge Bechhoefer, Nancy  
12 Burton.

13 JUDGE BECHHOEFER: Yes?

14 MS. BURTON: In the spirit of candor here,  
15 I feel constrained to report that the coalitions are  
16 planning to make a further filing in this matter, not  
17 expressly within the scope of our conference call this  
18 morning but related to our intervention generally.  
19 And the papers that will be filed are expected to be  
20 filed perhaps as early as this morning. They're being  
21 proofread at the present time.

22 I'm only bringing this up because there  
23 may be some issues of overlap that may make it  
24 necessary at some point here for us to ask for some  
25 kind of a waiver of the discovery. I'm not sure that

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that will be the case, but I didn't want it to come as  
2 a complete shock and surprise when this new material  
3 is filed later today. I can't really, however, say  
4 anything further about it until it's filed.

5 JUDGE BECHHOEFER: Well, when you say  
6 waiver of discovery, you mean waiver of --

7 MS. BURTON: Waiver of discovery  
8 limitation if it becomes necessary to request  
9 additional time, depending on how the board treats  
10 this new prospective filing. I don't expect you to  
11 rule on that now, but I just wanted to be sure that  
12 the record showed that we're making other efforts in  
13 this case to bring new information before the board so  
14 that it can fully weigh all of the pertinent issues.

15 JUDGE BECHHOEFER: Okay. Does staff any  
16 views on discovery schedule?

17 MS. HODGDON: As the staff has already  
18 pointed out to the board, the staff is preparing its  
19 inspection report on the FRAP and presumably also on  
20 the root-cause analysis. Whether that's included in  
21 the document that they intend to have in by the end of  
22 the month, I'm not entirely clear on. But the staff  
23 documents won't be ready until the end of the month,  
24 and, therefore, the staff won't be in a mode to answer  
25 discovery requests until after that time.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           If discovery starts on the 7th, then  
2 any -- well, the staff will not, as I said, be in a  
3 position to answer discovery requests until after the  
4 end of November, I think, when its document is out and  
5 its position is made clear with regard to these  
6 documents that have been produced by the licensee, the  
7 staff's new section of that. And that will, of  
8 course, be the staff's case.

9           The board said something in the last  
10 pre-hearing conference that this would trial  
11 preparation. Of course, it's not because these are  
12 documents that the staff would write whether this  
13 proceeding was taking place or not. So, obviously, it  
14 is not a trial preparation. That's all I have to say  
15 about that.

16           The staff also believes that 60 days is  
17 plenty of time for discovery. And it's not only a  
18 very narrow issue, it's really a non-issue. Because  
19 what it is is an allegation that there is commonality  
20 between this matter of Unit 1 and the issues that have  
21 already been determined in the Unit 3 license  
22 amendment, specifically Contention 4 that had to do  
23 with the increased risk of criticality because,  
24 essentially, of the creation of three regions instead  
25 of where there were formerly two. So that is how

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 narrow this issue is. It seems to me -- it seems to  
2 the staff -- that 60 days would be plenty of time for  
3 that.

4 As regard to Ms. Burton's announcement  
5 that the coalition is planning to make a filing today,  
6 we have no idea what that filing is. And so we can't  
7 say in any way whether the board will accept it, and  
8 what it is, whether it's a contention, what it is.  
9 But in any event, we certainly can't plan for any  
10 discovery on that at this time.

11 MS. BURTON: Judge Bechhoefer, Nancy  
12 Burton. Given what we've just heard from the staff,  
13 I would propose that the discovery period commence  
14 upon the distribution of the staff review of the FRAP  
15 and root-cause analysis now said to be filed by the  
16 end of November.

17 MS. HODGDON: Staff again. Ann Hodgdon.  
18 There's no reason that discovery against the licensee  
19 could not begin earlier than discovery against the  
20 staff. And that might, in fact, be more efficient.  
21 And so we should have the parties' views about that as  
22 well.

23 MR. REPKA: Mr. Repka for Dominion. I  
24 concur with Ms. Hodgdon, that there's no reason to  
25 defer beginning the discovery until the staff report

1 is ready.

2 MS. BURTON: Judge Bechhoefer, Nancy  
3 Burton. It would seem to be to everybody's advantage  
4 to begin the discovery period at the point I've  
5 suggested because we may I think that way proceed more  
6 efficiently and potentially even narrow issues down;  
7 whereas, if we're confronted after we are already a  
8 month into discovery with issues that hadn't occurred  
9 to us before, that might then trigger discovery  
10 questions in our hearts that would take more time  
11 necessarily.

12 MR. REPKA: Mr. Repka again.

13 MS. BURTON: I think we can just best  
14 coordinate it if we have that date as a starting-off  
15 point.

16 MR. REPKA: Mr. Burton's suggestion is  
17 really a request for deferral of this proceeding,  
18 which is exactly the request for deferral that the  
19 staff asked for before, which we, Dominion, opposed  
20 and the board has denied. And I believe Ms. Burton  
21 opposed that request as well, although I can't recall  
22 specifically. So I don't see that that request to  
23 defer the proceeding until the staff inspection report  
24 is any more appropriate now than it was a month or two  
25 ago.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 MS. HODGDON: Ann Hodgdon for staff again.  
2 If Ms. Burton, as she suspects or as she stated, there  
3 might be something in the staff report that would  
4 change discovery plans and so forth, something that's  
5 surprising. If there were something that cataclysmic  
6 that that might be good cause for extending discovery.  
7 But then, again, that's a bridge that we can cross  
8 when we get to it. We're not there now.

9 MS. BURTON: Judge Bechhoefer, Nancy  
10 Burton. It seems to me that we have objected, as  
11 Mr. Repka has noted accurately, to deferral of this  
12 case. We've been overruled on that twice at the  
13 request of the staff and I believe with the agreement  
14 of the licensee. Now we're being put at another  
15 disadvantage, which is that we're being -- because the  
16 staff hasn't produced this report -- and I think it  
17 was indicated earlier that it should have been ready  
18 by now, if I'm not mistaken -- we will definitely be  
19 put at a disadvantage and be prejudiced if we don't  
20 have the benefit of the staff's report before we begin  
21 discovery. So it's not at all that we want to defer  
22 the proceedings; we just don't want to be put at a  
23 disadvantage at the starting gate.

24 MS. HODGDON: Ann Hodgdon again for the  
25 staff. Ms. Burton said that the staff report should

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 have been ready by now. The staff report is, of  
2 course, based on the licensee's reports and the  
3 licensee's FRAP, the whole investigation and not just  
4 the report of it. And that is the way the staff does  
5 its business; that's the way it does things. It  
6 reviews licensee documents. Therefore, there's no way  
7 that the staff can be ready on any item at the same  
8 time as the licensee is. And that is not  
9 extraordinary, that's not unique to this case; that's  
10 the way staff work takes place.

11 Therefore, the staff suggestion was that  
12 discovery proceed against the licensee and against the  
13 staff when the document comes out. And contrary to  
14 what Ms. Burton says, it would seem extraordinarily  
15 inefficient to file something on non-existent  
16 documents. Once the staff document comes out,  
17 discovery on this document is appropriate and should  
18 be available. And it should take less time in that  
19 discovery against the licensee already has taken  
20 place.

21 MS. BURTON: Judge Bechhoefer, Nancy  
22 Burton. I don't see how it would be fair to begin  
23 discovery when the staff is saying they will be  
24 unavailable for discovery during part of the period.

25 MS. HODGDON: Ann Hodgdon again. The

1 staff has not changed its position in any regard,  
2 regarding this whole matter. And the board has ruled  
3 against the staff about deferring it. Now, when  
4 Ms. Burton is making the same argument, but for a  
5 different reason the staff made, it's really, in  
6 effect, asking the board to reconsider that ruling,  
7 which there's nothing here that hadn't already been  
8 argued.

9 JUDGE BECHHOEFER: Let us go off the  
10 record for a minute. We'll be right back. The board  
11 wants to talk about it.

12 (Whereupon, the foregoing matter went off  
13 the record at 9:58 a.m. and went back on  
14 the record at 10:00 a.m.)

15 JUDGE BECHHOEFER: Okay, we're back on the  
16 record.

17 MR. GUNTER: Judge Bechhoefer?

18 JUDGE BECHHOEFER: Yes?

19 MR. GUNTER: This is Paul Gunter, Nuclear  
20 Information and Resource Service. And I just wanted  
21 to get my notice of appearance on the record.

22 JUDGE BECHHOEFER: Okay. On this  
23 discovery matter, the board has decided to authorize  
24 90 days of discovery starting November 7th, but no  
25 discovery against the staff until December 4. That

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 would give, using the same period, about 60 days  
2 discovery with regard to the staff and 90 with regard  
3 to the licensee. And that would end on February 8,  
4 the way I calculate it, which is a Friday I think.

5 Well, anyway, that's the resolution. I  
6 might say that if there's a need for further discovery  
7 on new items or different matters, we can receive  
8 requests, and we'll act on them accordingly when or if  
9 we get them. But I think the 90-day schedule from  
10 November 7th is -- well, it's all that subpart K  
11 really would authorize absent special circumstances.

12 But withholding it against the staff I  
13 think makes sense, given their investigation and  
14 completion of their reports and analyses. So 60 days  
15 against the staff I think is fine. And if you start  
16 December 4 and end February 8th, rounding things off  
17 to the ends of weeks and that type of thing. I think  
18 that's satisfactory. So for the time being, we will  
19 establish that as a discovery schedule. And we'll  
20 issue a formal order once we get the transcript back  
21 probably early next week.

22 MR. REPKA: Mr. Repka for Dominion. Could  
23 I just request again that we have some board guidance  
24 on the issue of the last discovery request. We would  
25 request that they be filed at a time that would allow

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 a response on the schedule authorized by the rules at  
2 a minimum. Before February 8th.

3 JUDGE BECHHOEFER: Off the record for one  
4 second again.

5 (Whereupon, the foregoing matter went off  
6 the record at 10:03 a.m. and went back on  
7 the record at 10:05 a.m.)

8 JUDGE BECHHOEFER: Okay. The board has  
9 decided we will set -- we think the last request for  
10 discovery and production should be filed by  
11 January 25th, which is two weeks before the February  
12 8th date. Of course, again, this will have to exclude  
13 special circumstances, newly arriving information,  
14 that type of thing. But for the matters at issue  
15 right now, we will set that deadline. So that's a  
16 Friday, the 25th of January, for which all discovery  
17 requests must be filed. As I say, we'll formalize all  
18 of this in an order which we'll issue probably early  
19 next week.

20 Any further comments on this subject?

21 Next, we would go on to propose dates for  
22 the filing of prepared statements. And I would guess  
23 that should be probably at least 30 days beyond the  
24 end of discovery, if not more, but 30 days maybe,  
25 which would be --

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Under this schedule, March 11th, which is  
2 a Monday, prepared statements would be filed. And  
3 then oral argument would be -- well, let's see.

4 MR. REPKA: Mr. Bechhoefer, it's 15 days  
5 under the rule, but I don't have in front of me a  
6 calendar that would show when Easter is next year.  
7 And I really would suggest you take some  
8 consideration -- a day or two -- if that falls in that  
9 interim, but I don't --

10 JUDGE BECHHOEFER: Our calendar doesn't  
11 show when it is either. If Easter doesn't intervene,  
12 it would make either March 26th or March 27th a day  
13 for oral argument. But that would be in New London.

14 JUDGE KELBER: This is Judge Kelber. Palm  
15 Sunday is Sunday, March 24th. So the next week, then,  
16 is -- let's see. Well, Good Friday would be  
17 March 29th. Also, Passover begins on Wednesday, March  
18 27th. So that whole week is inadvisable for meetings.

19 JUDGE COLE: You may want to just make it  
20 the following week.

21 JUDGE BECHHOEFER: How about Tuesday,  
22 April 2nd for oral argument in New London? And let us  
23 just travel up on Monday.

24 JUDGE COLE: It sounds fine.

25 MS. HODGDON: Judge Bechhoefer, you might

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 want to consider putting off the prepared statements  
2 by a week, then, so as to make the 15 days, give an  
3 extra week there instead of -- that would be more  
4 consistent with the rules; although, the rules are  
5 being a little -- they're not being -- well, whatever.  
6 It might be preferable to do that. That's just a  
7 suggestion. This is Ann Hodgdon for the staff.

8 JUDGE BECHHOEFER: I think it's a good  
9 thing. Let me check my dates again. So that would be  
10 February 15th for the -- I'm sorry.

11 MS. HODGDON: You said March 11th. So it  
12 would be seven days after that.

13 JUDGE BECHHOEFER: March 18th, right.

14 Okay. And then, Tuesday, April 2nd, for  
15 oral argument. Okay. We'll do that. We'll establish  
16 that schedule.

17 About the only other matter we have left  
18 is, we would urge the parties, if they were able to  
19 during the period of discovery, to discuss among  
20 themselves whether they might be able to find a way of  
21 settling this proceeding. The commission does  
22 encourage settlements where possible, and if you could  
23 determine a way to do it, that would be fine. So we  
24 urge you to, perhaps, consider talking about  
25 settlement.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. REPKA: Dave Repka for Dominion. We  
2 are certainly always open to considering any specific  
3 proposal. Apart from that, however, we're fully  
4 prepared to demonstrate through this proceeding that  
5 there's no connection between the issue of Unit 1 and  
6 the issues in the license amendment.

7 JUDGE BECHHOEFER: Okay. Well, we just  
8 thought we would extend the suggestion, and if the  
9 parties follow up on that, that would be fine.

10 Is there anything further that any of the  
11 parties wish to consider before we adjourn for the  
12 day?

13 MR. REPKA: Nothing from Dominion.

14 MS. HODGDON: I don't believe the staff  
15 has anything further.

16 MS. BURTON: And Judge Bechhoefer, for the  
17 intervenors, that's all we have for now.

18 JUDGE BECHHOEFER: Okay. Well, we enjoyed  
19 talking with you, and the discovery schedule, et  
20 cetera, will go into effect as we described it. I'll  
21 issue an order once I get the transcript, which should  
22 be early next week. If it comes in Friday, I won't be  
23 here, so it will have to be next week.

24 With that, we bid you farewell.

25 MS. BURTON: Thank you very much.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

MS. HODGDON: Thank you.

MR. REPKA: Thank you.

(Whereupon, the foregoing matter went off  
the record at 10:13 a.m.)

**CERTIFICATE**

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

Name of Proceeding: Dominion Nuclear  
Connecticut, Inc.

ASLBP Number: 50-423-LA-3

Location: (Telephone Conference)

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.

  
\_\_\_\_\_

John Mongover  
Official Reporter  
Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc.