

NOTATION VOTE

RESPONSE SHEET

RELEASED TO THE PDR

3/23/94

date

initials

TO: SAMUEL J. CHILK, SECRETARY OF THE COMMISSION

FROM: COMMISSIONER REMICK

SUBJECT: SECY-94-020 - REDUCING COMMISSION REVIEW OF CERTAIN ENFORCEMENT ACTIONS

APPROVED ^{In part} DISAPPROVED ^{In part w/ comment} ABSTAIN

NOT PARTICIPATING REQUEST DISCUSSION

COMMENTS:

Please see the attached

250015

250037

[Signature]
SIGNATURE

16 Feb 94

DATE

RELEASE VOTE

WITHHOLD VOTE

ENTERED ON "AS" YES No

[Handwritten initials]
F03
11

Commissioner Remick's Comments on SECY-94-20:

I approve the staff's recommendation that it not submit Commission papers in cases of disagreement between the staff and OI unless the Director of OI believes that Commission consultation is warranted.

Nonetheless, the staff's reasons for disagreeing with OI should be documented for the files. Concern for documentation led the Commission to turn the staff down the last time it proposed submitting papers only when the Director of OI called for a paper.

In these cases, the staff should also provide the Commission with an EN which has a five-day notification period (instead of the staff's proposed three days.), and the EN should briefly describe the disagreement with OI.

Even with these modifications to the staff's recommendation, the staff will save resources.

I disapprove the staff's recommendation that the staff be allowed to issue proposed civil penalties and orders one working day after issuance of the EN to the Commission. The staff's proposed one day is too short a time, given the number of meetings and action items Commissioners often face in a single day.

As a separate matter, I ask that all ENs contain brief descriptions of the violations involved. Several recent ones, for instance EN 94-012 and EN 94-013, have contained only the most general descriptions of the violations.