# Official Transcript of Proceedings

# **NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

Title:

American Centrifuge Plant

Pre-Hearing Conference

**Docket Number:** 

70-7004-ML

DOCKETED

December 20, 2006 (11:01am)

Location:

(telephone conference)

OFFICE OF SECRETARY RULEMAKINGS AND ADJUDICATIONS STAFF

Date:

Wednesday, December 6, 2006

Work Order No.:

NRC-1368

Pages 1-38

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

TEMPLATES SECY 032

SELY-02

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

1	APPEARANCES:
2	On Behalf of the Licensee:
3	DONALD J. SILVERMAN, ESQ.
4	of: Morgan, Lewis & Bockius, LLP
5	1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
6	Washington, DC 20005
7	
8	DENNIS J. SCOTT, ESQ
9	PETER MINOR
10	USEC Inc.
11	6903 Rockledge Drive
12	Bethesda, MD 20817
13	
14	On Behalf of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission:
15	LISA B. CLARK, ESQ.
16	MARGARET J. BUPP, ESQ
17	of: Office of the General Counsel
18	Mail Stop - 0-15 D21
19	U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
20	Washington, D.C. 20555-0001
21	
22	
23	
24	

1	3
1	OTHER BOARD PERSONNEL PRESENT:
2	DEBRA WOLF
3	LIBBY PERCH
4	
5	OTHER NRC STAFF PRESENT:
6	JULIE OLIVIER
7	BRIAN SMITH
8	
9	OTHER USEC STAFF PRESENT:
10	EWAN TODD
11	
12	
13	
14	·
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

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

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

JUDGE MCDADE: Is the applicant?

MR. SILVERMAN: Yes, Your Honor.

JUDGE MCDADE: Okay. Pre-hearing conference will come to order in the matter of USEC Inc., ASLBP No. 05-838-01. There is before the board a motion by USEC, as I understand it the motion basically has two parts. One part has to do with the submission of pre-filed testimony by the Applicant. The other has to do with the tentative schedule that the board established or listed in its order of November 17<sup>th</sup>. Let me take them up surinam first having to do with the submission of pre-filed testimony, and let me raise the question and I'll put the question first to the Applicant and then to the Staff. a recent matter involving Grand Gulf what we proposed and what we did was the following, that we had the Staff, who we view as primarily responsible for moving this forward, file testimony.

We directed that the Applicant would have the opportunity to submit any corrections or supplements that they felt was necessary and I believe it was either seven or ten days later.

# NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

21

22

23

24

25

1

What we wanted to avoid is having two submissions that basically would include much, if not all, of the same material and then we would have to, you know, given the fact that there's going to be relatively tight time constraints at that point, go through figure out where they agreed and where they disagreed. And what we wanted to do is just simply have a submission from the Applicant that only indicated those areas where either they were in disagreement with the Staff or where they felt supplementation was necessary so that we didn't parallel submissions. From get two standpoint of the Applicant is that a system that would work int his particular case?

MR. SILVERMAN: Yes, Your Honor, this Don Silverman with Morgan Lewis on behalf of the Applicant. We are -- we have become aware of the Grand Gulf matter and the way in which that was handled and I think if we can work towards an expeditious schedule which is a separate issue we would be comfortable with that kind of an approach. We think there's a way to do this which would allow for no significant delay in the schedule. We would be pleased to be able to file testimony in response to the Staff to the extent

necessary to augment or correct.

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

We would like to be able, as we believe was the case in Grand Gulf, to cooperate with the Staff, work with them as much as possible in the drafting or in the review of their testimony, hopefully be able to comment on it at some point in time before it's submitted. That would help us a great deal.

JUDGE MCDADE: Well what we indicated to the Staff and to the Applicant in that case although viewed that we this as an was adjudicative hearing we didn't do it as adversary hearing at this point, given the fact that there are no interveners in the matter and that if we saw no reason why the applicant should see the Staff submission for the first time after it was submitted to the board. We urged them to work together in compiling the testimony and to ensure to the degree possible that the Applicant was aware of it at the earliest possible moment, so that in a relatively short period of time thereafter the Applicant would be in a position to submit either a corrective -- in their view corrective, the Staff might view it not as any place where corrective, but they took

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

exception to something that the Staff said or alternatively where they felt what the Staff said, although was accurate, required in the Applicant's view some supplementation. think that's where we would be leaning regardless of where we went, you know, with regard to the ultimate schedule. I mean to have a relatively short period of time, you know, to get input from the Applicant as to how long they thought would be required, you know, to probably tentatively set it at something about seven days, understanding depending on the complexity of it, it might be possible for the Applicant to do it It might be possible that they would quicker. need some additional time depending on the nature of, you know, how successful they were coordinating and how much additional testimony they believed would be necessary.

MR. SILVERMAN: We are comfortable with that, Your Honor.

JUDGE MCDADE: Okay. One thing I probably should do just to make sure the record is clear for the court reporter, there are a number of people here representing both the Applicant and the Staff, some of whom may have

speaking roles as we move ahead and some may not, so if I could just ask those representing the Staff just to state their name and position so that the court reporter can note that for the record.

MS. BUPP: I'm Margaret BUMP and I'm counsel for the NRC Staff. I'm joined at the counsel table by Julia Olivier, who's the project manager, and Brian Smith who is the branch chief overseeing this step of the review.

JUDGE MCDADE: Okay. Thank you. And for USEC?

MR. SILVERMAN: I'm Don Silverman, as I said with Morgan Lewis, counsel to United States Enrichment Corporation. On my right is Dennis Scott who is an associate, just in general counsel USEC in house. I have Bruce McPherson who is with my law firm and Peter Minor who is also with USEC.

JUDGE MCDADE: Okay. Thank you. The next aspect has to do with the tentative schedule that we had established. There is a motion by USEC to modify that schedule to basically look to a date of mid-March as opposed to May for the conclusion of this matter. Is there anything

24

25

further you would like to say on this before we start asking some questions, Mr. Silverman?

MR. SILVERMAN: Yes, there is one more thing we -- since we had presumed that the board might rule - propose in rule that we would file responsive testimony to the Staff. We've looked at the schedule that we proposed and we would add a suggested date, at least at this point in time, for a tentative date for USEC to file that proposed testimony, which we think would enable us to continue to meet this schedule. The schedule we propose would call for the submission of the Staff testimony by January 26th and we would propose, at least today without knowing what the board questions and issues are, that the -- that USEC be required to file the pre-file testimony by February 6<sup>th</sup>. That would be 11 days and what it would do, it would enable the board to have the Applicant's testimony a full week before the hearing.

JUDGE MCDADE: Okay. Anything
further?

MR. SILVERMAN: Not at this time.

JUDGE MCDADE: Okay. Based on the motion a couple of questions I have. One of

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

5

4

6 7

8

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

which, you indicated in the motion that there is a contract between the Department of Energy and USEC, indicating the construction is to begin no later than June of 2007. What happens as of June if construction is not begun in June, what happens next under this contract?

MR. SILVERMAN: I don't have the specific details, but I do know that, and I may ask Mr. Scott to weigh in here, but there are milestones and penalties associated with failure to meet the milestone, and I believe there is a process which could, at least theoretically, result in termination of the agreement between the Department of Energy and USEC. I'll let Mr. Scott.

Yes, Your Honor. The MR. SCOTT: agreement has a process, it has certain milestones that we have to meet. It also has a process for if we don't meet that what happens. We will also look to materiality on this. ultimately, the Department a number of revenues it can take including up to terminating the agreement, terminating our ability to complete this project. Obviously, you know, the tone of that and record remedies as well, depending upon

what the Department feels is necessary to protect 1 the government's interest. I think the important 2 thing to note is, you know, we certainly would 3 like very much so to be able to honor that 4 commitment to the milestone. 5 JUDGE MCDADE: When was this contact 6 7 entered into? MR. SCOTT: June of 2002. 8 JUDGE MCDADE: Okay. SO this was 9 10 entered into more than two years before USEC submitted it's application. 11 12 MR. SCOTT: Yes, sir. JUDGE MCDADE: The application was in 13 August of '04. 14 Yes, it was actually 15 SCOTT: entered into shortly after those documents, we 16 had access to the technology under initial 17 18 review, essentially it provided that. JUDGE MCDADE: And then for that final 19 period of time, an almost three year period of 20 21 time from when the application was submitted until this contract term of June of '07, it would 22 be totally outside of USEC's control first of all 23 as to how long it took the Staff to prepare the 24 25 safety evaluation report and the environmental

Tracky.

impact statement and then how long it would take the board to review it, adjudicate it, whether or not there were any interveners and how long that litigation would take if interveners were allowed, and then how long it would take the commission to review the board's decision.

MR. SCOTT: Certainly there's elements of that are beyond our control, as you know in any application process the quality of the application, how quickly we respond to requests for additional information are certainly within the control of the Applicant so in terms of timing on all of this, certainly a lot of it is outside of our control and, obviously if the board decided it needed additional time it's beyond our control so there are elements that are. So I guess that in the absence of all that certainly that would be an argument that we could make with the Department hopefully favorable on that, but we always like to reach the milestones if at all possible.

JUDGE MCDADE: Okay. Since you submitted your application back in August of '04, and more specifically, since the board issued its tentative scheduling order, have you heard

### NEAL R. GROSS

anything from the Department of Energy indicating 1 that the June '07 date was of consequence, that 2 if the application were not approved until June 3 4 as opposed to March that the Department of Energy would take a different position to the USEC under 5 the contract. 6 7 MR. SCOTT: We have -- no, Your Honor. We have not had that. 8 . 9 ADMIN. JUDGE LAM: And so should I 10 assume the contract would provide a lot of protection for you if it is delayed due to 11 elements out of your control? 12 13 MR. SCOTT: Yes, sir. JUDGE MCDADE: Are all the elements 14 that are within your control in place in order to 15 start construction in 2007? 16 MR. SCOTT: Yes, Your Honor. 17 Your Honor. We could begin, I mean, you know, 18 certainly there's a certain period of time to 19 start with respect to your contract or that we 20 could begin construction activity shortly after -21 22 What is the current JUDGE MCDADE: 23 status as far as the application itself? I mean 24 25 is it anticipated that there are going to be

supplements with regard to the technology submitted that are going to require further review by the Staff and supplemental safety evaluation reports prepared by the Staff?

MR. SILVERMAN: No, to the best of our knowledge, Your Honor, the -- after due process is done the SER has been issued, the EIS has been issued in final form and the last step in the process is the mandatory hearing process.

not on what's happened so far, it was just from the Applicant's standpoint of what's going on with the Applicant and whether or not you anticipate submitting to the NRC Staff for review any supplements, any changes that are going to require a supplemental safety evaluation report, or in your judgement, would require a supplemental safety evaluation report?

MR. MINOR: This is Peter Minor, at this time, Your Honor, no we don't. Certainly as the design continues to be finalized and we work with our architect engineer, certainly things will evolve, but we don't expect that we will have major changes that the Staff would have to review at this time.

(202) 234-4433

2

3 4

5

6

7

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

about construction that could arguably begin in the summer of 2007 are you talking about construction that I mean, you know, preparation of the staging area, preparation of a parking lot or are you talking about construction of the actual building itself and rehab of the existing buildings and construction of new buildings to accommodate the technology?

MR. MINOR: This is Peter Minor again. Certainly there are a number of examples that would be representative things that we might want to do immediately. For example, mobilization of construction resources, installation of office trailers, underground utilities and communications, security fencing. As you know there existing facilities there, some of which equipment left over from the prior Department of Energy program. Some of that equipment is required to be removed. Some of it is extensive. We're required to take out piping valves, electrical conduit, and the like. would -- that eats up a lot of time at the front of the work schedule. We also have on -

JUDGE MCDADE: Is that construction

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

Don

the

of

construction

that could not be started? For example, putting in fencing, utilities, prior to the time that Nuclear Regulatory Commission signs off on the license? Well we've not looked at MR. MINOR: that aggressively with the Staff, whether that's an activity that we might pursue. Your Honor, SILVERMAN: Silverman, I think that a number activities that this company is planning and hoping to be able to commence shortly after issuing of the license do constitute construction and other regulations, and would require the license to be issued. JUDGE MCDADE: And what are those? MR. SILVERMAN: I think that the underground utility work. I think construction mobilization -- some of the mobilization effort, which includes the fencing, gates, trailers, bear with me a minute. There is some work on seed and withdraw facilities including demolition activities and installation of new concrete which would -- the hope is to be able to commence fairly promptly. Those are some examples, HVAC and fire protection work.

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

JUDGE MCDADE: I'm sorry. . 1 hear that last thing. 2 MR. SILVERMAN: HVAC and fire 3 protection related refurbishment work. 4 5 JUDGE MCDADE: And all of activities are planning to be started June '07? 6 MR. SILVERMAN: It is -- the company -7 8 - there are a host of activities and, again please correct me if I'm wrong, but the goal is 9 to begin many or most of those activities as soon 10 as possible after issuance of the license. 11 ADMIN. JUDGE WARDWELL: Which of those 12 activities, specifically that you anticipate 13 starting June of '07, do you feel it's needed --14 that there would be a need for the license to be 15 approved in order to start those on June of '07. 16 MR. SILVERMAN: Right. 17 18 ADMIN. JUDGE WARDWELL: Not 19 generalities, because we're talking a total of five to six weeks difference, and I'm having 20 trouble understanding why this particular license 21 is in your critical path to start in June of '07. 22 It would seem to me that whatever you would need 23 to get in place by the first of April would -- in 24 25 order to start construction in June of '07 you

would need to get stuff in place such that the five to six weeks wouldn't make much difference with regards to your construction schedule and certainly in relationship to those things that aren't associated with licenses.

So elaborate, if you would, a little bit more on the critical path that you see. What are those components that make up the critical path? And then a little more specificity, if you would, on I'll let you turn it around and say what are those items that you could start in June without a license? If you could elaborate a little bit more on that I'd appreciate it.

MS. BUPP: Your Honor, if I could perhaps explain a little bit of what the Staff would allow without a license.

JUDGE MCDADE: If you could to the court reporter to state your name, please.

MS. BUPP: This is Margaret Bupp from the Staff. The activities prior to licensing are very limited. We would only allow site characterization and environmental monitoring or site preservation work, and we would allow offsite manufacturing to begin of components, but nothing onsite until the license is issued. So

1	almost everything that Mr. Silverman has named
<u>;</u> 2	on his list would not be allowed to begin without
, 3	a license. There's no to question as to whether
4	they could put up additional fencing, that that
5	might be site preservation, but almost everything
6	on his list would not be allowed with out a
7	license.
8	ADMIN. JUDGE WARDWELL: Thank you.
9	And the current schedule allows for that license
10	to be issued before June of '07, correct?
11	MR. SILVERMAN: The current board
12	schedule?
13	ADMIN. JUDGE WARDWELL: Yes.
14	MR. SILVERMAN: It's it is
15	possible, yes. We're just concerned about any
16	delay, Your Honor and we're concerned about sort
17	of the margin issue as well, which is that if it
18	doesn't give us a lot of time if there are
19	additional issues, concerns, which within the
20	hearing process last minute glitches, even in the
21	Staff approval of the license, so cutting it
22	close is one of our concerns.
23	ADMIN. JUDGE LAM: Excuse me. Mr.
24	Silverman, since you've mentioned about potential
25	other delays, I'd like to pick up on that and ask

the Staff a question. In the Applicant's motion for an accelerated schedule, in Footnote 1 the Applicant indicated the Staff does not oppose the accelerated schedule, is that correct?

MS. BUPP: That's correct, counsel for the Applicant contacted the Staff to make sure that the schedule that they were proposing was something that we could support. While the board's proposed schedule was also something we could support and we have no objection from the standpoint of the Staff to the board's proposed schedule. If the board were to adopt the schedule the Staff could meet all of the deadlines in the proposed schedule.

ADMIN. JUDGE LAM: My question to you then, Ms. Bupp, is this, without knowing what the issues and the questions about the board would identify, on what basis do you make that commitment?

MS. BUPP: We made that commitment based on the schedule is the -- time period between milestones and the schedule is very similar to the time periods in the milestones between the LEF mandatory hearing schedule and so the Staff can make that commitment knowing the

work that was needed for the LEF mandatory 1 hearing and based on the statements by the board 2 that you had anticipated things being similar tot 3 4 eh LEF mandatory hearing. ADMIN. JUDGE LAM: So you extrapolate 5 from that hearing to this board's inquiry as to 6 the scope and the quantity and the quality of the 7 questions we may ask? 8 MS. BUPP: Yes, I mean that's the only 9 basis that we had. 10 ADMIN. JUDGE WARDWELL: Is there any 11 difference between the LEF hearing and this 12 13 hearing? MS. BUPP: You know it's a different 14 board, it is a slightly different facility, but 15 they're both uranium enrichment facilities and so 16 17 I think that they would be more similar than if you were comparing it to an EFP or a new reactor 18 licensing, that they're similar facilities. 19 ADMIN. JUDGE WARDWELL: Was that a 20 contested hearing? 21 MS. BUPP: That contested 22 was а hearing, but I'm talking about the milestones for 23 the mandatory hearing portion. 24 ADMIN. JUDGE WARDWELL: Do the boards 25

gain any insights into some of the issues as part 1 of the contested portion that saves time during 2 the preparation and execution of the mandatory 3 4 hearing in general? MS. BUPP: I can't necessarily speak 5 for the board, but I think that, you know, some 6 7 of the issues that were addressed at mandatory hearing were also addressed during the 8 •...9 contested portion of the hearing so I would 10 imagine that they did gain some background in having those questions answered. 11 12 ADMIN. JUDGE WARDWELL: And did they 13 some background in the overall conditions, what's being proposed, the type of 14 15 construction, the design, and those types of things in the process of going through some of 16 17 the contested issues? BUPP: Yes, there was a long 18 19 period of time discussing the application before 20 the mandatory hearing began. ADMIN. JUDGE WARDWELL: 21 Do we have that here in this particular case that -22 23 MS. BUPP: Well it's an uncontested 24 hearing so we have not had the same period of 25 time.

ADMIN. JUDGE WARDWELL: Back to the critical path. What types of activities do you think, besides the advantage of having additional lead time and fall back time if you will, but what specific activities are being held up by the license in regards to your critical path and planning for and then implementing construction in June of '07? Because this isn't stopping as the current schedule as the construction of '07, I'm asking now are there activities, in fact, you are delaying pending this license that would in the process of scheduling the construction, interfere with that to start in June of '07?

MR. SILVERMAN: If I understand your question correctly, Your Honor, yes. I'm not the expert on exactly what the critical path construction process is, but as I think was mentioned earlier, there are a -- most of the construction -- most of the activities that I mentioned could not begin until we have the license issued.

ADMIN. JUDGE WARDWELL: Okay. That wasn't my question.

MR. SILVERMAN: Okay. Sorry.

ADMIN. JUDGE WARDWELL: My question is

#### NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

pre-activities are there any that the 1 construction depends upon being completed before 2 you can start that this license would interfere 3 4 with, and if so, specifically what are those? 5 MR. SILVERMAN: I'm not aware of any such activity. 6 ADMIN. JUDGE WARDWELL: So in fact 7 this schedule -- this hearing isn't on the 8 path, it could theoretically 9 critical 10 completed the very last day of May for construction to start the first of June. 11 MR. SILVERMAN: Well it may very well 12 13 be and I can't represent to you that it is, obviously there are -- there may very well be 14 15 pre-preparation activities that can be done now 16 regardless of the schedule for the hearing but again, there 17 are construction activities that can't commence until 18 we have the license. 19 ADMIN. JUDGE WARDWELL: Okay. We 20 understand that. Thank you. 21 22 JUDGE MCDADE: In the contract that 23 you have with the Department of Energy is there -24 - you indicated construction needs to begin under 25 that contract or should begin under that contract

24

25

in June of '07. Does it indicate what is meant by construction beginning, the level of construction, and also does it have a date by which the construction has to be completed?

MR. SCOTT: Your Honor, Dennis Scott speaking. The agreement has series of milestones, one of which is beginning construction and there's not really any further defining that or there certainly would be. I'm sorry. I said there are additional milestones drawn just to begin at construction, including when we reach a one million feet capacity and when we can get three and a half million feet capacity.

JUDGE MCDADE: Okay. Can you give us a feeling of what your current plans are for this summer and fall in regards to those construction activities. Were they just the ones you listed or were those the ones you were hoping to start in June?

MR. SCOTT: Well, I guess, for clarification, those are ones that we can if we had started earlier than June on the initial schedule of completion that we had of getting into March. They are all activities that,

. 

frankly, are waiting for the license and will begin as quickly thereafter as we can schedule once we have the license.

So I don't want to mislead you to think that all of these things are beginning in June, in fact, for planning purposes, we actually had planned on original dates that -- conditions that begin in a 30 month schedule that begins in March, and so had laid out a schedule based upon that original commission schedule. So with that we think the current plan would've had things occur in April/May as well as June. I don't know if that answers your question.

JUDGE MCDADE: I just -- I guess I wanted to get a feeling for how much more construction do you plan on doing throughout the summer and say for the first year. What's your master plan?

MR. MINOR: This is Peter Minor. Well certainly the first year is the critical aspect. We would begin all of the heavy construction of the new facilities. The feed and withdraw facility to clearly critical path as well as construction the facilities where we'll be assembling and testing the assembled center

3

4

5

∴ 6

. 7

8

9 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

fusion machines. So in order to ramp up to build the number of center fuses that have to populate the facility we have to start very early on that work so the heavy construction of the new facility would commence sometime in '07, as well as the testing and assembly of machines.

ADMIN. JUDGE WARDWELL: You were mentioning your design, you alluded to the fact that that's still ongoing. What's the status of that and what's the status of your construction contracts? Are they in place, ready to go? When do you anticipate them having to be in place and that type of thing for both the design and the construction?

MR. SCOTT: Dennis Scott, Your Honor, we have a contract with Thor, our engineering procurement company. They're already working on that doing design work. They're already doing the, I guess the prep work, if you will, getting ready for construction. We have in terms of the status of the design, I guess it depends on which systems there are and where you're at on certain things, but they are continuing to work on that, continuing to work as good as they can without having a license. They're also, like I said, we

have a contract with Thor to do all of this. 1 They're set to go and we have, you know, with 2 construction activity. 3 4 ADMIN. JUDGE WARDWELL: But you say they're already started in regards to the design. 5 They're doing design also for you. 6 7 MR. SCOTT: Yes, Your Honor. ADMIN. JUDGE WARDWELL: 8 And are they 9 the -- are they construction managers or are they 10 going to actually be having the shovels in their hands or subcontracting most of it out? 11 12 My understanding of it is MR. SCOTT: 13 that their construction manager will be 14 performing some of the work so it should be a combination of him subcontracting out as well as 15 self performing some of the work. 16 17 ADMIN. JUDGE WARDWELL: When do you 18 anticipate subcontracting out these first of 19 phase of things that are to be done, whether they're done in April or June or whatever? 20 MR. don't have 21 SCOTT: Ι that 22 information. Ι know they already have 23 subcontracted out the different systems things, but I'm not sure exactly where they ware 24 25 with respect the construction to and

subcontracting the construction. 1 certain --2 ADMIN. JUDGE WARDWELL: the 3 subcontracts they have out now are mostly for 4 the design? 5 MR. SCOTT: Yes, Your Honor, I believe 6 · 7 I mean, you know, again what they're doing right now is all of the design work since they 8 can't do construction. I'm not of the status of 9 they of getting the 10 where are actual subcontractors in place or where they are as far 11 12 as coming out and putting the shovel in the dirt, but their plan and their schedule to being is 13 when we have the license. 14 15 ADMIN. JUDGE WARDWELL: Thank you. JUDGE MCDADE: We have no further 16 Is there anything else from the 17 questions. 18 Applicant's standpoint you'd like us to take into consideration or present to us on the motion? 19 MR. SILVERMAN: Bear with me just a 20 21 second, Your Honor. I guess the only other thing I'd say, Your Honor, and it is reflected in the 22 motion, is that we also believe that the kind of 23 schedule that we've established is consistent 24 25 with the commissions expectations as reflected in

a number of pronouncements that they've made. We've reflected that in our -- in our motion to you and we'd ask you to take that into consideration as well in making your decision.

JUDGE MCDADE: Okay. Thank you. Anything further from the staff?

MS. BUPP: This is somewhat related to the schedule, but not exactly on point. We've been in contact with your law clerk regarding training for the members of the board and the clerks for the site visit out to the site facility, and it looks we with the support training the first week of January so if the board could take a look at their schedules to determine a date. It should only take a few hours. It's about half a day at the most to have a training, an hour, one hour, that would be convenient to the board on and our meeting to discuss follow up matters.

JUDGE MCDADE: Let me ask a follow-up question on that and the issue is not, you know, when we can set aside an hour, the issue has to do with the necessary security clearances prior to the time that the training is undertaken and the question is how much lead time do we need to

1	give you in order to schedule that training? In
2	other words, if by day X all of the security
3	clearances are have been received, day X plus
4	what can we have the schedule? You know how much
5	lead time do you all need?
6	MS. BUPP: That's a question I
7	couldn't answer.
8	MR. SCOTT: Your Honor, I think we
9	can immediately support your schedule.
10	JUDGE MCDADE: Well does immediately
11.	mean the next day?
12	MR. SCOTT: That's correct. Assuming
13	the personnel are available.
14	JUDGE MCDADE: Okay. Because, again,
15	from our standpoint if all of the security
16	clearances were available we could say, "Okay,
17	this afternoon looks good. Tomorrow looks good.
18	The next day looks good."
19	But the problem is at this point we
20	can't do that and, you know, we will notify you
21	as soon as we have been notified with regard to
22	all of the security clearances and would then
23	like to schedule the training as soon as
24	practicable thereafter, but just, you know, don't
25	want to put you all in a bind, you know, where
1 :	1

you have somebody just sort of sitting and 2 hovering and waiting, you know, and at the same period of time -- at a certain point in time we need to have a cutoff of either postponing the site visit, you know, and so just trying to get some input from you all as to what -- when the go no go date on that should be.

And I don't necessarily need that right now, but if you all could be thinking about it, we would like to go forward on the current schedule, having that training, you know, you've indicated in the first week of January and, if at all possible, we would like to do that and I just want to know if we need to postpone it, you know, how much lead time do you all need before it gets be, know, significant material to you inconvenience for both the Staff and the Applicant.

Your Honor, Dennis Scott. MR. SCOTT: Just a couple of things to mention. First off, that is actually relatively small portion of it is required for clearance. So we have a lot being uncleared and still in some stages control it. The second thing is our security department I talked to them about that issue. Certainly

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1

3

.5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

it's not optimal, but as long as the have confirmation of their clearance prior to the tour, they can then make arraignments for the briefing the day of the tour, if necessary. We'll certainly do whatever's necessary to support the board's visit and to support their schedule on it, but it is -- it's approximately a half hour to an hour in terms the application and the training on the specific technology and so that is not a circumstance worth --

> JUDGE MCDADE: Okay. Thank you.

ADMIN. JUDGE WARDWELL: Could you explain -- without saying too much, could you explain a little more in depth what is -- what portions of the site tour would require this clearance?

MR. MINOR: As Mr. Scott said there just a few areas right now as we have the lead Cascade that's in the stages of being deployed there are certain gauges and things that may be secret restricted data that we would have to shroud and clearly the control room is a secret restricted area and an open classified storage

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

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

area and so you won't have access to that if you 1 2 didn't' have a clearance. Principally everything else you'd be able to access. 3 ADMIN. JUDGE WARDWELL: So the rest --4 so the Cascade themselves would be non --5 wouldn't require the clearance? 6 MR. MINOR: As I said, we may have to 7 -- we would have to make arraignments to ensure 8 9 that the appropriate information or data or equipment was shrouded, but I think we can 10 11 accommodate a tour into the Cascade area. You used the word 12 JUDGE MCDADE: secret. Are you making a differentiation between 13 a Q clearance and an L clearance? 14 15 MR. MINOR: The major components of the center fuse are secret restrictive data that 16 17 require a Q clearance. ADMIN. JUDGE LAM: Can the two be 18 separated into two parts, one for Q and one for L 19 20 just case the clearance issue is not 21 resolved? MR. MINOR: Yes. We believe we can. 22 ADMIN. JUDGE WARDWELL: But that would 23 limit what the L clearance could see because if 24 25 you were going to vibrocate it then you wouldn't

ेम्हरू(के

shroud certain things and that may eliminate a whole room of being able to observe by the non secure people. If you can guess who that person is.

MR. SCOTT: Your Honor, Dennis Scott.

I think, you know, certainly we can do whatever is necessary to accommodate the tour and it would be beneficial to have at some point in time -- we did an uncleared tour and so if you wanted to see, for example, what was shrouded. So again we'll work with whatever is convenient for all based on what your schedule, but you can see a lot of it uncleared, it may require shrouding in the back.

ADMIN. JUDGE WARDWELL: I'll give you a little better feeling from what I think I would like to see. I would like to see the physical layout of the Cascades and what it all looks like.

What's the magnitude or the size that we're dealing with? Are these center fuses the same that you will be using for the full sized plant or close to them or are they a completely different size? But even if they aren't the same size I want -- I would like to see the layout.

## NEAL R. GROSS

+	Individual gauges and chings like that are
2	probably too far in depth for me to understand
3	anyhow and the control room, while it's usually
4	of interest, that's not near as critical. The
5	only thing that I really thought that I would
6	hate to miss would be just to see the inside, the
7	physical layout of the Cascades and what the
8	magnitude of that is.
9	MR. SCOTT: Yes, Your Honor, you
10	could actually see that and obviously can't be
11	inside the Cascades themselves.
12	ADMIN. JUDGE WARDWELL: No, I know
13	that.
14	MR. SCOTT: But you would see the
15	you would see the size of it, you would see the
16	facility, you would be able to see the layout
17	very clearly, but certain portions, certain gates
18	would, as I was saying, would have to be shrouded
19	again, the control room showing data.
20	ADMIN. JUDGE WARDWELL: So you could
21	see all of the Cascades as
22	MR. SCOTT: Yes, Your Honor.
23	ADMIN. JUDGE WARDWELL: As a series of
24	parallel you'd be able to see that layout?
25	MR. SCOTT: Yes, Your Honor.
ı	

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

; I	MR. MINOR: I don't think we think
. 2	there's a logistical problem that we couldn't
. 3	overcome, even if we're dividing up tours,
4	leading separate tours in any way that would
5	cause any need for delay in your in your
6	visit.
7	ADMIN. JUDGE WARDWELL: I just want to
8	make sure
9	MR. MINOR: Or accommodate it any
10	schedule that you want.
11	ADMIN. JUDGE WARDWELL: in the
12	process, if you are going to separate it then
13	that you don't say oh, gee we haven't hidden this
14	one little piece and therefore you can't even go
15	into this building. Then it's just not a point
16	of use.
17	- MR. SCOTT: No, Your Honor.
18	ADMIN. JUDGE WARDWELL: It's better
19	just to wait and do it some other time.
20	MR. SCOTT: Dennis Scott. Your
21	Honor, we have, in fact, Your Honor done tours
22	before in the past of facilities. But we'll
23	certainly make whatever, you know, whatever we
24	need to accommodate your schedule.
25	JUDGE MCDADE: Okay. There being
	NEAL R. GROSS

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

nothing further at this point. The motion is under advisement and we will rule on it as quickly as we can. Thank you. (Whereupon the above mentioned-matter went off the record at 1:41 p.m.) 

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

#### CERTIFICATE

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

Name of Proceeding: American Centrifuge Plant

Pre-Hearing Conference

Docket Number:

70-7004-ML

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.

Gabe Tabak

Official Reporter

Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc.