Official Transcript of Proceedings

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title:

Telephone Conference ITMO

Dale Miller and Stephen Moffit

DOCKETED USNRC

July 6, 2006 (1:36pm)

OFFICE OF SECRETARY RULEMAKINGS AND ADJUDICATIONS STAFF

Docket Number:

IA-05-053 and IA-05-054

Location:

(telephone conference)

Date:

Thursday, June 22, 2006

Work Order No.:

NRC-1112

Pages 21-38

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

TEMPLATE = SELY-032

SECY-02

1	NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
2	+ + + +
3	ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD PANEL
4	+ + + +
5	
6	In the Matters of:
7	DALE L. MILLER Docket No. IA-05-053
8	STEPHEN P. MOFFITT Docket No. IA-05-054
9	(Enforcement Actions)
10	
11	Thursday, June 22, 2006
12	The above-entitled teleconference came to
13	order, pursuant to notice, at 10:00 a.m.
14	BEFORE:
15	MICHAEL C. FARRAR, ASLBP Administrative Judge
16	NICHOLAS G. TRIKOUROS, ASLBP Administrative Judge
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
	NEAL R. GROSS

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

સુર કેનુકા.

APPEARANCES:
On Behalf of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission
<u>Staff</u> :
MARY C. BATY, ESQ.; and
SARA E. BROCK, ESQ.
of: Office of the General Counsel
Mail Stop - 0-15 D21
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555-0001
(301) 415-4073
On Behalf of Dale L. Miller and Stephen P.
Moffitt:
JANE GOWEN PENNY, ESQ.
THOMAS SCOTT, ESQ.
of: Killian & Gephart, LLP
218 Pine Street
P.O. Box 886
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17108-0866
(717) 238-5430

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1	On Be	ehalf of FirstEntergy:
2		DONALD P. FERRARO, ESQ.
3	of:	Morgan Lewis
4	:	1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
5		Washington, DC 20004
6		(202) 739-5376
7		
8	ALSO PRESEN	TT:
9		JONATHAN RUND, ASLBP Staff
10	1	SPECIAL AGENT SCOTT LANGAN, Office of
11		Investigations, Region III
12		
13		
14		
15		
16	!	
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		- 5
22		
23		
24		
25		
		NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

(202) 234-4433

All Pages

(202) 234-4433

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

(202) 234-4433

7,75,5

(202) 234-4433

	25
1	SPECIAL AGENT LANGAN: Scott Langan,
2	Special Agent with the Office of Investigations,
3	Region III.
4	JUDGE FARRAR: Thank you, Mr. Langan.
5	We're happy to have you with us.
6	And for the company?
7	MR. FERRARO: This is Don Ferraro, F-E-R-
8	R-A-A-R-O, counsel for FirstEntergy.
9	JUDGE FARRAR: Thank you, Mr. Ferraro.
10	We're pleased to have you with us.
11	Let me ask Ms. Penny, the purpose of this
12	call when we set it two months ago was just to make
13	sure that everything was on target with the scheduling
14	order that we had entered. And can you start and Staff
15	can add on, is everything going smoothly or what's
16	happening?
17	MS. PENNY: Well, Your Honor, this case
18	never goes smoothly simply because of the numbers of
19	documents. But seriously, I have received the
20	documents that Staff provided. I'm reviewing them.
21	We're both now responding to discovery requests. Those
22	are due June 30th. And we're trying to honor our self-
23	imposed discovery deadline of September 15th.
24	JUDGE FARRAR: All right. In responding
25	to each other did you claim any of your documents were

gj Sas

1	privileged?
2	MS. PENNY: Your Honor, I had very few and
3	I had sent them to Ms. Brock. It was basically
4	correspondence from my clients to me and vice versa.
5	JUDGE FARRAR: Yes.
6	MS. PENNY: There were maybe five or six
7	of them.
8	JUDGE FARRAR: All right.
9	MS. PENNY: For each client.
10	JUDGE FARRAR: Okay. And those were not
11	attorney/client privileged or
12	MS. PENNY: Yes, I claimed them as
13	attorney/client privilege.
14	JUDGE FARRAR: Okay. Okay. And in terms
15	of your dealing with the Staff privilege logs, is that
16	going smoothly?
17	MS. PENNY: Your Honor, what I did rather
18	than deal with the privilege log, was try to focus on
19	the documents I would need for my clients' defense.
20	I have listed those as document requests. Several of
21	the documents I felt I needed were heavily redacted,
22	and so I have made requests for pages from those
23	documents.
24	JUDGE FARRAR: Is that something that
25	seems like you all can work out yourselves or will the

NEAL R. GROSS

Board need to be involved?

MS. PENNY: Well, Your Honor, I think we're duty bound to try to resolve it ourselves. I don't think any board likes to get involved in discovery disputes. And so I certainly pledge to try to work it out. There are any number of ways. I think the rules provide whether for a protective order or a conference to meet and discuss the issue. And I certainly intend to -- I certainly hope to try to resolve it.

JUDGE FARRAR: Well, I don't think you've practiced before us before, but you've read the Board's mindexactly correctly in terms of, you know, we will get involved if we need to, but our view is usually that you all can come to a more sensible conclusion more quickly than we can. So we encourage those efforts.

Ms. Brock, Ms. Baty, anything in terms of the questions we've asked Ms. Penny; anything you'd like to add in or confirm?

MS. BROCK: No. I think we can work out most of our potential disputes we're -- I mean, where not trying to answer all the interrogatories and document requests by next Friday.

We may end up where we need to have a

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

17,1252

protective order entered on some privacy documents, but I'm sure if we do we will come to a joint agreement on what it should say.

JUDGE FARRAR: All right. Anything else in terms of where discovery is now? I mean I take it your view of the working relationship with opposing counsel is the same as Ms. Penny described?

MS. BROCK: Yes. I mean, there may be some things that we don't end up reaching agreement on, but that's sort of the nature of reality, a lack of working it out.

We probably will be coming to the Board for some subpoenas for deposition within the next few weeks for those individuals who are not -- since Ms. Penny only represents her clients, other individuals who we may wish to depose in the proceedings.

JUDGE FARRAR: Okay. When I got into the private fuel storage case we were passed the discovery phase, so I was never involved in those. Do you always need a subpoena or can you invite them to attend and they say fine, and then you don't bother to subpoena them or do you like to subpoena them just to make sure that at the last minute they don't get cold feet and not show up?

MS. BROCK: Well, I wouldn't normally

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1	subpoena anyone who was a represented party. We would
2	just reach agreement. And I think in terms of the
3	FENOC employees we may also be able to reach an
4	agreement.
5	The advantage of having a subpoena is that
6	then they can receive a witness fee.
7	JUDGE FARRAR: Oh, okay.
8	MS. BROCK: And I'm not sure. I don't
9	think they can if we don't have a subpoena.
10	JUDGE FARRAR: All right.
11	MS. BROCK: I would have to confirm that.
12	But that's one reason to go ahead and go that route.
13	JUDGE FARRAR: All right. Well, you know
14	when the time comes let us know.
15	And when we have those, Ms. Penny, is it
16	likely you would consent, you wouldn't be opposing
17	subpoenas for depositions, I wouldn't imagine?
18	MS. PENNY: No, Your Honor. In fact, I'm
19	the one who probably came up with the names.
20	JUDGE FARRAR: Okay. So if it's
21	noncontroversial, we could move quickly on it. And
22	let us know if it is controversial and we'll decide
23	what we to do.
24	So when are you looking at the time frame
25	for depositions?

A. Veres

1	MS. BROCK: The month of July and August.
2	We'll try to I mean, for anyone actually, I would
3	try to contact them first and have an agreeable date
4	before we went to the Board for a subpoena.
5	JUDGE FARRAR: All right. But if you're
6	looking at July and August time frame, then our
7	September 15th date for the end of discovery looks
8	pretty good?
9	MS. BROCK: From the perspective of the
10	Staff, yes.
11	JUDGE FARRAR: I missed that. Say that
12	again.
13	MS. BROCK: From the perspective of the
14	Staff, yes.
15	JUDGE FARRAR: Okay. Ms. Penny, that
16	looking
17	MS. PENNY: I'm trying to comply with it
18	too, Your Honor.
19	JUDGE FARRAR: Okay. If we do meet that
20	deadline or only have to extend it slightly, what are
21	we looking at in terms of hearing dates? Have you all
22	talked about that at all?
23	MS. BROCK: We have not discussed it. When
24	I charted out the model schedule, it sort of depends
25	on the summary judgment. If we end up doing summary
i	NEAL P. GPOSS

N. ...

judgment motions and how long the Board wants to rule 1 2 on those. JUDGE FARRAR: All right. And I take it 3 until you're further along in discovery you can't 4 really make, any predictions about how big a role 5 summary judgment will play? 6 7 MS. PENNY: That's certainly the case on my part, Your Honor. I'm not sure yet, however it 8 9 appears as though there are many factual disputes 10 here. MS. BROCK: I would be inclined to agree 11 with that. I think it's unlikely that the Staff would 12 be filing a summary judgment motion. partially because 13 14 it's our burden. 15 JUDGE FARRAR: Right. Okay. And I suppose to help your thinking we're not inclined to 16 grant summary disposition unless things are really 17 18 clear-cut. We've had a couple of cases on battles of experts where we've said -- now this is, of course, 19 not experts, but battles of experts where we say 20 21 summary deposition isn't the way to handle them. And I think rather than spend a lot of time on opinions 22 with lengthy denials of summary disposition if we 23 think the motions aren't well taken, we may just issue 24 very summary orders denying them rather than waste a 25

lot of time with our lengthy reasoning with these at all is simply a factual dispute. So keep us posted on that.

On a related subject would you instead of summary disposition be looking at stipulations on certain issues? I mean I'd assume we'd never have full summary disposition, could we have partial summary disposition or better yet stipulations? Have you been able to talk about stipulations yet?

MS. BROCK: We haven't discussed stipulations. I think especially after we enter the interrogatories both sides had several admissions, we'll have a much better sense of what stipulations we can reach.

JUDGE FARRAR: All right.

MS. PENNY: I agree with that, Your Honor.

JUDGE FARRAR: Okay. Well then there may not be a lot more progress or a lot more business today to conduct. Again, we wanted to have this conference just to make sure there weren't some problems getting in the way of things. But it sounds like you all are on target and working together as well as might be expected.

So let me ask counsel for the company, are in house or outside counsel?

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

12.553

1	MR. FERRARO: Outside counsel, Your Honor.
2	JUDGE FARRAR: With whom?
3	MR. FERRARO: Morgan Lewis.
4	JUDGE FARRAR: Anything? Even though
5	you're not a party here, any comment you'd like to
6	make on what, we've just talked about?
7	MR. FERRARO: No, sir. We have nothing to
8	add at this time.
9	JUDGE FARRAR: Then do either counsel for
10	the parties have any other business you'd like to
11	conduct today?
12	MS. PENNY: Your Honor, I do not.
13	JUDGE FARRAR: Ms. Baty?
14	MS. BROCK: No. It's Ms. Brock. No, we
15	don't have any other business.
16	JUDGE FARRAR: All right. Then why don't
17	we set another conference call for after discovery
18	concludes. And, again, just pencil it in. How's
19	Wednesday, September 20th look?
20	MS. BROCK: Well, that's fine with the
21	Staff.
22	MS. PENNY: That's fine with me as well,
23	Your Honor.
24	JUDGE FARRAR: All right. Let's
25	tentatively set that for 10:00 on Wednesday the 20th.
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

-12,12.

If, of course, you don't complete discovery, then we'll just scrub that date. And, of course, we're available at your call. If you have some disputes that either we need a mini oral argument on a motion or it's something you want to discuss with us to see if we can hammer it out together, feel free to call us even on short notice and we'll try to help resolve it.

MS. BROCK: Would you like us, Your Honor, to come up also with some time in middle of September work on a joint schedule for going forward post-discovery or is that something that the Board wants to decide?

JUDGE FARRAR: Oh, no. That would be fine. In other words, under the Commission's rules this is supposed to be an expeditious hearing that's limited, of course as Ms. Penny has mentioned, by the volume of documents involved. And so we're ready as soon as you are. And so as you near the end of discovery if you all can come up with even a tentative schedule, maybe that's something that you could put in front of us for that September 20th or thereabouts conference call and we would like to have that. We don't want to force you to hearing before you're ready, but by the same token if you come up with a schedule that makes sense, put it in front of us and we'll go ahead.

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

34/37

1	MS. BROCK: Yes. Well, I guess the thought
2	on the part of the Staff is just with potentially
3	having multiple witnesses and needing a fair amount of
4	time for the hearing to get that on the calendar so
5	that we can make sure that we have all of our
6	witnesses available. And so that it doesn't start
7	being delayed by kind of late scheduling would be to
8	an advantage. And I think we'll be in a position to
9	do that.
10	MS. PENNY: I think so, too, Your Honor.
11	JUDGE FARRAR: Good. Well, that can then
12	be a principal order of business on September 20th to
13	do that.
14	At this point I don't suppose you have any
15	idea how many days or weeks of hearing we need? MS.
15	idea how many days or weeks of hearing we need? MS.
15 16	idea how many days or weeks of hearing we need? MS. BROCK: I have a few budget estimates, so I have some
15 16 17	idea how many days or weeks of hearing we need? MS. BROCK: I have a few budget estimates, so I have some thoughts on it. This is a guess assuming a certain
15 16 17 18	idea how many days or weeks of hearing we need? MS. BROCK: I have a few budget estimates, so I have some thoughts on it. This is a guess assuming a certain number of stipulations and if we proceed with prefiled
15 16 17 18 19	idea how many days or weeks of hearing we need? MS. BROCK: I have a few budget estimates, so I have some thoughts on it. This is a guess assuming a certain number of stipulations and if we proceed with prefiled direct testimony
15 16 17 18 19 20	idea how many days or weeks of hearing we need? MS BROCK: I have a few budget estimates, so I have some thoughts on it. This is a guess assuming a certain number of stipulations and if we proceed with prefiled direct testimony JUDGE FARRAR: Yes.
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	idea how many days or weeks of hearing we need? MS. BROCK: I have a few budget estimates, so I have some thoughts on it. This is a guess assuming a certain number of stipulations and if we proceed with prefiled direct testimony JUDGE FARRAR: Yes. MS. BROCK: I think we would need
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	idea how many days or weeks of hearing we need? MS. BROCK: I have a few budget estimates, so I have some thoughts on it. This is a guess assuming a certain number of stipulations and if we proceed with prefiled direct testimony JUDGE FARRAR: Yes. MS. BROCK: I think we would need about a week of hearing for each case. If we do lie
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	idea how many days or weeks of hearing we need? MS. BROCK: I have a few budget estimates, so I have some thoughts on it. This is a guess assuming a certain number of stipulations and if we proceed with prefiled direct testimony JUDGE FARRAR: Yes. MS. BROCK: I think we would need about a week of hearing for each case. If we do lie direct testimony, I think that will extend

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

Qui:

1	against you now, Ms. Baty
2	MS. BROCK: That was Ms. Brock.
3	JUDGE FARRAR: Nothing against you, Ms.
4	Brock, but I found in the PFS case the Staff lawyers
5	and every lawyer's estimates to be off by about a
6	factor of three.
7	MS. BROCK: That's fine.
8	MS. PENNY: Oh, good heavens.
9	MS. BROCK: Yes.
10	JUDGE FARRAR: So thank you for that
11	guess. We'll give it the value it's worth.
12	Ms. Penny, but are those thoughts
13	consistent with yours?
14	MS. PENNY: Your Honor, yes. And all along
15	I have been considering that Ms. Miller's hearing will
16	take less time than Mr. Moffitt's.
17	MS. BROCK: I think that's true.
18	MS. PENNY: Mr. Miller's may indeed be a
19	week at most.
20	JUDGE FARRAR: Okay.
21	MS. PENNY: It's a limited period of time
22	and far fewer witnesses.
23	JUDGE FARRAR: Are there any parts of the
24	two gentleman's hearings that we would do together or
25	
1	NEAL B. GROSS

1	MS. PENNY: I wish I could say that, Your
2	Honor, but their issues are so different. They pick
3	up at different periods of time, unfortunately, but
4	we'll certainly keep an eye on it.
5	JUDGE FARRAR: Will any of the witnesses
6	be the same?
7	MS. PENNY: Very few.
8	JUDGE FARRAR: Oh, okay. All right. I
9	suppose to the extent any are, whichever hearing goes
10	first, if you all are satisfied with what happens we
11	could just adopt the particular witness' testimony as
12	given in one hearing and put it the other. But I'll
13	leave that to you to work out.
14	Let me ask my colleague, Judge Trikouros
15	if he has anything to add?
16	JUDGE TRIKOUROS: No.
17	JUDGE FARRAR: Okay. Is there any other
18	business that needs to come before us today?
19	MS. BROCK: The Staff doesn't have
20	anything.
21	MS. PENNY: And neither do Mr. Miller or
22	Mr. Moffitt.
23	JUDGE FARRAR: Okay. Thank you, Ms.
24	Brock, Ms. Penny and Mr. Ferraro. Good to have you
25	with us. Mr. Langan, thank you for sitting in.
	NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

(202) 234-4433

MAAR

(202) 234-4433

	38
1	And with that, then we will adjourn the
2	conference call with a plan for a September 20th call,
3	but the Board is ready to be called in if you all need
4	us before then.
5	Thank you very much.
6	MS. PENNY: Thank you.
7	MS. BROCK: Thank you.
8	(Whereupon, at 10:20 a.m. the conference
9	call was adjourned.)
10	
11	
12	
13	2
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	7
24	
25	
	NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

CERTIFICATE

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

Name of Proceeding: Dale L. Miller and

Stephen P. Moffitt

Docket Number:

IA-05-053 and IA-05-054

Location:

Via teleconference

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.

Alex Patton

Official Reporter

Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc.

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

(202) 234-4433

ख्र मुख्यारा

www.nealrgross.com