

BRIEFING ON MARKEY LETTER

CLOSED MEETING

EXEMPTIONS 9(b) and 10

Tuesday, April 24, 1984

Pages 1-39

8405310363 840521 PDR 10CFR PT9. 7 PDR Prepared by: ANN TIPTON Office of the Secretary

| 1 | UNITED STATES OF AMERICA |
|------|--|
| 2 | NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION |
| 3 | |
| 4 | BRIEFING ON MARKEY LETTER |
| 5 | |
| 6 | CLOSED MEETING |
| 7 | Exemptions 9(b) and 10 |
| 8 | |
| 9 | |
| 10 | Room 1130 |
| 11 | 1717 H Street, N. W. Washington, D. C. |
| 12 | - Tuesday, April 24, 1984 |
| 13 | |
| 14 | The Commission convened in a closed session at 4:03 o'clock p.m. |
| 15 | COMMISSIONERS PRESENT |
| 16 | NUNZIO PALLADINO, Chairman of the Commission |
| 17 | VICTOR GILINSKY, Commissioner THOMAS ROBERTS, Commissioner JAMES ASSELSTINE, Commissioner FREDERICK BERNTHAL, Commissioner |
| 18 | FREDERICK BERNTHAL, Commissioner |
| 19 | STAFF AND SPEAKERS SEATED AT COMMISSION TABLE: |
| 20 | S. CHILK |
| 21 | H. PLAINE M. MALSCH |
| 22 | J. ZERBE |
| 23 | AUDIENCE SPEAKERS: |
| 24 | C. KAMMERER P. CRANE |
| 25 | J. FOUCHARD N. HALLER |
| 1311 | |

PROCEEDING

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Please come to order. The purpose of this meeting is to bring to the Commission's attention for consideration Congressman Markey's April 24 letter requesting documents immediately.

We need to hold the meeting on less than one week's notice and then vote to close the meeting, and I'll ask OGC to give us the basis for closing the meeting.

MR. MALSCH: The basis would be primarily Exemption 10 which is to protect an ongoing adjudication and the reason why I think it is reasonably applicable is that the principal ground for withholding documents would be to protect the ongoing adjudication. That would involve discussion of adjudication, the bearing all these documents have on it.

We also suggest adding 9(b), frustration of purpose, which would apply to the extent you couldn't decide whether or not you could disclose the documents publicly without publicly disclosing the document. That would be a subsidiary ground for closing.

9(b) is a little risky because it goes against the Common Cause case but, along with 10, it's not too bad.

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: If frustration was a criteria, we could close everything. Refuse to release anything.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: I'm not persuaded of the validity of either of those two grounds for closing the

meeting. So I'll vote to hold the meeting on less than one week's notice but I won't vote to close it.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Well, let's take the motions separately, then. To vote to hold the meeting on less than one week's notice.

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Any further discussion on the vote to close the meeting?

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: Yes. You're saying that, in your judgment, Marty, it's perfectly legitimate to close it on Exemption 10, basically?

MR. MALSCH: On Exemption 10 and 9(b) is a little more questionable but the facts are better than the Common Cause case.

At least, if the meeting needs to get involved into the closure of the contents of the document, the, obviously, to open the meeting would frustrate the purpose of maybe not disclosing the contents of the document. I don't know to what extent we would get into a discussion of the contents of the document. To the extent to which we do, 9(b) is reasonably applicable.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: I can't see much basis for discussing the contents of the transcript from yesterday's meeting, quite frankly.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: That's only one of the

2

4

5

7 8

9

10

12

13

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

24

25

documents.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Are you saying, Marty, that, to the extent the transcript is not discussed in detail, the rest of it would be openly disclosable? In other words, after it goes through your review, it would be --

MR. MALSCH: Except for 10.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: That's covers the Shoreham case?

MR. MALSCH: Ten covers the Shoreham case.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Yes, but that's a deliberation on the issues of the case.

MR. MALSCH: Well, it's the conduct of agency adjudication and I think we're making an argument that, if the document is withholdable from Congress it's because of the need to conduct adjudication in a certain fashion. I think it's a reasonable argument.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: I guess if Jim is uncomfortable about it, I'm uncomfortable about it.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: I feel comfortable in closing the meeting.

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: I would vote to close it with the usual proviso that we release those elements are releasable, if they ever request the release of them.

MR. MALSCH: We're required to do that, in any event. Every closed meeting transcript has to be reviewed.

3

5

6

7 8

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: Right.

MR. CRANE: Can I just add a note in my capacity as Sunshine person?

(Laughter.)

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: Mr. Sunshine.

MR. CRANE: I think, in working on responses to congressional correspondence, there is a strong argument for 9(b) because, should we say such-and-such to the Congressman, no, that will cause him to react in such-and-such a way.

Above all, let us not give him that impression. That is frustration of purpose if the meeting is revealed, if ever there was.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: So you're saying 9(b) is stronger in your mind?

MR. CRANE: I think so.

MR. PLAINE: The key words of 9(b) are "likely to significantly frustrate implementation of an agency action."

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: Well, after Common Cause, I'm not just convinced there's much of anything left of 9(b) for this agency. The Commission almost went to jail on that, once.

(Laughter.)

MR. MALSCH: Well, actually there might not be but the Assistant General has advised us that he would be willing to take up the Common Cause-type case again under better

24

25

facts.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: So, what we're doing is providing a guinea pig for Justice to go back to the court.

MR. MALSCH: I think this is a much better case than we had in Common. Cause. I have to admit that there were some problems with the Common Cause case.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Are you ready to vote on closing the meeting?

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: I'm ready.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: All those in favor of closing the meeting say "aye."

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: - Aye.

COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: Aye.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Aye. Those opposed?

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: No.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Any abstentions?

(Laughter.)

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: It's all right, Victor, you don't go to jail anyway.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: I'm somewhere between abstaining and "no."

(Laughter.)

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Well, the majority has agreed to close the meeting.

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: Do they only put in jail the

three that voted to close it -- is that how it works?

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: I hope.

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: Them, plus the lawyers who advise them.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: That's right.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Congressman Markey, in letters dated March 28 and April 12, requested all documents leading to our resulting from my March 20 memo to the Commissioners on licensing delays. All documents, since March 20, on the subject of licensing delay, including licensing delay involving Shoreham, the identification and description, including documents of all communications with Lilco and Executive Branch representatives on Shoreham. I think, also, they requested the transcript of yesterday's meeting.

I believe that the Commission should discuss the Markey request and that's the reason I asked for the meeting. I think we have both legal and policy questions to address. I believe OGC is prepared to brief us on the legal rights and obligations and we should also hear from OCA on some of the past experiences of a similar kind.

Do other Commissioners have any comments they would like to make at the moment?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Well, let's turn it over to OGC and hear what they have to say.

MR. PLAINE: On the legal aspect, there are two bases to be looked at. One is the so-called Pillsbury doctrine that resulted from the case of Pillsbury Corporation against the Federal Trade Commission, decided by the Fifth Circuit in 1966, which was a question of congressional probing of an agency's deliberative processes in an adjudication which is still in progress and whether or not that didn't constitute improper pressure on the agency.

The second possible basis is the balancing of the Congress' right to know against the agency's right to maintain its deliberative processes free from inhibitions on the give and take of opinions and ideas. The balancing, basically, of what might be described as congressional pressure for a decision in a certain way as against what we sometimes refer to as the subsection 5 exemption under the Freedom of Information Act.

Each of them offer possibilities of making a good case given what is involved here is a pressure for a decision, in this case aimed, perhaps, almost entirely at the Chairman, at this point, and it seems to me that one could make those arguments.

I guess you balance against that some of the practical aspects of engaging in a contest with the Congress on this matter, and maybe it's useful to hear from Carl Kammerer on what was a similar argument that was made and resulted in a

sort of a draw, if you will, in a case not so many years ago.

Do you think it's proper to have that now, Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Yes.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: I would just ask one question before that, Herzel. Wouldn't you say, though, that the letter we received a couple of weeks ago from Congressman Bevill and his colleagues on the Appropriations Subcommittee, that asked for -- really basically called for a specific decision in another case, Diablo Canyon, is much more intrusive than these kinds of letters we've been getting from Markey that are asking for documents and information.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: What did that letter say?

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: It complained about our earlier decision not to go ahead with the low power license in Diablo.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Oh, yes.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: And urged expeditious action to correct that mistake, which seemed to me a lot more intrusive than these kinds of letters that are simply asking for answers to questions or information.

MR. PLAINE: Well, was the other accompanied by anything more than just simply making that statement?

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: It didn't have to be.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: No, it didn't have to be.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: We get a lot of letters from

3 4

congressmen --

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: We get letters all the time from people telling us what we're doing wrong or what decisions we're supposed to be making. I'm not sure this is any different.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: But, if Congress doesn't have the privilege of probing into the deliberative process, then what's the basis for their needing the documents? They're not fulfilling the function that they have.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: I guess I'm not prepared to tell Congress what is their --

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Well, we have in the past -- or the Commission has.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: Well, we can hear from Carl.

MR. KAMMERER: It seems like you guys don't want to make the decision.

COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: No, I'm ready.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: I've made the decision.

MR. KAMMERER: It seems to be what's at issue, here, is whether or not the giving of these documents would help the member of Congress make his case that the Chairman has prejudged this issue and, if you start with that premise, it seems that the advice that counsel has given you is that it could be withheld under one or both of those exemptions and I

7

9

10

11

13

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

24

25

think that we have that authority and that responsibility, in the agency, to review all requests that come to us in just that light -- what is our responsibility -- and I think it's to protect the integrity and the efficacy of the decision-making process, in this case, and we ought to do what we should do to keep that document from this gentleman.

COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: You're quite persuasive.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Eloquent.

COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: Right.

(Laughter.)

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Do you have any other points that we should consider?

MR. PLAINE: I don't think we do. Do you have any? Do you have any, Pete?

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: I had a question for Carl, while you're thinking.

MR. PLAINE: Okay.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: You didn't go to the one case that was identified that took place in 1979. Could you brief us on that?

MR. KAMMERER: That was a similar situation. Let me see, "similar." No. It was a case where another chairman was asking for the names that were under consideration for what ultimately turned out to be the Rogovan Commission on Three Mile Island accident.

In that case, the then Commission said, "No, we're not going to reveal those names to you. We're not going to give you the transcript" -- which is what ne was requesting in that instance -- so that he could see the names of the individuals that were under consideration, and the Commission was quite firm in its decision to withhold that document from Congress.

Now, what did ultimately occur is that, after certain iterations of requests for the document, then the Commission authorized me to take the document up to that congressman, that chairman, and to have him read the document -- only he -- in front of me, and I came back with the document. So we did not --

COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: Did he read it?

MR. KAMMERER: He thumbed through several pages of it but did not comprehensively --

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: He said, "Oh, hell --"

MR. KAMMERER: That's right. And his staff did not read it. It was the member, himself, who looked at it. He thumbed through several pages and gave it back to me and I returned it to the Commission.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: What steps were in the processes of reaching the decision to --

COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: Stonewalling, of course.

MR. KAMMERER: That's a good one. No, no. You do

3 4

have the exemptions that the General Counsel has mentioned and I believe that's the way you should go.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Let me ask you, is he getting whatever other documents he was interested in? He seems to have worked up his temperature on not getting some other things. What's the status of those requests?

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: I'll give you my impression but then I'll check with staff. My impression is that we have been pretty liberal on giving him most of the documents he's asked for. Occasionally, we tell him -- well, I guess in many cases we tell them, "These haven't been released. We would ask you to not release them," and we did have an agreement whereby he said he wouldn't release them.

Then there was a question where they quoted one, and then they finally agreed, "Well, all right, we'll include not quoting them as part of the agreement."

MR. MALSCH: One thing occurs to us. I'm not exactly sure of the extent of the documents we're talking about but if we're talking about, for example, memoranda of conversations with Lilco or memoranda of conversations or meetings which memoranda were provided to members of the staff, then there were would be deliberative process privilege that would apply to those.

This privilege would only apply to intra-Commissioner office --

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: Directly related to the adjudication.

MR. MALSCH: -- directly related to the adjudica-

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: That's right.

MR. MALSCH: OGC memoranda, OPE memoranda. The materials from staff or provided to staff or materials related to meetings with Lilco would not be subject to this kind of privilege.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Most of us didn't write any memo but I guess we could, saying what we discussed.

MR. MALSCH: I have memoranda from three of you of a conversation with the Lilco board chairman. That would not be subject to this kind of a privilege.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: Yes. What would, of the documents he's asked for so far, apart from the transcripts of yesterday's meetings?

MR. MALSCH: Well, for example, our memoranda to you all measures to expedite Shoreham would be covered by the privilege. I honestly don't know what else is covered by the document.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: Okay.

MR. MALSCH: The transcript certainly would be -- the transcript of yesterday's meeting.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: Right.

4 5

MR. PLAINE: That was our primary document.

MR. MALSCH: That was the principal focus of our analysis.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: I have to say, for myself, I guess I have mixed feelings about this. I think, in some respects -- I don't think it bears on the Chairman's actions one way or the other, but I think it would serve the public interest to release the transcripts of yesterday's meeting. I think it would be highly illuminating. Whether or not it's protected by laws is another matter.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: I would agree with that.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: How about some of these other things? And, incidentally, would that include, for example, suppose my legal assistant gives me a note.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: That's protected.

MR. MALSCH: I think that's protected.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Is that protected?

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Sure.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Now, Herzel, then I sent one to the Commissioners on the 5th in which I said, "I vote for Option 2" -- I'm going through those that I know of.

Then there's a limited distribution, Herzel Plaine to the Commissioners. That was April 2. Let's see, what else. Then I have a brief note from Fred Bernthal to me with copies to Gilinsky, Roberts, Asselstine, talking about a

3 4

question whether the Commission can or should do anything to attempt to expedite the proceeding further.

Then there's Roberts. "I favor no action on Shore-ham." Then another batch of letters -- myself to the Commissioners --

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Let's see, are we dealing with the entire --

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: I'm just going through those that my staff has identified for me.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: We're not going to pass on that.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: No. Then there's a document here -- I don't know whatever happened to it. It looks like a draft that my staff said we never sent. Here's another draft that we never sent.

Then we've got the material that was handed out by the staff when I met with the staff. I think we distributed all that. Then there's a memo from Denton to Dircks. Then a meeting I had with Secretary Hodell which I sent to -- I don't know what else OGC has or anybody else has.

MR. MALSCH: All I have is, I think, is three other collections of minutes and conversations with Lilco, our memo, I think a draft of something we never sent, plus a huge collection of staff documents which are miscellaneous notes, draft SER --

3 4

5 6

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: You mean your staff?

MR. MALSCH: No, EDO staff materials, which are not covered by this privilege, and I don't whether I even have a complete set of staff documents. This is just what I have received so far.. In any event, the staff documents would not be covered by that kind of privilege.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Any other comments?

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: Joe, what are we talking about here? Are we talking about only the stuff that's addressed in the third paragraph of his letter and we've not yet addressed the question of the transcript of yesterday's meeting?

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Well, what about the transcript of yesterday's meeting?

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: Pardon me?

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Do you have any thoughts on the transcript of yesterday's meeting?

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: Well, it seems to me there are almost two separate issues. One of them is this stuff that floated around here which you've just gone through here, which you've just gone through, and I'm not sure whether you require our advice or is that a Commission decision whether to release all of that stuff?

MR. PLAINE: Yes, it's a Commission decision.

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: All those various pieces of

paper and comments back and forth?

MR. PLAINE: Yes, it's a Commission decision.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Well, each Commission is free to release --

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: -- his own.

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: His own, certainly, yes.

MR. PLAINE: Weil, if you start with the transcript, obviously that's a Commission decision.

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: Well, the transcript is another matter, as far as I'm concerned. That's clear cut, but this other stuff is partly your own decision, it seems to me.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Let me speak to the basic question. It seems to me that, if the Congress granted us certain rights to protect us from the activities of the Congress itself, I think that, when we feel that the Congress is transgressing its own rules, then we should stand up to the right. Now, that's the gut feeling I have.

Whether or not to apply it to any particular case is a different question but I think, once we start to say, "Well, we'll give on this one," I think we're giving in on all our deliberative processes and that's what concerns me. This case, per se, may not concern me so much as the precedent that might obtain.

Particularly -- and I feel more strongly on the

transcript question -- there is a transcript of this morning's meeting that will become available that might actually clarify some of the things we talked about yesterday and may clarify even further some of the information he wants, and that's an open transcript and he'll get that, but I'm concerned about giving him a transcript on a meeting that involved, very directly, our deliberative process.

COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: I would agree. I would withhold the transcript of yesterday's meeting.

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: I agree. I must say that I'm astonished that in a process where what we really did was to take consideration -- it was a non-decision -- a consideration of whether to intervene. Take the extraordinary step of intervening in a licensing board proceeding and then decide not to do that, a release of a transcript of that type could, in itself -- assuming that it's not already released and we understand it is, at least in the sub-sense --

COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: Oh, it is?

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: It is?

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Where is it released?

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: We understand that people pretty much know on the outside what happened in that meeting, and that brings me to another point I would like to address, but the sense of the meeting clearly is out of this room as of about an hour after the meeting yesterday. Be that as it may,

I see no reason for us to release a transcript on a non-action that involves what was a consideration of an extraordinary intervention and, in fact, that was the principal basis of my decision that we should not take an extraordinary action like that when you've got a three-two, and a rather shaky three-two, whichever direction you look at it, consensus or lack thereof by the Commission.

Therefore, I simply don't believe we should -- we do no favors to our own process and, therefore, I would not vote in favor of releasing the transcript.

Let me just address the other issue since I've commented on it indirectly, although I'm well aware of the fact that it may serve the beliefs and inclinations of some of my fellow Commissioners. I must say I'm to the point of wondering whether we should ever vote to have a closed meeting because these meetings, in fact, are not closed. The information from them is on the street sometimes within minutes, and certainly within hours, in almost every case. I've more than once --

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Well, let's see, what is it you're talking about? I understood that Public Affairs was, in fact, going to inform people that there had been a vote.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: Yes, right after the meeting. That's right.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Are you talking about

8 9

anything beyond that?

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: From a closed meeting?

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: Yes. Joe just stood up at the end of the meeting and said, "I think I have to tell --

MR. FOUCHARD: Hold it. I consulted with Herzel and we were going to respond to inquiries and I believe we had two -- one from Newsday and one from the Associated Press, and maybe there were others -- that the Commission had decided not to intervene and that, if we were pressed, we would say, "Yes, there were three Commissioners --"

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: What I'm asking is, are you talking about anything beyond that?

MR. FOUCHARD: That's all that was said.

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: Yes. It's not just this particular case, yesterday, and I was not aware of the fact, I should say, that we had decided to release information.

First, on the fact there was a vote and, secondly, what the vote was. I'm somewhat surprised that that comes out of those meetings.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: Joe said it at the end of the meeting.

MR. FOUCHARD: Wait a minute. I think Herzel advised the parties to the proceeding.

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: This is not the first time we have voted to close a meeting and we read about it in the

newspapers the next day. Now, that is a fact. Now, I don't know how this place works, but I just wanted to --

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Well, you're talking about you agree, in one case, and you put it in your opinion.

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: I'm sorry? What?

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: I'm talking to Tom.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: That's true.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: So you've got to be careful about that.

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: We put what in our opinion?

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Never mind.

COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: Never mind.

CCMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: It's a historical --

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: It's water over the dam.

(Laughter.)

COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: Thank you for raising that -COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: I shouldn't have raised it
but you provoked me.

COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: Well, I enjoyed it. (Laughter.)

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: That's as good a reason as any. I must say, I'd enjoy seeing this transcript out.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: I would, too.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: We've had a request for it.

Maybe it's covered by his request. I don't know. It

1

4

3

5 6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

23

22

24 25 CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Well, the other documents.

right, what's next?

certainly comes from his request.

one. I mean the one of yesterday's.

Herzel Plaine's documents, for example. COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: What is that?

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Or even this one.

not to release the transcript of yesterday's meeting. All

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: No, no. I don't mean this

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: Yesterday's, that's right.

COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: Well, you've got three votes

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: The options paper on expediting the --

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Yes -- the Shoreham proceeding. COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: That was back when you were talking about the Commission issuing an order directing a schedule for the board's consideration of a low power license.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: And I think the draft order that the panel board chairman sent down.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: All that stuff sure seems pretty academic to me, at this point. I don't see what the harm is, quite frankly, in releasing all of it.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Only on the principle that, if we're going to allow probing of how we voted, what our considerations are, how we either changed our mind or held fast,

or whatever, I think --

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: All that stuff, really, wasn't even deliberation. The only thing I think can really be fairly characterized as Commission deliberations in the adjudication was yesterday's transcript. The rest of that stuff, at this point -- ever since the board was established and set up its own expedited schedule, all that other stuff was academic, anyway, and Tom and Fred pointed out.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: How about statements that say,
"I would vote this way" or "I would vote that way" or "I
prefer this option over that option"?

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: I'd leave that up to individual Commissioners.

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: I'm not really interested in getting the nuts and bolts of this piece of paper and that piece.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Are you say that, with regard to the memos we wrote, leave it up to each Commissioner?

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: Yes, and I'd say give them the OGC stuff and Tony Cotter's things. Of course, I'd give them the transcript, too.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Any other preferences?

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: I think the more you withhold, the more you are going to feed his suspicions that there's really something here. I don't think you're going to

9

8

12

15

14

16

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

solve the problem by refusing to give him this stuff.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Now, incidentally, I think that Norm Haller was called and the offer was made to come over and read this stuff. I don't know if that's still a valid offer or whether it would even be the substitute for Congressman Markey's --

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Mr. Markey would come over?

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: No, no. In this case, it was

Udell wanted to come over. Is that right?

MR. HALLER: This morning, Richard Udell, at the meeting, suggested that he might --

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: In a what?

MR. HALLER: In this morning's meeting, during the meeting that the Commission held, Richard Udell came over and sat down next to me and suggested that one option might be for the Commission to let him come over and read the documents.

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: Including the transcript, I presume.

MR. HALLER: At that time, the transcript was not addressed.

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: Well, under no circumstance would I permit Richard Udell to read the transcript. We may eventually get to the point where Carl was last time around.

CHAIRMAN PALLADING: Let's see, I vote not to release the transcript.

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: That's right.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Now, let me make another approach. I still think we ought to assert our right because I think we have to assert it just for the transcript purpose, and whatever we do on the other items, and I haven't gotten the vote, yet, on the OGC paper, we say that doesn't set a precedent with regard to our rights, but I do think I need a statement or a vote on whether or not a Commissioner is willing to release the OGC memo and the handouts that we got from the staff.

MR. PLAINE: Mr. Chairman, could I say something on the OGC memos. I think, over the past year or more, we've tried to provide you with legal advice which would help you make up your minds about things without necessarily disclosing those things to the public and we have deliberately written on them "Limited Distribution" for that purpose.

Now, I recognize, after the thing is over, maybe it no longer has significance but, while the process is on, it seems to me we ought to bear the position to advise you without having it publicly ramified all around -- people criticizing or checking out what our advice is.

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: That's right.

MR. PLAINE: It would seem, therefore, if you're going to start this business of giving up all the time, and I know that we've given up on a number of occasions when I

thought they should not have been given up. Nevertheless, they were given up, sometimes, without my even knowing it. It seems to me that isn't a very smart way to try to run an operation where you do need private advice from time to time.

I would hope you would stand firm at least once on this issue. If you get licked on it, so you get licked, but I would like to try.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: There is one problem. If we don't release -- I'm not encouraging release of the OGC document but suppose we don't release the OGC document and then each of us sends a copy of a vote which says, "Option 2 is desirable because it could focus the hearing, et cetera, et cetera; however, it concerns, et cetera," and so it tells you a little bit about what Option 2 is and then I go on and talk about Option 4, and so there's two out of the four, but still that would not be the same as releasing your document. That's my reaction to the subject.

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: We made a mistake in the area, I think, once before -- I suppose, if I thought, I could remember which one -- in releasing an OGC preliminary document or a document, and I think, particularly in this case, because of the nature of the document, that we shouldn't do that.

Now, if we're going to refuse to release the transcript of a meeting, then there isn't much logic in not releasing that and then releasing the advice of General

8 9

Counsel that was the core of the discussion yesterday, in many respects.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: I think what Herzel is talking about is the options for expediting the proceeding, back before the board adopted the expedited schedule. Isn't that the document we're talking about?

MR. PLAINE: I think that was one of them.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: I don't think that formed any basis for any discussion yesterday whatsoever.

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: I'm sorry. You're talking about an earlier document.

argument about this having some continuing relevance to the proceeding, I think it is totally irrelevant to the rest of the proceeding, now. I don't see what benefit is served by withholding that particular document. I agree with you, if you have an OGC paper that has some continuing relevance to an ongoing proceeding, I'd say yes -- or one that involved a lot of detailed reasoning and analysis. But what that was was an options paper about the various options the Commission might consider to get a low power proceeding going before the board did it on its own.

I'm perfectly willing to make the fight, at some point, about OGC documents, but it doesn't seem to me this is the one to fall on our swords over.

3 4

MR. PLAINE: Well, that may be. I would have to take a look at it. I don't remember it, now.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: I have it hear but I've lost it for the moment.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Why are we doing this?

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: I just want to find it. I want to get a vote on whether or not -- here it is.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Joe, I just --

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: The OGC paper, that's the only vote, and then --

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: I must say I can't participate. I have no idea what it is.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: At least the one I'm thinking of is April 2.

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: Well, let me make clear that I don't believe the OGC documents, or any documents, that related to that meeting yesterday should be released. That would be inconsistent with not releasing the transcript.

Joe, you have my permission to release any of those memos, notes, whatever else, was related to our interoffice communications of some of these things that you went over that I might have authored. If you want me to do that rather than you, I'd be happy to do that.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Yes, I was going to adopt a principle that each Commissioner decide for himself those

3 4

documents that he wrote --

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: I was just hoping I didn't have to remember what they were.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: I was coming down to where we decide on the OGC paper, the transcript, and I think the handouts we got -- they were better covered today than they were yesterday.

I would also send the transcript from this morning's meeting when we get it, but that's an open meeting.

COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: If Udell was here, I think the information is going to be transmitted.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Well, let me ask for OGC to identify which ones of its documents we need to vote on. I know we have one of April 2. Is there another one that I may have overlooked? That was on the Shoreham proceeding.

MR. MALSCH: The only that was sent to the Commission, I believe, on the subject of expediting the case was the April 2 Shoreham memo.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: That's right.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Do you have any expression on withholding or transmitting that one?

COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: I would rely on the advice of the General Counsel. If it's withholdable, I would be in favor of withholding.

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: Is this the one that Herzel

is talking about now?

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: Yes.

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: I suspect that that one is a little tougher to justify. It sounds to me like it's water over the dam. .

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: Yes.

MR. MALSCH: I will say that, when I drafted the memo, I drafted it with the idea that it would likely be disclosed.

(Laughter.)

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: There's a message in that that, I might add, gets to the heart of why we shouldn't always just keel over every time someone asks for an internal document because, then, pretty soon we will get memos and documents that are drafted under the presumption that they will be released and those probably aren't the best memos to get from staff, in some cases.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Right.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Well, I would propose to withhold the OGC memo just to get a different point of view on the table.

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: It's really very hard for me to make that judgment because I would have to look at the memo. Do I detect OGC waivering on whether they think that's

MR. PLAINE: I, personally, am not. Maybe some others are.

(Laughter.)

COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: I'm with you.

MR. PLAINE: I'm not waivering.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: I didn't hear you, Herzel.

COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: He says he's not waivering.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: He says he still wants to withhold it.

COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: He wants to withhold the April 2. I'm within your hands.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: All right. I would propose to withhold it.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: We ought to be able to wrap this up pretty quickly.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: I will have to get from each of you your decision on your own documents. I presume you two are willing to --

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: I'm willing to give up anything I authored.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: I mean, will you help us find them. I might not have them all.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: Sure.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: I thought we'd done that.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: I've sent Marty a memo

responding to one of Udell's questions. I'll check and see.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: I think I've turned everything in. We've turned our pockets inside out.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: That's right. Nothing to hide.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: While we're still deliberating

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: If you guys think you can defend this, then I'll vote with the Chairman on it not to release it.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Let's see, do we have three votes not to release the OGC memo.

COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: Yes, if, in their judgment, they have a legal basis to do so. That's my condition.

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: It won't be more than 30 days. Tom.

MR. MALSCH: The April 2 memo goes to the merits of these couple of issues. It does express OGC's view that the Commission's regulations do not discriminate between low power and full power of the general design criteria. It also observes that the schedule adopted by the low power board is tight without any apparent real benefits for LOCO in so doing.

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: There is that latter statement in there somewhere toward the end.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: While you're debating that,

what about memos that I received or you sent, would you identify those?

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: You can release anything I sent. I've sot no problem.

COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: I'll look into it.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Well, we've got only until 6:00 o'clock, or thereabouts.

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: What happens, then?
COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Life will go on.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: So, we've resolved the transcript, we've resolved the OGC memo.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: There is the caveat that, if OGC agrees there's a legal basis, and do I hear you on that?

MR. PLAINE: I still think that it's related to the decision and I think it ought to stay out of the public domain, at this point.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: All right. Then we've got the question of our own originated documents. We'll take care of that individually.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: What about documents between administrative assistants or personal staff and the Commissioner?

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: I would say that's withholdable.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: Sure, that's withholdable.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: All right. Any the other class that we ought to address that anybody thinks of?

MR CRANE: Yes. I think if there are documents that involve communications between Commissioners and the licensing board or Commissioners and the staff --

MR. MALSCH: Or Commissioners and outsiders.

MR. CRANE: -- or outsiders, then you would have a problem because, if you claim that they are germane to this adjudication, then you have admitted to ex parte communications.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: That's right.

COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: 'I volunteer all my correspondence to the hearing board.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: I didn't follow you, Peter.

MR. CRANE: My point is that, if there are communications and one hold thems back from the Congress saying, "You can't have these. They are relevant to the adjudication," and it turns out that they are off-the-record communications, then one has admitted to exparte contact.

(Whereupon, Commissioner Gilinsky left the room.)
COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: That's right.

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: That's great.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: What about drafts of memos that weren't sent but kept entirely within the office.

MR. PLAINE: I think you're entitled to withhold.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: I'm asking for guidance because we're going to try to make the decision within the hour and, while I've got the benefit of this talent, I want to take advantage of it.

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: I think Senator Simpson is right. Maybe, if we just didn't have any lawyers at all in this agency -- sorry, you guys.

yesterday's transcript, we voted not to release OGC's legal opinion of April 2, and we've agreed that each individual Commissioner would release his memos, as he sees fit, and I think most of us will release them but I may want to talk to General Counsel on one or two of mine. We'll leave it up to each Commissioner.

For anything we don't send them, we've got to make sure it's covered so that I don't say, "We've sent you all these classes of things" and then we find out we didn't.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: You're going to send all yours?

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: Yes

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Tom wants to look at his.

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: Are we finished with this?

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: And I intend to look at mine with the probability of sending most if not all.

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: I just want to say that I'm

3 4

. .

quite serious, though, and want staff to hear the comment about closed meetings.

I may have slipped up myself, and I'm sure we all do, from time to time, and I still have to be instructed on where I did that, if I did, but --

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: Not, it was Tom that I think Victor was talking about.

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: Oh, I see, okay. But a closed meeting is a closed meeting and I am not going to vote to close meetings, after a while, if we don't all understand that. That was the simple point that I wanted to make.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: I'm for that, Fred, I'm for that.

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: I know you are. You're going to get there one way or another, Jim.

(Laughter.)

MR. PLAINE: Fred, I misunderstand, I think. Are you talking about the fact that we had to notify the parties, yesterday, as to the result of the --

commissioner Bernihal: No, Herzel. Yesterday, I understand there is apparently some question about what we wanted to release and decided to release, but it is a fact that we too often here, very quickly, not only the outcome of the a vote but the contents of a closed meeting on the street or read it in the newspaper the next day.

All I'm saying is, that if that pattern persists -and I'm not pointing the finger at anybody but, if it persists, then there's no point in closing meetings.

MR. PLAINE: Of course, I agree.

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: That's all that I'm saying.

MR. PLAINE: Yesterday, I know I talked about the fact that we had this obligation to counsel because they were waiting on us before they took certain actions and I think we agreed on a simple statement that the Commission met and decided not to intervene, and that's all that we agreed upon.

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: That's all we agreed on.
That's correct.

MR. PLAINE: And that was transmitted to the parties.

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: That is not all that was available.

MR. FOUCHARD: Your point is most valid, Mr. Bernthal, irrespective of yesterday.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: I want to touch on one item, though, before we close. Are you going to give me a legal opinion on the basis to support the votes on the transcript and OGC? In other words, you gave us orally what you thought the basis was, but we're going to have to transmit something. Maybe we could get a transmittal letter together.

MR. PLAINE: Do you want to use it as part of the

transmittal letter?

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: I think we have to.

MR. PLAINE: I guess you might want to. I would guess we would help draft the letter that you send out.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Yes. Now you've said the right thing.

MR. PLAINE: Right. Is the letter going out today?

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: No, I don't think the letter
will go out today. I think we'll communicate what our decision is and what we are doing.

We will stand adjourned.

(Whereupon, the foregoing meeting was adjourned at 4:50 o'clock, p.m.)

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

This is to certify that the attached proceedings before the Commission in the matter of: Briefing on Markey Letter, held on Tuesday, April 24, 1984, at 1717 H Street, N. W., Washington, D. C., were held as herein appears, and that this is the original transcript thereof for the file of the Commission.

Elizabeth Ann Tipton Official Reporter (typed)

Elizabeth aun Listen