



13-4

UNITED STATES  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

Summary of Interview with

Edward J. Holcombe  
Vice-President and Controller, GPU  
Phone: 201-263-4900 x620

9/6/79  
At Office of J. Liberman

Ed Holcomb reports to V. Condon, Chief Financial Officer, and is responsible for accounting, budget and tax compliance.

Ed wrote a letter to FPC (now FERC) about the 120 day test period so that GPU didn't have to submit a report until after TMI-2 was in service. The final report has not yet been filed. Ed's letter was to Mr. Fitzgerald.

Ed reviewed with Bob Arnold the criteria in Rev. Rul. 76-428 because Ed felt only Arnold could supply the assurance that the criteria were met. This was done at a meeting in December 1978 of GPU Service Corp. Board of Directors, also attended by service corp. officers.

The basic schedule of TMI-2 was re-established in a 1974 letter to the Pa. PUC.

The experience of Phila. Electric Co. and of Public Service Elec. & Gas Co. (Salem 1) proved that, once testing period is complete, a unit must be declared to be in commercial operation.

The Bureau of Power has some oversight function relating to "accepting" nuclear plants in service.

Herman Dieckamp established the Commercial Operations Review Board (CORB) because he wanted more formal criteria for the accounting decision of a declaration of commercial operation.

Ed didn't know if a certificate of construction completion was issued by Catalytic.

Ed supplied a schedule (attached) showing the cash flow benefits of bringing TMI-2 into commercial operation in 1978 vs. 1979. Because GPU started taking ITC on progress payments in 1976, some large part of 1978 costs would be eligible for ITC even if TMI-2 not declared in commercial operation until 1979.

Will provide:  
1 letter to FERC

I

8001180 238