

11218
SECRETED
December 21, 1990

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION '90 DEC 21 112:33

ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD

Before Administrative Judge
Peter B. Bloch

RECEIVED DEC 21 1990

In the Matter of

THE CURATORS OF
THE UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI

(Byproduct License
No. 24-00513-32;
Special Nuclear Materials
License No. SNM-247)

Docket Nos. 70-00270
30-02278-MLA

RE: TRUMP-S Project

ASLBP No. 90-613-02-MLA

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER
(Telephone Conference)¹

DATE AND TIME OF CALL: 12/20/90 ABOUT 3:20 PM

Among Peter B. Bloch, Administrative Judge; Maurice Axelrad, counsel for University of Missouri; Leis Green, Intervenor.

Bloch: Both parties may record this call mechanically. The conference is being called at Mr. Green's request to request clarification of LBP-90-45. I will take notes and will prepare a summary of the call. We will proceed by having Mr. Green request clarification of one particular

¹I prepared these notes as presiding officer. They are intended to reflect the substance of the call, not to be a verbatim transcript. Parties with substantive corrections should file their comments by facsimile transmission within four hours of mechanical reception of this communication. Brief extensions may be granted for cause.

9101020242 901221
PDR ADOCK 07000270
C PDR

DSO 2

area of the decision; then, Mr. Axelrad may respond before I respond or reserve decision.

Mr. Axelrad: This does not seem appropriate. It is a lawyer's function to review and interpret orders. (I assured Mr. Axelrad I would be cautious.)

Green: Generally my concern is I must file my rebuttal soon and decide what I should eliminate from the rebuttal I have been preparing as a result of the Order.

Bloch: You could make an offer of proof.

Green: I do not think I need to file affidavits that are now irrelevant. An offer of proof is less than that. Therefore, I feel I should not file extensive affidavits and argument about matters already ruled on, for example on compliance with emergency plan regulations that have been determined not to apply and on whether dose calculations comply with regulatory requirements that also have been found not to apply.

Axelrad: My understanding is that it would not be appropriate for Intervenors to file evidence on those subjects. Motions for reconsideration would be possible. Certain of the decisions were on the motion for summary disposition and could be subject to a motion for reconsideration despite the judges ruling that he would not accept motions for reconsideration on decisions concerning motions for reconsideration. If a motion for reconsideration

tion were granted, I am sure the presiding officer would permit ample time for filing of evidence on such a point.

Bloch: It is my ruling that you need not file evidence on anything I have ruled on and made irrelevant. You may, where I have not already decided on a motion for reconsideration, move for reconsideration. If I should grant that motion, I would make appropriate provisions for filing evidence at that time. Does that help?

Green: That helps me a great deal. Another minor point: in previous orders you have often allowed 10 days for reconsideration. What time should be allowed.

Axelrad: The provision in the regulations on motions for reconsideration is on final determinations. That has been applied to Memoranda and Order by analogy.

Bloch: I apply the provision on final determinations by analogy to intermediate determinations; thus, there such motions may be filed ten days from the date of issuance.

Green: One other aspect: this decision has thrown our preparations into quite an uproar. We have had people preparing affidavits about comportment with regulations on dosage and emergency planning. I do not think the presiding officer has struck any area of concern, eliminating it from the proceeding.

(Bloch: that is correct.)

Green: I would dearly love to get this behind me as quickly as possible but I am skeptical that is possible. I am inclined to request an additional week.

Axelrad: Whether they relied on the regulations or not is strictly up to them. There has been an additional week already. Licensee has been prepared to file its surrebuttal for a while. We do not want our project to continue under a cloud. We object to any further extension.

(Bloch: Is Friday the date for filing? Green & Axelrad: No, Monday.)

Bloch: I would permit Intervenors to file on time and to include an offer of proof for particular areas indicating [1] what would be shown in an additional week and [2] why my order disrupted preparation in such a way as to require additional time for response.

Axelrad: That would not meet our needs. It may just result in a further extension.

Green: That would not meet our needs either, as we do not have our documents in finished enough form for that purpose and are discontinuing our previous work rather than pursuing it. It just would not help.

Bloch: Then, Mr. Green, you do not need to use the provision I am making but you will be permitted to do so. Remember to file on time and to meet the two criteria I have set forth if you wish to show cause for a further one week extension.

Green: That won't help but I appreciate the spirit with which it was offered.

Bloch: Then there does not appear to be anything else.

Green: That is correct.

Green & Axelrad: Thank you judge.

Bloch: Have a good evening. [Disconnect.]

Respectfully ORDERED,



Peter B. Bloch
Presiding Officer

Bethesda, Maryland

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

In the Matter of

THE UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI

Docket No. (s) 70-170/30-2278-MLA

(Special Nuclear Materials Lic. 247
Byproduct Mat. Lic. 24-00513-32)

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that copies of the foregoing LB M&D (TELEPHONE CONFERENCE) have been served upon the following persons by U.S. mail, first class, except as otherwise noted and in accordance with the requirements of 10 CFR Sec. 2.712.

Atomic Safety and Licensing Appeal
Board
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

Administrative Judge
Peter B. Bloch
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

Administrative Judge
Gustavo A. Linenberger, Jr.
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

Office of the General Counsel
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

Maurice Axelrad, Esquire
Newman & Holtzinger, P.C.
Suite 1000 - 1615 L Street, NW.
Washington, DC 20036

Lewis C. Green, Esquire
Attorney for Petitioners
3 North Broadway, Suite 1830
St. Louis, MO 63102

Director
Research Reactor Facility
Research Park
University of Missouri
Columbia, MO 65211

Betty K. Wilson, Esq.
Attorney for Individual Intervenors
Oliver, Walker, Carlton and Wilson
Market Square Office Building
P. O. Box 977
Columbia, MO 65205

Henry Ottinoer
Missouri Coalition for the Environment
511 Westwood Avenue
Columbia, MO 65203

Mark Haim, Director
Mid-Missouri Nuclear Weapons Freeze,
Inc.
804 C East Broadway
Columbia, MO 65201

Docket No. (s)70-270/30-2278-MLA
LB M&O (TELEPHONE CONFERENCE)

Robert L. Blake, Jr., M.D.
Physicians for Social Responsibility/
Mid-Missouri Chapter
1-228 UMC Health Sciences Center, MD U.
Columbia, MO 65212

A. Bert Davis
Regional Administrator
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Region III
799 Roosevelt Road
Glen Ellyn, IL 60137

Dated at Rockville, Md. this
21 day of December 1990

Kris Carter
Office of the Secretary of the Commission