

RAS 12162

Official Transcript of Proceedings

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: Vermont Nuclear Power Station
Pre-Hearing Conference

Docket Number: 50-271-OLA; ASLBP No. 04-832-02-OLA

Location: (telephone conference)

DOCKETED
USNRC

August 25, 2006 (3:45pm)

OFFICE OF SECRETARY
RULEMAKINGS AND
ADJUDICATIONS STAFF

Date: Tuesday, August 22, 2006

Work Order No.: NRC-1225

Pages 324-364

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

1 APPEARANCES:

2
3 On Behalf of the Licensee:4
5 JAY E. SILBERG, ESQ.

6 MATIAS E. TRAVIESO-DIAZ, ESQ.

7 of: Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw Pittman

8 2300 N Street, N.W.

9 Washington, DC 20037

10 (202) 663-8142

11
12 On Behalf of the Intervenor, New England
13 Coalition:14
15 RAYMOND SHADIS, ESQ.

16 New England Coalition

17 P.O. Box 98

18 Edgecomb, Maine 04556

19 (202) 882-7801

20
21
22
23
24
25

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

1 On Behalf of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

2

3

SHERWIN E. TURK, ESQ.

4

STEVEN C. HAMRICK, ESQ.

5

of: Office of the General Counsel

6

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission

7

Mail Stop O-15D21

8

Washington, DC 20555

9

(301) 415-1533

10

11

ALSO PRESENT:

12

MARCIA CARPENTIER, ESQ., ASLBP Staff

13

RICK ENNIS, Project Manager, NRC

14

CRAIG NICHOLS, Project Manager, Entergy

15

BROOKE POOLE, NRR Management

16

JONATHAN RUND, ESQ., ASLBP Staff

17

KAREN VALLOCH, ASLBP Staff

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

P R O C E E D I N G S

(11:11 a.m.)

1
2
3 ADMIN. JUDGE KARLIN: Good morning. This
4 is Alex Karlin, Chairman of this ASLBP Panel. It is
5 in the Matter of Entergy Nuclear Vermont Yankee L.L.C.
6 regarding an up-rate license application for an up-
7 rate at the Vermont Yankee facility. It is our Docket
8 No. 50-271-OLA, I believe.

9 And we are here for our regular pre-
10 hearing conference call. Before we proceed, I would
11 like to introduce those people who are here today in
12 Rockville, Maryland in the NRC Offices. I'm here
13 together with Karen Valloch, our administrative
14 assistant, and Marcia Carpentier and Jonathan Rund who
15 are our lawyers and law clerks supporting the Board
16 here.

17 Judge Baratta and Judge Rubinstein will
18 introduce themselves if you would please.

19 ADMIN. JUDGE RUBINSTEIN: This is Judge
20 Rubinstein.

21 ADMIN. JUDGE BARATTA: Okay, this is Judge
22 Baratta.

23 ADMIN. JUDGE KARLIN: Thank you. Thank
24 you. Both of them are calling in from remote
25 locations this morning.

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 And for the record, we would then need to
2 go around the table. And Mr. -- for NEC, Mr Shadis?

3 MR. SHADIS: Yes, Raymond Shadis for NEC.
4 Good morning.

5 ADMIN. JUDGE KARLIN: Good morning.

6 And for Entergy, Mr. Silberg?

7 MR. SILBERG: Yes, Jay Silberg. And
8 Matias Travieso-Diaz from Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw
9 Pittman. And also from the plant, Craig Nichols, our
10 Project Manager for the whole up-rate.

11 ADMIN. JUDGE KARLIN: Good morning. Thank
12 you for joining us.

13 Mr. Turk please?

14 MR. TURK: Good morning, Your Honor. For
15 the staff, Sherwin Turk and Steven Hamrick. Joining
16 us today are Rick Ennis, the Project Manager for the
17 staff and Brooke Poole, who is currently with NRR
18 management, and she is joining us for the conference
19 call today.

20 ADMIN. JUDGE KARLIN: Welcome. Welcome,
21 Ms. Poole, making a special appearance I see here.
22 Didn't you start this thing several years ago?

23 MS. POOLE: Yes, Your Honor, I did. I
24 couldn't stay away forever.

25 ADMIN. JUDGE KARLIN: I can imagine you

1 couldn't, yes, I know it.

2 And do we have anyone else on the call?

3 (No response.)

4 ADMIN. JUDGE KARLIN: All right. Fine.
5 We all, I think, know the ground rules here. And,
6 again, if we -- and I'm probably the worst offender
7 but if we could all try to state our name before we
8 begin talking, it would help the court reporter.

9 The main purpose of this call is for our
10 monthly status report really. Our last pre-hearing --
11 this is our last pre-hearing conference call before
12 the evidentiary hearing begins in September of '06.
13 So we probably have several topics that need to be
14 covered. I can think of three.

15 And then if you all have any other
16 suggestions for the agenda that are urgent or
17 important, please I'll ask for that. The three that
18 I think we want to talk about briefly are first NEC's
19 withdrawal of its Contention No. 4, just a brief note
20 on that.

21 Second is the schedule and the site visit.
22 That will need to be adjusted given the fact of NEC's
23 withdrawal of Contention 4.

24 And third is some more specific and
25 practical, I guess, suggestions or instructions

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 regarding the evidentiary hearing logistics and
2 protocol.

3 Those are the three that I had in mind.
4 I'm not sure whether Judges Baratta or Rubinstein have
5 any other -- do you have anything else you want to
6 talk about?

7 ADMIN. JUDGE BARATTA: This is Judge
8 Baratta. No, I don't.

9 ADMIN. JUDGE RUBINSTEIN: Judge
10 Rubinstein, no, I'm fine.

11 ADMIN. JUDGE KARLIN: Great. Okay. And
12 the parties? Anything else -- a burning issue that
13 needs to be confronted here?

14 MR. SILBERG: We have several issues but
15 I think they fall within the scope of the ones that
16 you mentioned.

17 COURT REPORTER: Please identify yourself.

18 MR. SILBERG: Oh, I'm sorry. This is Jay
19 Silberg.

20 ADMIN. JUDGE KARLIN: Great, thank you,
21 Mr. Silberg. I think it probably will. And if at the
22 end of the call we haven't covered them, perhaps you
23 can speak up at that point and we will see if there is
24 something else that needs to be addressed.

25 MR. SHADIS: This is Raymond Shadis, Your

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

1 Honor. We need some direction or we would like some
2 direction with respect to how to deal with updates to
3 the hearing file, in particular, the most recent
4 update which has documents dating back to 1981 to
5 1984. We simply don't know how we are to handle them
6 or react to them. So perhaps at the end we can
7 explain a little more and get some direction from the
8 Board.

9 ADMIN. JUDGE KARLIN: And when you say
10 updates to the hearing file, you mean the staff's
11 regular updates to the hearing file?

12 MR. SHADIS: That's correct. That's
13 correct.

14 ADMIN. JUDGE KARLIN: And the recent
15 update has included some 1981 to '84 documents?

16 MR. SHADIS: That is correct.

17 ADMIN. JUDGE KARLIN: All right. Well,
18 let's not get into it. But let's add that to the
19 agenda.

20 MR. SHADIS: Thank you very much.

21 ADMIN. JUDGE KARLIN: Okay. Very good.
22 Okay. Anything else? Mr. Turk, anything that you
23 have there?

24 MR. TURK: No, I think that covers
25 everything we would like to raise as well, Your Honor.

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 ADMIN. JUDGE KARLIN: Okay. All right.
2 Good.

3 Then we will turn to the withdrawal of
4 Contention 4 by NEC. Just -- we just want to note
5 that obviously it appears to be a unilateral
6 withdrawal. There is no quid pro quo or settlement
7 agreement associated with it. So as far as we are
8 concerned, that is a fait accompli.

9 And just for everyone's assurance, the
10 witnesses associated with Contention 4 then no longer
11 need to be delayed or need to be brought to the
12 hearing. That contention has been withdrawn. And we
13 see that as the end of that matter.

14 Next, regarding the schedule and the site
15 visit, because of the withdrawal of C4, which was
16 previously scheduled for the first day of the hearing,
17 which was the 12th of September, we now sort of have
18 a gap in our program. The site visit was on the 11th
19 and we were going to begin on the 12th on NEC 4. And
20 then NEC 3 was going to be the 13th, 14th, and, if
21 necessary, 15th.

22 In light of that gap, we have contacted --
23 Marcia Carpentier has contacted counsel for Entergy
24 and they have indicated they are amenable to moving
25 the site visit back a day. The facility can

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

1 accommodate postponing it from the 11th to the 12th.
2 And so that is what we have decided to do which would
3 be have the site visit on the 12th and commence the
4 evidentiary hearing on Wednesday, the 13th, focusing,
5 of course, on the only remaining contention at this
6 point, NEC 3. And we have thus three days for NEC 3
7 plus a couple in reserve in October if necessary.

8 We really don't think that will be needed
9 but -- so that is our plan. And we will be issuing an
10 order shortly, probably tomorrow, which will reflect
11 this point, among others, i.e., moving the site visit
12 back a day and proceeding in that manner.

13 Are there any questions on that from
14 anyone?

15 (No response.)

16 ADMIN. JUDGE KARLIN: Okay. Great. I
17 think that will work and I feel pretty confident, and
18 we have thought about it, that we should be able to
19 get through in the three days or if not shorter, the
20 remains for NEC Contention 3.

21 Let's see. With regard to the site visit
22 itself, as I think we have indicated, it will -- and
23 we're not going to change this -- I'm not trying to
24 change this -- the date changes but the time is still
25 9:00 a.m. I think I have that right.

1 I was going to ask Mr. Travieso-Diaz or
2 Silberg or perhaps Mr. Nichols if there is a place we
3 should meet at 9:00 a.m. -- a visitors' center or a
4 guard shack or something like that?

5 MR. TRAVIESO-DIAZ: Craig, can you address
6 that?

7 MR. NICHOLS: Yes, Judge Karlin, this is
8 Craig Nichols from Entergy. At the entrance to the
9 site at the first guardhouse, immediately to the left
10 of that is a large white building referred to as the
11 Governor Hunt House. And that is where we have a
12 small meeting place where we can gather, inform people
13 about the tour rules, and provide safety equipment.

14 ADMIN. JUDGE KARLIN: Okay. So that is
15 where we will presumably need to meet at 9:00. If
16 everyone could be there crisply at 9:00, that would be
17 helpful.

18 ADMIN. JUDGE BARATTA: This is Judge
19 Baratta. Is it obvious as to parking and that sort of
20 thing?

21 MR. NICHOLS: There is parking right in
22 front of that building. Not for an excessive number
23 of cars but certainly enough, I think, for the folks
24 that are coming on this tour. And we will have that
25 designated for ASLBP parties for that day.

1 And then if needed, we will either walk or
2 if the weather is inclement, we will find a way to
3 shuttle people down closer to the entrance to the
4 facility.

5 ADMIN. JUDGE KARLIN: Okay. So we are
6 planning on walking generally unless the weather is
7 inclement. And obviously we will have casual attire
8 as appropriate. Is there any particular -- I mean
9 hard-toed shoes, this sort of thing?

10 MR. NICHOLS: We don't have a requirement
11 for tours for what are referred to as safety or steel-
12 toed shoes but do require, you know, a sturdy shoe, a
13 leather sneaker, or, you know, a leather shoe. No
14 open toes for shoes, no sandals, things like that.

15 What you would do, you know, in an
16 industrial environment. If there are ladies coming
17 with us, I would not recommend dresses -- pants, et
18 cetera, because we will be climbing stairways and
19 going around.

20 And that is one thing we do -- we would
21 like to find out is what exactly the Board et al would
22 like for the tour.

23 ADMIN. JUDGE KARLIN: Okay. Well, this is
24 helpful. One of the things we also wanted to adjust
25 is we have asked you in the order -- in the site

1 visit, the order previously issued, that you give us
2 an initial briefing as to essentially what we are
3 going to see and the basic layout. And accompany that
4 with a map of what we are going to see.

5 We would also like to have a basic
6 schematic of the flow or of the -- to go with the map
7 so we have both a physical locator and a, you know,
8 flow schematic locator as we go. If you could provide
9 that, we would appreciate it.

10 MR. NICHOLS: I assume provide that at the
11 time versus in advance?

12 ADMIN. JUDGE KARLIN: Yes, yes, at the
13 time.

14 MR. NICHOLS: Certainly, we can do that.

15 MR. SILBERG: When you say -- this is Jay
16 Silberg -- a physical locator, you mean the order in
17 which you are going to be at various places?

18 ADMIN. JUDGE KARLIN: Yes, here is a map
19 of the site. Here is where we are going to go, one,
20 two, three, four, and, you know, maybe have it marked
21 on the map. And then the schematic I don't think
22 needs to be marked in that way. But it would just
23 show basically the schematic.

24 Maybe Judges Baratta or Rubinstein have
25 more guidance on that?

1 ADMIN. JUDGE BARATTA: Yes, this is Judge
2 Baratta. Basically we are looking for the overall
3 system schematic. Not the real detailed type of thing
4 but that shows us the basic flow and where, when we go
5 in the plant, okay, this is the part of the system
6 that is going to be accessible to us at this point,
7 you know.

8 Because we realize that if a plant is in
9 operation, there will be areas that won't be
10 accessible. Just so that we are oriented as to both
11 the physical location of what we are looking at as
12 well as the location in the system itself as to what
13 we are looking at.

14 ADMIN. JUDGE RUBINSTEIN: Yes, we are
15 looking for the schematics that show the functional
16 overview of the system.

17 MR. NICHOLS: When you say the system, you
18 mean plant systems like --

19 ADMIN. JUDGE RUBINSTEIN: The systems
20 relevant to the NEC 3 that we're going to see -- that
21 are available to be seen.

22 MR. NICHOLS: Okay.

23 ADMIN. JUDGE KARLIN: Okay. Craig, do you
24 understand that?

25 ADMIN. JUDGE RUBINSTEIN: We will

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 articulate it in the order a little better.

2 ADMIN. JUDGE KARLIN: Okay.

3 MR. NICHOLS: And I believe I understand
4 the request and I believe, obviously, we are used to
5 doing tours. And I think we will only do a slight
6 variation of what we call the standard tour to focus,
7 as I think Judge Rubinstein said, those areas related
8 to NEC 3.

9 ADMIN. JUDGE RUBINSTEIN: Yes, you know,
10 please provide a schematic showing the overview of the
11 systems of interest.

12 MR. NICHOLS: We have that, certainly.

13 ADMIN. JUDGE RUBINSTEIN: I'm sure, yes.

14 ADMIN. JUDGE KARLIN: Great. Okay.
15 Anything else we need on that point Judges Baratta or
16 Rubinstein?

17 (No response.)

18 ADMIN. JUDGE KARLIN: Okay. So we will
19 have the schematic. We will look forward to the tour.
20 I think -- I don't know whether you have the names and
21 the information that you need for the participants but
22 I guess the original site visit order lays out that
23 and what needs to be provided. So good, it sounds
24 like we are good to go on that. And appreciate your
25 ability to move that from the 11th to the 12th.

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 MR. TRAVIESO-DIAZ: Judge Karlin, this is
2 Matias Travieso-Diaz. As far as I know, we have not
3 received that information from the parties who are
4 going to take part in the visit. So this is just a
5 reminder that we need to obtain that information prior
6 to the tour.

7 ADMIN. JUDGE KARLIN: Right. Exactly.
8 And I think we laid out in the order, you know, the
9 time frame within which you need to get that -- you
10 need to be provided that information. So please, if
11 everyone can cooperate and get that information to
12 Entergy so they can have that.

13 MR. TURK: Your Honor, this is Sherwin
14 Turk.

15 ADMIN. JUDGE KARLIN: Yes?

16 MR. TURK: Could I ask -- while we are
17 talking today, to ask Entergy to tell us exactly what
18 information they need for each person that will be on
19 the tour?

20 MR. NICHOLS: I had -- this is Craig
21 Nichols from Entergy -- I had provided a list, name,
22 social security number, date of birth. We can ask our
23 attorneys to resend that list to everyone.

24 MR. TURK: Thank you. That would be very
25 helpful.

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

MR. NICHOLS: Okay. We will do that.

ADMIN. JUDGE KARLIN: Good, good, please do that. That is great.

Okay, I think that is all we need to discuss in terms of the adjustment in the schedule and the site visit.

ADMIN. JUDGE BARATTA: This is Judge Baratta, one last thing, make sure everybody brings a photo ID.

ADMIN. JUDGE KARLIN: Brings a photo ID, right.

ADMIN. JUDGE BARATTA: A government-issued photo ID.

ADMIN. JUDGE KARLIN: Right, right.

Turning to the evidentiary hearing protocol, we are focusing -- I'm focusing a little bit now on the testimony and the exhibits for the practical, concrete things that we are looking for in this Subpart L type of proceeding, it will be similar in many respects, we think, to the way the L proceedings and even to some extent the G proceedings went with regard to introduction of witnesses.

All right. NEC 3, scheduled for the 13th to the 15th. I think you need to pretty much have all

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 your witnesses available most of that time frame. We
2 may very well get to all three panels on the first
3 day. That would be moving very quickly but it is
4 possible. So please have them available with some
5 flexibility.

6 We would contemplate, and this will be
7 laid out in an order, as I say, we are going to issue
8 tomorrow or hopefully tomorrow or maybe within the
9 next few days, but please listen carefully because the
10 time is, you know, a couple weeks, three weeks away,
11 opening statement.

12 We thought it would be useful if everyone
13 could give us an opening statement of about ten
14 minutes. If you want to do it, that is an opportunity
15 for you to talk about your presentation in your case.

16 Then we would contemplate the testimony.
17 Each panel would be sworn in and the sponsoring party
18 -- we want you to bring an original and two copies of
19 the testimony. We know that it has been pre-filed.
20 And the original and two that you bring in should be
21 identical to the pre-filed testimony except for
22 corrections.

23 We don't want to discourage corrections
24 but we don't want to leave the door open for a lot of
25 modifications or changes except as corrections are

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

1 necessary. So the sponsoring party brings an original
2 and two copies of testimony. The sponsoring party
3 asks basic questions of the witnesses for the
4 foundation for the admission of their written
5 testimony as if it was read into the record.

6 This will be a 1a 10 CFR Section 2.11B, as
7 in boy, typically the way it is done in the NRC
8 proceedings. Nothing surprising or different there.

9 We will then presumably admit into the
10 written testimony as if read. This will allow it to
11 be put into the transcript and more easily referred
12 to. And then we will turn to the exhibits. And you
13 would -- each party would, in their turn, present
14 their exhibits.

15 The sponsoring party will bring -- we're
16 asking them to bring an original and two hard copy of
17 each exhibit. And each exhibit is you have pre-filed
18 exhibits, direct, rebuttal, and supplemental. And we
19 would want you to bring an original and two hard copy
20 of each.

21 We would like you to have them pre-marked
22 with certain information on them. We were going to
23 send you a stamp out -- we are going to send it out
24 today -- that we ask you to use to pre-mark certain
25 information on the front page of each of the original

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

1 and two.

2 The sponsoring party will then briefly
3 describe each document and move for its admission.
4 And then we will rule on their admission or not.

5 Exhibits should be identical to the pre-
6 filed exhibits. You don't need to bring extra copies
7 for anyone else either for the judges or for the other
8 parties so long as they are identical to what was pre-
9 filed and which we already have.

10 The original and two are for the SECY and
11 for other, you know, record purposes that need to
12 have.

13 And we would also like you to give us an
14 electronic pre-filed list. We would call it -- it is
15 a little bit of chart which we will use for keeping
16 track of things. And we are going to ask you to email
17 that to Marcia Carpentier. That will probably be like
18 on September 5th or 6th, about a week before we get
19 started.

20 Once the testimony and exhibits are
21 brought into evidence, then the Board will ask
22 questions of the witnesses. And we will, of course --
23 if there are proprietary questions or issues that we
24 have to ask questions about, we will take a break or
25 somehow adjourn and ask the members of the public and

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 anyone who hasn't signed the non-disclosure agreement
2 to be excluded. And then we will reconvene and ask
3 the questions we need to ask.

4 So any questions?

5 ADMIN. JUDGE BARATTA: This is Judge
6 Baratta. May I interject?

7 ADMIN. JUDGE KARLIN: Yes, yes, please do,
8 please do.

9 ADMIN. JUDGE BARATTA: The exhibits and
10 the pre-filed testimony, if there are any corrections
11 to those, there will be a point at which we will ask
12 you, for the record, to identify those so that even
13 though you have corrected copies, we will need to
14 enter into the record what those corrections were.

15 Also, we didn't mention anything about an
16 electronic version of the testimony if there are
17 corrections. And I haven't talked to my colleagues
18 about this.

19 But I really would prefer to get an
20 electronic copy if that does not pose too much of a
21 problem as it will aid me in writing the decision.
22 And I'm certain it would also aid my colleagues in
23 doing that if that's acceptable to my colleagues.

24 ADMIN. JUDGE RUBINSTEIN: That would be
25 very helpful. And in addition, please identify it as

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

1 corrected copy of such and such a date, which you
2 would do anyway.

3 ADMIN. JUDGE KARLIN: Right. I think that
4 would probably be good. I mean that could be brought
5 in -- it doesn't have to be brought in in advance of
6 the hearing. But at the hearing or soon thereafter it
7 seems to me.

8 MR. TURK: Your Honor, could I ask --
9 again, Sherwin Turk --

10 ADMIN. JUDGE KARLIN: Yes?

11 MR. TURK: -- if there are any corrections
12 to testimony, could I ask that they be put in with red
13 line strikeout marking so that we can see how the
14 revised testimony differs from the original?

15 ADMIN. JUDGE KARLIN: Yes, that is a good
16 suggestion. And we would like to have that
17 highlighted. Strike out and redlined and that sort of
18 thing for corrections or changes so we all know where
19 they are.

20 And presumably if there is a correction to
21 testimony, we will -- the sponsoring party when they
22 sponsor that witness, if there is anything different
23 from the pre-filed testimony, we want to hear about
24 each chapter and page and verse of that up front,
25 right then and there I think as well as having it

1 highlighted on the physical copy.

2 Now I would also say this that if there
3 are changes, then you need to bring enough copies to
4 give everyone in the room -- the other parties --
5 copies of the corrected versions. If they are the
6 same, no such problem. We will rely on the pre-filed
7 as being identical to the ones being submitted.

8 ADMIN. JUDGE BARATTA: This is Judge
9 Baratta again. One other point, if you, perchance,
10 get the stamp before the order comes out for marking
11 the exhibits, hold off until the order comes out
12 because there will be specific instructions as to
13 placement of the stamp and the type of information
14 that we expect you to put on the exhibits.

15 ADMIN. JUDGE KARLIN: Right, right. Good
16 point. This, I think, will help move it along and
17 make sure we get everything into the record properly
18 for purposes of ruling on this.

19 So -- and if you have questions, I mean I
20 would generally consult, you know, 2.1207 -- 11 has
21 certain rules about evidence. I mean I can't recite
22 all the regs here but we are just going to try to
23 follow them as much as possible.

24 The one thing different here is that in
25 2.1207, it talks about the testimony being admitted as

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 exhibits -- separate exhibits. Here we want to have
2 the testimony admitted as if read into the record so
3 that it will be part of the transcript. So that is a
4 little bit different than what you would see in the
5 straight reading of the reg there.

6 ADMIN. JUDGE BARATTA: And typically in
7 these hearings when we move for admission, we just
8 say, you know, move the testimony identified be
9 admitted as evidence incorporated in the transcript at
10 this point as if read. And the Board would typically
11 say, you know, done.

12 ADMIN. JUDGE KARLIN: Absolutely. That's
13 the way we would proceed. We also note that we have
14 already gone through motions in limine on all of this
15 material.

16 So, you know, unless there is some motion
17 dealing with one of the -- some correction that is a
18 problem, we don't expect -- you have already had your
19 opportunity to file your motion. There has already
20 been a ruling on it. And that is in the record. So
21 you don't need to restate it to get it into the
22 record.

23 But there we go. So with that, I think --
24 first, before we get to Mr. Shadis' question about the
25 hearing updates, I believe Mr. Silberg said that there

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 were some issue or questions he had on the hearing
2 issues. Has this answered your question, sir?

3 MR. SILBERG: Not entirely but let me note
4 the points that I thought would be important to cover.

5 First, the order of presentation,
6 typically the applicant goes first. The intervenors
7 go second. And the staff goes last. Is that the
8 order that the Board would like to follow in this
9 case?

10 ADMIN. JUDGE KARLIN: Well, the applicant
11 will go first. I think we will address that. And I
12 am not sure whether that is the way we will do it or
13 not. But yes, the applicant will go first. And we
14 may have the intervenor go last.

15 MR. SILBERG: Okay. The second point, do
16 you want each party to put in its testimony followed
17 by questions from the Board or do you want all parties
18 to put in their testimony up front and then
19 sequentially have questions from the Board?

20 ADMIN. JUDGE KARLIN: Well, we will deal
21 with that later. We'll deal with that later.

22 MR. SILBERG: Okay. You talked about the
23 segmentation of proprietary and non-proprietary. One
24 question is the potential admission into evidence of
25 documents that we provided to the Board, at the

1 Board's request, on June 19. Do you want all those
2 documents introduced into evidence?

3 ADMIN. JUDGE KARLIN: Yes, we want you to
4 bring the original and two of each of those documents.
5 We probably -- but we can decide that at that time.

6 ADMIN. JUDGE BARATTA: This is Judge
7 Baratta. We probably -- and I haven't talked with my
8 colleagues about that but if those documents are
9 proprietary, we will probably have to have you mark
10 them slightly differently. So there may be some
11 additional clarification on that point.

12 MR. SILBERG: Okay. So the legend that
13 you are going to send us would indicate whether it is
14 proprietary or non-proprietary?

15 ADMIN. JUDGE BARATTA: Well, we haven't
16 discussed that point yet but I will discuss that with
17 my colleagues before the order goes out and we will
18 come up with a statement on that.

19 ADMIN. JUDGE KARLIN: Yes, we definitely
20 would want -- I agree with Judge Baratta -- we would
21 want the document to say on its face to be marked as
22 proprietary. Whether or not the stamp itself covers
23 that or whether it is just marked that way, yes,
24 obviously that marking is important.

25 MR. SILBERG: Yes, the documents typically

1 would be marked as proprietary. But I just didn't
2 know whether you wanted the stamp to somehow reflect
3 that or not.

4 ADMIN. JUDGE KARLIN: I don't know whether
5 or stamp accommodates that variable but we will
6 certainly keep it in a separate manner, you know, and
7 recognize the proprietary nature of the document and
8 handle it accordingly.

9 MR. SILBERG: Okay. And I assume for some
10 of the exhibit documents, which obviously many of them
11 have not been prepared by the witnesses that we would
12 have that our sponsoring witnesses could describe the
13 source of those documents and authenticate it that
14 way, we would not need to bring in original sponsors,
15 if you will, for the exhibits.

16 ADMIN. JUDGE KARLIN: Well, if you are
17 talking about authentication, that sort of thing, I
18 mean we don't have any -- no motions or objections
19 were filed.

20 So I don't contemplate anything of that
21 nature. So, you know, I think you just identify -- we
22 would like want you to go through each document, you
23 know, Exhibits 1 through 22, for example, and give us
24 a brief statement of what that exhibit is.

25 And then it would be marked for

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

1 identification purposes. You would already have pre-
2 marked certain information on it. And then the Clerk
3 of the Court -- we will be using Marcia Carpentier for
4 this -- will then mark it for identification.

5 And then, we presume, you would move for
6 its admission.

7 MR. SILBERG: Right.

8 ADMIN. JUDGE KARLIN: And then we would,
9 you know, absent any startling new objection on
10 something that has changed, it would be admitted.

11 MR. SILBERG: Okay, that's fine.

12 MR. TURK: May I ask one question on the
13 documents? This is Sherwin Turk.

14 ADMIN. JUDGE KARLIN: Yes?

15 MR. TURK: Back when we were filing
16 documents with the Board, I noticed, as I'm sure the
17 Board did, that many of the documents identified by
18 the applicant were also identified by the staff. For
19 instance the GE topical report.

20 ADMIN. JUDGE KARLIN: Right.

21 MR. TURK: I don't see any reason for us
22 to introduce duplicate hard copies of exhibits. And
23 I'm wondering if we can establish a procedure where
24 perhaps the staff, with Mr. Silberg, can identify
25 those exhibits which we would simply leave as

1 applicant exhibits or mark as joint exhibits.

2 ADMIN. JUDGE KARLIN: All right. We will
3 -- I think that is a good point. And we will address
4 that to avoid unnecessary duplication of documents.

5 And since at this point, as far as I can
6 tell, you know, I would just encourage the staff and
7 the applicant to coordinate on that. And the
8 applicant will go first. I presume the applicant's
9 number would be the relevant one. The staff wouldn't
10 need to introduce it again.

11 And as far as I can tell from what has
12 been filed, and the NEC did not file any exhibits
13 other than, of course, having an opportunity to refer
14 to the exhibits of the other parties, they don't have
15 any exhibits of theirs so they don't need to worry
16 about that duplication issue.

17 MR. SILBERG: We're happy either to file
18 these as joint exhibits or probably easiest would be
19 just to have whichever documents are common, you know,
20 have an applicant's exhibit number and the staff can
21 rely on that numbering system.

22 MR. SILBERG: I think --

23 COURT REPORTER: Please identify yourself.

24 MR. SILBERG: I'm sorry, Jay Silberg.

25 ADMIN. JUDGE KARLIN: Yes? Okay. We will

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

1 address that in the order and basically we will ask
2 you to consult and avoid duplication where possible.
3 That is a good point, Mr. Turk.

4 Anything else?

5 (No response.)

6 ADMIN. JUDGE KARLIN: Mr. Silberg, have we
7 covered your questions then?

8 MR. SILBERG: I think we have at this
9 point.

10 ADMIN. JUDGE KARLIN: Okay. Now we will
11 turn to Mr. Shadis' issue or question. Please Mr.
12 Shadis, what is the issue here.

13 MR. SHADIS: Thank you. Much of it, I
14 think, has been answered in the discussion that we
15 just had. But being unfamiliar with the rules, we
16 were left just a little perplexed -- that both NRC and
17 Entergy have continued to provide disclosures in the
18 hearing file index after having filed their statements
19 of position, rebuttal, and supplementary filing.

20 And I guess what I was looking for was to
21 figure out whether or not the documents identified in
22 the hearing file index would be admissible or
23 presented as exhibits in the hearing. And what I
24 derived from our conversation, and please correct if
25 I am wrong, if they have not already been introduced

1 as exhibits, they would not be admissible in the
2 hearing.

3 ADMIN. JUDGE KARLIN: Okay. Good
4 question. I think perhaps out of a function of being
5 careful or inertia, the staff and Entergy and even NEC
6 might have continued to update regularly their
7 documents in the file -- and the hearing file in the
8 case of the staff.

9 But I think it is correct to say that only
10 the exhibits that have been pre-filed as being
11 critical to this case are the ones that will be
12 exhibits -- that are pre-filed as exhibits and will be
13 admitted, you know, or submitted for admission as
14 exhibits.

15 So the answer to your question is yes.
16 Only those that have been attached as exhibits are
17 going to be brought into this evidentiary hearing in
18 September.

19 MR. TURK: Your Honor, Sherwin Turk.

20 ADMIN. JUDGE KARLIN: Yes?

21 MR. TURK: I think what Mr. Shadis is
22 referring to is, in particular, and he can correct me
23 if I am wrong, the most recent staff update of the
24 hearing file --

25 ADMIN. JUDGE KARLIN: Yes?

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

1 MR. TURK: -- in which the staff
2 identified two early generic letters in which ODYN was
3 approved for use for things such as the issues
4 involved in this proceeding. These are documents that
5 have been available in ADAMS. In fact what happened
6 here was the Project Manager, Mr. Ennis, was doing an
7 ADAMS search and he came across them.

8 These are documents that are 25 years old
9 now. They go back to the time when ODYN was first
10 approved. We were not aware of these documents in
11 particular when we forwarded documents to the Board
12 previously.

13 But they are definitely relevant and the
14 staff -- we are on the verge of reaching a decision
15 whether or not we want to use them as exhibits. I
16 think they would be very helpful to have in the
17 record.

18 ADMIN. JUDGE BARATTA: Yes, this is Judge
19 Baratta here. Judge Karlin and Judge Rubinstein,
20 could we maybe discuss this and provide a ruling in
21 our order?

22 MR. TURK: In fact, Your Honor, I might
23 suggest that we make copies rather than simply leave
24 these in the hearing file, that I send them out by
25 letter so that everyone has a physical copy in hand.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 And if the staff decides they want to
2 introduce them as an exhibit, we will move at that
3 time and the Board can rule at that time. But all
4 parties and the Board will have had the documents and
5 will be well aware of what they are before you are
6 asked to rule.

7 MR. SHADIS: This is Ray Shadis, Your
8 Honor. This is out of time. It is essentially a
9 pleading without testimony and out of time. And so I
10 am hoping that you will not permit these to now be
11 introduced as evidence.

12 And that goes equally for the documents
13 that Entergy has provided following the last date for
14 filing of testimony.

15 ADMIN. JUDGE RUBINSTEIN: This is Judge
16 Rubinstein. Before we respond to that, let me ask a
17 question. My memory may be hazy but as I remember
18 reading the staff's testimony, you included the
19 staff's 1981 report approving ODYN.

20 MR. TURK: That is correct.

21 ADMIN. JUDGE RUBINSTEIN: And I think that
22 incorporated a cover letter or two.

23 MR. TURK: That is correct.

24 ADMIN. JUDGE RUBINSTEIN: Is this of the
25 same sense? Or does it go beyond that?

1 MR. TURK: These are of the same time
2 frame. One document is November 4th of 1980. The
3 other is January 29 of 1981. These were generic
4 letters informing all holders of construction permits
5 and operating licenses for BWRs that they may use
6 ODYN.

7 The SE was the formal document that
8 approved the use of ODYN and these were the
9 notifications that went out to licensees informing
10 them of the approval.

11 ADMIN. JUDGE RUBINSTEIN: In essence,
12 these are meaningless documents.

13 MR. TURK: The SE is actually the staff
14 assessment and approval. And then these are the
15 notices to --

16 ADMIN. JUDGE RUBINSTEIN: Saying that it
17 has been approved.

18 MR. TURK: Yes.

19 ADMIN. JUDGE RUBINSTEIN: But these are
20 essentially, for our case, meaningless documents.

21 ADMIN. JUDGE KARLIN: Well, yes. I think
22 -- I'm certainly not here to disagree with that, Judge
23 Rubinstein, at all.

24 I think we probably ought to take this
25 offline but I have a concern, Mr. Turk, because these

1 documents are 25 years old. They were apparently
2 pointed out to you by the applicant.

3 There is nothing new about them. Mr.
4 Shadis and the NEC have three times attempted to
5 supplement the record and asked for our indulgence in
6 expanding and supplementing the record. And we have
7 denied that three times because of the cascading
8 effect we think that would have.

9 If you now want to file some sort of a
10 motion to supplement the record a la the way Mr.
11 Shadis has tried to do three times before and been
12 denied, we would think you could do that. But it is
13 very late in the day.

14 And if it is something crucial, startling,
15 you know, important, that is one thing. But I can't
16 speak for my colleagues but I think it is problematic
17 to be coming in at this late date with new exhibits,
18 new evidence, especially ancient material.

19 MR. TURK: I understand your position,
20 Your Honor. Incidentally, these were not pointed out
21 to us by the applicant. This was Mr. Ennis, the
22 staff's Project Manager, who conducted the ADAMS
23 search and located them.

24 But I understand, Your Honor. I have not
25 moved their admission at this point. And I know from

1 the tenor of this conversation that if I decide that
2 I want to move them, I had better anticipate the
3 ruling. I had better have a very persuasive case to
4 make if I hope to get the documents in.

5 ADMIN. JUDGE KARLIN: Yes, well, I -- no,
6 no, my colleagues and I have not discussed this so I
7 don't know what our ruling would be. But our approach
8 has been that each party had their opportunity to
9 submit their direct testimony and exhibits, their
10 rebuttal testimony and exhibits, their supplemental.
11 And that is to be the evidence upon which we have to
12 decide this case.

13 But, again, if you want to -- I'm not sure
14 whether you want to make a motion, whether you are
15 making a motion, you know, or what we have here, if we
16 have anything at all to rule upon.

17 But I think we have probably -- my take
18 would be we would need a motion of some kind for
19 supplementing the record if you wanted to add those
20 documents. And there would have to be an opportunity
21 to respond.

22 ADMIN. JUDGE BARATTA: Yes, this is Judge
23 Baratta. I would second that opinion, too.

24 Judge Rubinstein, do you have any
25 comments?

1 ADMIN. JUDGE RUBINSTEIN: No, I agree. I
2 think we could probably dispose of this in about two
3 minutes in a private conversation.

4 ADMIN. JUDGE KARLIN: Okay. So does that
5 answer your question, Mr. Turk? If you want to file
6 a motion, you can file a motion. I would suggest you
7 do so very quickly because time is a-wasting.

8 MR. SILBERG: This is Mr. Silberg. One
9 final point, Mr. Shadis, I guess, pointed out that we
10 may have identified some additional documents as well.
11 We have no intention of moving those documents into
12 evidence at this point in time. We are just trying to
13 be complete.

14 ADMIN. JUDGE KARLIN: Yes, yes. I
15 understand. Sort of inertia sets in and there is an
16 obligation to update the files every X days or weeks.
17 And people keep doing it even though, you know, of
18 course, the pre-file testimony has already been, you
19 know, submitted.

20 MR. TURK: Yes, I don't know that I would
21 characterize it as inertia. We believed that we had
22 a continuing obligation.

23 ADMIN. JUDGE KARLIN: No, I understand.

24 MR. TURK: If the Board wants to have that
25 obligation stop as of this minutes, we will be more

1 than happy to.

2 ADMIN. JUDGE KARLIN: We might. That is
3 worth considering actually. We probably should have
4 thought about that earlier.

5 MR. TURK: It would probably save us some
6 administrative time and we would -- not having thought
7 of that before, would welcome that opportunity.

8 ADMIN. JUDGE KARLIN: All right. Well, I
9 think we will think about putting that into this order
10 we hope to get out in the next day or two or three or
11 whatever.

12 Okay. Let me put it this way, because of
13 the shortness of time, maybe we could say that if you
14 have something supplementary on this issue that you
15 want to file or a motion in this regard, Mr. Turk,
16 please file it within -- well, can you file it by the
17 end of this week? This is a Tuesday, let's say next
18 Monday. Mr. Turk, are you there?

19 MR. TURK: Yes, thank you, Your Honor. We
20 will do that. If we are going to file at all, we will
21 do that.

22 ADMIN. JUDGE KARLIN: Okay. File it by
23 next Monday. Oh, gosh, this brings us right up
24 against Labor Day, doesn't it?

25 MR. TURK: I'll do it this week, Your

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

1 Honor. Maybe if -- I'll talk to the staff and if they
2 decide they want -- if they feel it is really
3 important to put this in, we will file the motion
4 today or tomorrow.

5 ADMIN. JUDGE KARLIN: I would appreciate
6 it. That would be great. Okay, get it in this week.

7 And we will then proscribe until, you
8 know, seven days or next Friday, whichever comes
9 earlier, for Mr. Shadis for you to respond if you
10 would to that. Okay?

11 MR. SHADIS: And just to be clear, Your
12 Honor, this is Ray Shadis, just to be clear, what we
13 are talking about is the filing of proposed additional
14 exhibits. Is that correct?

15 ADMIN. JUDGE KARLIN: These two exhibits
16 you have pointed out -- the ones that have been
17 discussed, the 1981 reports. Those are the ones we
18 are talking about.

19 MR. SHADIS: I see.

20 ADMIN. JUDGE KARLIN: 1980 and '81. No
21 other. This is not opening the gate for everybody to
22 file motions to supplement at this point. We're just
23 talking about the two documents that you pointed out,
24 I think.

25 MR. SHADIS: And Entergy has represented

1 they have no intention of attempting to file any of
2 the documents they have provided recently. And I'm
3 looking for clarification here.

4 I am wondering if it is possible to draw
5 the line at the due date for the supplemental filings
6 that the Board asked for on the direct -- if what we
7 are talking about is anything that was produced after
8 that date.

9 MR. TURK: Well, the documents that we
10 intend to seek to introduce as exhibits are those that
11 we have already circulated. We don't have any
12 intention of adding any more documents no matter when
13 they were disclosed.

14 ADMIN. JUDGE KARLIN: Right. The only
15 subject of this particular motion that the staff has
16 an opportunity to make is the two 1980 and 1981
17 documents, 11/4/80 and 1/9/81, if I got it right. If
18 they want to move to have those admitted, please do so
19 by the end of this week.

20 And, Mr. Shadis, you will have an
21 opportunity, as I guess Entergy will as well, to
22 respond.

23 And you must do so by the end of next week
24 to that. And, therefore, we will have the pleadings
25 on that all ready to go over the Labor Day weekend.

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 And, you know, we will rule promptly on that.

2 With that, is there anything that we have
3 missed here?

4 (No response.)

5 ADMIN. JUDGE KARLIN: Okay. I appreciate
6 your patience and indulgence. I look forward to our
7 get together up in Brattleboro and then Newfane.

8 And with that, we will close the call.
9 This call is adjourned. Thank you very much.

10 (Whereupon, the above-entitled pre-hearing
11 teleconference was concluded at 11:57 a.m.)

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

CERTIFICATE

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

Name of Proceeding: Entergy Nuclear Vermont Yankee, LLC and Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc.

Pre-hearing Conference

Docket Number: 50-271-OLA and

ASLBP No.04-832-02-OLA

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.



Charles Morrison
Official Reporter

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

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com