

U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

REGION III

Report No. 50-358/82-16(OSC)

Docket No. 50-358

Licensee: Cincinnati Gas and Electric Company  
39 East 4th Street  
Cincinnati, OH 45201

Facility Name: Wm. H. Zimmer Nuclear Power Plant

Meeting At: Chicago O'Hare Airport  
O'Hare Hilton Hotel

Meeting Conducted: November 22, 1982

*RFW for*  
Report Prepared By: D. R. Hunter, Chief  
Section 1, Zimmer

2/10/83

*RFWarnick*  
Approved By: R. F. Warnick, Director  
Office of Special Cases

2/10/83

Meeting Summary

Meeting on November 22, 1982 (Report No. 50-358/82-16(OSC))

Meeting Subject: Discuss the licensee response to the September 24, 1982 "Demand for Information" issued under 10 CFR 50.54(f) by NRC Region III. A total of 12 staff-hours were involved in the meeting.

Results: The meeting was conducted for clarification and understanding of the Demand. No commitments were made by the licensee.

## DETAILS

### 1. Persons in Attendance

#### Cincinnati Gas and Electric Company

D. Waymire, Manager, Engineering (Coordinator)  
J. Hoffman, Engineering Supervisor  
J. Vennemann, Legal Department  
M. Wetterhahn, Counsel

#### H. J. Kaiser

B. Varchol, QA Administrative Manager  
P. Hickey, Counsel

#### U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission

R. F. Warnick, Director, Office of Special Cases  
D. R. Hunter, Chief, Section 1, Zimmer  
S. H. Lewis, Regional Counsel

### 2. Management Meeting

#### a. The licensee discussed the following general matters:

- . H. J. Kaiser to assist in the answering of some of the allegations.
- . The volume and complexity of the information contained in the Demand.
- . Grouping of the allegations for ease of response.
- . Reference to documents available as public documents rather than provide the documents with the response.
  - The NRC suggested that the referenced documents should be attached to the response.
- . The difficulty with responding to "general" subject type allegations, especially if information is not specifically available to CG&E.
- . The difficulty with answering questions when CG&E is unable to locate "attachments" referenced in the material.
  - The NRC stated that the licensee should attempt to respond to the question to the best of their ability.
- . The credibility of some of the documents used in the petition from MVPP.

- b. The NRC discussed the following general matters:
- . The licensee should attempt to answer each paragraph, even if the response is "no response required."
  - . The response/results of the September 24, 1982 Demand should be made available and considered in the independent assessment programs and plans being considered under the November 12, 1982 Order.
- c. The licensee commented that an extension may be necessary due to the size of the task and the additional work under the November 12, 1982 Order.
- . The NRC stated that the licensee should communicate the request for an extension in writing and include the justification. (The licensee requested an extension from December 31, 1982 until March 1, 1983, by letter on December 6, 1982. Their request for an extension was granted on December 30, 1982 as documented in a January 17, 1983 letter from the Regional Administrator to the licensee.)