

HUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION WASHINGTON, D.C. 20565

June 14, 1979

THEN PROJECT OF CONCENT AND UP

COMMISSION DETERMINATION REGARDING PUBLIC DISCLOSURE UNDER THE GOVERNMENT IN THE SUNSHINE ACT OF:

Discussion of Tarapur February 15, 1979

Pursuant to the Commission's regulations implementing the Government in the Sunshine Act (10 CFR 9.108(d)), the Commission, on the advice of the General Counsel, determined that the attached portions of the subject meeting record, a transcript, should be made available to the public. The remaining portions have been withheld from public disclosure as noted below:

Page/Line	through	Page/Line	Exemption	
3/20		3/24	10 CFR 9.104(a)(1)	
4/1		4/2	10 CFR 9.104(a)(1)	

Secretary of the Commission

Attachment: Transcript

282 055

79676344176



DISCUSSION OF TARAPUR

(Closed to Public Attendance)

February 15, 1979

Pages 1 - 41

Prepared by: C. H. Brown Office of the Secretary

1	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
2	NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
3	
4	DISCUSSION OF TARAPUR (Closed to Public Attendance)
5	
6	Commissioner's Conference Room
7	1717 H Street, N.W. Washington, D. C.
8	. Thursday, February 15, 1979
9	
10	The Commission met, pursuant to notice, at 1:47 p.m.,
11	Joseph Hendrie, Chairman of the Commission, presiding.
12	PRESENT:
13	Chairman Hendrie .
14	Commissioner Gilinsky
15	Commissioner Kennedy
16	Commissioner Bradford
17	Commissioner Ahearne
18	ALSO PRESENT:
19	S. Chilk
20	L. Bickwit H. Shapar
21	C. Stoiber J. Becker
22	R. Burnett J. Shea
23	G. Oplinger T. Sherr
24	J. Devine J. Fouchard
25	

PROCEEDINGS

3

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

- 9

20 21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: If we could come to order.

The Commission mets this afternoon to discuss the Tarapur Export License, No. 1222.

I think the first thing I would like to do is to make a report to you, and the second thing I would like to do is talk something about procedure, and to review some of those procedural matters.

The progress report has to do with a telephone call I got about lunch time from Tom Pickering, the Assistant Secretary of State with whom we deal on these matters. Mr. Pickering has been recently in India, last Thursday and Friday, having conversations with high Indian officials on matters related to these exports, and the problems of coming to agreements that are in conformance with the Non-Proliferation Act, and he called me to reflect some discussion that has gone on in his bureau in State, since he got back over the weekend, along the line that the proposed safeguards committee may, in the long run, turn out to be less effective as a means of dealing with some of the differences between India and the U.S., than had been thought, and that perhaps more continued or increased emphasis in bilateral negotiations would produce a better result. He does not communicate this as a decision of the Department of State, but said he was aware that we were meeting these days on the Tarapur license, and wanted to communicate to

me that at least this thought was around there.

I understand Mr. Christopher will be going out at the end of this month, and the negotiations will continue.

Mr. Pickering was very strong and reiterated several times the fact that in communicating, trying to keep us up to date on the progress of their thinking that this had not in any way affected their views as to the desirability and merits of the 1222 license application, and he also said they had specifically discussed and thought about that aspect.

So I tell this to you for information and you will have to make your own assessment of what it means and to that end, I suppose individual Commissioners could call Pickering, if you wanted. He suggested that because it did not reflect any sort of policy decision at this point that he felt it was probably premature for a briefing, although, obviously at a mutually agreeable time, why, he would be glad to come and talk to us.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Did he -- Excuse me.

CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Okay. That's the end of my report.

I thought I ought to let you know.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY:

CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: No.

282 059

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY:

2

3

CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: He didn't offer any word on the subject and I didn't ask him.

5

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Well, this is just for the record, because the statement has been made, and of course, is a part of life in the world as it is.

7 8

Is the staff aware of any -- Did anybody make any calls on this? Were they aware of this at all?

9

10

MR. DEVINE: I expect, sir, it refers to Vance's letter to the Chairman in late December.

11

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: That was the basis?

13

MR. DEVINE: I think so ..

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Good.

14

CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Okay, now as to procedural matters.

The suggestion last time was -- there was discussion

16

We talked briefly at an agenda session several days

17

ago about the procedural aspects here. I have told you that it

18

seems to me that opinions are becoming sufficiently well crystallized so that we could come to a division of the house and find out

20

which way the General Counsel ought to be drafting an order

21

to represent the majority view in the case.

22

in that context about what we should do then and the thought

24

was -- one thought was expressed that we would look at the

25

order draft language, exchange opinion drafts and one thing or

another. I'm not sure, on further reflection, that that is likely to be as productive an avenue as I might have thought once. I'm not sure that everyone's willing to trade draft opinions and it appears to me that ---

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Who isn't?

CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Well, I think there have been some expressions about past experience that don't encourage people to want to do it this time.

It seems to me that we are well advanced with the discussion and the arguments in the case. The situation has been enhanced considerably since our last meeting, why numerous writings which have come to all the Commissioners. I am delighted to find that on occasion I'm getting critiques of papers before I get the papers, and I look forward, if we were to go much longer to getting rebuttal to critiques before the critique, which in turn would be before I'd get the paper.

Any way, I admire the speed of response very much and the arguments are useful in developing the points of view.

It does seem to me that we are well along in that process and that it might be desirable to go ahead and take a division of the house, ask the Counsel's office to then begin to draft as rapidly as he can, an order reflecting the majority view, presuming there is a majority view and then look forward to a time when individual opinions of Commissioners can be combined with that order and produced.

f. C

5

6

8

9

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

23

24

25

What I would suggest to you is that a final and formal, if you will, vote on the matter could be in the nature of an affirmation vote on the majority order, and that at such time as that vote was scheduled, which would be when the majority had agreed on the order language, that we would look and see if individual Commissioners expect to have such comments as they might want to make in hand by that time, and I would try to schedule that affirmation to take account of the time that people need to gather their invididual thoughts together.

COMMISSIONER BRADFORD: I'm a little puzzled, and I'm concerned as well by one aspect of this.

When we agreed to circulate opinions, I thought we did -that was certainly fine with me. I haven't been shy about
circulating opinions up to now, and certainly whoever writes
a majority opinion will be able to shape whatever they have to
say in response to the points that have been on my mind.

I would like, before writing any final opinion in the case, to have had a chance to see what others have to say.

COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: That's fine with me.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: That's the way it has been done before.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Not exactly.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Well, you know you are referring to the previous Tarapur vote.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: No. I'm referring to three

occasions.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Well, let's pick up --COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: I'll put them all on the record, okay?

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Well, let me ask you which three occasions.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: I'll put the three occasions all on the record. Delighted to do so.

I recall a Tarapur matter and I recall reading in the press a reasonably accurate account, that there were 11 drafts circulated as one rebuttal followed another in an endless process, terminated only because some Commissioners were exhausted in continually rewriting everything to take account of yesterday's rebuttal.

I don't intend to go through that process.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Well, I don't either.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Secondly, -- Good, I'm delighted to hear that, and I hope that that's very clear on the record.

Secondly, I recall another Tarapur matter in which precisely that was suggested and at this table I was overruled because it was a little late, the other opinion having been -- having reached a stage of -- in the dissemination, that to stop it would have caused perturbations since it actually was on the table.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: No, that wasn't the point.

The point was ---

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Well, that certainly was the point and that was the only point.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: May I just say something about it?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: You may if you wish, of course.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Well, the past practice has

been ---

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: No. Past practice has been whatever certain Commissioners wanted it to be. And I'm telling you -- it doesn't make any difference to me what you do, I have no intention of circulating a draft of my opinion until it is written and final and ready to be issued, at which point, everybody will get it.

I want the third one on the record. We followed precisely that procedure in Seabrook, you will recall, with our full agreement. Only after I left town with that understanding, was my opinion then rebutted and in a way that had some slight tinge of inaccuracy. And I have no intention of either rebutting inaccuracy or submitting myself to it.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Well, let me take up the Tarapur matter.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Feel free.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: The practice has been, or let's say it was before that, to have the vote at the time opinions --

1 Let me turn it around. ---2 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: That represents 1 and 2. 3 Which is the one which shows the trend? COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Okay. Weell, the vote and the 5 opinions being released went together, and the significance of 6 it was that when the vote is released people have a reasonable 7 right to have the notion as to why you voted that way. 8 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Why did we then change it? 9 COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: I would have been happy to 10 delay a vote. The point is that we had a wote and ---11 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Who called out for the vote? 12 COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Well, ah ---13 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Those whose opinion had been 14 written. 15 COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: I don't know about that. 16 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Those who were participating 17 in the discussion which was leading, presumably, to the decision of the Commission, but having already written it. 18 19 COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Well, it was the ---20 COMMISSIONER BRADFORD: But it had also been circulated 21 for several days before the meeting.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Never. I had not seen it.

It may have been circulated to some. Indeed, I had the distinct impression it may well have been, but not to me.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: As I remember, it was your

22

23

24

25

insistence on taking a vote in public on this matter.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Exactly as it remains my insistence here.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: In that case, I thought it entirely appropriate to release opinions along with the vote, and I didn't think that that broke with past practice.

Now, what did break with past practice was the fact that we did not delay the vote until we had the opinions prepared and exchanged. I think the proper way to do it is, in fact, for Commissioners to prepare their views, to exchange them, and then vote on the matter.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: I assert that we are free to do this, I intend to write my opinion, and when it is ready for issuance, I will issue it, along with the majority opinion of the Commission, whatever it may be, whether I am part of the majority or othewise. And when that issue is ready to be issued, my opinion will be appended to it.

Anyone wishes to follow that, to rebut it, is free to do so on the public platforms of the nation. I couldn't care less, but I am not going to sit here and go through a four-month exercise, to be terminated only when I believe it is terminated leaving town and having it then resumed while I'm not available to do it. I'm not going to go through that again, ever.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Let me remind you that this exchange of 11 drafts was not at my insistence, it was at the

Chairman's and the Commission. At the time, it didn't want to go out with their opinion until they felt they had fully rebutted my views each time, and it was only ---

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Well, that is a martter of perception, depending on which side of the writing you were on.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: We can go out with your majority opinion anytime you wanted, you didn't want to do it, but anyway, that's ancient history.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Well, I've stated my view, and insofar as I know, the Commission's rules do not require that I circulate my opinion. And if I choose to do so I wi'l and if I choose not to do so, I will not.

COMMISSIONER BRADFORD: I should certainly indicate that I certainly don't recollect the Seabrook opinion in that way, but this isn't the place to discuss it.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Recollection is different. The record is clear.

CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: It does continue to seem to me that in the circumstances the course most likely to produce an expeditious termination is to move today to what I'll call a preliminary counting of hands so that we can instruct the Counsel in which direction to shape an order, assuming there is a majority, and then to schedule an affirmation vote, a public affirmation vote for that order as soon as I can foresee when the majority side is agreeing on its language, and at the same time

ask the other Commissioners whether they will have any separate opinions ready by the time of that affirmation.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: You do not foresee allowing some opportunity for reflecting the majority views, whatever they are?

CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: I would think that we would all get the drafts from the Counsel. I don't see any objection to that.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: I see what you mean.

COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: I wasn't a participant in any of these previous issues and ---

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: You may count yourself fortunate.

I'm trying to assure that you are not involved in

13 another one.

CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Let me stick that last word in, John, before you speak.

I was going to my -- if I'm able to get myself on paper any time before zero hour, why, I will be glad to circulate and will circulate to you the stages of my drafting as I get it prepared, and would be glad to see the direction in which yours are going and Dick prefers not to circulate his, and I guess that's his privilege.

John?

COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Well, as I was going to say,
I am fully prepared to vote this afternoon, I came here prepared
to vote. I have some rough drafts of my arguments and I wall have

it, I think, ready to distribute on Tuesday in draft, and I have no problem with distributing it as a draft version. I am prepared to vote.

commissioner bradford: I have no difficulty with a tentative -- I don't think I would call it a vote -- but a tentative indication of views which you suggested, but it does seem to me and obviously in this case it is desirable to be expeditious as well, but it does seem to me, in the interest of producing sound Commission opinions, that it is well for a full an opportunity for comment back and forth on drafts as possible to take place. I mean, the Supreme Court would never consider issuing an opinion without full circulation, and I would guess that 11 drafts would fall far short of their record. I'm not suggesting that we emulate it, but it wouldn't surprise me at all to have a document go back and forth several time to take into account different arguments and different reflections of positions.

Now, in this case, one has to balance the need to act expeditiously with the need to have a good document, but I wouldn't come down entirely on the side of expedition.

CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Well, of us, you have been particularly active ---

COMMISSIONER BRADFORD: There is that as well, I feel singularly exposed at this point.

CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: -- in geting some things in writing

for which, I must say, it is helpful to get them done.

mention that I don't know whether this case will be like other instances, but it appears that of my experience in the Government, the ability of this organization to withhold to itself any actions is not as effective as other organization I have been in. So I would expect that after a vote it ---

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Oh, I think it will be kept clean until tomorrow morning, only because the other papers have gone to press already.

COMMISSIONER BRADFORD: Well, there's always the radio.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: That raises the question again, which I suggested to you last time as to whether on balance — I don't know whether to put it in the sense that it creates an equal opportunity for all leakers or seekers of information or whatever, but I think it is worth thinking again about whether a simple one or two sentence statement on behalf of the Commission wouldn't be — after we know where it goes — wouldn't be the best thing to do.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Well, however remote the chances, one of the purposes with exchanging views is that one or another person's views may change. You may not end up -- well, you may not change entirely, but you may change in part,

282 070

you may qualify your views ---

÷

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Until the last Tarapur meeting, I would have thought that had some merit as an argument. But indeed, I would think in principle that ought to be true, but when one comes to the table for a two-hour discussion and then at the end of the discussion, hands out a 40-page opinion already printed, one wonders what the purpose of the discussion was, except as sort of a Commission briefing in the interest of making it easier for people to read the document. I mean, really.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Well, as I remember, you were unwilling to have meetings on the subject among ourselves.

COMMISSIONER KENNELY: I did not want priwate meetings, because I don't believe private meetings is the way the Commission ought to do its business.

I think the purpose of the Sunshine law was precisely to insure that the public knew what the Commission was doing when it was doing its business. I contend that that is the reason for the sunshine law and I support it.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Well, I support it too. But at any rate ---

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: The only difference is I vote for it.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Well, I think the Congress votes

for it, but at any rate ---

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: I vote for its application.

a Commissioner may go from voting for to concurring or something like that. I think it is true that it may be difficult to .

keep this information from getting out, but I think, just as in an adjudicatory case one might have in domestic licensing, it seems to me that the proper way for the Commission to work is to get its views together and then announce them, you know, when they have been bounced back and forth. That's part of the point in having a Commission.

MR. STOIBER: If I may point out one procedural aspect which may bear on this under the Non-Proliferation Act.

If you vote, for example, to deny the license then that triggers the Presidential referral, and under the Act, you must submit your views and your decision to the President at the same time that the license is forwarded.

Of course, on the other side, if you approve the license there is no further legal operation. However, you may want to consider whether or not there is some usefulness in having a parallel procedure of both of those sides.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: I don't follow you. Parallel being ---

MR. STOIBER: Parallel being, I guess --CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Do you mean the practice of letting

individual comments and opinions be published at the same time
as the order -- as the majority decision order?

MR. STOIBER: Right.

1.1

CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: I must say, I think there is merit in it, but I continue to wonder whether -- you know -- sort of trying to guess what the probability of maintenance of confidentiality for another week and a half might be against the -- if it is going to breach -- against the benefits of having a simple statement that said -- I don't know -- I would suggest something just along the lines that an initial division of the Commission indicates majority in favor of "X" ---

COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: What is an initial ——
CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: It doesn't strike you?
COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: No.

CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: All right.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Well, you either have a vote or you don't, John. And this is either a vote to which you are held or it isn't, and if it isn't then I don't think it ought to be announced.

CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Yes, it could be not announced.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Well, I don't know. You can experiment.

(Laughter)

COMMISSIONER BRADFORD: Just label it a non-binding vote and then the next -- the most it can be announced as is a

non-binding vote.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: The fact that the Commission is sitting at the table obviates the need for an affirmation. The fact that the Commission votes sitting at the table is its affirmation. Isn't that correct? What we would not vote subject to an affirmation of our vote, the vote would have been taken. Isn't that right?

MR. STOIBER: The mechanics are relevant here also, because when you take a vote, that is an instruction to the staff, and unless you want to say in your vote to instruct the staff not to, in effect, to actually issue the license, then you have sort of done a very odd thing.

CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Wait, wait. Say that again?

MR. STOIBER: Taking a vote but do not issue a

license, because under the procedures you have established, the

Commission's vote merely constitutes a recommendation to the

staff that it has decided that the criteria are met and that

they can, in fact, send the piece of paper to the Edlow

International Company. So what you would ---

CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Well, let me tell you what I had in mind for this afternoon.

I need some sort of indication so that unless you folks want to prepare two equal and opposite orders, okay, then we could have them here in due time, in a week or so on, I don't know how we agree on then, since in agreeing on them, why it

may become clear what the vote is. What I'm looking for is some sort of a straw vote to see which way to direct the order to go Now, having done that, I have said I think we ought, then when the majority side can agree on the language of that order, that we ought to set a date for a public affirmation. vote, we could just come in and do a regular affirmation, and that vote will be the formal vote on the application and the license will issue or not issue, subject to that circumstance. And in setting that affirmation time, I would want to take account of what individual Commissioners felt they needed as a time to be able to bring their individual comments in final form to the table so they could go with the order as a package.

Now, this may not be the ideal course from a number of points of view, but in view of some of the various opinions expressed, it seems to me to be perhaps a practical one for us that we could agree on, and in fact, the only one that strikes me, at the moment, as a practical way to go forward. So now what we are talking about is -- if I could assume for the moment that I can get agreement on that course, what I'm now asking you is whether you want to reconsider the discussion of several days ago about any sort of an announcement by the Commission of the direction of its straw vote.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: What discussion do you refer to?

I don't recall any.

CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: There was one at an agenda session

the other day where I raised questions about some of these procedural matters for today.

Joe, you want to get your two bits worth in.

MR. FOUCHARD: Yes. I'll play kami kaze pilot.

At the conclusion of this meeting there are a number of media, including the Indian media, who are going to ask: Did the Commission vote on the Tarapur license? It has either got to be, it seems to me, a yes or a no. Irrespective of if the answer is "yes" then the obvious follow-on question is: How did it go.

It seems to me that if the Commission is going to vote today on Tarapur, it should announce the results of its vote promptly, after notifying the Executive Branch, Congress, and that should go bing-bing-bing, real close in. I just don't believe that a straw vote, sir, will hold. I think a leak in this situation, with the eyes of many media, many government agencies, and -- it just shouldn't leak. It should be handled straight away.

CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Well, that calls for a formal vote on the matter to be announced immediately and without either an order in hand, even ---

COMMISSIONER BRADFORD: Well, not necessarily. One can also instruct the General Counsel's office to prepare opinion both ways or to prepare one opinion if one or more Commissioners' want an opinion prepared that way, you don't have

to vote at all until later. It does seem to me that the question is a significant one. Is it possible for this Commission to meet, have a tentative indication of views to guide a particular office in preparing a document, without at that point, having had it made public as though it were a final Commission decision. Things may be relatively clear-cut today, I don't know about that, but there are going to be cases in which we are going to want to see what different opinions look like in writing. Now, there ought to be a way to do that.

COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Joe, I have to at least take some exception to you, I think, in that Peter, I think put his finger on the point. Are you saying that we could never reach a tentative vote without having to therefore announce that we have voted?

MR. FOUCHARD: No. I'm saying that it is unlikely that you can reach a tentative vote in a matter with this much attention being paid to it and have that tentative vote not become public in some way.

COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: We could try.

COMMISSIONER BRADFORD: As I said before, if it is not more than a tentative vote, then that is the most that should become public.

COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: For example, we have 40 people or so here, and if it doesn't work with that, then maybe the next

time we could do it with 6 or 7. An if that doesn't work --(Laughter)

If that doesn't work then each of us will write our own opinion, give it to the General Counsel and he will be the one.

CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: That's good. I like that.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Pull them out of a hat.

MR. SHAPAR: Another option of course, is to have two opinions written going in the opposite directions without expressing an opinion as of this time which way anybody wants to go. It is done that way in a other agencies, I understand.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: That's the logical course to follow. The bulk of the work done on either side would then be useful in any event. It would have to be done sooner or later.

CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: If that leaves the General Counsel's office either with a spare opinion for or a spare opinion against the license, will that prejudice the consideration of the next license since he will already have -- you know ---

MR. BICKWIT: That was the least of our concerns.

MR. STOIBER: Historically, the way we have prepared these opinions has required a good deal of counsultation with the Commissioners who have voted with the majority, and it seems to me, personally, I guess, because I will be engaged in the process, not a very efficient use of our resources to prepare two free-standing separate opinions which we cannot relate

1 to the real votes or the real positions.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Let's see, why can't they be assigned to different persons.

MR. STOIBER: Oh, it can be assigned to different persons ---

COMMISSIONER BRADFORD: I think I see Carl's point.

It is the different people they were assigned to that would want to know which Commissioners they should talk to for input.

Of course, they could go from office-to-office and say, are you interested in talking to me?

(Laughter)

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: It seems to me that Commissioner Gilinsky conveyed a view that would form the basis of at least one opinion in what seemed to me a reasonable, clear and straightforward sort of note. I would be prepared to do the same thing which doesn't necessarily commit me to anything, except I'd like to see that opinion that said that. I'd like to see the opinion that is written along the lines that he is talking about.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: You'll see it.

CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Well, all right, let me see.

I'm not sure that I detect consensus at the moment.

23 | What would you ---

COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Well, as I said, I had come today prepared to vote and that is still what I'm still prepared to do.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: But, let's see, did you ---2 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: My preference would be to vote, 3 to then direct the General Counsel to attempt to prepare it, to direct Public Affairs to do that which is not unknown in the 5 history of government public affairs to attempt to keep the press 6 at arms length during that period of time ---7 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: The Defense Department tries 8 that more often than most with a singular lack of success. 9 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: We know about the lack of 10 suceess. 11 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Oh, yes. I know about the others 12 too, and their numbers are smaller. 13 COMMISSIONER BRADFORD: It was never known as the 14 Defense Commission, however. 15 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: See, I'm -- 1 would prefer to have the General Counsel focus its efforts on writing the 16 opinion that they may have to then defend. 17 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Yes. 18 MR. BICKWIT: That's what I was looking for. 19 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: That's looking for the easy way. 20 (Laughter) 21 COMMISSIONER AHEARNS: I recognize the General 22 Counsel staff is uniformly of high quality, I assume though, 23 that there might be some ---24

COMMISSIONER BRADFORD: It's a good theory, John, but

25

its applicability here is limited by the fact that there is no one who is standing to appeal, except, of course, the applicant.

COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: I would imagine that the -other than if the ---

CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Can't these things go to court?

COMMISSIONER BRADFORD: I thought the NNPA left the the intervenors without a standing to get into court.

commissioner ahearne: Well, if there is no reason for the order that the General Counsel prepares to say other than yea or nay, then that's very straightforward and doesn't have to work at all on it. If there is a reason for a lot of work to go into it then I'm the one that is going to have to be defended, putting aside where it is going to have to be defended.

MR. OPLINGER: Would it help at all if each of the Commissioners were to express the direction in which he is leaning now, but specify that he is not prepared to say final where he comes out at this point.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: I'd rather not read about that tomorrow.

CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Well, that's the sort of testing of the water that I had been hoping to come to and then to use that as guidance to the drafters of language here, as well as to us individually since those of us on the minority side are surely going to want to have our opinions published at the time of the order, and even though the majority side may want to express personal views on the matter, but the question of whether or not in so doing we can maintain a reasonable confidentiality for such working up the language and exchange of drafts to whatever extent that's possible, that is one of the questions before us. The suggestion is that if you take any kind of a vote, why it will inevitably become known and I guess sort of the corollary then is that a way to avoid this is to not take a vote and ask the Counsel's office to work on parallel documents with opposite polarities and then come to an affirmation vote.

ŝ

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Let me point out that Commissione:
Gilinsky and J have always felt strongly, whichever of us in the
individual case ---

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: I want to hear the end of this.
(Laughter)

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: -- We have both felt strongly that the minority should be afforded just as much service from the General Counsel in the preparation of its opinion as the majority. Whichever one happens to be on is irrelevant. The fact is that that's where the legal staff is that serves the Commissioner directly and thus, it seems to me, they are going to have to write two opinions anyway, and the sooner they get at it the better.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: I agree with that.

COMMISSIONER AHEARVE. Well, I would be most interested

in the opinion that says that we should license. 2 COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: I'd be interested in both. 3 COMPLISSIONER BRADFORD: One always focuses harder on what one is going to have to rebut. 5 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: That's a lawyer speaking, 6 that's not a position. 7 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Other -- Let's see. I've got two 8 votes for a two-opinion initiative. 9 COMMISSIONER BRADFORD: Well, I'll vote for that. 10 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Well, I vote for that. 11 COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Yes. 12 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Yes, I was counting you and Vic, 13 and now Peter joined in. I think there is a majority there, 14 John. 15 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Well, I've already said the 16 opinion I'd like to see, and cert inly General Counsel can prepare 17 any number of opinions. 18 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: I take that to have been an 19 expression of confidence in the General Counsel. 20 COMMISSIONR AHEARNE: Absolutely. I have high 21 confidence in the General Counsel, as well as other people in the office. 22 23 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: As long as there are more of them 24 than there are of us, I guess it is possible to have whatever number of opinions that are required in any given case. That may 25

work to keep idle hands from getting into mischief or whatever it is that idle hands get into down on the 10th floor, but it seems to me -- All right, I'll ---

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: -- I'll decide we have a Commission -I wouldn't say necessarily roundly-applauded direction, but it
is clear a majority of the Commissioners would prefer, rather than
taking -- me asking for a raising of hands or other indication
of a direction here, to ask you to crank forward on these two
directions.

COMMISSIONER BRADFORD: Could I ---

CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER BRADFORD: Could I ask, it is on a separate and much slower track that OGC and maybe OPE and OPA, think a little about Commission adjudicatory sessions in general, and the best way in which to shape them with an eye toward ---

CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Yes. I think that is a useful comment. I would just as soon not come to this sort of impass in terms of an axiously awaiting public at ence without the doors and need for some exchange of -- desirability of exchanges and written views, but nobody -- Commissioners are not going to sit down and write two sets of views, one for and against, and onen at the last minute announce: "I take 'A'". You are going to write what you think and if there is to be a

chance for that to happen and for any circulation of that among us before a formal decision is announced, then we have to have a way to protect that process in adjudications. And I would be interested, indeed, in seeing if we couldn't have a general agreement so that we don't have to patch one together every time we have one of these.

suggesting that we have a version of the legislative analysis that was -- well which we prepared for John, and that a memorandum be prepared for the Commission. If it turns out to be merely a change of addressees so be it, but I think that a number of -- Well, if nothing else, Peter has written a memo which I think ought to be taken into account, and my conversations with Len suggest to me that there's more to his memo than meets the eyes, so ---

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Maybe less.

(Laughte.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: -- Well, no. I mean, it's --COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Which memo are you referring to.
Do you mean the February 13th one?

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Yes.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: On the legislative history?

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Yes. And I would like to see a memo on that subject addressed to the Commission.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: I assumed that although it was

answering a specific question and was forwarded to all Commissioners that any such memo -- I have always assumed that any such memo is to the Commission. Is that an erroneous assumption? 5 COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Well, if nothing else, he . 6 didn't have a chance to take other views into account. Now, he 7 may feel that he doesn't want to change a word, Int he may feel 8 that he wants to, and ---. 9 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: I'm lost. 10 COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Well. I'm referring to Peter's 11 memo. 12 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Well, he didn't have Peter's memo. 13 Peter's memo post-dated this memo. 14 COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: That's right. 15 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: It is a critique. 1.6 COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Yes, well, I just think it is 17 an important document and, you know, the General Counsel's 18 memorandum on the legislative ---19 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: We are asking the General Counsel's critique of the critique. Is that what you are asking? 20 COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Well, I'm asking him to ---21 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: I would urge that, and in fact, 22 if the General Counsel feels that he could do it without greater 23 24 trepidation than he already suffers.

25

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: What I'm asking is for the

4 5

Commission to ask the General Counsel to address a memorandum on that subject to the Commission. If his views haven't changed at all, and even take into account Peter's memo, then so be it, but if they have and other discussions have -- or if he wants to amplify it or change it or whatever, then I think that ought to be in there.

commissioner kennedy: I think before he does that, though, he ought to prepare a full list of the discussees in order that all of the readers can understand the basis on which he arrives at his conclusions. Up to now, my assumption has been, and I think it is correct, that the original memo which he drafted was drafted based upon a careful analysis of the record.

Now, if we are to introduce into that, a variety of opinion and other things, I think that's fine, but I think that all ought to be carefully footnoted so that one is not making erroneous assumptions about the basis for the judgments and conclusions which are reached in the paper. Does that make sense to you, Counsel?

MR. BICKWIT: Yes. I do want to make clear that the memo was produced, as you said ---

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: There was never a doubt in my mind on that score.

MR. BICKWIT: Yes. I also think probably it should have some amplification on the discussion between Commissioner Gilinsky and myself that led to the interpretation that there might

be more to the memo than met the eye.

٥.

memo.

Not as to this memo. What I'm suggesting is that if a new memo is to be done as Commissioner Gilinsky suggests, and I see merit in that, but if it is to go as he suggests, taking into account other discussions and views, the nature of those needs to be rather carefully spelled out so that all the readers know that it is not just the law and the legislative history which has been taken into account in the writing, but also, views which may have been gleaned from these discussions. That's all. I just want to be sure that our scholarship is clear and clean as it can be.

MR. BICKWIT: Would it be simpler ---

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Oh, I think it would be simpler to just stick to the facts, of course. That's where I'd begin.

MR. BICKWIT: -- to stick to Commissioner Bradford's

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Well, I think whatever you do ought to be in a memorandum addressed to the Commission as a whole. I mean, it is a ---

COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: I think he certainly meant to address that to the Commission as a whole.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: There is nothing wrong with him addressing a memorandum to a Commissioner, it is just ---

COMMISSIONER KENNIDY: Let me assure my colleagues and the General Counsel and anyone else who is interested that

whenever I receive a mimorandum addressed to a particular Commissioner, I assume it is intended for me as well as to them. It is addressed to them specifically, only because that individual or those individuals were the ones who speficially asked the question and therefore, are getting a direct reply, but that memoranda, written by the staff, whoever they may be, to any Commissioner is a memorandum to the Commission. That's my understanding of the way the Commission functions and I hope it is a general understanding. Could we agree on that as a certain matter of policy?

CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: I think that's clear, sure.

COMMISSIONER BRADFORD: You mean in cases where copies go to all Commissioners?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Yes. Well, I assume they do.

COMMISSIONER BRADFORD: I think _ ey do as well, but
I guess I can conceive of a situation, let's say an open-door
submission where it might not, and that might be a different
sort of matter.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Right, of course.

COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: But certainly, if there is copy at the bottom.

CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Okay, now ---

COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Joe, what is our schedule then, because if we can only vote together and we are not going to be together for more than two weeks, are you suggesting, therefore, w

do not vote for two weeks?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Well, it isn't going to make any difference. The only import at this juncture of a vote, if I understand it, because someone earlier stated, the only import of a vote at this juncture is an instruction to the staff to issue or not to issue a license. So if we are not going to do that until --- What?

COMMISSIONER BRADFORD: It can be done with less than five.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Yes. It could. It could be done with three. It would be an interesting sort of exercise which three.

COMMISSIONER BRADFORD: You would want the right three.
(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: You might find a Commissioner to vote against his principles in order to let the will of the majority be done.

What about schedule? Now, you are not going to be here next week and Dick's not going to be here the week after.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Well, I'm going to leave Tuesday afternoon, and I will be away, then, for the rest of that week.

CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: You will be back the following week, but you will be gone. It is going to take a while to put it together. You are not about to do it instantaneously.

.

MR. BICKWIT: Yes. And we have some additional questions of this procedure we thought ought to be raised.

What is the Commission's position on the exchange of drafts? We know that the Commission wants two drafts prepared, how does it come down on that question? That's one of our questions.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: As to the two drafts, I assume we will all look at the two drafts.

MR. BICKWIT: I see.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: (A), we will decide what we think about each one of them, and then -- (a) -- and then (b) decide what we think about which we would prefer, (a) or (b).

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Now, are they preparing the other drafts beyond that? I asked them to prepare drafts. Is that one of these two or is that the third draft?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: I had asked them to do some --
COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: -- or is that bracketed material
in one draft?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: -- I had asked them to do some work for me which would be applicable in either case.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Now, presumably these drafts, and they are usually written in certain bracketed sections, you ought to incorporate, it seems to me, everything you do, into two drafts.

COMMISSIONER BRADFORD: So far.

3 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: I expect there is going to end up being individual expressions --5 MR. BICKWIT: That's my next question. 6 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: -- nc matter what, and ---7 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Unless this is to be a genuine 8 first. 9 COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: I'm afraid not, Dick. Sorry: 10 COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Are you talking about five 11 opinions or something? 12 CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: I was just mulling ---MR. BICKWIT: There is also the difficulty of whose 13 instructions to follow in revising these drafts. 14 15 (Laughter) COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: That's right. He has got -- at 16 that stage, there is a fairly valid point. If one set of drafts 17 are "yea" and the other set of drafts are "nay", I would guess 18 that the people that he ought to be following for the revision 19 to the "yea" are those who are going to vote for the "yea". 20 COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: The changes of the drafts takes 21 place in the General Counsel's office. 22 (Laughter) 23 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Let me just point out that that 24 really was one of the problems which we were having in the first 25

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Well, all I can say to that is

1

2

"good luck".

Tarapur exercise. What was it that people were working on, and it was never clear, because (a) the dissenter was working upon the majority opinion and would try to say: "Oh, no, that's wrong." So the majority would change it, whereupon, the dissenter would then change his dissent, you see, to coincide with the new draft of the majority. And it can go on for ever. So it is not as clear as ---

COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: I think we have found a way never to issue a license or reject it.

the drafts are prepared the Commissioners are going to have to meet, to some measures among themselves, and see who agrees with what. The group at that point faces the difficulty is the majority because their meeting becomes a Sunshine. So they will have to do it through their assistants and the minority will have no such problem.

(Laughter)

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: You can't sell tickets to a close meeting.

CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: By George, that's almost a good reason to avoid being in the majority.

MR. SHAPAR: I would also assume that at any time during the process any one or more Commissioners could say that I'll draft myself, from this point on. I think that's really the important thing.

-

CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: I tell you, since we seem destined to go in this multi-drafted fashion, it seems to me that what you try to do is to get up an initial opinion one way and the matching opinion the other way and circulate them and Commissioners will have to focus in on one or another, and then I think ---

Let me just say for myself that I will not propose to kibitz on the opinion running in a way that I don't propose to vote. Then I think Commissioners leaning each way have to take the lead in either taking over the draft, or at least working with the Counsel's staff member who has got that one, to get it perfected.

Now, ---

MR. BICKWIT: At that point, each Commissioner will make the decision about the further exchange of drafts?

CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: Yes, I think so. I think once the Commissioners, in effect, assume possession, as it were, of the drafting effort, then those that are for circulation will circulate and those that are not for it won't.

MR. DEVINE: Sir, OPE may be involved marginally in preparing these statements, what issues precisely should be discussed in the two opinions?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Those that are relevant.
(Laughter)

MR. DEVINE: I'm referring now to the issues raised, for example, in the Commission order on the oral hearing, the

written hearing. Fuel need, adequacy, safeguards and things of that nature.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Certainly any opinion as to a comment to explore as appropriate, a justification for the view, whether or not the criteria are met, obviously. That's one.

MR. DEVINE: That, I think, narrows the list of issues to be addressed then.

COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Tuesday, I will give you what I think are the relevant issues and, at least, where I come out on them.

CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: But, I think, it would seem to me that some attention to the items which we cited, particularly for the oral hearing, or for the comments from people, ought to be covered. Some note ought to be taken of those meetings.

We, after all, exercised people and encouraged them to address them, and presumably we had some interest hearing them. But I think beyond the question of the criteria and those points, then from there on, it think it may depend on what Commissioners want to see in one side or the other.

MR. DEVINE: Let me ask Howard a question: You mentioned that agencies did this normally, preparing two drafts, the same people in the agencies, Howard?

MS. BECKER: I was the one who told Howard that, but it was structured somewhat differently and the board would give the General Counsel's staff instructions and then a board member

. .

-- very often the same attorney would prepare the draft.

COMMISSIONER AHEARNE: Out of curiosity, how, in the absence of the Commissioners expressing what they believe are the important issues and how they come out of it, how does the General Counsel adopt the argument that they then agree with them?

MR. BICKWIT: I think there will have to be some instruction. It may take place as a back-and-forth methodology.

COMMISSIONER BRADFORD: As one final chilling note,
I can't think of any part of this meeting that is withholdable.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN HENDRIE: I will note that the report I made to you from the Department of State, let it be quite clear is classified on the normal basis that internal deliberations to the government in connection with foreign policy matters, National Security Information.

Well, I'm not sure we came to where I had hoped we would come to this afternoon, but I think we have sort of run down on this subject.

Let me note once again, for the benefit of everybody present that the Commission is attempting to preserve for itself confidentiality until these opinions and orders can be prepared and we can meet in public meeting to take a final vote on the Tarapur application.

There are institutions in this to m and elsewhere that manage to work in that fashion with some success. I admire

them for the tradition that they have managed to build among their members and staff and assistants and so on, to preserve that ability of those bodies to work. I think of the Supreme Court, particularly. My impression has been that similar efforts here have not been very successful. Let me ask each one of you to please accept for yourselves a responsibility to help us maintain this confidentiality and to allow the Commission to work in this fashion until it is ready to come to a public meeting and take a formal vote.

Thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER BRADFORD: Well, put.

(Whereupon, the Commission meeting was adjourned at 2:55 p.m. and the Commission moved on to other business.)