ISHAM, LINCOLN & BEALE

COUNSELORS AT LAW

LDWARD 5. ISHAM, 1872-1902 ROBERT T. LINCOLN, 1871-1889 WILLIAM G. BEALE, 1865-1923

CHARLES A. BANE

DEAN A. ESLING WILLIAM W. DARROW FREDERICK R. CARSON

RICHARD G. FERGUSON

RICHARD & OGILVIE

RICHARD D. CUDAHY RICHARD E. POWELL

A DANIEL FELDMAN

PHILIP F. PURCELL

MICHAEL I. MILLER

SHARON L. KING

JON R LIND

ROBERT E. CRONIN EILEEN STRANG ONE FIRST NATIONAL PLAZA FORTY-SECOND FLOOR

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60603

312-786-7500 TELEX: 2-5288

WASHINGTON OFFICE" 1050 ITT STETET, N. W WASHINGTON, D. C. 20036 202-833-9730

ASSOCIATES

AWRENCE & ADELSON GEOFFREY A ANDERSON MARGARET C. BAXTER EUGENE H. BERNSTEIN ALAN P. BIELAWSKI JAMES B. BURNS JOHN E. CIPRIANO CLARK EVANS DOWNS EDSELL M. EADY, JR. ROBERT L. ESTEP DAVID J. FISCHER MARY L. FITCH JAMES A. FLETCHER MARTHA E. GIBBS STEVEN R. GILFORD PAUL C. LEMBESIS JAMES R. LOOMAN

EDWARD W. MALSTROM HUGH R. NCCOMBS. JR. WILLIAM S. MCKAY, JR. MUL M. MURPHY GLENN E. HELSON JAMES N. NOWACK! THOMAS GRADY RYAN STEVEN R. SCHAFER FREDERIC E. SCHREYER PAUL W. SCHROEDER DAVID M. SPECTOR BOYD J. SPRINGER DAVID M. STAML PHILIP P STEPTOE. B PAMELA & STROSEL WILLIAM P SURIANO PATRICIA M. SWEENEY RICHARD B. THIES JOHN W.

REYNALDO R GLOVER ROBERT H. LOEFFLER DONALD & MCLACHLAN ALEXANDER HEHMEYER

April 17, 1979 DOCTET NUMBER DE PROPOSED RULE TIS

DAVID J. ROSSO DONALD E. VACIN JOHN L. MCCAUSLAND

LAURENCE D. LASKY

C. RICHARD JOHNSON

GERALD D. MINDELL GERRY D. OSTERLAND

DONALD B. HILLIKER

ROBERT W. KLEINMAN TERRY F. MORITZ

ROBERT H. WHEELER

JOSEPH GALLO

ROBERT A. YOLLES

JOHN W. ROWE

Secretary of the Commission U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, D.C. 20555

Attention: Docketing and Service Branch

Dear Sir:

This law firm offers the following comments with respect to proposed 10 CFR §§2.719, 2.780 concerning ex parte communications. 44 Fed. Reg. 12428 (March 7, 1979).

We find the definition of "ex parte communication" set forth in proposed 2.780(b) confusing and poorly drafted. The new rule appears to forbid, with certain specific exceptions, communications which are (1) not made on the public record, and (2) not made with reasonable notice to "all participants." The requirement that all communications be made on the record appears overbroad. This would interfere with conference calls and other informal conferences where the Licensing Board and all parties are regresented but no public record is kept. Such conferences are useful and as long as all parties are represented there is no need to require the constant attendance of a court reporter. A better definition of ex parte communication would resemble that implicit in the Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. §554(d), that is, the term would be limited to those communications made without notice and opportunity for all parties to participate.

A second problem with the proposed definition is that it states that reasonable prior notice must be given to "all participants in the proceeding." This could be interpreted to include persons who make limited appearance

364 090

Secretary of the Commission April 17, 1979 Page 2

statements. See 10 CFR §2.715. But giving notice to all such persons prior to any communications would of course be administratively impracticable. We suggest that the word "participants" be changed to "parties."

Finally, we suggest that the specific exception provided in proposed 10 CFR §2.780(b)(5) for communications between the Commission and the staff in respect of generic issues be broadened to include parties other than the staff. There seems to be no reason why other parties should be restricted in communicating their views on generic issues to the Commission. For this limited exception, as opposed to the general definition of 10 CFR §2.780(b), a requirement that all communications be on the public record would be appropriate.

Respectfully submitted,

Philip Steptoe

PS:1k