Official Transcript of Proceedings NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: Detroit Edison Company

Docket Number: 52-033-COL

ALSBP Number: 09-880-05-COL-BD01

Location: teleconference

Date: Monday, September 16, 2013

Work Order No.: NRC-247 Pages 232-270

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

	232
1	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
2	NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
3	+ + + +
4	ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD PANEL
5	+ + + +
6	HEARING
7	x
8	In the Matter of: :
9	DETROIT EDISON COMPANY : Docket No. 52-033-COL
10	: ASLBP No.
11	(Fermi Nuclear Power : 09-880-05-COL-BD01
12	Plant, Unit 3) :
13	x
14	Monday, September 16, 2013
15	
16	Teleconference
17	
18	BEFORE:
19	RONALD M. SPRITZER, Chair
20	DR. ANTHONY J. BARATTA, Administrative Judge
21	DR. RANDALL J. CHARBENEAU, Administrative Judge
22	
23	
24	
25	

			233
1	APPEARANCES	:	
2	On Bel	nalf of the Applicant:	
3		DAVID REPKA, ESQ.	
4		TYSON R. SMITH, ESQ.	
5	of:	Winston & Strawn, LLP	
6		1700 K Street, N.W.	
7		Washington, D.C. 20006-3817	
8		(202) 282-5726	
9		AND	
10		JON P. CHRISTINITIS, ESQ.	
11		BRUCE R. MATERS, ESQ.	
12		PETER SMITH, Director of Nuclear	
13		Development	
14	of:	DTE Electric Company	
15		One Energy Plaza	
16		Detroit, Michigan 48226	
17			
18	On Bel	nalf of the Nuclear Regulatory	
19	Commission:		
20		MARCIA CARPENTIER, ESQ.	
21		KEVIN ROACH, ESQ.	
22		ANTHONY WILSON, ESQ.	
23		MEGAN WRIGHT, ESQ.	
24		NICHOLAS KOONTZ	
25	of:	U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission	

		234
1	Office of the General Counsel	
2	Mail Stop O-15D21	
3	Washington, D.C. 20555-0001	
4	(301) 415-4126	
5		
6	On Behalf of Beyond Nuclear, Citizens for	
7	Alternatives to Chemical Contamination, Citizens	
8	Environmental, Alliance of Southwestern Ontario,	
9	Don't Waste Michigan, Sierra Club, et al.:	
10	TERRY J. LODGE, ESQ.	
11	316 N. Michigan Street	
12	Suite 520	
13	Toledo, Ohio 43604-5627	
14	(419) 255-7552	
15	AND	
16	KEVIN KAMPS	
17	of: Beyond Nuclear	
18	6930 Carroll Avenue	
19	Suite 400	
20	Takoma Park, Maryland 20912	
21	(301) 270-2209 ext. 1	
22		
23		
24		

1	P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S
2	(10:07 a.m.)
3	CHAIR SPRITZER: Let's go on the record.
4	We are here this morning in the matter of
5	Detroit Edison Company, which is Docket Number 52-033-
6	COL, also ASLBP Number 09-880-05-COL-BD01.
7	We are here to conduct a prehearing
8	teleconference to go over issues related to the
9	conduct of the evidentiary hearing that we will be
10	holding starting on October 30th.
11	Why don't we go around and have everybody
12	identify themselves for the record. Why don't we
13	start with the Intervenors.
14	MR. LODGE: This is Terry Lodge. I'm
15	counsel for the Intervenors. I am joined from a
16	separate location by Kevin Kamps, who is a
17	representative of one of the Intervenors, Beyond
18	Nuclear.
19	CHAIR SPRITZER: Very well. And for the
20	staff, who do we have again?
21	MS. CARPENTIER: This is Marcia
22	Carpentier. And with me are Kevin Roach and Megan
23	Wright, all attorneys for the NRC staff, and Nicholas
24	Koontz, a paralegal. And dialing in from another
25	location is Anthony Wilson, also counsel for NRC

1	staff.
2	CHAIR SPRITZER: Okay. And for Detroit
3	Edison?
4	MR. REPKA: Yes. This is David Repka,
5	counsel for DTE Electric. And also on the line today
6	from different locations are my partner, Tyson Smith,
7	and also from Detroit Bruce Maters and Jon
8	Christinitis. And also listening in today is from
9	DTE Electric is Peter Smith, the Director of Nuclear
10	Development for DTE Electric.
11	CHAIR SPRITZER: Very well. And here in
12	Washington in our conference room, in addition to
13	myself, are our two law clerks for this case, Onika
14	Williams and Matt Zogby; Matina Solomakos, our
15	clerical administrative person; and Andy Welkie, who
16	is our technical expert, who is going to help us
17	explain the setup in the courtroom when we get to that
18	issue.
19	Randy Charbeneau, one of our other judges,
20	is on the line I believe, and
21	JUDGE CHARBENEAU: I am still here. Good
22	morning, everybody.
23	CHAIR SPRITZER: Good. And as I
24	mentioned, Judge Baratta will hopefully be joining us

in the very near future, but we will go ahead and

1 start moving through the things that we are here to 2 talk about. 3 First thing -- well, first two issues I 4 guess are kind of general background on the logistics, 5 security, and so forth. The building probably -- I think everybody has been to this building before when 6 7 we had our -- at least some members of each group have been to this building before when we had our oral 8 9 argument there. I think it was in 2009. I remember, the parking was pretty 10 reasonable there. It wasn't difficult to park. 11 Security is being handled locally. 12 is, the NRC is not directly doing the security. 13 14 have contracted with/arranged with the local police to 15 take care of that. My understanding is there will be 16 17 screening or metal detector-type device, so take that into account in terms of planning for when you arrive. 18 19 And of course, obviously, it would be good to have a picture ID with you when you come in the building. 20 don't know if they will require one or not. 21 We have sent hopefully everybody -- all of 22 the parties got the pictures we sent out Friday that 23 24 show the arrangements, at least generally, of the They don't exactly tell you how we're 25 courtroom.

1 planning to set things up, but of course the Judges will be in the middle of the bench facing counsel, who 2 3 will be at tables. And I think the plan is, what, to have monitors at each table for counsel? Yeah, that's 4 5 correct. The witnesses will be seated -- well, if 6 7 you're facing the bench, they will be seated on the 8 left side. There are several monitors and microphones 9 shown over there. Law clerk and Court Reporter will be to the Judges' left, to counsels' right. 10 If anybody doesn't have these pictures, by 11 12 the way, or don't know what I'm talking about, please let me know. And as I said, we'll have tables for 13 14 counsel in front facing the bench, obviously, and we will have monitors for -- at each counsel table. 15 16 Do we know how many we are going to have? 17 One monitor on each table. So hopefully that will be sufficient, depending on how many attorneys you have. 18 19 But they should be large enough, I would think, that they will be able to see the documents. 20 There will also be -- there is a screen 21 over to the right -- I'm not sure if it shows up in 22 all of the pictures -- but a screen where the 23 24 documents will be displayed.

And, as I said, the witnesses will have

1	monitors in front of them. They probably also can see
2	the screen. It's a little far away, but members of
3	the audience can they will have to turn their necks
4	to the right I guess, but they will be able to see
5	documents that are put up on the screen as well.
6	Before we move on, any questions about the
7	setup?
8	MR. LODGE: Yes, Judge. This is Terry
9	Lodge. Is there going to be Wi-Fi available?
LO	CHAIR SPRITZER: We don't know at this
L1	point. Why don't you we will try to get back to
L2	you on that. Yes. We don't know the answer to that.
L3	It's not our facility, obviously, so we'll have to
L4	check with the people out there.
L5	By the way, Judge Baratta has just joined
L6	us. So we have done the preliminaries and are talking
L7	about the setup there.
L8	JUDGE BARATTA: I do apologize for being
L9	late, but there has been some strange things going on
20	in D.C. today, so and caused a lot of traffic jams.
21	CHAIR SPRITZER: All right. Well, let's
22	move on, then. If nobody else has any questions about
23	the setup of the hearing room, let's move on to talk
24	about exhibits.
25	First, well, the Intervenors, Mr. Lodge,
l	I

1	at least let's see, was this true on contention 8
2	only, or contention 8 and 15, that they filed them as
3	one document?
4	MR. LODGE: I'm sorry. I don't understand
5	your question. This is Terry Lodge.
6	CHAIR SPRITZER: I'm talking to my
7	colleague over here.
8	MR. WELKIE: Yes. I wasn't able to find
9	any other documents attached to their statement of
10	position.
11	CHAIR SPRITZER: Okay. Well, first of
12	all, contention 8, you filed exhibits as one document.
13	MR. LODGE: Yes.
14	CHAIR SPRITZER: What we need for to do is
15	to refile those as separate numbered exhibits, each of
16	the documents with a separate number. I think the
17	convention that has been used I know it was used by
18	the staff was for the environmental contention, for
19	contention 8, it would be you know, your first
20	exhibit would be I guess INT for Intervenors, E for
21	environment or environmental, 001, and
22	MR. LODGE: Okay.
23	CHAIR SPRITZER: and then sequentially
24	after that. And I think what the staff did I think
25	DTE can correct me if I'm wrong I think they did
	I control of the second of the

1	it the same way, was for the for contention 15,
2	that would be INT, S for safety, and then, again,
3	numbered sequentially with three numbers, 001, 002,
4	et cetera.
5	So we need you to refile those. Do you
6	think you can do it in 10 days?
7	MR. LODGE: Yes, sir. Easily.
8	CHAIR SPRITZER: Okay.
9	MR. LODGE: Sir, how are the proprietary
10	exhibits being filed? Same way?
11	CHAIR SPRITZER: Same way. You don't have
12	any proprietary exhibits, do you, or do you?
13	MR. LODGE: A few.
14	CHAIR SPRITZER: Okay. Yes, I don't think
15	they would be filed the numbering system would be
16	the same. How have we been indicating proprietary
17	exhibits?
18	MR. WELKIE: Again, this is Andy Welkie.
19	For exhibits that are filed with a redacted and an
20	unredacted version, we have typically identified them
21	with the same exhibit number with a U at the end of
22	the unredacted version, or with a designation that
23	says not public information.
24	If it's a document that doesn't have a
25	public version filed, we just number it. If it was,

1 say, Intervenor 1, it would be just Intervenor 1. CHAIR SPRITZER: Anything, of course, that 2 3 has privileged information that hasn't been redacted 4 would be filed in the protective order file, not in 5 the public file, obviously. So for the staff, we had one small issue 6 7 with your exhibits. I think at least some of your 8 testimony did not have an exhibit number, and I'm told 9 that's necessary. Can you refile those with exhibit 10 numbers, any --Certainly, Your Honor. 11 MS. CARPENTIER: -- any testimony that CHAIR SPRITZER: 12 wasn't -- doesn't have an exhibit number. 13 14 I think DTE -- we didn't have any problems 15 with Detroit Edison's exhibits or testimony. 16 For everyone, we would like to have 17 ideally 10 days before the hearing, unless it's a problem -- why don't we shoot for that -- a final 18 19 exhibit list. You may already have submitted one. you haven't changed it, that's fine. Maybe just send 20 an email to our law clerk saying, "We don't have any 21 changes to our final exhibit list" on that day. 22 If you do have changes between now and 23 24 then, obviously update the exhibit list, file -- it

sounds like both the Intervenors and the staff will

have -- need to make changes to their list based on renumbering various items. So please file final exhibit lists no later than 10 days before the hearing. That would be October 20th.

So unless there is some issue with that -what we would normally do -- what we will do at the
hearing in terms of moving documents into evidence,
hopefully you all can confer and if there are any
problems, any objections to exhibits, try and work
them out among yourselves.

If you can't, what we will do at the beginning of the hearing, each side will move the documents on their final exhibit list into evidence as one -- at one time. That is, Intervenors will say, "We hereby move into evidence all of the documents on our final exhibit list." If there are any objections, at that time they can be stated and the Board will rule on them.

The idea, of course, is to get the documents that are admissible into evidence as quickly as possible. We will do the same thing for the staff and Detroit Edison. That is, you will move your final exhibit list as a whole into evidence, we will rule on any objections, and hopefully quickly move into the testimony at that point.

Any questions on exhibits?

(No response.)

Hearing none, we will move on to opening and closing statements. Our thought was -- we have two contentions, obviously, but that we will do one opening statement for both contentions at the start of the hearing, and then we'll have closing argument on both contentions when we have finished with both.

That is, we won't have a separate opening statement for contention 8 and contention 15. You cover whatever you have to say about both in your opening statement at the beginning of the hearing.

Closing, we will probably have that on the last day of the hearing. I don't know -- we are hopeful that we can finish the testimony in two days, but, in any event, our thought would be we would do closing argument, and, if there are any witness testimony remaining, that as well on the morning of the -- I guess it's the first, Friday, November 1st.

And our thought was 10 minutes -- given that we already have your statements of position, your prefiled testimony, we are going to have a pretty good idea coming in what your position is. So 10 minutes for an opening statement ought to be sufficient. Ten minutes per side, that is, so a total of 30 minutes

1 for all three parties. And, as I said, the closing will be the 2 last day. 3 I don't think we will set a time limit on 4 that, or, if we do, it will be later on. We will see 5 how much we think we need to hear in the way of closing argument. 6 7 On witnesses, just to be clear, unless I 8 missing something, the Intervenors have no 9 witnesses on contention 8. Is that correct? That is correct. 10 MR. LODGE: CHAIR SPRITZER: We think we will have --11 that we will be able to move fairly quickly through 12 contention 8. We are estimating that we would 13 14 spend --15 THE COURT REPORTER: This is the Court Reporter. Can I ask again that people state their 16 17 name before they speak? CHAIR SPRITZER: That was just Mr. Lodge 18 19 there speaking, and this is Judge Spritzer again. So our estimate is we are starting at 9:30 20 unexpected 21 on barring some technical will 22 difficulties, we be starting at 9:30 Wednesday, the 30th, half an hour or so for opening 23 24 statements. We are hopeful that we can finish with

contention 8 in the morning, within an hour or two,

1	and move on to contention 15 after that.
2	We had thought we might be able to
3	eliminate some witnesses for contention 8. But after
4	having looked everything over, the only witness I
5	think we can eliminate is the NRC staff's witness
6	sponsoring the EIS. I don't think that will be
7	necessary.
8	Mr. Lodge, you don't have any objection to
9	admitting the final environmental impact statement
10	into evidence, do you?
11	MR. LODGE: This is Terry Lodge. No.
12	CHAIR SPRITZER: Okay. You don't need to
13	bring anybody out there to sponsor the environmental
14	impact statement on contention 8. That person is, of
15	course, welcome to attend if he or she chooses, but
16	is that acceptable to the staff?
17	MS. CARPENTIER: Yes, it is.
18	CHAIR SPRITZER: Okay. As I said, you're
19	welcome to bring that individual if you want, but
20	we're not going to have any questions for him or her.
21	On contention 15, as I said, that would
22	follow contention 8. Our thought on the order of
23	witnesses would be that we would start with the
24	Intervenors' witness, Mr. Gunderson. Our questions
25	for him may or may not we may or may not finish

1 with him on the first day. After that, we would move into the Detroit Edison witnesses, and then the staff 2 3 witnesses. If anybody has any different view as to 4 5 we ought to proceed on either of those two 6 contentions, let us know. On contention 8, I think we 7 would start in reverse order with the staff, and then move to Detroit Edison on contention 8 in terms of 8 9 witnesses. 10 MR. SMITH: Judge Spritzer, this is Tyson Smith for DTE. On contention 8, you know, in light of 11 the fact that Intervenors don't have a witness, I'm 12 just wondering how you were planning to handle that. 13 14 Are you thinking that there will be some legal 15 questions for Mr. Lodge? Or I'm just trying to 16 understand what -- how you were thinking to get the 17 Intervenors' views, if any, orif at all, contention 8. 18 19 JUDGE SPRITZER: Well, we're not going to call Mr. Lodge as a witness. He is the representative 20 of a party, and that wouldn't be appropriate. 21 have any legal questions, we will take them up at the 22 -- during the legal argument stage at the end. 23 24 I think our questioning will be -- you 25 know, have -- the reason we are having any

1 witnesses at all is we have some questions to ask the 2 staff, and probably a few for the Detroit Edison 3 witnesses, including some that Intervenors 4 submitted in camera. So that is what we are planning 5 to do. You know, we have the case that the 6 7 Intervenors have put forward in their statement of 8 position and their exhibits, and that's what we are 9 taking their case to be. But as I said, we don't 10 expect to spend a great deal of time on contention 8, given the absence of any Intervenor witnesses. 11 As far as the order in which we were going 12 to call -- are planning to call the various witnesses, 13 14 any comments or questions on that from anybody else? 15 (No response.) All right. We will move on. We will, by 16 17 the way -- on questioning, we will allow all parties to submit questions to us. We have questions that you 18 19 submitted already, but during the hearing you can submit additional questions to us. Obviously, they 20 will need to be prepared quickly. They can be 21 submitted in handwritten form; index cards are a good 22 way I have found to do that. 23 24 So we will entertain additional questions

may want to submit during the actual

you

1	testimony itself. Of course, it's normally at
2	least the practice that we will follow, and I think
3	most boards follow, is that they will we would ask
4	those questions after the Board has asked our own
5	questions.
6	To the extent we may have covered the same
7	issues, you know, we won't duplicate. But if there
8	are some issues that you brought up in your questions
9	that we haven't covered, we generally try and ask
10	those questions.
11	Any questions on the questioning procedure
12	or procedure for submitting questions during the
13	hearing?
14	MS. CARPENTIER: Judge Spritzer, this is
15	Marcia Carpentier for the NRC staff. I have only one
16	question related to witnesses, and that is, will you
17	be empaneling witnesses as a panel or calling them
18	individually when there is more than one for a
19	contention for a given party?
20	JUDGE SPRITZER: I assume the staff's
21	preference and you can correct me if I'm wrong
22	
	is to do them as a panel. That's what we have been
23	is to do them as a panel. That's what we have been contemplating. If for any reason somebody would want

But generally it's a little more efficient

1	since often one we will be asking questions of one
2	that we expect one witness will have the answer to,
3	and it turns out somebody else has the answer, rather
4	than have to defer the question until later, to have
5	them as a group. I think you don't have more than,
6	what, three or four witnesses on any
7	MS. CARPENTIER: Yes. Three is our
8	maximum.
9	JUDGE SPRITZER: Yes. That sounds
10	manageable. So, you know, we are quite happy to do it
11	that way unless the staff would prefer something
12	different.
13	MS. CARPENTIER: No, that's fine. We just
14	wanted to be clear in advance.
15	JUDGE SPRITZER: Right. And same thing
16	for Detroit Edison. Unless you all have a different
17	preference, we would call your witnesses as a group.
18	I don't think what is the maximum how many
19	witnesses do you all have on contention 15?
20	MR. SMITH: This is Tyson Smith for
21	Detroit Edison. We have for DTE. We have four
22	witnesses for contention 15.
23	JUDGE SPRITZER: Okay.
24	MR. SMITH: But I think, you know,
25	realistically, I think there will you know, there

1	will probably be one or two of them who do the bulk of
2	the responding, and, you know, I think you will
3	probably be talking regularly to at most three of
4	them. That's my how I anticipate it going.
5	JUDGE SPRITZER: Okay.
6	MR. SMITH: We would prefer to do it as a
7	panel as well, as you mentioned, as given the scope of
8	the contention, it is sort of hard to define exactly
9	who is going to they are not broken up into, you
10	know, bite-size chunks on a witness-by-witness basis.
11	So I think it would make sense and we would prefer
12	to do it as a panel.
13	JUDGE SPRITZER: All right. Unless, Mr.
14	Lodge, do you have any problem with us handling it
15	that way for the you only have one witness on
16	contention 15, as I understand it Mr. Gunderson.
17	MR. LODGE: Correct. This is Mr. Lodge.
18	Yes.
19	JUDGE SPRITZER: Would you have any
20	problem with us having the staff and Detroit Edison
21	witnesses testify as a panel rather than individually?
22	MR. LODGE: No.
23	JUDGE SPRITZER: That's generally the way
24	we they're often handled that way at NRC hearings.
25	All right. Well, that's what we'll plan

1	to do.
2	While we're on the subject of questioning,
3	obviously, there have there is information in this
4	case that is covered or designated as proprietary. We
5	don't really know at least the Board members don't
6	really know what that is. What we would propose to
7	do, generally everybody still there? I guess
8	somebody signed off.
9	MR. LODGE: Intervenors are.
10	JUDGE SPRITZER: The staff and DTE, are
11	you still there?
12	MR. SMITH: Yes, Judge Spritzer. This is
13	Tyson Smith.
14	MR. REPKA: David Repka. We're still
15	here.
16	MS. CARPENTIER: And the staff is still
17	here. This is Marcia Carpentier.
18	JUDGE SPRITZER: All right. This is Judge
19	Spritzer again. So apologies, again, to the Court
20	Reporter.
21	For the proprietary information, I think
22	what is probably going to what we would plan to do
23	is have a separate session. It doesn't seem likely
24	that there would be any proprietary information

related to contention 8. I assume this is all

information related to contention 15.

So what we would propose to do is at the end of the second day clear the courtroom and have -- at that time we would ask whatever questions we might have that are proprietary in nature. Now, that obviously leads to the problem of, how do we know what questions might get into proprietary information?

The most obvious way is for counsel for Detroit Edison, who I assume is the party designating information as proprietary, to tell us, "Judge, your question may call for an answer that would lead the witness to disclose proprietary information." We will simply have to mark that question and -- for later review and ask it at the session that is -- where the public is not present.

I don't know if there is anything Detroit Edison can do to let us know, give us some idea, maybe in some sort of letter submitted in camera, of things we -- areas that we might want to avoid so as to avoid -- you know, so as to not be constantly asking questions during the public session that are getting into proprietary information.

But that -- you know what the information is. We don't. Would that be of any help, do you think?

MR. SMITH: Yes. This is Tyson Smith for Detroit Edison. I think your first -- with respect to your first comment about having a separate in camera session at the end, if we need to get into that, I think that makes good sense. And we are of course, since the information is proprietary, we have designated it as such, and we are happy to, you know, raise that for the Board if it looks like we are going to get into questions that touch on that proprietary information.

I think realistically, having reviewed the pleadings of the parties and understanding I think what some of the discussion is going to be about, I kind of doubt we are really going to get deep into any proprietary information. So I think it is not likely to be something that is going to be coming up regularly. That said, I am happy to see if I can articulate in a few bullets kind of what we see as the information.

And I think that will be helpful at, if nothing else, giving the parties some comfort that we are not going to touch on too much proprietary information during the contention 15 discussion. But I am happy to take an action to outline what the information types are, and I think that's something

1 that I could, you know, share with all of the parties, and the Judges of course, to give you some idea of 2 3 what we're talking about. 4 JUDGE SPRITZER: Sure. That would be 5 We'd obviously like to avoid -- you know, move the hearing along faster if we can avoid getting 6 7 into those areas, to the extent we might. 8 All right. Is there anything else we need to talk about with respect to proprietary information? 9 10 (No response.) All right. Next on the list -- again, 11 Next on the list is deadline this is Judge Spritzer. 12 for proposed transcript corrections and proposed 13 14 findings of fact and conclusions of law. 15 Thirty days -- what will generally happen, is we'll get the hearing transcript 16 17 probably four or five business days after the hearing concludes. At that point, we would start the time 18 19 period for making transcript corrections. Those are, of course, not to change the substance of anyone's 20 testimony, but simply to correct errors in the 21 And normally 30 days seems sufficient, so 22 transcript. we would propose 30 days for transcript corrections. 23 24 In terms of proposed findings of fact and

conclusions of law, that is starting to get into the

1	Christmas holiday period. That is, if we have 30 days
2	for transcript corrections, we are probably going to
3	get those early December. So we thought we would give
4	you 45 days from well, an extra 45 days, so I guess
5	it would be what would that be? Seventy-five days
6	from receipt of the transcript to submit proposed
7	findings of fact and conclusions of law.
8	Does that sound reasonable to everybody or
9	not?
10	(No response.)
11	No one seems to be objecting, so we'll go
12	with those.
13	Last, but not least, are there any issues
14	that anybody wants to raise that I haven't covered
15	here this morning?
16	MR. LODGE: This is Terry Lodge. Yes,
17	sir. There is several things that we would like to
18	raise. I don't know if do you want us to do so now
19	or wait?
20	JUDGE SPRITZER: Well, if they're related
21	to the procedure for the hearing, we should talk about
22	them now. If they're substantive arguments about the
23	merits of the case, that's not what we're really here
24	to do today.
25	MR. LODGE: We think they relate to the

former.

2 JUDGE SPRITZER: Okay.

MR. LODGE: One is that we have a pending request to the NRC to provide us information on fees paid for licensure that has been pending for nearly four months, and we don't have that information yet. We believe it might be pertinent to issue 15 and -- to contention 15.

JUDGE SPRITZER: Well, if you want to put an issue in front of us, you'll have to file some kind of motion. Right now, we don't have -- I don't -- to my knowledge, we don't have anything pending before the Board on that. Am I mistaken?

MS. CARPENTIER: This is Marcia Carpentier for the staff. I just wanted to let you know that the public document room is working on the request and should have an answer shortly.

Spritzer again. You know, if you think it's related to the hearing, and you're not -- you of course have an obligation to discuss the issue with the staff and try and resolve it with them without bringing it to us. If that can't be done, and it is in some way related to the hearing, it would be a good -- now would be -- or in the very near future would be a good

1	time to raise it, because we would have to get a
2	response from staff and then rule on it, it sounds
3	like.
4	Now, is this a FOIA request? I'm not
5	clear on this. Is this something
6	MR. LODGE: Yes. Yes.
7	JUDGE SPRITZER: All right. Well, I'm not
8	sure I'm not even sure whether we have any
9	jurisdiction in FOIA matters, to the best of my
10	knowledge.
11	MS. CARPENTIER: Yes. It's not strictly
12	a FOIA request, Judge Spritzer. This is Marcia
13	Carpentier again. It is Mr. Gunderson approaching our
14	reference librarians in the public document room, and
15	a lot of what he has asked for is outside of the
16	public document room as such and involves the Office
17	of the Chief Financial Officer. So some research has
18	been done, but there should be an answer soon.
19	JUDGE SPRITZER: All right.
20	MS. CARPENTIER: And it's not under FOIA
21	or any other particular statute, other than that the
22	public is allowed to call our public document room.
23	JUDGE SPRITZER: Okay. All right. Well,
24	you said you had several this is Judge Spritzer
25	again. Mr. Lodge, you had

1	MR. LODGE: Yes.
2	JUDGE SPRITZER: you have some other
3	matters you wanted to raise?
4	MR. LODGE: Yes. This is Terry Lodge
5	again. As I recall, the Board had solicited memoranda
6	from the parties on the matter of the transmission
7	order for purposes of determining whether or not to
8	make a reference to the full Commission of the matter.
9	JUDGE SPRITZER: Right.
10	MR. LODGE: I understand that doesn't
11	that isn't part of this hearing coming up. But does
12	the Board have any idea as to the timing of that?
13	JUDGE SPRITZER: Well, we are working on
14	it. This is Judge Spritzer again. But because it
15	doesn't really impact the hearing one way or another
16	that we can see, we will probably you know, I hope
17	we can get something a ruling out on that before
18	the hearing, but it won't affect the hearing one way
19	or the other. I don't see any connection between
20	issues are going to be having the hearing on and that
21	question.
22	In any event, even when we rule, it has to
23	go to even if we were to decide that we wanted
24	that we were to recommend the issue to it would

have to go to -- our ruling would have to go to the

1	Commission for their approval.
2	So you're not likely to see any final
3	resolution of whether that issue will be heard by the
4	Board or not, until after the hearing is over. That's
5	the best information I can give you on that, because,
6	as I said
7	MR. LODGE: Okay. This is Terry Lodge
8	again. The final item is, as I recall, there is also
9	going to be a public hearing or meeting convened by
10	the Licensing Board the night before.
11	JUDGE SPRITZER: That's correct.
12	MR. LODGE: Okay. That is for purposes of
13	public comment?
14	JUDGE SPRITZER: Right. It's not for
15	argument by the parties to this case. It's for
16	members of the public to come and state their views on
17	the issue we are to hear, but the statements don't
18	constitute evidence, can't be used as the basis of our
19	ruling. They are more like a general public
20	participation session, but not for the purpose of
21	taking evidence or hearing argument from the parties.
22	MR. LODGE: I'm sorry, Your Honor. This
23	is Terry Lodge. One last thing is that we are
24	awaiting 18 non-proprietary documents that have been

listed but not cited by DTE in its disclosure since

1 April. That's the final matter. And I intend to 2 confer with counsel for DTE on the provision of those. JUDGE SPRITZER: Very well. All right. 3 4 Well, I mean, if there are any -- going to be any 5 disputes about production of documents that impact the hearing, as I said, you first need to consult with the 6 7 other counsel, try and resolve the issue. And if that 8 can't be -- if the issue can't be resolved, raise it 9 with us in time to get a ruling before the hearing. 10 All right. Anything else from any of the parties? 11 This is Tyson Smith with DTE MR. SMITH: 12 I just had one question about the exhibits, 13 14 and I apologize for not raising this earlier. 15 wasn't clear on how -- whether we were going to have a separate discussion on audio-visual equipment. 16 I know Mr. Welkie mentioned that there 17 would be monitors at the counsel table and before the 18 19 witnesses, and I quess for the Judges, and then also a screen in the room. Are we going to be able to use 20 those to call up individual exhibits, you know, when 21 we want to -- do we want to reference those so that 22 the public can see, or, you know, if we've got a 23 24 couple of key exhibits that, you know, we wanted to --

you know, existing, already submitted exhibits that we

wanted to blow up and have available so we could talk to and point to if we thought that would be helpful.

I'm just trying to understand what you were anticipating in that regard.

JUDGE SPRITZER: Yes. This is Judge

Spritzer again. The procedure -- you of course I

think remember the Calvert Cliffs hearing. I think we

are doing it basically the same way, same type of

equipment, same procedures there. So if you -- you of

course won't be -- and I take it it has been clear

from our previous order that counsel will not be

asking questions at this hearing.

But if a witness wants to refer to a document to say -- I mean, I don't know whether they are going to know exhibit numbers. If they can give us an idea of what the exhibit is, obviously that would be helpful. I don't know that we will have them all committed to memory.

But we can certainly -- we plan to bring up exhibits as appropriate during -- and put them on the screen during witness testimony. If a witness has something that they want to refer to, and if you can let us know maybe before the testimony starts so that we are prepared, you know, our technical people know what the document number is and can bring it up to the

1 screen quickly, that would be helpful. But that may not always be possible. 2 3 MR. SMITH: Okay. That makes sense, and 4 I appreciate and understand that. So we'll -- if 5 necessary, if we decide it's warranted, we will try and provide a list of any exhibits we think we are 6 7 almost certainly going to raise beforehand. 8 But then if during the course of, you 9 know, our witnesses testifying they want to refer to 10 an exhibit, they just, you know, can say it out loud by the exhibit number and your technical people have 11 the capabilities to pull that up on everyone's screen, 12 so we can all be talking about the same thing. 13 14 JUDGE SPRITZER: Right. Exactly. As long 15 as they can identify the exhibits by an exhibit 16 number, they should be able to do that. As you know, 17 of course, many of the Board's questions will actually start by putting an exhibit up on the board and 18 19 saying, you know, "Tell me what this means," something to that effect. So we will probably -- a 20 lot of the time there will be something up on the 21 screen as part of our questioning. 22 MR. SMITH: Okay. Thank you very much. 23 24 That was helpful. 25 JUDGE SPRITZER: And the same thing

1	applies to all parties. Obviously, if you have
2	exhibits that one of your witnesses expects to refer
3	to during his testimony and we are not going to
4	the witnesses are not going to make speeches. They
5	are going to only respond to the questions we ask.
6	But they might very well anticipate that
7	in responding to our questions they would likely refer
8	to particular exhibits. And if you can identify what
9	those are and give us the exhibit numbers beforehand,
LO	that would make our technical the job of our
L1	technical people easier. But if we have to go through
L2	and try and find an exhibit for you, we'll try and do
13	that, as long as it doesn't get out of hand.
L4	Okay. Anything else? Any of the Judge
L5	Charbeneau, Judge Baratta, do you have any anything
L6	you
L7	JUDGE BARATTA: This is Judge Baratta. I
L8	don't have anything else.
L9	JUDGE SPRITZER: Judge Charbeneau?
20	(No response.)
21	All right. Let me just review my notes
22	and make sure I haven't left anything else.
23	MS. CARPENTIER: Judge Spritzer?
24	JUDGE SPRITZER: Yes.
25	MS. CARPENTIER: This is Marcia Carpentier
	I and the second

1 for the NRC staff. I have two logistical-related 2 issues. 3 JUDGE SPRITZER: Okay. MS. CARPENTIER: One of them is, in the 4 5 days of paper exhibits, we used to stamp them. 6 that required anymore, or are the documents that we 7 filed already with exhibit numbers typed on them sufficient? 8 9 JUDGE SPRITZER: The latter. The ones you 10 have submitted are sufficient. We are not planning on using any paper documents if we can possibly avoid it. 11 The last hearing I had we did have one with a witness 12 13 produced more or less sua sponte. But apart from 14 something like that, we are going to be using 15 electronic documents and electronic documents only. 16 MS. CARPENTIER: Thank you. And the 17 second is, I know that the Board's hearing room here in Rockville has three small conference rooms for the 18 19 parties to use during the proceeding. Has something like that been arranged at this venue or not? 20 This is Judge Spritzer 21 JUDGE SPRITZER: again. We do have breakout rooms or conference 22 Yes. rooms for the parties. They are divided up between 23 24 the first floor, the second floor, and the fourth

We will get an email out to you and let you

floor.

1	know have we assigned them or
2	(Pause.)
3	Yes. We do have three conference rooms.
4	We are going to have to figure out who gets what
5	conference room. I guess some are further away from
6	the courtroom than others, so I guess we will have to
7	draw straws out of a hat or something.
8	Does any party have any problems with
9	witnesses who might have physical problems in terms of
LO	getting around the courthouse?
L1	MR. REPKA: This is Dave Repka for DTE.
L2	No, we do not have that issue.
L3	JUDGE SPRITZER: Staff, do you?
L4	MS. CARPENTIER: No, we do not.
L5	JUDGE SPRITZER: And Mr. Lodge?
L6	MR. LODGE: This is Terry Lodge. No, we
L7	do not.
L8	JUDGE SPRITZER: All right. Well, we'll
L9	probably put ourselves the furthest away. We probably
20	don't have as much need for a conference room as you
21	all may. But in any event, we'll let you know exactly
22	what room numbers, but, yes, there will definitely be
23	conference rooms available. At least that is our
24	understanding.
25	While I was on that the subject of

witnesses, is there any witnesses -- any witness who 1 2 is going to only be available for one or two of our 3 hearing days? In other words, any problems with 4 availability of witnesses? Mr. Lodge, why don't we 5 start with you. Is Mr. Gunderson going to be available all three days? 6 7 MR. LODGE: Thank you. If you would, I 8 wonder if I might have a couple of minutes to confer 9 with him by phone. 10 JUDGE SPRITZER: All right. MR. LODGE: I believe he might be, but I 11 don't know. 12 JUDGE SPRITZER: Well -- all right. 13 14 don't we do this. Why don't you -- you don't need to 15 do that right now. Why don't you talk to him, get back to our law clerk, Ms. Williams, let her know. 16 17 mean, the plan right now, as I said earlier, is to have him testify on Wednesday, the 30th. But it could 18 19 easily, you know, extend into the 31st. Conceivably, we might have some additional 20 questions for him after we have heard the Detroit 21 Edison and staff witnesses on contention 15. 22 saying that will happen; it might. If he's not there, 23 24 obviously, that would make it difficult to ask him any

questions, in fact impossible. So, but let us know on

that.

As I said, we're planning, we're hopeful that we will finish both contentions by the end of the second day -- that is, the 31st -- and limit -- and Friday would be just for closing arguments, which will probably include some questions from the Board. I don't think we're going to be asking questions during your opening statements, but during the closing arguments we may very well have some questions about the evidence and your legal positions.

MR. LODGE: Judge, this is Terry Lodge again. Pardon me for interrupting. I have word from Mr. Gunderson that, indeed, he will be present and can be available any time the Board --

JUDGE SPRITZER: All three days?

MR. LODGE: Yes.

JUDGE SPRITZER: Great. And for the staff, are there any witness availability issues?

MS. CARPENTIER: All of our witnesses are available. However, we are, as most of the Federal Government is, operating under sequester. And if at some point the contention 8 witnesses can be dismissed, that would be useful, so that they can travel back earlier and save on money.

JUDGE SPRITZER: That would be fine. As

1	I said, I would be shocked if they are if we're not
2	finished with them on the morning of the by, you
3	know, 1:00 at the latest, assuming we don't have any
4	problems with the technology out there. Our people
5	will be there on Tuesday setting up the equipment, so
6	hopefully we will be ready to go at 9:30 on the 30th.
7	So, yes, I think they could realistically
8	expect to leave and go back at the end of the
9	during the first day or at the end of the first day.
LO	And, last, for Detroit Edison, any issues
l1	with witness availability?
L2	MR. SMITH: No. This is Tyson Smith. No.
L3	No, Judge Spritzer, we don't. I mean, although the
L4	same as Ms. Carpentier said, if our contention 8
L5	witness, you know, was done at the end of Wednesday,
L6	that would be good to know. But we have no
L7	limitations on our witness' availability.
L8	JUDGE SPRITZER: All right. Great. All
L9	right, then. That covers everything we have.
20	One last chance, Mr. Lodge, do you have
21	anything further?
22	MR. LODGE: No, sir.
23	JUDGE SPRITZER: Detroit Edison, do you
24	have anything further?
25	MR. SMITH: No, Judge Spritzer.
	I .

1	JUDGE SPRITZER: And the staff, do you
2	have anything that you haven't covered?
3	MS. CARPENTIER: No. Thank you very much.
4	JUDGE SPRITZER: Very well. We will
5	conclude the hearing at this point and the
6	prehearing conference at this point. And we look
7	forward to seeing all of you on the 30th in Monroe,
8	Michigan.
9	Very well. We will go off the record,
10	then.
11	(Whereupon, at 10:49 a.m., the
12	proceedings in the foregoing matter were
13	concluded.)
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	