

ORIGINAL

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

c  
Seismic P2  
5/20/80  
Parker 3  
ml

NEED FOR ADDITIONAL OFFSHORE SEISMIC PROFILES

NEAR SAN ONOFRE SITE

- - -

Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Room P-202  
Phillips Building  
Bethesda, Maryland 20555

Tuesday, May 20, 1980

The Commission met, pursuant to notice, at 10:30 a.m.

BEFORE:

- RICHARD VOLLMER, NRC
- H. ROOD, NRC
- J. P. KNIGHT, NRC.
- R. E. JACKSON, NRC
- A. SCHWENCER, NRC
- DARRELL EISENHUT, NRC
- EDSON CASE, NRC
- A. S. CARSTENS, INTERVENOR
- K. BASKIN, SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON
- P. J. WEST, SCE
- D. G. MOORE, SCE

8006110458

300 7TH STREET, S.W., REPORTERS BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20024 (202) 554-2346

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

BFM2

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

1  
2 MR. ROOD: Good morning. My name is Harry Rood. I am  
3 project manager for the NRC Licensing Review of San Onofre 2 and  
4 3. We are here today at the applicant's request for a meeting  
5 to discuss the subject of the need for additional offshore  
6 profiling to be potentially conducted off the plant.

7 Unfortunately, the key participant in this meeting, our  
8 consulting reviewer from the United States Geological Survey is  
9 unable to be here today. Therefore, we will not be able to get  
10 into the technical details of this meeting.

11 However, we would like to take this opportunity to  
12 discuss the need -- I would like to have the applicant discuss  
13 the need for a decision on this issue, and also to discuss  
14 scheduling and meeting later on where we would be able to go into  
15 this in all the detail that it deserves.

16 I guess that is the only -- without introduction, I will  
17 turn the meeting over to Mr. Baskin, or would you rather say some  
18 more, Dick?

19 MR. VOLLMER: I am Dick Vollmer, Director of Engineering.  
20 Again, we apologize for not being able to hold the meeting as  
21 originally intended and advertized, but as Harry indicated, our  
22 primary reviewer on this is not available today. We would like  
23 to, before this meeting is over, entertain a couple of actions as  
24 to how to best accommodate all the parties and get the original  
25 intent of this meeting dispensed with.

300 7TH STREET, S.W., REPORTERS BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20024 (202) 554-2346

bfm3

300 7TH STREET, S.W., REPORTERS BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20024 (202) 554-2345

1           Whether it would be best to do it this week with the  
2 USGS reviewer     still in Washington and available, or if another  
3 time would be best. So we should consider that. It is unfortu-  
4 nate that so much travel and people have come together without  
5 the ability to have the most meaningful part of the meeting, we  
6 apologize for that.

7           MR. KNIGHT: Dick, I am Jim Knight. I think, along those  
8 lines, it is worth pointing out that what occurred here, of  
9 course, Mr. Green was going to be in Washington on USGS business.  
10 We were hoping to usurp, in a way, some of his time to have this  
11 meeting.

12           As it turned out, we discovered early this morning that  
13 the people at USGS, upon looking at what they had planned for  
14 him and the activities they wanted to complete since he was on  
15 their time, if you will, simply would not allow him to be here  
16 today.

17           So, it is just a matter of priority in their scheme of  
18 things.

19           MR. EISENHUT: Darrell Eisenhut, Director of Licensing.  
20 I would just like to second that. Maybe what we ought to do  
21 right away, at the beginning, is try to lay out the structure of  
22 when we could be able to meet on the more substantive matter for  
23 all parties concerned, and when the experts from USGS probably  
24 would be available and probably pin that down as a key area  
25 because that may well dictate the need for -- the scope of some

1 of the discussion here today.

bfm4

2 It is our understanding -- and Dick, correct me if I'm  
3 wrong -- that the USGS could probably be available to meet with  
4 us Thursday of this week. The key spokesmen for USGS are in  
5 town and are available. It is regrettable that they had a last  
6 minute juggling in schedule, but I can certainly understand it  
7 since they do have a pressing need for a bunch of other conflic-  
8 ting priorities.

9 They would be available to meet Thursday morning, is  
10 that right, Dick?

11 MR. VOLLMER: As best we know, Thursday morning.

12 MR. JACKSON: They recommended either Thursday --  
13 tomorrow evening or Thursday. They expressed somewhat of a  
14 preference for tomorrow evening because it does not interfere  
15 with their other meetings that are going on.

16 Mr. Green is attending another conference. So -- there  
17 is a conflict with one of the managers at USGS. Bob Morris has  
18 a personal conflict on Thursday. It is a personal tragedy, from  
19 what I understand. So, he cannot attend.

20 So, the survey has a policy of not sending their  
21 reviewers or staff members without some support from management.  
22 So, we would have to work with them on any tentative time we  
23 set up to see if they can accommodate us.

24 So we can work something out either tomorrow night or  
25 Thursday. Tomorrow night presents its own problems, but I would

1 be willing to meet tomorrow night to discuss it.

2 I think there are two things I would need to know. One  
3 thing, primarily, is what the intent of the meeting is on the  
4 part of SCE and what is hoped to be accomplished, because neither  
5 the USGS reviewer nor the NRC reviewer who is working with him  
6 has been able to complete a review of the information submitted.

7 The last of which was received on Friday by the reviewers  
8 a compilation chart. So, we have only begun to initiate our  
9 review of that material. My understanding is that it would take  
10 at least 30 days to accomplish a review, for at least the first  
11 cut of that information.

12 MR. BASKIN: Maybe I can, at this point, give a little  
13 background, again. My name is Ken Baskin. I am with Southern  
14 California Edison. For those of you who have not heard our  
15 situation before, I think we all recognize that San Onofre unit  
16 2 is nearing completion in the construction phase. We expect to  
17 be complete with the plant and hopefully have an operating license  
18 by mid-April of next year.

19 As a result of recent discussions, at meetings with the  
20 staff and intervenors over the past several months, it has been  
21 suggested in various ways that there may be a need to do more  
22 offshore exploration of San Onofre before the geology-seismology  
23 issue can be settled, finally.

24 We have been attempting to get this issue resolved.  
25 Our situation at this point in time is that from a practical

1 standpoint, we have either got to do the work now -- by now, I  
2 meant get it started this week, hopefully today or tomorrow -- or  
3 because of previous contractual commitments, all the boats and  
4 types of equipment that does this goes up to Alaska for the  
5 summer. Essentially, we lose them until the September-October  
6 time frame.

7 The problem with going ahead now is two-fold. One is  
8 a very large commitment of dollars on our part. Before we make  
9 that dollar commitment, we would certainly like to understand  
10 why we are making it, as well as the fact that it is necessary to  
11 make it.

12 Maybe more importantly, the commitment at this time to  
13 gather more data, at least in our judgment, certainly implies  
14 a commitment not only on our part, but on the part of the NRC  
15 and the USGS to review such data prior to making any conclusions  
16 which, again, based on the sort of schedule we are talking about  
17 would or could result in project delays.

18 So, the dollars associated with that and the problems  
19 associated with that outweigh the other aspects. We had the  
20 opportunity last Friday to meet informally with Dr. Green of the  
21 USGS, specifically Phil West and Gene Hawkins and Dave Moore, one  
22 of our consultants.

23 We talked about his data. It was, I think, very inter-  
24 esting to us that there is nothing in his data that we disagree  
25 with. More importantly, there is nothing in his data that we

1 think is significantly new or different, maybe a very slight expansion  
2 sion on the information we have, but nothing new or different of  
3 any great significance, certainly nothing that would change the  
4 basic conclusions that have been made on the project review.

5 It was for that reason we felt it would be desirable to  
6 get together among ourselves, the USGS and the staff, to at least  
7 talk briefly about the work Dr. Green has done; see if, based on  
8 the review that has been performed to day, the staff could  
9 provide any better guidance or decision -- let me say, the ideal  
10 world -- at least better guidance after having a chance to talk  
11 with us and Dr. Green in terms of what the feelings might be  
12 regarding the need for more offshore work.

13 It is unfortunate that he could not be here today. We  
14 would certainly like to meet with the people here and Dr. Green  
15 at the earliest possible date. If that is Wednesday evening,  
16 that is certainly acceptable to us. If it is Thursday morning,  
17 that is certainly acceptable to us. If it could be -- you know --  
18 tomorrow morning, that is even better.

19 MR. JACKSON: I would like to respond in general. I  
20 think we are acutely aware of the responsibility we must have in  
21 making any decision for further investigations, as we do for any  
22 site.

23 I, among others here on the staff, have wrestled with  
24 this issue. The easiest thing to do is just to tell you to go out  
25 and do something. We are trying to make a responsible decision,

b-8

1 both to the people who pay electricity and people who have concern  
2 about the plant. We have not reached any conclusion either for  
3 or against further work.

4 We are in the midst of the review. The best that can  
5 be done is to allow us to go through and complete our review as  
6 soon as we can.

7 Because of the time frame that we have fallen into, it  
8 has created a problem, I agree. We initiated some of these  
9 questions back in December as a result of presentations at the  
10 San Diego GSA meeting.

11 It took -- the last meeting we had in Los Angeles, it  
12 was discussed a little bit more, but it really did not come to a  
13 head until a couple of months ago. So, it is just an outgrowth  
14 of the review process. We have talked to the people who origin-  
15 ally testified in the San Onofre proceedings, Dr. Ziony.

16 We trust and depend on his judgment to some extent. We  
17 have not met with Dr. Green. I think any meeting he had, I would  
18 insist on a presentation by you folks on what you have made  
19 available to us to review your interpretation of the significant  
20 lines that you think should be used. We will be available to  
21 listen.

22 I doubt very much at this point in time whether we can  
23 have a great deal of interaction. We can give you our judgement.  
24 If you need an answer this week, that is all we can give you.  
25 We have wrestled with this problem, we have tried our darndest to

bfm9 1 work on this this week.

2 The date in my own mind is May 25th --

3 MR. VOLLMER: Could you also characterize for the record  
4 of what the status is of Green's review?

5 MR. JACKSON: It is an early stage. His first comments  
6 were based on his own studies which were proprietary, internal  
7 to the USGS. It is not an open file, yet.

8 He is not aware of all the previous data. I will agree  
9 that Southern Cal Edison has accumulated a vast amount of infor-  
10 mation offshore. I think the one plot submitted on Friday gives  
11 credence to that, but I think we need several weeks to get a  
12 good handle on whether it is needed or not.

13 We can make some early judgments, if that is necessary,  
14 but I would like to have the opportunity to meet with Green  
15 independently. He, in effect, is an extension of the staff as  
16 an advisor to us and should be treated as a normal staff member.

17 Meetings with him should involve normal routine contacts  
18 with the staff.

19 MR. EISENHUT: Let me make one other observation.  
20 Obviously, there is another party, the intervenor. I guess the  
21 other question is would the intervenor be available to attend a  
22 meeting tomorrow, tomorrow evening, or Thursday?

23 MR. CARSTENS: Yes, I will be there.

24 MR. EISENHUT: It is not a matter, I guess -- the  
25 logistics is not a great matter. I think we ought to finalize

bfml0

1 the arrangements for that meeting as soon as possible, some time  
2 this morning, as soon as possible.

3 One of the first orders of business this afternoon would  
4 be to issue a meeting notice that goes to all the parties that  
5 the meeting will be tomorrow night or Thursday morning, or when-  
6 ever it is, and the purpose of the meeting is to accomplish the  
7 following: A, B, C, D, and make a precise list.

8 I want to ensure -- I appreciate the logistics of  
9 times, the expert consultants, et cetera. I want to be sure all  
10 the parties have a fair shake at attending the meeting, so we are  
11 not leaving out a key ingredient.

12 MR. CARSTENS: I would make one suggestion. Most of  
13 these meetings are informal; no notes are taken. I wonder if it  
14 is not possible to have a reporter there so we could have a  
15 transcript of the meeting.

16 MR. EISENHUT: Yes.

17 MR. VOLLMER: Yes.

18 MR. EISENHUT: We have a court reporter for this  
19 meeting. If we have the meeting here tomorrow night, or Thursday,  
20 there will be a court reporter.

21 First, there are two problems. The meeting is in short  
22 notice, but the meeting is in Washington, so we will have a court  
23 reporter.

24 MR. CARSTENS: Thank you.

25 MR. EISENHUT: With that, I think maybe we ought to

bfml1 1 press on to whatever business you would like to accomplish at the  
2 meeting today, or -- seeing the logistics laid out for the meeting  
3 tomorrow or Thursday. That is really your option.

4 MR. BASKIN: From our standpoint, Darrell, without  
5 Dr. Green being here, I do not think there is much we can do. I  
6 do not think there is anything we can do that we have not already  
7 done.

8 Whatever we would say at this point would just be a  
9 repeat of what we said already other than, you know, information  
10 we learned from our discussion with Dr. Green.

11 I think he has to be here for that sort of thing. So,  
12 from our standpoint, I would suggest we just do whatever is  
13 necessary to see when we can set up the meeting.

14 MR. JACKSON: I would like to reinforce something again.  
15 As you are well aware, the USGS serves as a consultant to us, they  
16 become an extension of the staff, they recommend to us.

17 Based on their recommendation, we can either accommodate  
18 that recommendation in the staff's review or we can reject it.  
19 Green is not one-on-one to Southern Cal Edison as a reviewer. He  
20 is working part time for Bob Morrison, Jim Devine, who are  
21 in charge of our reactor evaluation team at USGS. They work  
22 through him.

23 His conclusions will come as a USGS recommendation. We  
24 can, with our own staff, either overrule it and require additional  
25 work regardless of its recommendation because he is not a regulator

ofml2

300 7TH STREET, S.W., REPORTERS BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20024 (202) 564-2345

1 He is a scientist. He is reading profiles. We are in  
2 the regulatory position and we are used to making those decisions.  
3 The decision will be a branch decision based on the recommendation  
4 of the survey. That is the way we function.

5 MR. EISENHUT: In fact, in some cases, you will see the  
6 USGS as a consultant to us and we may have a half dozen other  
7 consultants working with us. All of those recommendations are  
8 input into the decisionmaking process. I am compelled to say  
9 one other thing, though.

10 A lot of poeple have the tendency to look at the USGS  
11 differently because it is the Department of the Interior. So,  
12 it is slightly different in this case.

13 However, USGS is functioning just like a consultant.

14 MR. BASKIN: Let me just say we are very aware of that.  
15 That is one of the reasons certainly, why we asked for this  
16 meeting today, is recognizing that it is the staff that makes  
17 the decision. It is guidance from the staff that we need on  
18 this particular issue.

19 MR. EISENHUT: I concur with you. I think the useful-  
20 ness of the meeting today -- the only remaining real issue is  
21 to finalize the understanding of actually when the meeting is,  
22 and what I might suggest is, Bob, are you prepared to just to  
23 go ahead and say when you want to do it?

24 USGS is flexible.

25 MR. JACKSON: We will talk to them. Harry and I can

bfml3

300 7TH STREET, S.W., REPORTERS BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20024 (202) 554-2345

1 probably talk to the survey after we finish this meeting. They  
2 are waiting to hear from us. One individual has a real severe  
3 problem on Thursday.

4 MR. EISENHUT: I think before the parties leave, though,  
5 we ought to finalize it so everybody has a good understanding.  
6 Let's try to do it before we leave the building.

7 MR. JACKSON: Okay.

8 MR. EISENHUT: People go off to another meeting,  
9 different people have different commitments. I want to make sure  
10 all parties have a good understanding.

11 MR. JACKSON: The problem is Green is at another  
12 meeting at the Dulles Marriott. They will have to contact him.

13 MR. VOLLMER: Do the best you can.

14 MR. JACKSON: Because of our travel restrictions which  
15 hurt the survey more than us, actually, it is useful to take  
16 advantage of his availability in the area and try to have the  
17 meeting -- I think it will be somewhat a limited accomplishment  
18 because of the time we have for review.

19 We can listen and interact as we normally do. So, it  
20 can be useful, and we ought to take advantage of it. We will  
21 try to work it out. We can call from here or my office.

22 MR. ROOD: Another question is the location of the  
23 meeting. We can have it here or we can have out near Dulles or  
24 Reston.

25 MR. JACKSON: I prefer to have it here. I think they

bfml4

1 are planning on coming over here.

2 Probably, it would be like at 7:00 or 7:30 because we  
3 would like to meet with these surveys separately, ahead of time to  
4 discuss with them, since we have not had an opportunity prior to  
5 that meeting.

6 MR. EISENHUT: It is highly desirable to get a time  
7 lined up because as soon as get the final time lined up, we will  
8 alert our legal office and notify all parties involved.

9 MR. JACKSON: Is there a preference? The one thing  
10 we have moved for it is to have it Thursday and have an alternate  
11 to Bob Morris available. That would have to be worked out, or  
12 we can have it tomorrow night and ensure Morriss's availability.

13 MR. VOLLMER: He is available tomorrow night?

14 MR. JACKSON: Yes. My understanding from Harry is  
15 that his mother passed away and his mother's funeral is Thursday.

16 MR. ROOD: Wednesday night is fine with me. Maybe  
17 we can give him a quick call and just verify it.

18 (Recess.)

19 MR. JACKSON: Bob Morris's survey has confirmed a  
20 meeting at 7:00 tomorrow evening with the utility or at 7:30 --  
21 maybe a little better at 7:30 with the parties. It gives us half  
22 an hour to eat dinner.

23 MR. BASKIN: In this building here, Bob?

24 MR. JACKSON: Let's assume it will be in this building.  
25 Is that all right? Do we have to get special access?

bfml5

300 7TH STREET, S.W., REPORTERS BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20024 (202) 564-2345

1 MR. ROOD: There should be plenty of conference rooms  
2 available.

3 MR. CASE: What is the purpose of the meeting?

4 MR. JACKSON: My understanding is to hear Southern Cal's  
5 presentation of the data that they looked at and point out infor-  
6 mation that they think is most significant to our decision that  
7 we need to reach in the need for further, and will be available  
8 with the survey to interact with them and talk about it.

9 We truly are in a mode of just exploring this issue.  
10 We have not reached any conclusion at all, one way or the other.  
11 There is a lot of data available. I think that Southern Cal  
12 Edison has recently compiled that all for us. We just need a  
13 little bit of an opportunity to look at that.

14 Maybe we can talk about the significance -- you can  
15 pick out those lines that you believe are of the most significance  
16 to the interpretation of the closest approach to the OZD and  
17 the connections with the truncation of the Christianitos Fault.  
18 These seem to be the issues that are circulating around.

19 MR. BASKIN: We can certainly identify and discuss the  
20 key issues in relation to the offshore -- potential offshore work.

21 MR. ROOD: The meeting will be 7:30, Wednesday, May 21st.

22 MR. JACKSON: I do not think we will be able to reach  
23 any conclusions at the meeting. Maybe we can caucus at the end  
24 and discuss it or something, but I do not think at this point in  
25 time that I would be ready to reach any conclusions.

bfml6

1 MR. EISENHUT: Good.

2 MR. JACKSON: If you absolutely need a judgment, we  
3 can try our best to reach that judgment.

4 MR. EISENHUT: Let me again say we are sorry for the  
5 inconvenience to all parties, but sometimes there are unforeseen  
6 circumstances with availabilities of some of the key people.

7 MR. ROOD: When you try and set something up on very  
8 short notice, such as this, a couple of days, then you run the  
9 risk of not having a meeting come off.

10 MR. CASE: Do I understand that we did not find out  
11 until 7:30 this morning that the USGS fellow could not come out?

12 MR. ROOD: That's right.

13 MR. VOLLMER: Very good.

14 (Thereupon, at 11:33 a.m., the meeting in the above-  
15 entitled matter was recessed, to reconvene at 7:30 p.m. on  
16 Wednesday, May 21, 1980.)

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

300 7TH STREET, S.W., REPORTERS BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20024 (202) 554-2345

This is to certify that the attached proceedings before the

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

in the matter of: Need for Additional Offshore Seismic Profiles  
Near San Onofre Site

Date of Proceeding: May 20, 1980

Docket Number: \_\_\_\_\_

Place of Proceeding: Bethesda, Maryland

were held as herein appears, and that this is the original transcript thereof for the file of the Commission.

David S. Parker

Official Reporter (Typed)



Official Reporter (Signature)