## UNITED STATES OF AMERICA NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title:

PRESS CONFERENCE

Location: ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND

Date:

DECEMBER 21, 1992

Pages:

11 PAGES

NEAL R. GROSS AND CO., INC.

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 Rhode Island Avenue, Northwest Washington, D.C. 20005 (202) 234-4433

### DISCLAIMER

This is an unofficial transcript of a meeting of the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission held on December 21, 1992 in the Commission's office at One White Flint North, Rockville, Maryland. The meeting was open to public attendance and observation. This transcript has not been reviewed, corrected or edited, and it may contain inaccuracies.

The transcript is intended solely for general informational purposes. As provided by 10 CFR 9.103, it is not part of the formal or informal record of decision of the matters discussed. Expressions of opinion in this transcript do not necessarily reflect final determination or beliefs. No pleading or other paper may be filed with the Commission in any proceeding as the result of, or addressed to, any statement or argument contained herein, except as the Commission may authorize.

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

# UNITED STATES OF AMERICA NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

PRESS CONFERENCE

PUBLIC MEETING

Nuclear Regulatory Commission One White Flint North Rockville, Maryland

Monday, December 21, 1992

The Chairman of the Commission, Ivan Selin, met with members of the press, pursuant to notice, at 3:34 p.m.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

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

question, but we have considerable authority. We can

issue a demand for information ourselves and, if we

don't get satisfactory answers to that demand, we can

shut down operations immediately and take steps to go

for the assets. I hope it won't come to this, but

that's a legal question about whether they are in fact

a passive investor or they take a very strong role in

the management. Our view is they're clearly an

integral part of the operation. They've given us

assurances far beyond those you would ever expect just

what is your basic concern about their arrangement

-

3:34 a.m.

3

pretty clear, but I'll still try to answer whatever

9

6

questions you may have.

that's a hypothetical question.

from an investor.

QUESTION: (Questioner off mike.)

CHAIRMAN SELIN: This is a hypothetical

Now, as far as GA's responsibilities,

QUESTION: To a more general audience,

CHAIRMAN SELIN: I thought the meeting was

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

that guarantees payment for the --

CHAIRMAN SELIN: It doesn't guarantee

anything. I mean, their arrangement is based on --

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

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

1

3:34 a.m.

4

6

9

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

CHAIRMAN SELIN: I thought the meeting was pretty clear, but I'll still try to answer whatever questions you may have.

QUESTION: (Questioner off mike.)

CHAIRMAN SELIN: This is a hypothetical question, but we have considerable authority. We can issue a demand for information ourselves and, if we don't get satisfactory answers to that demand, we can shut down operations immediately and take steps to go for the assets. I hope it won't come to this, but that's a hypothetical question.

Now, as far as GA's responsibilities, that's a legal question about whether they are in fact a passive investor or they take a very strong role in the management. Our view is they're clearly an integral part of the operation. They've given us assurances far beyond those you would ever expect just from an investor.

QUESTION: To a more general audience, what is your basic concern about their arrangement that quarantees payment for the --

CHAIRMAN SELIN: It doesn't guarantee anything. I mean, their arrangement is based on --

#### NEAL R. GROSS

well, we have -- I tried to say it clearly, but we have two major concerns.

The first is to get a plan in hand which is driven by the technical considerations that Mr. Blue addressed at the end. I agree with the last thing Mr. Blue said. It may take a while, but it should be driven by what makes sense in what order to close things down.

The second -- so, the first consideration is assurances that there will be financial resources available to pay for a reasonable decontamination plan. And the second is assurances that we get a reasonable decontamination plan, that it's not based on external financial considerations, but --

QUESTION: (Questioner off mike.)

CHAIRMAN SELIN: Yes. I mean, basically they want the citizens of Gore, Oklahoma, to be shareholders in ConverDyn and after all other expenses are paid you get your share. They clean up your neighborhood based on your profits from this future organization.

QUESTION: (Questioner off mike.)

CHAIRMAN SELIN: It's not even 12 years.

I mean, a flow of funds -- in my opinion, a flow of funds which is based on the future prospects for an

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS.
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

4

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

unknown business is completely inconsistent with our regulations and what's to be expected. QUESTION: (Questioner off mike.) CHAIRMAN SELIN: I need to see in detail 4

what money they propose to put in on what schedule. It's not out of the question that you had a plan that took 12 years before you got final complete decontamination, but we would expect and wish to see measurable major amounts of decontamination far in advance of that. It's not clear to me from this meeting that that's inconsistent with SFC's plans.

QUESTION: (Questioner off mike.)

CHAIRMAN SELIN: They asked us to have a proprietary meeting on some business purposes in July.

QUESTION: (Questioner off mike.)

CHAIRMAN SELIN: Yes. I would have listened then if somebody had told us what it was about. I mean, it just sounded to me like they wanted a meeting that we would go to and everybody else would be excluded from.

Ben, let me just finish. The fact is that they were still a going operation in July and a closed operation in November, so that's sort of a smoke screen. I mean, what were they going to tell us, that they continued to operate?

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

(202) 234-4433

6

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

QUESTION: That's what I mean. Do you feel euchred?

euchred? Well, a smart leader is never euchred, of course, but there were assurances given to us which do not seem to be holding up under pressure and we intend to make sure that those assurances are followed up on.

But, I'd like to come back to Mr. Weiss' point. What we are objecting to -- we don't have a plan in hand, so we're not objecting to the plan. We don't have a financial plan in hand. We're not objecting to that. We're telling them up front before they get very far that we will not depend -- which means that you and your neighbors will not depend on some company's being able to generate some cash to pay. They have a commitment and a responsibility that's independent of ConverDyn or anything else.

We're not a bankruptcy judge who's trying to choose between Chapter 11 and Chapter 7 to try to figure out what their financial future is. They have an obligation. If they choose to fund it through ConverDyn, let ConverDyn reimburse General Atomics, not pay directly for the clean-up.

QUESTION: (Questioner off mike.)

CHAIRMAN SELIN: We have -- I mean, SFC in

#### NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

10

11

12

14

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

bankruptcy court or General Atomics?

4

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

QUESTION: (Questioner off mike.)

CHAIRMAN SELIN: Well, we think we've got a very good shot at General Atomics' resources based on a whole set of actions that have opened up --

QUESTION: (Questioner off mike.)

CHAIRMAN SELIN: Well, Super Fund would be an extreme situation. Super Fund would open up the liabilities not only to General Atomics but to previous licensees. That is an option available. It's not one we would choose early in the chain.

QUESTION: (Questioner off mike.)

Atomics or the government would be able to go to Kerr-McGee and say, "Regardless of your arrangement with General Atomics, you're still liable for the contamination." That is a long-term option. It's not early in the list of things that we would do.

The key point I want to make is we do not intend to accept a clean-up plan based on timing that's driven by external financial considerations and funding which is based on if a company happens to produce the money it will pay for the pieces. That's internal to GA and SFC. We want assurances of a timely plan and resources behind it. And whether they

#### NEAL R. GROSS

use the profits from ConverDyn to repay themselves, that's their business.

We don't think you, the citizens of Oklahoma, or we, the federal government, should be effectively shareholders in ConverDyn and we won't accept such a situation.

QUESTION: What sort of timetable is there? You said if they don't fall into line, provide this detailed plan --

Sitting down in February with a detailed decontamination plan. Everything depends on the decontamination plan. In fact, what I've been saying is we want to start with the decontamination plan and then look at the funding, not start with the funding and see what can you afford to do in the way of decontamination.

I have to say, I still have quite a bit of confidence in Mr. Sheppard and his straightforwardness and his ability to run an operation if supported, so we're optimistic that that plan will in fact be a reasonable plan and, if it is, then we can concentrate on the funding and the assurances and the assets that are put up to back the plan. If not, then we're at an impasse and then we'd have to take stronger measures.

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

QUESTION: Mr. Chairman, Mike Napik with McGraw-Hill.

Because there is some controversy or difference of opinion about what these documents and the contract with ConverDyn actually say and what revenue streams this contract will generate, do you think that these documents ought to be made part of the public record?

CHAIRMAN SELIN: Well, that's a little bit backwards. I mean, our view is that, in order for us to make certain decisions on behalf of the public, we must be given certain assurances on a nonproprietary basis. In theory, if -- I mean, we might look at the proprietary information in order to confirm something that we could demonstrate in a way that Ms. Curran and her colleagues could be satisfied themselves. You know, it's like a security classification. You still have to make the argument with unclassified data, but the classified information might improve your confidence in it.

So the answer is, we're not going to accept -- we would not accept an argument purely on proprietary information. We might look at -- I mean, we have the authority and really the need to look at the proprietary information to see if by digging a

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

step deeper we feel better or worse, but it would be purely in a confirmatory basis. But, that's not the big objection.

The big objection is there isn't -- it doesn't matter what the numbers say. We don't care. That's their business. How they fund their obligations is their business. We want to know that funding and requirements for this decontamination are based on assets in hand, not on the success of some future business. We're not going to try to make a business judgement about whether that's a good business or a bad business. Let them worry about it.

assets not contingent on the profits or the revenue stream of a future organization. So, to go a step further, not only would we not make a decision based entirely on proprietary information or that couldn't be justified in public, but in this case it's not the proprietary information that's the problem. It's the business concept that some future business is going to make the money and, if they don't make the money, the implication is that the decontamination doesn't get paid for.

It's not that ConverDyn is any worse a business than SFC. It's just irrelevant. I mean, we

#### NEAL R. GROSS

want to know, as of today, regardless of what happens, that that decontamination will be done.

Yes, Mr. Rice?

QUESTION: (Questioner off mike.)

CHAIRMAN SELIN: Well, you know, it's not reasonable to expect a guarantee on day 1 in terms of fixed assets in an escrow fund, to take the extreme case, that could pay for decommissioning 30 or 40 years down the road.

On the other hand, this has led me to take a look at what we expect in escrow funds for nonreactor licensees and I do think that the amounts are inadequate. The obligation is no less for not putting up the same amount of money, but we have — it is true we have not applied to facilities, nonreactor facilities, the same logic that we have applied to reactor facilities in terms of decommissioning funds.

QUESTION: (Questioner off mike.)

the main issue. The main issue is that even in a reactor you don't have them put up enough money on day 1 so that if they had to close down on day 2 they could pay for the whole clean-up. I mean, that's really unreasonable. You need some assurances, partly escrow and partly other assets, that the licensee has

#### NEAL R. GROSS

6

9

10

1.1

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

23

24

1	both the ability and the willingness to pay.
2	Now, if you ask me a different question,
3	do I wish that the Commission five years ago had done
4	different things with McGee and General Atomics at the
5	time the deal went through, the answer is I don't
6	know, but maybe. I mean, that was a long time ago.
7	QUESTION: From what you do know, is \$20
8	million enough to clean-up?
9	CHAIRMAN SELIN: It's not a pessimistic
10	assumption. It's likely not to be less, but it's not
11	a ridiculous amount. It's really hard to say, Mr.
12	Franklin.
13	You know, we do need that plan. As they
14	said, they haven't drilled. For good reason, they
15	haven't drilled through the pools. Those pools are a
16	major contamination concern.
17	You see, I'm not who is the <u>Inside NRC</u>
18	reporter? Well, you are, but is there a McGraw-Hill
19	person here too?
20	You see, I'm not really livid. I'm not
21	pleased, but I'm not livid.
22	Anything else?
23	MR. FOUCHARD: Is that all? Thank you.
24	(Whereupon, at 3:44 p.m., the above-
25	entitled matter was concluded.)

This is to certify that the attached events of a meeting

of the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission entitled:

TITLE OF MEETING: PRESS CONFERENCE

PLACE OF MEETING: ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND

DATE OF MEETING: DECEMBER 21, 1992

were transcribed by me. I further certify that said transcription is accurate and complete, to the best of my ability, and that the transcript is a true and accurate record of the foregoing events.

Carol Lynch

Reporter's name: Peter Lynch

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005