

TRM
~~Boyd~~
Boyd
Files

UNITED STATES ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION



-----X
 :
IN THE MATTER OF: :
 :
 : Docket No. 50-313
 :
 ARKANSAS POWER AND LIGHT COMPANY :
 :
 -----X

PRE-HEARING CONFERENCE

Place - Washington, D. C.

Date - October 15, 1968

Pages.....1...42...

THIS DOCUMENT CONTAINS
POOR QUALITY PAGES

OR COPYING OF THIS TRANSCRIPT
GRAPHIC, ELECTROSTATIC OR OTHER
REPRODUCTION IS PROHIBITED BY THE ORDER
OF THE COMMISSION

Regulatory Docket File

Telephone:
(Code 202) 547-6222

ACE - FEDERAL REPORTERS, INC.

Official Reporters

415 Second Street, N.E.
Washington, D. C. 20002

8304150737 T

NATION-WIDE COVERAGE



BEFORE THE
ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

-----X
 :
 In the Matter of: :
 : Docket No. 50-313
 ARKANSAS POWER AND LIGHT COMPANY :
 :
 -----X

Room 115
811 Vermont Ave. N. W.
Washington, D. C.

The pre-hearing conference came on for hearing,
pursuant to notice, at 2:15 p.m.

BEFORE:

ALGIE A. WELLS, Chairman
DR. LAWRENCE R. QUARLES, Member
R. B. BRIGGS, Member

ALTERNATE MEMBERS PRESENT:

J. D. BOND, Chairman
DR. JOHN GEYER, Member

APPEARANCES:

W. HOPACE JEWELL, ESQ., and PHILIP K. LYON, ESQ., of
House, Holmes & Jewell, 1550 Tower Building,
Little Rock, Arkansas 72201 and
ROY B. SNAPP, ESQ., 1725 K Street, N. W., Washington,
D. C. 20006, on behalf of the Applicant.

THOMAS F. ENGELHARDT, ESQ., Regulatory Staff, Atomic
Energy Commission.

2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

ebl

P R O C E E D I N G S

1
2 CHAIRMAN WELLS: This is a pre-hearing conference
3 that is scheduled in accordance with the Notice of Hearing.
4 It pertains to an application by Arkansas Power and Light
5 Company for a construction permit for a pressurized water
6 reactor to be located at a site in Pope County near
7 Russellville, Arkansas.

8 We are convened at the place designated in the
9 Notice of Hearing, we are about 10 or 15 minutes after the
10 time designated but I think it is close enough. The date is
11 October 15th as prescribed in the Notice of Hearing. On
12 October 30th in Russellville there will be a hearing conducted
13 in this matter. This is only a conference designed for the
14 purpose of identifying the issues and settling procedural
15 matters.

16 This Board is composed of Dr. Lawrence Quarels, on
17 my right, and Mr. Beecher Briggs, on my left. My name is
18 Algie Wells and I have been designated Chairman of the Board.

19 Dr. John Geyer has been designated as a techni-
20 cally qualified alternate of the Board and Mr. J. D. Bond
21 has been designated alternate Chairman of the Board. Both
22 Mr. Bond and Mr. Geyer are with us this afternoon, but un-
23 fortunately there is not room up here for them. I see them
24 sitting in the back of the room.

25 As alternates, Dr. Geyer and Mr. Bond will participate

eb2 1

2 with the Board in the discussion of matters pertaining to the
3 preparation for the hearing. They will not participate in
4 making decisions unless they should become members of the
5 Board in accordance with the applicable rules and regulations.

6 Except to say that Dr. Quarles is Dean of the
7 College of Engineering at the University of Virginia and
8 Mr. Briggs is Director of the Molten Salt Reactor Program
9 at Oak Ridge, I think I can dispense at this conference with
10 the customary statement on the background of the Board mem-
11 bers, as I believe these gentlemen are well-known to you.

12 Dr. Geyer and Mr. Bond are also well-known.
13 Dr. Geyer is the Chairman of the Department of Sanitary Engineer-
14 ing and Water Research at Johns Hopkins University and
15 Mr. Bond is a Hearing Examiner with a long and distinguished
16 career, who is presently assigned to the U. S. Atomic Energy
17 Commission.

18 Copies of the Notice of Hearing which I have
19 mentioned earlier are available if any of you would like to
20 have a copy so that you can follow the proceedings with perhaps
21 a little more interest.

22 As I mentioned earlier, this conference is pri-
23 marily a procedural one. We will not take evidence as
24 such. The main reason for us being here this afternoon is
25 to settle procedural problems, exchange testimony between
the parties -- I think we only have two parties -- identify

eb3 1 witnesses and identify principal substantive matters that will
2 be discussed at the hearing.

3 Mrs. Barther is our Reporter and we would like for
4 you to feel free to interrupt us, Mrs. Barther, whenever you
5 feel it is necessary to understand anything that is said.

6 The Applicant, Arkansas Power and Light Company, has
7 made timely answer to the Notice of Hearing and the Board has
8 received notification of the appearance of Mr. Horace Jewell,
9 Mr. Edward B. Dillon, Jr., Mr. Philip K. Lyon, and Mr. Roy
10 B. Snapp on behalf of the Applicant.

11 Mr. Jewell, perhaps you would introduce yourself
12 and your colleagues, so that the record will show your presence.

13 MR. JEWELL: I am Horace Jewell. On my right is Mr.
14 Philip Lyon. Both of us are from Little Rock. And on my
15 left is Mr. Roy Snapp of Washington. And we are here today
16 representing the applicant.

17 CHAIRMAN WELLS: Thank you very much.

18 The Board has also received notice of the appearance
19 of Mr. Thomas F. Engelhardt on behalf of the Regulatory Staff
20 of the Atomic Energy Commission.

21 Mr. Engelhardt, perhaps you would introduce yourself
22 and your colleagues for the purposes of the record.

23 MR. ENGELHARDT: I am Thomas F. Engelhardt and I
24 represent the Atomic Energy Commission's Regulatory Staff.

25 To my left is Mr. Neil Newman, who will be assisting

eb4

1 me during the course of these proceedings, although Mr. Newman
2 is not admitted to the bar as yet. He will shortly be so
3 admitted and until such time he will not file with the Board
4 a notice of official appearance in this proceeding.

5 To my right is Mr. Charles Long and to his right
6 is Mr. Albert Schwencer, both of whom will be the staff's
7 principal technical witnesses at the forthcoming hearing.

8 CHAIRMAN WELLS: Thank you, Mr. Engelhardt.

9 I believe I can say that in addition to representing
10 the Regulatory Staff, Mr. Engelhardt and his colleagues are
11 prepared to assist the members of the public who may wish to
12 consult with them concerning the regulations and procedures
13 applicable to this conference and the hearing which we will
14 hold in Russellville. They will I am sure be glad to give any
15 assistance desired, if the members of the public can contact
16 them at the appropriate time.

17 The Board is not informed of any request to inter-
18 vene in these proceedings. The Notice of Hearing prescribed
19 the request for intervention be submitted not later than
20 October 10th. If there is anyone present who desires to inter-
21 vene and can show good cause for not submitting his petition
22 within the prescribed time, we will be glad to consider the
23 request.

24 (No response.)

25 CHAIRMAN WELLS: The record will please show there

eb5 1 was no such request made.

2 We have on the other hand received three requests from
3 persons who would like to make limited appearances. One is
4 from Mr. E. F. Wilson, Director, Division of Radiological
5 Health of the Arkansas State Board of Health.

6 I wonder if by chance Dr. Wilson is here this after-
7 noon?

8 MR. JEWELL: He is not, Mr. Chairman.

9 CHAIRMAN WELLS: Thank you, Mr. Jewell.

10 The Board has informed Mr. Wilson that he would be
11 permitted to make a limited appearance on October 30th.

12 In addition, the Board has received a request from
13 Dr. Howard K. Suzuki, Professor at the University of Arkansas
14 Medical Center in Little Rock. This request was only received
15 either yesterday or today. If I hear no objection from the
16 parties, the Board will inform Dr. Suzuki that he will be per-
17 mitted to make a limited appearance.

18 (No response.)

19 CHAIRMAN WELLS: Hearing no objection, we will so
20 inform Dr. Suzuki.

21 We received another request for limited appearance
22 from Mr. S. Ladd Davies, Director of the Arkansas Pollution
23 Control Commission. If there is no objection the Board would
24 propose to inform Mr. Davies he would be permitted to make a
25 limited appearance.

eb6

1 MR. ENGELHARDT: Mr. Chairman, I notice in Mr. Davies'
2 letter, his last sentence indicates that his statement will
3 be confined to thermal and chemical aspects only, since the
4 radiological aspects are under the jurisdiction of the Arkansas
5 State Health Department. This statement is not entirely ac-
6 curate, and it also indicates that this individual will be
7 speaking in connection with matters which the Atomic Energy
8 Commission has no direct jurisdiction over at this time.

9 Would it be the intent of the Chairman in respond-
10 ing to this request to indicate to Mr. Davies the extent of
11 this Board's jurisdiction in order to provide him with some,
12 well, what shall we say, to, one might say, straighten him
13 out on exactly what it is that this hearing is to consider and
14 the scope of the Commission's jurisdiction?

15 CHAIRMAN WELLS: Well, it might be worthwhile. I
16 was just wondering, I'm not sure the Board would want to do
17 this in our brief letter. I might refer to the regulations.

18 At the time of the hearing I think it would be ap-
19 propriate for the Board to inform him what are the limits of
20 our jurisdiction.

21 MR. ENGELHARDT: I think it would be appropriate
22 for him, since he does seem to be a little confused on who
23 has jurisdiction in various matters, to provide that back-
24 ground and if the Board so desires, at the time limited ap-
25 pearances are called at the hearing, I would be happy to make

eb7 1 such a statement if the Board does not choose to make such a
2 statement.

3 CHAIRMAN WELLS: Thank you. You might even find it
4 useful if you could seek him out on the morning so he would
5 know beforehand. My suspicion is that there will be no diffi-
6 culty with this. I don't suppose he is going to want to
7 wander too far afield.

8 MR. ENGELHARDT: With that comment, I have no objec-
9 tion to the Board's admitting this individual as a limited
10 appearee.

11 CHAIRMAN WELLS: Thank you.

12 Does the applicant have any comment on that?

13 MR. JEWELL: The applicant has no objection to a
14 limited appearance by Mr. Davies.

15 CHAIRMAN WELLS: Good. Then I believe that takes
16 care of that.

17 I would like to acknowledge and express the Board's
18 appreciation to Staff Counsel for taking the initiative in
19 developing a proposed agenda for this afternoon's meeting. It
20 has been submitted, if I understand correctly, Mr. Engelhardt,
21 with the concurrence of your colleague, the Applicant's Coun-
22 sel?

23 MR. JEWELL: That's right.

24 CHAIRMAN WELLS: If you have enough copies of the
25 agenda, you might wish to let any person who is interested in

eb8 1 the agenda have a copy so they can follow it as we discuss it.

2 MR. ENGELHARDT: May I inquire if all of the Board
3 members have copies, in which case we will just pass the rest
4 of them out to the rear of the room and they will be avail-
5 able.

6 CHAIRMAN WELLS: I believe we have already covered
7 Items 1 and 2 of the proposed agenda. We come next to the
8 procedural items.

9 3-A of the proposed agenda again brings us to another
10 proposed agenda and this is the agenda for the hearing. Before
11 we came over this afternoon, the Board had an opportunity to
12 go over this suggested agenda. We think it is a very good
13 one. Again, thank you for it.

14 I am rather inclined to think, however, that the
15 adoption of this agenda ought to be the adoption of an agenda
16 for a guide rather than something that we would rigidly follow,
17 because for one reason or another it might be desirable to
18 modify it.

19 MR. ENGELHARDT: It certainly was the intention of
20 the staff in submitting this to the Board to have it considered
21 as such, as a guide, subject to change by agreement of the
22 Board and parties during the course of the hearing.

23 CHAIRMAN WELLS: Good. Thank you very much.

24 MR. ENGELHARDT: I have additional copies of this
25 proposed agenda. Would there be any useful purpose served

eb9

1

here in distributing copies to those in this room or shall

2

we reserve on that until the hearing?

end 1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 CHAIRMAN WELLS: I am inclined to think it would be
2 better to keep such copies as you have for the hearing. If
3 we should have a number of people there, they might like to read
4 it.

5 MR. ENGELHARDT: We will have a number of copies
6 of the agenda available for public distribution at the hearing.

7 CHAIRMAN WELLS: Good, thank you.

8 The next item on the agenda is the method of intro-
9 ducing testimony and exhibits.

10 Would the staff counsel or would the applicant like
11 to speak to this item?

12 MR. JEWELL: The applicant, Mr. Chairman, proposes
13 of course to introduce its summary description of the unit
14 as an exhibit and as its primary testimony in the case.

15 We would propose to have the summary sponsored by
16 Mr. Harlan Holmes, who is the nuclear project manager for
17 Arkansas Power and Light Company.

18 CHAIRMAN WELLS: Mr. Jewell, pardon me, I get the
19 impression that you are not being heard in the last row. Even
20 though it is a small room, our public address system is not
21 working. Could you speak a little louder, please?

22 MR. JEWELL: Mr. Holmes will also be the chief
23 witness for the applicant for answers to the questions of the
24 Board which may be presented this afternoon to us.

25 In addition to that, the applicant proposes to have

1 Mr. A. B. Cohen, the Vice President, Secretary and Treasurer
2 testimony as to the financial ability of the company and its
3 technical qualifications. This is the proposed testimony of
4 the applicant.

5 CHAIRMAN WELLS: Mr. Engelhardt, do you wish to add
6 anything?

7 MR. ENGELHARDT: Yes, sir. The principal staff
8 technical witnesses will be Mr. Charles Long and Mr. Albert
9 Schwencer.

10 There may be additional witnesses added to this group
11 who will be identified at the hearing. But at this time it is
12 intended that Mr. Long and Mr. Schwencer will be our principal
13 witnesses with respect to the technical matters related to
14 this evaluation of the application.

15 In addition, the Regulatory Staff proposes to offer
16 testimony of Mr. Charles A. Lovejoy of the Office of Comptroller
17 of the Atomic Energy Commission who will testify with respect
18 to the technical qualifications of the applicant.

19 I might say at this time that the staff is prepared
20 to distribute to the Board and to the parties a statement of
21 professional qualifications of Mr. Long and Mr. Schwencer and
22 the prepared testimony of Mr. Charles A. Lovejoy with respect
23 to the financial qualification of the applicant. And if the
24 Board so desires, I am prepared now to ask Mr. Newman to distri-
25 bute these copies.

1 Additional copies of this testimony will be forwarded
2 to the public officials of the State of Arkansas, so that
3 their records will be complete prior to the commencement of the
4 hearing.

5 CHAIRMAN WELLS: All right. You may distribute those
6 at this time.

7 MR. ENGELHARDT: While Mr. Newman is distributing
8 these documents, I might also add that the staff intends to
9 introduce its principal evidence with respect to the
10 evaluation of this application in the form of a staff safety
11 evaluation which has previously been distributed to the Board
12 and to the parties. This staff safety evaluation was transmitted
13 to the Board under cover of a letter from the staff counsel
14 dated October 1, 1968.

15 The testimony of Mr. Lovejoy which you have just
16 received has been prepared by Mr. Lovejoy and an affidavit to
17 that effect has been prepared and if it is agreeable with the
18 Board and with counsel for the applicant, I would like to
19 request that Mr. Lovejoy's testimony in this proceeding be
20 stipulated and accepted into the record of the transcript of
21 the hearing as if read without Mr. Lovejoy's presence at the
22 hearing. The affidavit would provide the appropriate sponsor-
23 ship and authentication of that testimony of Mr. Lovejoy.

24 CHAIRMAN WELLS: Mr. Engelhardt, anticipating that
25 this proposal might be made as it has been made in most of the

1 cases, the Board has consulted on this and we see no reason
2 why Mr. Lovejoy should appear. I think we ought to read this
3 testimony, though, and perhaps let you know by the end of this
4 conference whether or not that is still our opinion.

5 MR. ENGELHARDT: I think if we can receive infor-
6 mation within a week or so that the Board has no questions to
7 ask of Mr. Lovejoy, that will be a sufficient time, so if the
8 Board does desire Mr. Lovejoy's presence, appropriate travel
9 arrangements can be made for his appearance at the hearing.

10 CHAIRMAN WELLS: Good.

11 MR. ENGELHARDT: The final matter I might mention
12 with respect to staff exhibits, the staff would propose to
13 offer two exhibits at the hearing, Staff Exhibit 1 would con-
14 sist of a statement of the professional qualifications of the
15 members of the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards,
16 and Staff Exhibit 2 would provide the professional qualifications
17 of the principal members of the Regulatory Staff who partici-
18 pated in the evaluation of the application.

19 That, I believe, would constitute the Regulatory
20 Staff's case in this proceeding.

21 CHAIRMAN WELLS: Thank you.

22 If I understand correctly, what you and Mr. Jewell
23 have said, you have covered item 3-b and 3-c.

24 MR. ENGELHARDT: There is one pending matter which I
25 neglected, and that is the matter of Joint Exhibit A, which

1 under cover of a letter to the Board dated September 17, 1968,
2 the Regulatory Staff transmitted to the Board copies of the
3 application and pertinent documents relating to that application.
4 Included in that collection of documents was an index of the
5 record for hearing. This is a three-page document containing
6 14 items. It is this document which the staff would propose
7 as the Joint Exhibit A to identify those documents which are
8 essential, which consist of the application and pertinent
9 documents which I have identified and to which the staff
10 proposes in its motion to receive the joint exhibit to request
11 that all documents contained in this listing may be used by
12 Board and parties by reference for whatever purpose is necessary
13 during the course of the hearing. In other words, this
14 record for hearing index which I have just identified would
15 constitute Joint Exhibit A and all of the documents identified
16 in this index would be used and could be used by Board and
17 parties for whatever purpose is necessary by reference and thus
18 incorporate them into the record of the proceeding.

19 CHAIRMAN WELLS: That is satisfactory to the Board,
20 Mr. Engelhardt.

21 MR. ENGELHARDT: I have copies of this index to which
22 I have been referring which I would be happy to distribute to
23 the members of the Board if they desire or I shall await that
24 until I offer this as Joint Exhibit A at the hearing.

25 CHAIRMAN WELLS: I think it might be useful for us

1 to have a copy. If you don't wish to do it now you can do it at
2 the end of the conference. If you have nothing further to add
3 as far as the Board is concerned, I think that completes
4 item 3.

5 We come next to item 4, the identification of
6 significant safety matters.

7 Normally, and I see you have so indicated on this
8 proposed agenda, the staff would make a statement at this
9 time on these issues.

10 MR. ENGELHARDT: We do have such a statement that
11 we are prepared to read into the record. We also have pro-
12 printed copies of this statement which we can make available
13 to the Board to follow while Mr. Schwencer is reading the state-
14 ment or if the Board so desires, it can be incorporated into
15 this record as if read.

16 CHAIRMAN WELLS: Let me consult with the Board for a
17 moment.

18 I think what would be most useful to us, Mr.
19 Engelhardt, is if you would be good enough to give us the
20 prepared statement and we will read it and save you the trouble
21 of reading it orally. We might take about 10 minutes to do
22 that, or maybe even less.

23 MR. ENGELHARDT: Very good.

24 Mr. Newman will distribute those copies.

25 CHAIRMAN WELLS: To enable those of you who are

1 attending the conference, to take a rest, we could call a
2 brief recess while we read this and reconvene in 10 minutes
3 from now.

4 (Recess.)

5 CHAIRMAN WELLS: Will the meeting come to order,
6 please.

7 Mr. Engelhardt, thank you for the statement and it
8 has been helpful for us to review it. I think we are now
9 prepared to indicate to the applicant and to the staff the
10 general lines of questions that the Board has in mind.

11 MR. ENGELHARDT: May I inquire, Mr. Chairman, as
12 to whether this statement will be incorporated into the
13 transcript of the prehearing conference?

14 CHAIRMAN WELLS: As if read, yes.

15 MR. ENGELHARDT: Thank you.

16 We will make a copy available to the Reporter.

17 CHAIRMAN WELLS: Thank you so much.

18 (The Prehearing Statement follows:)

19
20 XXXXXX PREHEARING STATEMENT

21 ARKANSAS POWER AND LIGHT COMPANY

22 RUSSELLVILLE NUCLEAR UNIT

23 The Arkansas Power and Light Company (AP&L), by
24 application dated November 29, 1967, and subsequent amendments,
25 has requested a license to construct and operate a pressurized

1 water reactor, identified as the Russellville Nuclear Unit, in
2 Pope County, Arkansas.

3 The proposed reactor is designed to operate initially
4 at core power levels up to 2452 megawatts thermal (Mwt). The
5 applicant anticipates, however, that the reactor ultimately
6 will be capable of operating at a core power level of 2568 Mwt.
7 Accordingly, the applicant and we evaluated the engineered
8 safety features of the reactor, and accident consequences at
9 a power level of 2568 Mwt, and evaluated the thermal-hydraulic
10 characteristics of the reactor on the basis of a core power
11 level of 2452 Mwt.

12 Since the initial filing of its application, the
13 applicant has made three significant changes in the design
14 of the plant: (1) the containment building design was
15 revised to provide for three instead of six vertical
16 buttresses and for 240-degree instead of 120-degree span of
17 horizontal tendons, (2) the emergency core cooling system was
18 revised to provide more complete separation and better pro-
19 tection against failures, and (3) the electrical system was
20 redesigned to provide automatic selection of offsite power for
21 emergency conditions. In addition, the applicant made the
22 following significant changes in the plant design as a result
23 of the regulatory staff evaluation of the application: (1)
24 installed a chemical addition iodine removal system to the con-
25 tainment sprays to assure that any offsite radiation exposure

1 does not exceed 10 CFR 100 limits, (2) added an onsite pond of
2 water to provide a backup source of emergency cooling water.
3 The applicant has also agreed to (1) replace 1200 feet of an
4 existing gas line which traverses the site with piping which
5 meets the current ASA code and to isolate the gas line so that
6 in the event of a break the gas line can be shut off, and (2)
7 to perform tests on the containment structure's liner and tendon
8 anchorages to confirm the adequacy of their design. We find
9 the above additions and design changes to be acceptable and
10 compatible with the Commission's General Design Criteria.

11 The nuclear steam supply system design and the
12 overall containment design of the Russellville plant are very
13 similar to those of the three Oconee plants currently under
14 construction by the Duke Power Company.

15 The Regulatory Staff, its site and environment con-
16 sultants, and the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards
17 have reviewed the various site-related factors and have
18 ascertained that the site is suitable for the proposed
19 reactor. In this regard, the Environmental Science Services
20 Administration has commented favorably on the meteorology of
21 the proposed site. The U. S. Geological Survey commented
22 favorably on the hydrological and geological aspects of the
23 proposed site. The Fish and Wildlife Service recommended
24 that the applicant cooperate with appropriate Federal and
25 State agencies in planning the proposed environmental monitoring

1 program, and that the results of the program be provided to these
2 agencies for review and reference. We have also reviewed the
3 design of the proposed plant as related to natural phenomena
4 and have found the design to be acceptable in this respect.

5 Our seismic design consultant, Nathan M. Newmark,
6 Consulting Engineering Services has determined that the design
7 bases and the design criteria can provide an adequate margin
8 of safety for seismic resistance to those seismic accelerations
9 which have been estimated by the applicant and found acceptable
10 by the U. S. Coast and Geodetic Survey.

11 We have evaluated the consequences of potential
12 accidents which could involve the release of radioactivity
13 from the Russellville Nuclear Unit and have concluded that in
14 the unlikely event of any of these accidents, the potential
15 doses from the release of radioactivity would not exceed the
16 guidelines set forth in 10CFR Part 100 of the Commission's
17 regulations.

18 The applicant has identified further development work
19 on a number of items which will be performed during the
20 detailed design of the plant. Each of these items has been
21 identified in the application and in our public safety
22 evaluation. We believe that this development work will be
23 completed for incorporation in the final design of the
24 Russellville Nuclear Unit. In our opinion, these development
25 programs will provide the data necessary to construct the

1 facility in accordance with the criteria and specifications
2 set forth in the Preliminary Safety Analysis Report.

3 The Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards, in its
4 letter of September 12, 1968 to the Chairman regarding the
5 AP&L application, made several comments and recommendations.
6 We have considered each of these and will be guided by all of
7 them in our continuing review of the Russellville Nuclear
8 Unit. The ACRS letter concludes that with due consideration
9 to the various items mentioned therein, "... the proposed plant
10 can be constructed at the Russellville site with reasonable
11 assurance that it can be operated without undue risk to the
12 health and safety of the public."

13 We have concluded, as a result of our review and
14 evaluation of the AP&L application for the Russellville
15 Nuclear Unit, that the appropriate findings can be made on each
16 of the issues set forth in the Notice of Hearing for this
17 proceeding.

End #2

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

#3 htl

1 CHAIRMAN WELLS: I suppose every Board gives
2 this caveat, but I hope that the parties will understand
3 that our questions or the lines of questions which we will
4 identify this afternoon are simply that. We may have
5 additional ones by the 30th, but I think the kinds of questions
6 that we will identify this afternoon will be those which we think
7 you might want to have some time in preparation. If between
8 now and the hearing other questions come to our mind in our
9 view that might require information that your witnesses
10 wouldn't have readily available, we will try to get them to
11 you in a suitable form.

12 I think also I might add that it will not be
13 our intention to phrase the questions just as precisely as
14 we may wish to during the hearing. Again, it will be for
15 the purpose of giving you the idea of the kinds of things we
16 are interested in. But I think it goes without saying, and I
17 will certainly repeat this at the hearing, some of these
18 questions will be designed not so much to inform ourselves,
19 although at least one-third of the Board, namely its Chairman,
20 needs to be widely informed, but some of the questions we will
21 ask will be designed to inform the public, because if there
22 should be members of the public at the public hearing, and I
23 don't know whether there will be or not, I think it would be
24 desirable for them to get some general idea of the kinds of
25 questions that one thinks about and talks about when he is

1 considering the safety of a plant of this kind. Also because
2 we have a small group this afternoon, we can make this quite an
3 informal session and we would be very glad to have the
4 applicant or the staff to ask us to elaborate on our questions,
5 try to clarify them if they are not clear to you, and generally
6 try to make this a useful session for you in preparation for
7 the hearing.

8 I wonder, Dr. Quarles, if you would be willing
9 to begin with your questions.

10 DR. QUARLES: Yes. As the Chairman has said, I
11 am not trying to make these specific, but rather to alert the
12 applicant and the staff to areas in which there will be
13 specific questions later on. On page 17 and 18 of the
14 staff's analysis you speak of a five-year period before
15 radiation effects become critical in the pressure vessel,
16 and then indicate that there are means to mitigate the
17 consequences of such failure if it should occur. I would
18 like some discussion of what means are available, how they
19 would be applied after five years and why they cannot be taken
20 into consideration initially. Why wait five years? A
21 general discussion of this whole aspect of it.

22 I can't help but comment that the staff's file on me
23 seems to be quite up to date, my tornado question is already
24 in the staff analysis but I would like to know what criteria
25 will be used to determine if it is necessary to add protection

1 to the fuel storage pool and other critical aspects of the
2 whole plant. This may be directed towards the staff of the
3 applicant and concerns off-site power availability. I would
4 like some discussion of just how independent the sources of
5 off-site power may be, if they are subject to any accident
6 that could cause failure of all sources, a single accident
7 that could cause failure of all off-site power.

8 I believe criterion 39 talks about failure of
9 one component. In a recent case, a distinction was made
10 between an active component and a passive component. I
11 would like some elaboration of why there needs to be any
12 distinction between active and passive components. And in
13 connection with this, the same question, how reliable is the
14 automatic selection of off-site power, is there adequate
15 redundancy to be sure it will operate and if it will not
16 operate under all conditions, what does the operator himself
17 do to take care of a failure of this automatic system? We are
18 concerned about quality control as most boards seem to be and
19 a recent news item has caused even more concern and we wonder
20 what effect reported delays may have on quality control. We
21 would like some additional information on the qualifications
22 of the key quality control personnel. And particularly to
23 the applicant, who and his qualifications in the applicant's
24 organization will have the competence, has or will have the
25 competence to pass on the performance of contractors. The

1 applicant may delegate certain things, but he cannot delegate
2 responsibility and therefore somebody in the applicant's
3 organization should be qualified in this area and we would
4 like information on who this is and what his qualifications
5 are.

6 We also are concerned about this gas pipeline
7 that goes by the site and we would like a discussion of
8 possible rupture of this gas line and the consequences to the
9 plant. To give you an idea of what sort of thing we are
10 getting at here, if the gas line ruptures, it will come out of
11 the ground and whip around and undoubtedly there will be a
12 fire. Suppose this whipped around so that the jet flames
13 directed against the side of the reactor containment. What
14 then? Another possibility that we would like discussed
15 is suppose unignited gas gets into the ventilating system,
16 what is the relation of the ventilating system of the entire
17 plant to this gas line, both in its present position and
18 in any possible position the ends of the pipe may go when
19 they break. Unignited gas going into the ventilating system
20 could blow up the whole outfit. So I would like some
21 assurance on the review of this particular type of hazard.

22 Mr. Chairman, I believe that covers the notes I
23 have now, but I reserve the right to ask any further ones at
24 any time before this hearing is finally adjourned in
25 Russellville.

1 CHAIRMAN WELLS: Your reservation is duly noted.

2 Mr. Briggs?

3 MR. BRIGGS: I have several questions here that
4 are of interest to me. One, I would like to elaborate a
5 little more on the gas line problem. It would be interesting
6 to me to know what accident was evaluated, what conditions
7 were considered in the evaluation by the staff and its
8 consultants and also by the applicant. This possibly will
9 be the accident that Dr. Quarles has talked about, it might
10 be a different one. I would like to have information about
11 the present state of knowledge of the background radiation
12 at the site, how much this background can be expected to be
13 increased by normal operation of the plant, and how these
14 estimates of increase in background correspond to experience
15 in existing nuclear power plants. I would like to know
16 something about the experience that the designer and con-
17 structor, if a constructor has yet been selected, what their
18 experience has been with prestressed concrete vessels and I
19 would like to know in more detail about the program that is
20 to be undertaken or is being undertaken to qualify the
21 anchors for the tensioning members, and to qualify the anchors
22 for the liners. I would be interested in knowing about the
23 schedule for completing this work.

24 On page 45 of the applicant's summary there is
25 discussion of the training program and of course further

6ht
1 discussion in the application. In here in one phase of
2 the training it is mentioned that there will be three to
3 five months training in an existing plant or on a simulator.
4 I would like to have some discussion of the equivalence of
5 training in operating plants and simulator training, the
6 relative merits of the two, and what basis will be decided for
7 which kind of training will be given, I mean what basis
8 will be used for deciding which kind of training will be
9 given. And what the staff considers to be adequate training
10 on simulators as opposed to training in an existing operating
11 plant.

12 On page 29 of the staff analysis they discuss the
13 containment spray system for removing iodine. I would like
14 to have additional discussion by the staff and by the applicant.
15 In particular, I would like to have discussion in some detail
16 of the staff's evaluation of the iodine removal factors for
17 the Russellville containment spray system, what removal
18 factor is required, the staff's estimate of the degree of
19 conservatism in the iodine reduction factor that it calculate
20 and I would like to have the applicant's opinion of the degree of
21 conservatism involved, or that is obtained in these calculations.
22 I would like to know in some detail the additional R&D has
23 required, who specifically will do the work, and the schedule
24 for accomplishing this work, what the critical problems are
25 that could cause the spray system to prove inadequate and

7ht 1 whether there is really serious consideration being
2 given to substituting charcoal absorbers for the spray
3 system, and if so, what R&D is required for the charcoal
4 absorption system or what evidence we have that a design
5 can be provided with demonstrated certainty of meeting the
6 requirements for reducing the iodine concentration in the
7 Russellville plant. I believe that is all that I have now.

8 CHAIRMAN WELLS: Thank you, Mr. Briggs.

9 I had one question, I am sure it will be a fairly
10 easy one, but it is related somewhat to the questions on
11 quality assurance, at least in an indirect way. My memory
12 is that the proposed construction permit provides that the
13 reactor will be built some time in early '72, maybe February
14 as the earliest date and the latest date July 1, 1972. First
15 of all, I wondered, was that by any chance a mistake? This
16 five months difference between the earliest and the latest date.

17 Mr. Jewell, do you happen to know on that?

18 MR. JEWELL: That was not a mistake.

19 CHAIRMAN WELLS: That is not a mistake. The
20 question that I had in mind about this is are these dates
21 realistic in light of possible delivery of pressure vessel and
22 the supply of components and that kind of thing? As I
23 indicated, this is informal, but I think this has an indirect
24 relationship to the quality assurance question. I don't know
25 how badly you are going to need the electricity in early

8h4
1 1972, but if you were going to need it very, very badly,
2 this raises the question of how fast you and your contractors
3 are going to have to work to get it done and does the quality
4 assurance program take into account the strain that might
5 thereby be placed? I would be very grateful for any general
6 exposition you might be able to make on that at the hearing.

7 Mr. Engelhardt, I believe I am correct, am I not,
8 and if not I would appreciate your correcting me, that whereas
9 the construction permit provides that the plant must be
10 completed by an outside date, in this case it would be July,
11 1972, it has been customary in cases where good reason could
12 be shown for the Commission to extend that time?

13 MR. ENGELHARDT: That is correct. If the applicant
14 is unable to complete the construction of the plant by the date
15 specified in the construction permit, the applicant would
16 normally request the Commission for an extension of that date
17 upon a showing of the reason why that date was not to be met
18 and the Commission would, all things being equal, and the
19 proper cause being shown, would provide for an extension of
20 that construction permit by order of the Commission. This is the
21 customary procedure that is followed.

22 CHAIRMAN WELLS: I think perhaps related to this
23 also -- and this question perhaps should be directed to the
24 staff at the hearing -- since as of now at least this is an
25 uncontested proceeding, this Board will be required only to

9ht
1 ascertain that the manufacturer supports the application and
2 the review of the application has been adequate -- it might be
3 useful if the staff would give the Board, if it continues to be
4 an uncontested case, some general ideas of how they evaluated
5 the quality assurance program in terms of the ability of the
6 contractors to meet their obligations on a timely basis. Is
7 that reasonably clear?

8 MR. LONG: Yes, it is.

9 CHAIRMAN WELLS: The Board recognizes that these
10 are very nebulous matters to say the least, and yet when a
11 judgment is reached, there is always some general basis for
12 that judgment. I think one of the questions that Mr. Briggs
13 suggested was broad enough to cover two or three things that
14 I had in mind. But let me state it my way and then we will
15 be sure that it is generally covered. One of the things that
16 concerns me is, as a member of the Board, and I think it does
17 my colleagues, is at the construction permit stage much of the
18 design is yet to be completed, there is still research and
19 development to be done. That is normal and we accept that.
20 But that does mean that we have to come to some kind of
21 conclusions as to whether there is reasonable assurance that it
22 will be done. Now again we may have a comparatively easy task
23 here, because it appears it is uncontested. But noting in
24 both the applicant's summary description and the staff
25 evaluation there are identification of additional research and

1 development to be done and also further design to be
2 completed -- incidentally, I think this was a very useful
3 and clear presentation -- but at the hearing I think it would
4 be useful if you could to update these things to the extent
5 that you can. Now if it is necessary, I can go through here,
6 I have a number of them marked, but I would prefer not to have to
7 do that, so we wouldn't prolong this meeting. But for example
8 there are certain instances particularly in the applicant's
9 summary description where certain things are to be completed
10 by January 1969. Now it will be the end of October when
11 we have the hearing, so presumably you will be pretty close
12 to completion of those. Perhaps this was written say two or
13 three months or five or six months back, so you may be able to
14 bring us up to date on these items.

15 Does the applicant understand what we have in
16 mind?

17 MR. JEWELL: Yes, sir.

3 18 CHAIRMAN WELLS: One of the favorite questions
19 that I have with reference to these kinds of applications
20 is whether or not the materials that will be produced or the
21 materials that will be used for fuel will be adequately safe-
22 guarded against diversion for unauthorized uses. I noticed
23 the applicant has stated it will abide by the regulations of
24 the Commission. I am not informed as to what the status of
25 the Commission's regulations on this particular point is.

1 I know, in the Diablo case the Board was informed that they
2 were in preparation. Perhaps the staff at the hearing
3 would be good enough to bring us up to date on the status of
4 the regulations.

5 MR. ENGELHARDT: Mr. Chairman, would it be sufficient
6 in response to that last question if the staff counsel were
7 to provide, call it a status report if you like, of the
8 current regulations in this area? Or would this be a matter
9 that you require a witness for?

10 CHAIRMAN WELLS: No --

11 MR. ENGELHARDT: Because neither Mr. Long and
12 Mr. Schwencer are conversant in this area, this area of
13 safeguarding the material is a responsibility of a newly
14 formed Division of Nuclear Materials Safeguards, and normally
15 their testimony is not required in hearings of this nature,
16 but I would be happy to provide a response to your question
17 if that would be satisfactory.

18 CHAIRMAN WELLS: That would be satisfactory for my
19 purposes. I don't think we would want to go any further
20 than that. It is really simply the question that we know, at
21 least I think I am correct, that as a matter of law the
22 applicant must abide by the Commission's regulations on
23 this subject. Then if the regulations are promulgated, ipso
24 facto the applicant will have done what is required to be
25 done. But the missing link in our minds now is the status of

1 those regulations.

2 I would like to add one general question on the
3 general subject of iodine removal which Mr. Briggs referred
4 to. Since this question has arisen in several cases in the
5 last six or seven months, I don't know how many, but it seems
6 to me practically every transcript I read a fairly
7 sizeable portion of the transcript is devoted to this question,
8 this Board would be particularly grateful if Mr. Briggs'
9 question could be answered in a way that perhaps would not
10 require much discussion at the hearing and might even be
11 useful to subsequent board to which this question arises.

12 MR. JEWELL: Mr. Chairman, the applicant did not
13 quite understand that last question.

14 CHAIRMAN WELL: Mr. Briggs asked a series of
15 questions concerning the plans for removal of iodine. As I under-
16 stand it in general certain chemical additives are expected
17 to do this. Research or experimentation is being done to
18 ascertain if they will. If they don't, then the alternative
19 is to have charcoal filters. This general subject, I said,
20 has been the subject of considerable discussion in many of
21 the hearings. I confess I am not quite sure why it has taken
22 so much time in each hearing, but it has. So I expressed the
23 hope that the Board and the applicant and the staff, with a
24 reciprocal sympathy in asking and answering the questions,
25 might be able, one, to minimize the time that is required to

13ht
1 be spent on this subject, and two, perhaps get it answered
2 in a sufficiently definitive way that it would be acceptable
3 to this Board and perhaps to later boards.

4 MR. JEWELL: Thank you, sir.

5 CHAIRMAN WELLS: I wonder, Dr. Geyer, do you have
6 any questions you would like to add to these?

7 DR. GEYER: One thing that it seemed I would like
8 to have a little additional information on is the whole
9 question of protection against floods. It seems a bit
10 unusual that a plant be designed to have eight feet of water
11 around it under the extreme conditions -- I realize these
12 conditions are exceedingly remote. But then the question
13 comes up what constitutes protection provided by Class 1
14 structures and problems of floating tanks, anything floating
15 away in the vicinity of the plant, any drains that might
16 admit water inadvertently back into places where it wasn't wanted.

17 CHAIRMAN WELLS: Any other questions?

18 DR. GEYER: No.

19 CHAIRMAN WELLS: Mr. Bond, do you have any
20 questions or any elaboration on the ones the Board has
21 already posed?

22 MR. BOND: I will spare the record and audience
23 elaboration, Mr. Chairman. But I would like to mention one
24 matter which might be of concern to me in the remotely
25 credible circumstance that I might be participating in the

14ht

1 activities of this Board. If so, I would want the record
2 to have a bit of clarification or explanation or justification
3 for the position the Board might find itself in in undertaking
4 to approve a proposed finding by the Director of Regulation
5 that the applicant is technically qualified, when thus far
6 examining the papers, including the staff's proposed evidence
7 it appears that the finding there reposed and the con-
8 clusion there reached is that the applicant and the
9 contractors are technically qualified. There is a possible
10 inconsistency between the published stated issue and the
11 conclusion thus far reached.

12 CHAIRMAN WELLS: Yes. I wonder if the question
13 might not be posed this way -- and I think it is a useful one
14 to whoever is participating on the Board -- what does the
15 word "applicant" imply in the proposed finding that the
16 applicant is qualified? Does it ipso factor include its
17 contractors, or is it just the applicant alone? The staff
18 might wish to advise the Board on that. Isn't that essentially
19 the problem, Mr. Bond?

20 MR. BOND: That certainly poses the problem of
21 who is the licensee, who must be found qualified and must be
22 responsible to such limitations as the Commission in the
23 license and ensuing licenses may impose on it. Does that or
24 does it not include anyone other than the applicant? Maybe
25 I am asking a biased question.

15ht 1 CHAIRMAN WELLS: Well, I think for the benefit
2 of the applicant and the staff you are probably aware of
3 it, but in one of the recent cases, the Rancho Seco case, I
4 have read the decision hurriedly, and I believe this was a
5 matter of concern to the Board, and this Board would propose
6 to read the decision more carefully and perhaps you would
7 want to too, but I have an idea that that decision expresses
8 the concern that Mr. Bond is expressing of whether or not this
9 particular Board will be equally concerned I am not quite sure yet
10 until we read it. But I do think that the one question that
11 would be useful for the staff to reply to is when the
12 proposed finding refers to the technical qualification of the
13 applicant, does that include the utility whose name appears
14 on the application, or does that include his principal
15 contractors, his servants, employees, and what not. And
16 therein I think probably lies the answer to this question.
17 But in connection with this, one of the things I noticed in
18 this application and I meant to mention it and I forgot it,
19 and I am grateful to you, JD, for reminding me, the
20 contractor to do the construction work apparently has not
21 been selected yet. Is that correct, Mr. Jewell?

22 MR. JEWELL: That is correct, sir.

23 CHAIRMAN WELLS: I don't know whether this is
24 customary or not, but whether it is or not, I suppose that
25 might have some bearing on the question, if the applicant

1 includes its principal contractors, and if the contractor
2 to do the construction work is one of the principal
3 contractors, that might have some bearing on the finding.

4 Mr. Bond, did you have any further questions?

5 MR. BOND: Thank you, no, Mr. Chairman.

6 CHAIRMAN WELLS: I think it might be useful if we
7 gave the applicant and the staff an opportunity to ask us
8 any questions about the questions we have asked you just to
9 make sure that you have understood generally what we were
10 talking about.

11 MR. ENGELHARDT: I think Mr. Long has a question
12 unless you want to defer to the applicant.

13 CHAIRMAN WELLS: Why don't we wait until they
14 confer. I think we have plenty of time, so take your time.

15 Mr. Jewell?

16 MR. JEWELL: Mr. Chairman, the applicant's staff
17 has no questions concerning the questions.

18 CHAIRMAN WELLS: Well, the Board has been unusually
19 clear. Thank you very much.

20 Mr. Long?

21 MR. LONG: I just, Dr. Quarles, I would like to
22 inquire, you mentioned active versus passive with relation to
23 off-site power.

24 DR. QUARLES: Yes.

25 MR. LONG: Are you referring mainly to switching

1 equipment versus transponders?

2 DR. QUARLES: I would like a definition of that.
3 I am referring to the Maine Yankee case specifically. I just
4 read it this morning. I was alternate on that Board, and
5 didn't get the transcript until this morning. But one of the
6 questions I posed in that case was the redundancy of off-
7 site power. I don't know whether you are familiar with it in
8 detail or not, but there are two 161 kv lines, so they said, and
9 it turns out both of them are on the same tie line for two
10 miles, one runs down one side and one the other, and in my
11 terminology, that is one line, but they called it two and
12 they hedged on the answer to the question by saying the ACRS
13 which referred to redundancy of off-site power, had meant
14 active components, and if I recall the wording correctly, the
15 person answering that said by active components they meant
16 moving things like generators. To me switch gear would be
17 an active component.

18 But my question really goes to the point that I see no
19 difference in the ultimate result, whether you call a component
20 active or passive, provided that component's failure causes loss
21 of power. I couldn't care less whether it rotates or stands
22 on its head if it fails.

23 MR. LONG: That is the reason I asked the question.

24 DR. QUARLES: I can't refer you to the page, but
25 I think you will get it if you look at the Maine Yankee
case, about the middle of it.

1 MR. LONG: Fine, thank you.

2 I have one other question in general to the Board,
3 as far as the iodine removal, the expression has been made that
4 we be direct and I guess short in our response. We feel that
5 in order to adequately cover the subject, particularly in
6 light of Mr. Briggs' questioning, it might be more adequate
7 if the staff were able to prepare -- and I am not saying now
8 I am, -- but able to prepare an exhibit which we could sub-
9 mit to the Board and then summarize at the hearing to indi-
10 cate what we have done, but the exhibit itself would set forth
11 the details.

12 Would this be acceptable to the Board if we are able
13 to do it between now and the hearing on the 30th?

14 MR. BRIGGS: I think that could be acceptable. I
15 believe the problem Mr. Wells was concerned with is our spend-
16 ing three or four hours on one day and three or four hours
17 on the next day asking questions and getting answers and then
18 asking questions again. One would like to clear it up with
19 the staff telling what the status is, and what work needs to
20 be done and what they went through in making the evaluation,
21 what the conservatism is, and then the Board having to ask
22 maybe only a very few questions to clear the whole matter up.

23 MR. LONG: That is what I was driving at. I have
24 suffered through one like that.

25 CHAIRMAN WELLS: Well, if there are no other questions,

eb2 1 I think we come to the item on the agenda marked post-
2 hearing procedures. Before we get to that, however, and per-
3 haps it can be related to questions, I might mention to the
4 applicant that the Board would like an opportunity to visit
5 the site on Tuesday afternoon, October 29th, some time after
6 three o'clock. We will be coming from various directions and
7 I can't be sure exactly when we will arrive, but hopefully no
8 later than four and as shortly after three as possible.

9 Would that be possible, Mr. Jewell?

10 MR. JEWELL: It will be possible and will be ar-
11 ranged.

12 CHAIRMAN WELLS: Thank you. I think actually the
13 guard at the gate might just be alerted we will be coming. We
14 will probably have our own transportation.

15 MR. JEWELL: There is no gate, no guard, and there
16 is really nothing to identify the specific site of the reactor.
17 You are going to need a little guidance, and we will provide
18 that.

19 CHAIRMAN WELLS: Thank you very much.

20 With respect to the post-hearing procedures, the
21 transcript corrections, what would you suggest with respect
22 to the transcript corrections, Mr. Engelhardt?

23 MR. ENGELHARDT: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think the
24 transcript corrections could be made either simultaneously
25 with the filing of the proposed findings, or depending on how

eb3 1 we establish the proposed findings schedule, the transcript
2 corrections could be made within one week of the conclusion
3 of the hearing.

4 CHAIRMAN WELLS: I wonder if it wouldn't be useful
5 for us to decide this on the 30th.

6 MR. ENGELHARDT: I think it would be very appropriate
7 to decide that on the 30th.

8 CHAIRMAN WELLS: It might happen we could complete
9 all of this fairly quickly and it may be certain questions are
10 raised that we would want a little more time. But why don't
11 we delay these things until the 30th.

12 MR. ENGELHARDT: Are you talking about transcript
13 corrections or all of the post-hearing procedural matters.

14 CHAIRMAN WELLS: Yes, I was including all of them.

15 MR. ENGELHARDT: I think one point, with regard to
16 proposed findings, is would this Board accept proposed find-
17 ings at the conclusion of the hearing, assuming this proceed-
18 ing remains an uncontested proceeding, would it be acceptable
19 for this Board to receive proposed findings without refer-
20 ence to the transcript pages? Or let me say without reference
21 to specific additional matter that might be discussed during
22 the course of the hearing, other than that matter which is
23 already covered in the summary statement and the staff's
24 Safety Evaluation?

25 CHAIRMAN WELLS: I haven't had an opportunity to

eb4 1 discuss this with my colleagues and I will do so before the
2 30th.

3 My view on this, Mr. Engelhardt, is that if there
4 has been substantially no new material developed during the
5 course of the hearing on the 30th, we would be sympathetic
6 to receiving the proposed findings and conclusions of law at
7 the conclusion of the hearing, without references to the
8 transcript. If, however, we feel that either as a result of
9 our questions or volunteered information, that there has been
10 substantially additional information presented, it would be
11 helpful to us in writing our decision if we had that keyed to
12 the transcript.

13 So I think it would be useful just to play this by
14 ear, depending on how the hearing goes on the 30th.

15 Now this would suggest to me, and I don't want to
16 be presumptuous, but that you may want to prepare your proposed
17 findings and conclusions of law and I assume if you prepared
18 them and had them ready for submission, you would not have lost
19 anything, even though you might be given a few more days to
20 key them to the transcript.

21 Would that be acceptable to you?

22 MR. JEWELL: That would be acceptable to the appli-
23 cant.

24 MR. ENGELHARDT: It would certainly be acceptable to
25 the staff.