

Transcript of Proceedings NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

DISCUSSION OF SHOREHAM ORDER

Exemption No. 10

Friday, April 27, 1984

Pages 1-41

Prepared by: ANN TIPTON Office of the Secretary

8405310370 840521 PDR 10CFR PT9. 7 PDR

1 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA 2 NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION 3 4 DISCUSSION OF SHOREHAM ORDER 5 6 CLOSED MEETING 7 Exemption No. 10 8 9 10 11 12 The Commission met in closed session at 4:10 13 o'clock, p.m. 14 COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: 15 NUNZIO PALLADINO, Chairman of the Commission VICTOR GILINSKY, Commissioner THOMAS ROBERTS, Commissioner JAMES ASSELSTINE, Commissioner FREDERICK BERNTHAL, Commissioner 16 17 STAFF AND PRESENTERS SEATED AT COMMISSION TABLE: 18 S. CHILK 19 H. PLAINE M. MALSCH 20 P. CRANE 21 AUDIENCE SPEAKER: 22 J. FOUCHARD 23 24

25

Room 1130 1717 H Street, N. W. Washington, D. C. Friday, April 27, 1984

3

5

6

7

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

PROCEEDINGS

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: This is a closed meeting on Shoreham. We need a vote to hold this on less than one week's notice and a vote to close it.

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: To introduce the subject, let me just briefly say the following -- can we get attention.

MR. PLAINE: We're worried about the audience.

Just a moment.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: I suppose whether the meeting is, indeed, closed.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: We haven't voted to close it yet, have we?

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Are we all set? Gary?
MR. GILBERT: Yes.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: Did we vote to close.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: I think we voted to close.

MR. CHILK: Yes, on both counts.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: Okay.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: The way we stood this morning, we got Commissioner Asselstine's additional comments. They were quite disturbing to me and I think to others. I think they introduced issues that are not before the court and I

was prepared, first, to ask Commissioner Asselstine to withdraw two statements at least, or then I was prepared, also, to add my additional comments, if you didn't.

Commissioner Bernthal said, "I think I can sell a compromise position."

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: I don't know the answer to that, yet.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: So, after much deliberation and discussion, I said, "Okay, if you sold it to at least three Commissioners -- I would prefer all four -- I would vote for this alternate proposal, but without any additional comments -- at least at this time."

I don't know where the proposal stands.

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: It's right here.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: I'll try to give you my version. I let Fred give his version. Why don't I let Fred give his version.

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: I'm going to circulate this memo, in any case and we can burn it or do whatever you want to.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Why don't you outline the proposal.

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: This is the first time any of you have seen this version, as a matter of fact.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: I haven't seen any version.

to be precise. .

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: I can only talk to so many people at once.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: No need to apologize.

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: In fact, only one at once,

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Are you going to highlight it for us?

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: Well, I think the essence of it is on the second page. Now, the three points, here, that are the policy issues that I suggest, since there is no longer a question of delay of the hearing. The hearing is going to be delayed by some weeks, at least. I'm simply urging that we make use of that time and go ahead and consider the policy issue.

The parties can go ahead and argue their time-table, which they have been doing for three weeks, now, and which they are under court order to do, in any case. If they don't reach agreement, then General Counsel's Office should go ahead, in case that happens, and prepare a schedule so that we can comply with the court on Monday, if the parties can't comply with the court order.

The policy issues themselves, I've essentially reworded Victor's version there with some modifications and the addition of the third point because of the question of whether you should not also consider the case of exemptions.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Could you read these out loud?

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Let me ask kind of a procedural question. It looks to me as if we are not going to have an order by 5:00 o'clock, unless that order is the original order plus the views that have been prepared up to this point.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Well, perhaps we don't need an order by 5:00 o'clock.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Well, then you have to call people and tell them that the order is not in effect.

COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: That's correct.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: It seems to me you've got those two choices, right now, before we continue to discuss this point.

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: The last paragraph suggests that we need to tell them quickly if we're going to supplement that order.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: I haven't had a chance to look at this and I don't know how I would come out, but it doesn't seem to me that we could agree on some modification of this between now and 5:00 o'clock and put out an order. Just realistically this is not going to happen.

So, it seems to me the Commission needs to do one of two things.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: If we could get an agreement

on principle, then I'd agree to tell them that order is not going out.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: The principle being what? In any case, that order is not -- well, let me ask you this: does this modify the order that was put out?

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: Yes.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: We haven't put out the order.

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: Yes. This is a supplement to the order.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Okay. No, I mean other than talking about reviewing the issues, does it modify the schedule part of the order?

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: That's essentially what this deals with.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: I mean, is it different from the order that was read to the parties?

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: I don't even have that in front of me.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Because if it is and if we're going down some different path, it seems to me we have to tell them what was told them no longer applies. The Commission has pulled back. We may come out similar to that. We may come out in some different direction, but I don't see how you can let them go forward. You've given them a dead-line until 5:00 o'clock tonight.

MR. MALSCH: I think the status is that they are all sitting around in a hearing room waiting to hear from the Commission and getting sort of upset about what's going on and wondering why no order.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: If we're going to continue this subject --

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Let me make a proposal. I think we're in the following situation where I think it's the best for all parties involved and I think also for the Commission is to tell them to -- I don't know what to tell the courts but at least let's talk about what we want.

I would say, let's not let them keep working on the schedule.

you leaving them with the deadline of 5:00 o'clock tonight?

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Five o'clock tonight?

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: To do what? I'm sorry.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: Monday -- noon Monday.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Monday? I thought -- okay.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: I think Fred had said, yes, he'd like to leave that.

well, fine. Noon Monday.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Then I'd plan to put out my views by 5:00 o'clock.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: All right. I would propose

don't let them keep scheduling. Just stop the scheduling. Set a meeting for May 7.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Wait a minute. I didn't understand that part. I thought you said --

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: He -- now, I'm making my proposal. My proposal is.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Oh, okay.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: My proposal is, tell them to stop scheduling.

COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: Disregard the the order that was read to them on the phone.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: That's right.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Disregard the order. We will issue an order on perhaps Monday -- I hope it's Monday -- that says we're going to hold a briefing meeting on May 7, starting at 10:00 a.m.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Is that the following week?
COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: A week from Monday.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: A week from Monday, right.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: They wouldn't be ready Monday, they wouldn't be ready Tuesday, and there's travel all the rest of the week.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: Right.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: So the next first day is Monday the 7th and besides I think they need some time.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: May 7, 10:00 o'clock, oral argument.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: "Oral argument," that's the word I was looking for.

COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: And what are they going to argue?

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: And they argue on the substance of the issue. I would also suggest that they make comments about schedule, at that point, if the substance of the issue turns out such that there is to be a hearing.

We would try to make a decision promptly, but we would not expect the hearing to start until some reasonable period of time after we issue our decision. Now, I could amplify on what I think is reasonable. But no additional comments to go with that.

COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: What?

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: No additional comments to go with the order.

COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: Well, you lose me.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: What would you want to do?

COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: I am dismayed at apparently what has occurred today, of which I have not been privy to any, and I'm not prepared to make a decision at 4:25 at the end of a long week and I assure you my comments, whether it's picking up the phone and calling NRC or attached to an order.

will give you more will give you more trouble than Jim
Asselstine's has on the original order. This is no way to do
business and I will not be a party to it.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: What do you think we should do?

COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: What we decided yesterday afternoon, pure and simply. I will reiterate the whole circumstances if anything gets changed.

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: Well, but the thing is, Tom

COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: There's no "well, but" to me, Fred, because you've lost me.

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: I'm not convinced we have anybody but we've run out of time and the point is, one way or another, this thing is going to be delayed and, quite aside from what details and procedure we follow between now and Monday or'Tuesday, that whole proceeding is delayed at least to the order of a month and, if we do nothing between now and then, it's going to be longer than a month.

There's no way to avoid the delay and we just plain didn't have enough time to do things before very late in the day on Friday, that's all, and I apologize -- I don't apologize because it's simply a matter of doing our work but nobody sitting at this table has seen a final version of this thing, yet. I was just trying to seek some middle ground,

12

15

14

16

18

19

21

22

24

25

here, where we could do everybody a favor.

I don't think we're doing ourselves any favors if we do nothing. That's all. We're certainly not doing licensee any favor.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: My preferred position would be to go out with the order and no additional remarks, but I gather that is not acceptable to those who want to put additional remarks.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: Well, for myself, I think what you have described would be satisfactory to me and I don't think I would need additional remarks.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: But Tom would put additional remarks.

COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: I would add additionally remarks.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: So you would have Tom's remarks.

COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: Absolutely. No question
CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Let me ask Jim the following,
just so I know what my options are:

There are two sentences particularly that bothered me in your additional remarks. One, it says at the end of the first-paragraph, "indeed, it makes no sense to allow the licensing board to proceed with the hearing because a majority of " commission now questions the basis for the

1 2 3

4 5

7

8

10

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

25

hearing." I don't know that.

The other is where you say, "There are serious questions regarding fundamental failure of the hearing board," but the one that says, "procedural irregularities associated with certain action by the Chairman of the Commission which bears some relationship to the case."

This is the first time I've heard you say that. It shocks me and it is very difficult for me to address a baseless assertion at this late time, except to say that.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Let me just interject here that I've written a brief paragraph, which I haven't circulated, which just says I agree with Jim's views and repeat the first item about -- I'm not sure I used the same wording, but I say, "Commission majority agrees that the proposition of the general design criteria do not apply to low power operating licenses. The basis for this hearing should be reexamined by the Commission before the start of the hearing."

I think that's true. That's the way I took Fred's remarks.

CHAIRMAN FALLADINO: If that's Fred's vote or not, we never voted on it.

-- COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Well, I think the clear expression of the position was that that was the case.

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: I think everyone here needs

to understand that I made a decision to write this memo last night and I began writing it this morning and the thing sort of ballooned, as we tried to seek some reasonable accommodation on the thing.

These-are my views and the Commission is free to do with it whatever it wants. So I put this on the table, at this point, for all of you to look at. Joe, it's one option that I wish you would consider.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: With Tom's additional remarks

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Well, what is Tom going to say?

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: It beats me, but -COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Why don't you ask him?
Tom, what are going to say?

COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: I'm going to say how we caved in. I'd say, clearly, Joe is willing to do virtually anything to prevent Jim from making those comments.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: No.

COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: No, let's not objurgate.

Come on.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: I was trying to keep the court

COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: No, Joe.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: I don't think I'd worry

5 6

8 9

. 16

about Tom's remarks.

COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: Good. Don't.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: Joe, if I understood your proposal, it was that we'd hold oral argument on May 7, the parties wouldn't have to do anything more on schedule until them, or anything more in preparation for the hearing, we'd trying to make a decision promptly, and then, after that, we'd do whatever had to be done on schedules. If that's your proposal, I'd be prepared to agree to it and not have views.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: One thing, I am not caving in because you put that statement in there. I was prepared to deal with it.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: I think the whole notion of caving in brings in -- puts a kind of emotional overlay on the thing that has nothing to do with the issues, here. The question is, what is the sensible and reasonable course.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: That's right, given what the court has done.

Why I think that's a reasonable course. If we go out with this and we start to argue about whether we have agreement on the basis, then—the court will throw up its hands and say, "I don't what's going on." If they say, well, there are improprieties, then the court will say, "Well, I would want to look into those improprieties before I go on."

I think, if you are interested in helping the licensee, that doesn't help any. It just delays it further. If we address it, we come to May 7, if we make a prompt decision -- I'm not saying how I'm going to decide on it -- then we can proceed.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: You know, Tom, the fact of the matter is I really believe firmly that you are heading up a legal blind alley and you are leading the applicant up that alley, too. This is just going to lead to a big legal mess. Now, it's all very well to sit here and express your support for nuclear power and maintaining discipline, and all that sort of thing, but the fact of the matter is, you are creating a mess and it's going to be bad for everybody, on all sides.

There's a basic question here that needs to get sorted out. The licensing board has taken a big step forward in interpreting regulations and that needs to have either the approval or redirection by the Commission before this thing can go anywhere because it's going to be back here and it's going to be back in court, if you go in some different direction.

Now, after you have had this review of the issue, if there is a majority on the Commission to support that licensing board, you will have lost a week or two. If there isn't, then you will have saved yourself a lot of grief. It would be better to discover that in a week or two than to

discover that after the hearing has taken place. God knows whether it will take place.

month's delay, more or less, whatever the time-table turns out to be. It can only get worse, if we do nothing. I think that's the bottom line and how we avoid doing nothing and avoid making a time-table worse, if you only consider that single issue, is open to any amount of creative thinking but I just think that we have got to do something. Otherwise, it only gets worse and the court has now made it a month worse. There is just no way around that.

MR. PLAINE: Mr. Chairman, can I intervene briefly. I was hoping that, since we are dealing, basically, with a procedural matter, that we could maintain some collegiality here that doesn't frighten the court into believing that we can't even agree on a simple order for setting a time for a hearing and making the whole process go away.

If we are going to each put on different views on what our timing proposition means, you inevitably set the court off to thinking, "My God, this thing is so completely bad that we're going to have issue maybe a permanent injunction, let alone a preliminary injunction.

Now, we've had this fresh delay already. You are following a procedure that you came very close to agreeing on last Monday and it would help the law suit to go away and let

us get on with the business of the low power license or not, whichever it turns out to be. I would hope that the Commission could refrain from making of a simple time issue, coupled, of course, with an indication of why we are doing a little bit more than that, something that the court could read and understand and say to all of the parties, "Go ahead. God bless you. We don't have to intervene in this matter, at this point.

I'm fearful, whether it is new additional views that we haven't seen, that that kind of thing will really destroy any hope of recognizing this body as a collegia! body and I just don't think you are being fair to yourselves when you do that.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: I guess I'm not clear on precisely what you are saying. Are you telling Tom not to write his views?

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: I think so.

MR. PLAINE: I would hope so.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: I think that's what he is suggesting.

COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: He's not telling Jim not to

Lor

COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: No, no way. I'm sorry.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: I don't think anyone is going to pay any attention to Tom saying that the Commission is caving in, frankly. It will upset --

COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: Oh, it will be pretty detailed.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: It will upset J.Q. Worth, or somebody like that.

COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: The people who watch this minutia will certainly get the message.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: I mean, I'll ready it will interest.

(Laughter.)

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: But I don't think it's going to make any difference in court.

COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: Good.

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: Look, are we going to sit around arguing about caving in or are we going to try and discuss the issue and what we might be able to agree on.

It's possible there may be some grounds for agreement here, if we focus on it.

COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: I must say. Tom, you are not doing LILCO any favors, here.

-- COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: I don't have any obligation to do LILCO any favors.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: I understand that.

COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: Quite the contrary.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: What I'm saying is, I take you to be concerned about LILCO getting a fair shake here and, if they've got a way of getting started, you want them to be able to get started. Now, is that unfair?

COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: That's a little strong. If you think I'm running up and down the hall saying, "My God, we've got to license Shoreham, you're dead wrong."

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: No, I haven't seen you running up and down the hall.

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: I don't see it serves any purpose to characterize each other views. Let's figure out just what we are going to do, here.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: I like Joe's proposal.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Well, I wrote it down. Meet on May 7 -- oral argument on May 7. Substantive matter.

Comments on schedule. The Commission decision reasonably promptly -- and I put in parenthesis that this is not for publication but for us -- by the end of the week, by May 13.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: Okay.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Allow reasonable time after decision before start of hearing -- I would say a week. I think that's reasonable.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: In light of the court decision, I don't think it is reasonable.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: You have to have the same schedule --

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: I'm sorry. When I say, "Start a hearing," I mean --

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: Negotiating the schedule, at that point.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: -- I meant before you would start discovery or that part of it, or the hearing process.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: So, that's the point where you negotiate out.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: It seems to me that, whatever that schedule that is, it would have to be the same schedule that you would have set early next week under different circumstances.

In other words, whatever is reasonable ought to get translated.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: It also depends upon how we resolve the issues at the oral argument, too.

commissioner Gillinsky: Right. Well, let me just go back to Tom here, for a minute. Is your concern one of just being consistent with the early decision?

COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: Yes, that's an element of it. I thought, yesterday afternoon, we had agreed on what we were going to do. Now, all of a sudden, we're not agreed and, I'm sorry, I don't have much stomach for that.

with.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Well, I can understand that.

COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: Okay?

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: It something I can identify

(Laughter.)

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: I think we've got to get off the dime.

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: May I ask one procedural thing, here. I don't understand what happens between now and Monday. Why is it not possible for us to simply overlay, add, amend, whatever we did yesterday with some new and additional conditions?

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: I'm sorry, I didn't understand.

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: What happens between now and Monday, with respect to those parties agreeing or not agreeing and at what point do we have to step in?

MR. PLAINE: All we said in the order was that, if they hadn't reached that agreement by noon on Monday, we will step in.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: But I think the question is, why make the parties negotiate something over the weekend if, for all practical purposes, the Commission --

MR. MALSCH: The parties are not negotiating

anything or any aspect of the order until they see a written order.

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: Why not let them try and negotiate an agreement on it now?

(Simultaneous conversation.)

MR. PLAINE: Would you say it again, Fred. They are all talking at once.

COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: Yes, I'm sorry.

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: I'm just saying, why not give them the opportunity to try and agree.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: They're not going to agree. I think it is not playing straight with them. If we are modifying the order, we ought to tell them right now that there is a new order in the works and the previous order is "non-operative."

MR. PLAINE: It is "kaput," is the word.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Or whatever the right word is.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Herzel, if you went this way, why wouldn't --

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: That still doesn't answer the question of why they should be allowed to try to agree on a time table.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Because you are changing the ground rules and what are they supposed to be devising a

time table for?

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: But we tell them exactly what the ground rules are. We can tell them exactly what the ground rules are -- here's what we intend to do, here's what we --

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: No, no. It makes no sense to talk about a schedule until you have dealt with the substantive matters. Now, there is nothing wrong in having them comment in their presentation that, if you are going to pursue this, this would be a reasonable schedule to pursue the question.

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: Well, they are free to decide that. They, of course, could decide, "We don't want to negotiate." In which case, then, we have an option.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: This is futile. We are getting close to 5:00 o'clock.

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: It's not a big point.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Let me ask one question.

Herzel, suppose we adopted this, what do we tell the court or what is that step?

MR. PL*INE: If you adopt an order of this kind, then I think we would file it with the court as indicating that we have worked out a solution for the problems that have been raised by the plaintiff and we would ask the court to dismiss.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: The question of schedule will still not have been settled. It won't end the case. What I'm saying is, after we have made our basic decision, then we have got to schedule and we can try to work on it but, if they don't agree, then we've have got to set one and that might then go back to the court.

MR. PLAINE: Are you suggesting that what you do, now, will have no reference at all to scheduling?

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: I am going to ask them if they can give their remarks on scheduling.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Herzel, wouldn't the Chairman's present proposal moot the present case before the court?

MR. PLAINE: I think it would.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: It might return to that situation if the Commission decided that it wanted to go back to its earlier view but, for the moment, it would moot the case.

MR. PLAINE: There is one other possibility, Vic. The plaintiffs, who now have a temporary order, might argue that "this is just a promise and we want the court to hold the temporary order in place until we get what we are entitled to..." Now, the court might say, "Well, all right, if that's the case, I'll continue this matter for a period of time or indefinitely," or something like, and you can come

back.

The worst that would happen to us, at that point, is that we would have a temporary restraining order against holding the oral hearing that was scheduled.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Which we --

MR. PLAINE: Which we will probably end up disbanding anyway, the way you are looking at it.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Right. It seems to me it would put the Commission in the best possible light before the court in that we would be extremely forthcoming.

MR. PLAINE: I would think so.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: The best possible light would be to go with the present order and no additional remarks.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Well, you're not going to get no additional remarks.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: That's right.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: If you want to go with the present order, I'm perfectly happy to do so and I will have this typed up and ready by 5:00 o'clock.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Fred, have you got any comment?

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: Everything I have to say is on a piece of paper.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Which, personally, we have not had time to look at and there are probably all sorts of

profound things in it.

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: Had I stuck to my projected original intent, it would have been much shorter.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: Fred, do you have a problem with Joe's proposal?

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: I understand that -CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: I am going to take a lot of
flack for this from a lot of places.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: I understand that.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: My position was, until about 1:00 o'clock or 1:30, to stick with the old order and to ask you to withdraw those two sentences.

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: Let me see if I understand what you are proposing. You are essentially saying that on the 7th we meet and hear from the parties on the on the policy issue and decide, shortly thereafter --

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: They can also make comments on the schedule.

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: At the same time -- well, okay.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: Decide, shortly after that, on the policy issue. No further negotiations on schedule. No further prehearing work until after the Commission makes its decision.

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: And that satisfies the

court, in your judgment?

MR. PLAINE: I think it would. It would indicate to the court that you are really now taking a good look at the whole thing.

MR. MALSCH: One thing that might help us to make it clear is that the board's whole schedule is hereby vacated by the Commission.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: Yes.

MR. MALSCH: That is implicit in all this. It is a necessary corollary to say it up front. We absolutely should present the entire case before the district court. You no longer have an order restraining.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: I honestly think this is the most sensible course in the interest of all the parties.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: I do, too.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: My deep down gut feeling is to go with the old order. I'm just having trouble with that.

commissioner Gilinsky: What we have got are some people on the side-lines who are looking at this and don't have a very clear idea of what the details are and, you know, they pick sides and they see a good side and a bad side but have not involved themselves in the complexities and don't understand the consequences of coming down one course or another.

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: Two things have changed.

The court has introduced a month's delay.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: How do you know it's a month?

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: Well, I'm not an expert.

What does counsel say?

MR. PLAINE: At the very least it's a month.

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: If we do nothing for a month, and then this thing comes back at us and we delay another two, three, four weeks, that's not a sensible way to proceed, it seems to me.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: So, part of this is to vacate the current schedule.

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: The situation was different a week ago. The situation before was not one where we had a certain month's delay. The question is whether we might introduce a week or ten days delay which we chose not to do.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Let me ask a question. I was going to ask whether Fred supports the -- the Chairman asked about it. Are you going to support this approach?

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: I'm going to wait to hear from the Chairman before I decide what to do, here.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Well, contingent on the Chairman's approving it, that's what I'm saying.

.. COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: Pardon me?

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Contingent on the Chairman.

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: Yes, I'll certainly approve

it if the Chairman feels --

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Now, I have to maintain one caveat. After I see Tom's comments, I may feel obliged to answer them.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Well, I can understand that but I must say that there's a good deal -- let's see, I guess the court has gone home.

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: About three hours ago.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: But it something that ought to be there Monday, it seems me. I think we ought to be phoning the parties by 5:00 o'clock and I think we ought to have something by Monday morning.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: If we get it by Monday, it depends on what time we get Tom's comments.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Yes.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: I amy regret it, but I would vote for this.

COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: I can't hear you, Joe. .

CHAIRMAN FALLADINO: I say I may regret it, but I will vote for it, but I want it understood that I am not, in any way, caving in because you said there are procedural irregularities. As a matter of fact, I categorically reject any implication of that, but I'll treat that as a separate matter.

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: It's just that we are in a

mess, here, and I don't think we need to worry about motives or anything else. We just make it worse for the licensee and everybody else if we don't do something in the next month.

MR. PLAINE: Would it help, Mr. Chairman, if we tried to dictate, just outside this room or somewhere, a brief one-page order to cover the points that you have got?

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Except we ought to see it.

MR. PLAINE: I mean dictate it and bring it back in here.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: I've got vacate present board schedule. Commission hear oral argument on May 7 starting at 10:00 on substantive matter -- you will have to get some different words for "substantive matter."

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: On the questions suitably phrased.

MR. PLAINE: On the issues, maybe. Is "issues" a good word?

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: On the premise in the board order and comments on the schedule.

COMMISSIONER COBERTS: Are you going to delineate the premise? Are you going to be specific?.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: That's why I hate to put anything out. I'd like to see the order before it goes out. Get Commission decision on policy matter reasonably promptly -- don't put a date. Allow reasonable time after decision

before start of hearing, if needed -- or if called for or decided upon.

We can't go on for ever deciding. I would vote for that.

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: One point. Don't we want to include in this what the policy issues are going to be?

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: I think we do.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: That's why I am hesitant about writing something up that is not complete on what the issues are.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: I have not had a chance to look at yours, Fred. I thought we had agreed on your modification or mine. So I don't know to what extent your new one is different.

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: The only essential difference is that--

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: I don't know which one you are reading.

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: -- is the third point, here, that it is also the case that we should address the possibility that the licensee might request an exemption.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: Well, they haven't requested an exemption.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: It seems to me it is up to them to submit a request for exemption. At which point, we

1 2 3

. 16

will take it up.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: Why don't you just ask that question at oral argument.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: We can ask it at any time but it is odd for us to be anticipating exemptions that haven't been asked for, particularly as grantors for exemptions.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Can I try a shorthand -COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: I thought we were trying to
set out a general policy guidelines here that's not only
related to Shoreham abut other cases as well and, if you do
that, then you want to cover the whole picture.

You could argue, on the face of it, that the regulation, itself, the plain language of it, simply doesn't permit it.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Well, nothing prohibits us from bringing it up and I'm sure you are going to get answers on the subject, but I find it awkward for us to be asking for applications for exemptions.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Let me make a suggestion. If you want a shorthand version -- Commission hold oral argument May 7 on (a) the applicability of GDC-17 to low power, (b) comments on schedule. That, at least, tells you what the substantive issue is.

Give Commission decision on applicability on GDC-17

to low power reasonably promptly. Allow reasonable time after decision before start of hearing, if decided upon -- if a hearing is needed.

MR. PLAINE: In connection with your May 7, do you still want written memoranda from the parties?

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: We're trying to write the order, which I didn't think we were trying to write but, yes, I would ask them to file --

MR. PLAINE: Ask them to file that by Friday morning?

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: If we are going to start that morning, we won't have a chance to read them.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: Yes, that would be fine.

MR. PLAINE: That would give you part of Friday.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Well, you don't have much time, if they file them Friday morning. You don't get time to read them.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: The meeting is on Monday, so you have from Friday to Monday.

MR. PLAINE: When do you want them -- Thursday noon?

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: I'm sorry, you're right. I was picture Friday was the hearing.

MR. PLAINE: The hearing is on Monday.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: All right, Friday morning.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: Friday morning.

MR. PLAINE: Friday morning, okay.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Vacate the present board schedule. Oral argument on May 7 at 10:00 a.m., (a) on the applicability of the GDC-17 to low power, (b) comments on schedule. Commission lecision on the applicability of GDC-17 to low power reasonably promptly. I don't say anything about setting a schedule. Maybe you want to put, "Allow reasonable time after decision before start of the hearing, if hearing is needed. Commission will work with parties to develop a schedule."

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: We will establish the schedule, yes.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Well, we've got six minutes to tell the parties.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Can we vote on this question.

MR. PLAINE: Do you think it is that important at
this moment, or can it be done before the night is out and
let them know that they don't have to here Monday morning or
wherever they are assembling?

We'll try to do it as close to 5:00 as we can, but -- excuse me, what are we telling the parties? If we are going to call the parties, what are we --

MR. MALSCH: You could call the parties, right now, in the hearing room, and simply orally give, say, exactly what you just said.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Well, I didn't write "establish a schedule."

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: I would suggest just telling them that we are holding up on the previous order.

MR. PLAINE: That's right.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: Holding up on the previous order --

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Just tell them that we are vacating the previous order, period.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: With an order the following Monday.

MR. PLAINE: We're confused enought, right now.
Not let's make it worse.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: I think, this time around, it ought to come out --

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Vacating the board schedule.

Vacate present board schedule.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: But, also, void yester-day's order.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Well, we never sent it.

MR. PLAINE: We'll destroy yesterday's order.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: That's right.

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: Is that just a formality to comply with what the court has already done?

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: No, no, yesterday's order. The other one is, yes.

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: The board doesn't have a schedule anymore.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: That's been vacated.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: That has already been vacated by now.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: We have to negate the telephone call we made to them, yesterday.

MR. PLAINE: Can't we say we are replacing yester-day's order --

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: -- with another order that will come out on Monday. I think, at this point, we ought not to read them anything.

MR. PLAINE: That's right.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: I like that because I don't know where it will come out on Monday.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: Disregard previous message. New message to follow.

...COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Watch this space.

(Laughter.)

COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: Don't hold your breathe.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Are we ready to vote? All those in favor say aye.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: Aye.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Aye.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Aye.

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: Aye.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Opposed.

COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: No.

MR. PLAINE: Hold it just a minute, please, Mr. Chairman. Do you want to discuss at all, very briefly, this subpoena matter or is that something for another day.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: Another day, don't you think?

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: We don't have that much time. Why don't you at least tell them what has developed? Why don't you inform us on what has developed.

MR. PLAINE: Do we need a separate meeting or can we probably regard this as part of the Shoreham meeting. itself, because it relates to Shoreham?

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Yes, I think it is related to Shoreham. I am not prepared to talk about what we do as a result of it.

AMR. PLAINE: No, but we made need a little bit of your approval. If not entirely, at least to know that we are acting in concert and information with the letter that you

sent.

The subcommittee staff director, Steven Richardson, called me this afternoon, not too long before we walked in here, telling me that the subcommittee was accepting the offer contained in the last paragraph of the letter sent Mr. Markey on the 26th, to meet with General Counsel and go over some of the things that we thought might be done to satisfy the request of Mr. Markey.

He did indicate that he needed to have that meeting with him and various other staff members who are lawyers for the whole committee on Monday afternoon at 3:00 o'clock and I agreed that we would show. We would be there.

I think I would like to be authorized to offer some of the things that we alternatively had in mind to meet in some way compliance with Mr. Markey's request, short of just releasing both the letter and the minutes of the meeting that we indicated we would withhold. If I can do that, there is the possibility that we might avoid the business of a subpoena because they are, in contemplation, going to be discussing the possibility of a subpoena with the full committee on Wednesday.

If there is no objection to my having agreed to appear -- The offer indicated that I would appear if asked -- I will do that and I will try to find ways and means of satisfying Mr. Markey's request and report back to you.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: The part of the meeting where you state our position and you probably would state why we want to withhold and they would show why we shouldn't withhold, I think you could clearly go in and, out of all of it, you may get a sense of direction.

What I am not clear on is what you do after that and I think we have to get a Commission majority, at least on the maneuvering room you have. We were starting to talk about that when --

MR. PLAINE: You were starting to talk about it but you had to interrupt yourself to pull this meeting.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: We could go through a couple of them. One might be have Markey look at the transcript and I start with a bid position of just looking at the transcript and not getting the General Counsel's advice involved here, and then give it back to us.

MR. PLAINE: I was told, Mr. Chairman, that, on a previous occasion, this kind of request was satisfied by letting the chairman of the subcommittee view and read the documents in question and then taking them back.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Rather than try to outline all the things that one might do, I'm going to suggest that we can continue to discuss options and then, on Monday, we ought to meet on the subject. Otherwise, I'm not sure where we are going to go.

We should have closed the other meeting.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: Yes. Okay.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Can we adjourn the other

meeting.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: We have stopped.

(Whereupon, the foregoing meeting was adjourned at 4:55 o'clock, p.m.)

NUCLEAR | EGULATORY COMMISSION

This is to certify that the attached proceedings before the Commission in the matter of: Discussion of Shoreham Order, held on Friday, April 27, 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.

Official Reporter (typed)

Chapter (Signature)

1 2