UNITED STATES OF AMERICA NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

In the matter of:

REPORT ON INVESTIGATIONS AT TMI AND REPORT ON ADJUDICATORY AT TMI

Docket No.

Status and Options regarding Adjudicatory Matters Exemption 10

Closed Meeting

Location: Washington, D.C.

Pages: 1 - 63

Date: Thursday, October 6, 1983

8407130041 840604 PDR FOIA DETJEN83-27 PDR

TAYLOE ASSOCIATES

Court Reporters 1625 I Street, N.W. Suite 1004 Washington, D.C. 20006 (202) 293-3950

| 1 | UNITED STATES OF AMERICA |
|----|--|
| 2 | NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION |
| 3 | REPORT ON INVESTIGATIONS AT TMI AMD |
| 4 | |
| 5 | REPORT ON ADJUDICATORY MATTERS AT TMI |
| 6 | STATUS AND OPTIONS REGARDING ADJUDICATORY MATTERS |
| 7 | CLOSED MEETING - EXEMPTION 10 |
| 8 | |
| 9 | Nuclear Regulatory Commission Room 1130 |
| | 1717 H Street, N. W. |
| 10 | Washington, D. C. |
| i1 | Thursday October 6, 1983 |
| 12 | The meeting convened in closed session at |
| 13 | 11:15 a.m |
| 14 | COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: |
| 15 | NUNZIO PALLADINO, Chairman of the Commission VICTOR GILINSKY, Commissioner |
| 16 | THOMAS ROBERTS, Commissioner |
| | JAMES ASSELSTINE Commissioner |
| 17 | FREDERICK BERNTHAL, Commissioner |
| 18 | STAFF AND PRESENTERS SEATED AT COMMISSION TABLE. |
| 19 | S. CHILK |
| 20 | H. PLAINE |
| - | J. ZERBE J. MONTGOMERY |
| 21 | R. LEVI |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |

PROCEEDINGS

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: I wonder if we could reconvene.

For the second part of the closed meeting, there are two major issues I think we should address. I am going to propose an order in which we would address them.

However, I am willing to reverse them if people think they would like to reverse them.

First, I would like to discuss the question of where do we go from here in making a restart decision. We currently appear to be on a track which likely will not allow, a restart decision before mid to late next year, even if then.

My question is are there alternative approaches we should consider that might make an earlier decision possible?

Secondly, we have a related issue on how to allocate the remaining investigative work between OI and the Licensing Board. ALAB 738 identifies the possibility that OI and the Boards will both be investigating the Hartman matter and we need to address whether Commission guidance is to be provided and, if so, what that guidance should be.

Now, unless you would like to reverse the order,

I would propose that we turn the meeting over to OPE to

lead us through their thinking on the first matter and then treat the next one by having OGC make the presentation. I am willing to go either way.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Well, then why don't we proceed with OPE introducing the first subject.

MR. ZERBE: Just as a matter of some of the documents that we have sent to you recently to put them in the right perspective of what we are talking about here today, on the 9th of September we sent you a revised schedule that updated the various aspects of the restart decision. The earlier one was back in June.

Back then on September 23rd we sent you additional comments relative to that schedle and it came out of reviewing the schedule and some observations that occurred to us and many of those things have been discussed here earlier at least in outline form.

Where we felt with the scheduling stretching out as far as it was and with the Board getting involved with some efforts that were duplicating what were being done by OI, we felt that there was a need to look at the broad issue of whether the Board should continue with OI or whether one or the other should take the lead and the other one step aside.

| 8 | What I wanted to do at least for a half hour |
|------|---|
| 9 | is go |
| 10 | (Laughter.) |
| 11 | CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: We are scheduled to go |
| 12 | until 12:30. |
| 13 | COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: Are we! |
| 14 | (Laughter.) |
| 15 | COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: Oh, all right, sorry. |
| 16 | CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: We are scheduled to go to |
| 17 | 12:30. Well, we haven't gotten to the hard part of the |
| 18 | meeting. |
| 19 | COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: That is right. |
| 20 | (Laughter.) |
| 21 | CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: I would like to discuss |
| 22 | possible approaches to see whether or not are we going |
| 23 | to proceed and wait for everything that is shown on this |
| 24 | schedule, plus whatever else might come up, or are there |
| 25 | alternative ways of approaching a decision short of waiting |
| | for all those things? |
| - 11 | |

Now I have been talking to my staff and Bill Reamer came up with a number of options that we might consider, and at least I wanted to walk through these and see what kind of reactions we got and whether there are other things that the Commission wants to do. It would be nice if we could say that we have a consensus and we are ready to go, but I would at least like to through the items.

I went over these last night and I thought they were worth reproducing and giving to members of the Commission. So we walked them around this morning and I have a few extra copies for people that need to participate that don't have them or if you didn't bring your copy with you.

Do you have one, Rick?
MR. LEVI: No.

(Copies were distributed to those that didn't have them.)

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: This is a draft working paper.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: It is a working paper.

Among the things that he listed was, first,
the present approach where OI completes investigations,
NRC staff revalidates management competence/integrity
position, Board completes hearing on Hartman and rules on

other reopening issues and completes those hearings, and Commission makes immediate effectiveness decision, and that could be anywhere in the dotted area of the OPE chart.

A sub-option, the Commission makes immediate decision after OI completes investigation and NRC staff revalidates management's position, but before the hearings are complete.

That is one.

The second one is Commissioner Gilinsky's total quarantine. And, as I understand it, the Commission issues order which which describes ---

(Laughter.)

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Well, it is not one to be ruled out categorically.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: It is more the characterization I think, the "total quarantine."

(Laughter.)

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Incidentally, Bill prepared it for me and he doesn't mind using words like that when talking to me. He didn't anticipate that I would ask him to reproduce this for everybody.

The Commission issues order which describes the current impasse on management issue and identifies the option of a new entity to operate the plant; if a new entity is substituted, Commission makes restart decision based on

1 management qualifications of that entity; further hearings 2 on that entity before a Commission decision may be needed. COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: That is what I want to 3 know. Could we have some advice on that? What is the likelihood of that happening? 5 6 COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Well, I think you would 7 have a hearing of some kind or other. 8 CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: I think if GPU went and hired ---9 10 COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: That is not a question 11 mark? 12 CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Well, it was in Bill's mind 13 when he wrote this, but I do believe if GPU went out and 14 hired somebody to run the place for them, we would have 15 to change the license and I think that would require a 16 hearing. 17 MR. PLAINE: There will be some kind of a hearing 18 I am sure. 19 COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: But you might avoid the kinds of wide range of competence and integrity issues 21 that we now have. 22 CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Tom was suggesting that 23 we cross out the question mark and we actually take away

COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: Yes. We must be realistic.

24

25

the parentheses.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Item 3 or option 3, a partial quarantine. This is below Dieckamp in shorthand. Commission issues order which describes impasse over management issue and asks whether licensee is willing to remove temporarily Arnold (but not Clark) and any other TMI-1 employee below Arnold who can reasonably be implicated in any matter under OI investigation; if licensee agrees and develops a suitable proposal, Commission makes restart decision based on management qualifications of non-quarantined TMI-1 management; further hearings on the management competence of the nonquarantined management before a Commission decision he raises as an open question.

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: Have we borrowed this term from the Department of Defense or Center for Disease Control?

(Laughter.)

MR. LEVI: On the question of further hearings let me point out that even if you have further hearings on the merits questions, that does not necessarily preclude the Commission from making an immediate effectinveness decision.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Are you saying that if --MR. LEVI: Even under the total quarantine
approach, if the Commission found that there was no reason
for keeping the shutdown order immediately effective, it

| 1 | could probably lift the immediately effectiveness and then |
|----|---|
| 2 | have hearings on the merits. |
| 3 | MR. PLAINE: That boggles the mind. |
| 4 | (Laughter.) |
| 5 | COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: Yes. I agree with |
| 6 | Herzel. |
| 7 | CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: What is that? |
| 8 | COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: Herzel said it boggles |
| 9 | the mind and I agree with him. |
| 10 | MR. PLAINE: That is one that you call a techincal |
| 11 | possibility. |
| 12 | (Laughter.) |
| 13 | COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Rick is saying that |
| 14 | legally you could do it. |
| 15 | CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Yes. Now sub-options. |
| 16 | Quarantine below Arnold; Quanrantine below Kuhns. |
| 17 | I think the basic one that is being shown |
| 18 | here is the partial quarantine below Dieckamp. |
| 19 | COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: I think one point that |
| 20 | this, or at least one of the paragraphs here doesn't do |
| 21 | full justice to is that it may involve just .a lot of people. |
| 22 | When you say anyone who can reasonably be implicated in any |
| 23 | matter of OI investigation, that may just be a lot of names. |
| 24 | COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: Yes. In fact, if you |
| | |

look at who got the Keaton report, it goes to Dieckamp and

it goes to Kuhns.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Well, there are certain assumptions made in every one of these. This is a very short-hand list, but I think it can be helpful in seeing where . we want to focus.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: He has an option called Help.

(Laughter.)

which describes the impasse over the management issue (and the likely schedule to resolve that impasse if the present approach is followed to conclusion) and asks whether parties believe some other approach is preferable; then licensee possibly makes a proposal; and if proposal is acceptable, Commission adopts that approach to a restart decision.

A sub-option, include in the order Jack Zerbe's idea of requesting comment onwhether to give investigative lead on some or all matters to the Board, but I wouldn't throw that in for the moment.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: No.

MR. ZERBE: I don't know why that is in there.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: I said I wouldn't throw
that in.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: Jack is withdrawing

it.

(Laughter.)

MR. ZERBE: It is a different subject.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Jack didn't put this together. This was Bill Reamer trying to help me see where the options are and I am providing it because I thought it might be helpful to all of us. Incidentally we were going start with this and then go to the ALAB, but it seemed like ALAB came along and we wanted to do it.

Another option task force. Commission creates special group within the NRC staff to do what it takes.. to develop a staff position on the management issue; this task force has power to make an inquiry into all matters under investigation by OI, for limited purpose of developing all the facts as they relate to TMI-1 report. Ultimate responsibility to conduct full investigation and to follow up on wrong-doing suspcions remains with OI; task force develops the staff's management competence/integrity position which is basis for Commission's immediate effectiveness decision as well as further hearings before Board; Commission makes immediate effectiveness decision on the basis of staff position before hearings are completed.

Now I don't know what initial comments or reactions you have to these various approaches. I would like to see something other than the present approach because I think we have been at this so long that we are

going to run through several more Commissions if we go out to '85. We are losing both the background and some continuity of thinking that has gone on since the accident.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: It seems to me that these various options are not mutually exclusive.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: No, they are not.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: That is right.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: You could simply say that this is the track we are on with the present approach and there are some alternatives if GPU would make changes of one kind or another that would simplify things. That basically gets you into 2 and some version of 3 and 4 is just a ---

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Two and three are the ones that I am focusing on.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: But in any case, the alternative to some change is that we continue on one.

COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: What was that, Victor?

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Well, the alternative to some change which we ourselves I don't think can effect, or we at least can't do it all ourselves, would be simply that we continue on the course we are on. I think making that clear would probably produce some changes.

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: I agree. I think the way I read this, No. 4 is the one that might present some

new thoughts and perhaps a rapid solution that does not in the end present the Commission with this dilemma at least as I see it that I sort of opaquely referred to in the public meeting of just how deeply we should get into managing a utility.

Five may expedite the path that we are on right now. It might expedite No. 1, but you will still be confronted I think with 2 or 3 at some point.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: That is why I think it is so important just to lay out the present course, and whether in fact that ends up being what happens or not, it is barring some change ---

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: I have no objection to laying out what the present course is. We have been focusing on changing all along.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: So we will make it a loose-leaf notebook or something., and just say the consequence of everyone hanging fast to where they are is that we are proceeding down this course which is pretty slow.

Now you can stop there or you can go further and say that you think some changes would be advisable or would present us with a different proposition. I think I would do that. But in any case, I think the most important thing is to lay out what the prospects are, and

I think that will produce some changes in the Board and elsewhere.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: It sure in the hell would. Excuse me French.

(Laughter.)

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: It is all right. It is a closed meeting.

say go to Duke Power and sign a contract and do this and do that, but we can say to continue as we are means that we are going to be moving very, very slowly for a long time. I think that is the case. I mean no matter how we address things, we will improve it a little bit and make it a little bit more sensible, but still that is the situation. The bit question mark is will the results of these investigations and so on develop information that will in effect force a reopening of a hearing. Then kind of all bets are off at that point.

GOMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: I would just agree I guess with the procedural difficulty that Victor points out. We may all end up at very different conclusions on what the Commission's role should be on these management issues.but if we continue along a path, and it looks to me like we are, where the half life of the procedure is longer than the half life of the Commission, we are just

inviting ourselves into another situation of something that never ends it seems to me and we ought to look very carefully at where we are headed and try and figure out a way to expedite it, it seems to me, and let the chips fall where they do and the Commission can make up its mind then on this question of management and what to do on it.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: Except I do think that Victor's point is correct, that to a large extent the present approach is driven by what we have before us. The present approach is dictated by the utility's desire to continue with its present management and personnel

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: They did make a proposal.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: They did make a proposal, that is right, which would be some version of a partial quarantine, but I thiink if we make it clear that if the approach continues as it is now, which is to use the same management and people, then this is the course we are on and here is when it might lead to some kind of a resolution. It really is up to them and to the other parties to propose some kind of an alternative formulation that might result in a more expedited approach.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Jim, could you refresh my memory. Did we reject their proposal? I don't think we ever formally rejected it. We have such a proposal before us.

-

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: I guess that is what I remember

MR. MONTGOMERY: As I recall, you objected to the staff's proposal and not the GPU proposal.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: That is right, we rejected the staff's proposal, to my knowledge.

GPU proposal. So we have such a proposal before us and maybe one of the things we need to do is act on it.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: We may, if we followed No.

4 say we do have that proposal before us and we don't feel

it is complete or as gratifying as we want at this time

and we would encourage further development of that proposal.

That may be one way to handle that.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: There are some new realities here. When we were looking at this earlier the staff was straining to say yes. I mean they just don't want to be the ones who are saying ---

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: They don't want to be up front.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: They don't want to be out in front on this one and they don't want to take the responsibility. It was just very different before, and that is why earlier you could talk about removing one little

stumbling block or one person or another and now it is just pretty clear they aren't comfortable with it and all of the sudden you have 262 documents to look at. So that is definitely a new situation I think.

make a proposal building on Fred's and yours and Jim's and other comments, that we try a version of No. 4 that say we have gotten to this impasse and here is what it looks like if we continue on the way we are going and that we really feel that if a reasonably prompt decision -- prompt is not the right word -- but one in the near future has come about that it is going to take some different action from just following that and we are looing for other approaches. We did have the one from GPU and while we found it interesting, we didn't think it went far enough, and then ask for other proposals.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: I would say if you wanted to go beyond that, too, and even list say 2 and 3 as possibly options, that that would be acceptable to me.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: I don't know when the lawyers think it through whether or not that gives them any problem, the second part.

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: I have difficulty with that as a policy matter at least in just making a quick

gut judgment. I think we need to discuss that because it seems to me it is a major policy issue whether we begin to get into that kind of scrutiny and recommendation, detailed recommendation on management.

It seems to me what Joe is proposing here, and in fact if it is consistent with Victor's earlier comments and desire that we lay out a fairly firm timetable, in a sense you have made kind of a decision then. You have listed the time line for the utility to make a decision. This is the way it is going to be and it is going to take this many years, I am afraid, if we conintue the way we are right now. You need to be cognizant of that and make a decision.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: I accept your comments.

Going back to what I was thinking of and referring to the proposal they did make, I believe we ought to be a little more constructive and we ought to at least raise some questions about that if we are going to refer to it, but maybe while OGC and OPE are preparing a possible approach to this, we could take a look at that and come up with some specific questions because if you say well, it wouldn't go far enough, they don't know what that means.

That would be one approach and I would suggest that we try to get OGC and OPE to do that. The question is in what time frame. Now the reason I raise that question

(.

12"

is because my time frame for immediate action is tomorrow at 12:30, in 24 hours. That may be too tight a requirement for them. Another time frame is when I got back, but there is a whole time frame in between and it may be something that ---

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Well, it seems to me that we could deal with something like this.

explain the impasse and do we need some other proposals if we are going to deal with this question. Now the only problem with saying that is if GPU's answer is we gave you a proposal and you never acted on it, and I was sahing well, let's refer to that and give them some guidance based on that. Then that document could go out.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: I mean you can even put on here tentative and not endorsed by the Commission, I mean all that kind of stuff, and this is the way it looks to them.

tentative projections of completion dates for major issues.

Now would you go along with having OGC and OPE try to develop an approach such as Item 4, recognizing that we already have the GPU proposal?

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: Yes. That would be fine with me. I think if you want to go beyond to make comments on the GPU proposal, I guess the principal comment that I have is that I think to be a workable approach you really have to separate out all of the people that are implicated by all of the investigations that are now going on. I guess my big concern is how feasible is it to do that with a partial quarantine, because I think these things are just pervasive. They go everwhere in the organization.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: I started out a different way. I started out in saying let me try assumptions, and my first assumption was let's assume that Dieckamp is clean and everybody above him is clean and then what do we do? If I took that assumption, I had to make another one, and that is that the TMI-1 leak rate investigation is not going to identify falsification by people who are not on the staff.

I thought that was not an unreasonable assumption because we are talking about 30 questionable ones

ī

out of 1200, and if they wanted to cheat they could have cheated over a longer range. I am just justifying my assumption is not implausible and that it is not impossible if you are making leak rate tests that goes over a period time that somebody goes over and sees a tank that is low and says oh, I had better bump this water level up and even though it might show on the computer the guy that is doing the test might not look at it. I just think it is not implausible. I am not saying it is plausible, but that is one of the partials.

I think in the GPU proposal Ross was an open question and I would say don't make that an open question, and until Ross is proved otherwise, he is quarantined.

What I was getting at is try to get something written that explains our impasse, include something like this and ask for a proposal. Then I think you almost have to refer or say something about the GPU proposal. I would say if something comes to where it is so definitive that all four of your agree while I am gone, I would say go ahead. If you want to wait until I come back, well, that is an option. But I do think we need to say something, and we need to say something reasonably soon.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: I agree with that.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: I don't think it is something that we should demand by 12:30 tomorrow.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Let me say I think I

1

2

3

5

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

would go with a piece of paper like this and simply say that the Commission is going to speak to this further and wait with that until you come back.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: If we are going to try to get a decision before all these items are completed, we need some alternate proposals and we welcome them from anybody, but we particularly need them from the licensee.

MR. PLAINE: Mr. Chairman, do you visualize this as building on the proposal that GPU put in and that we are in effect drafting a reply to that which says to them please give us a little stronger proposal because?

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Well, I started out picking up on Fred Bernthal's suggestion that No. 4 is a good way to go and ask for a proposal. Then I remember we had that proposal and I said you can't really ask for a new proposal when you have already got one unless you speak to the one you have. So I would suggest that we ought to speak to it one way or another.

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: Let me just make a comment. I must say I do have some problems. If the time line is worded in such a way that it is stacked knee deep with qualifiers that we have not really realistically laid out for them exactly what the timetable is likely to be, and I think we all have a pretty good sense for that and I don't think it is fair for the utility, and it is

not fair to the Commission at some level to waffle on that issue. In one sense we have tossed the money on their back then and avoided our responsibility if we don't come forward with something that is pretty firm, it seems to me.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: All the estimates have gone up by a very, very large factor in the last several months, and they have gone back and forth over the past several years. You can just give them the best sense of what you have and it depends on a lot of things.

I think one thing you can say is it can only longer than what you have.

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: That is frankly my concern. I am concerned that we give them a timetable that is unrealistically short, if anything.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Well, I think the qualifiers, depending on how these things turn out, you may be on the dotted line. Now if it turns out great for them, they won't be on the dotted line. I am a little skeptical from the way Ben was talking whether he can meet an April 1 deadline. But anyway, let's suppose you accept that or maybe it is just missed by a couple of months or something like that. The real-question is what kind of years question, and is that then going to force reopening of a hearing.

Now I think when a Commission has been sitting around on a case for four years which involves management integrity and it says that at this point it can't decide that question for another year or maybe even two, that speaks volumes about what the Commission thinks. You know, you ought to get this stuff up to the line at that point and just say the fact of the matter is we are pretty uncomfortable with this crowd, or otherwise you just go in there and you vote yes.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: If you get down to the meat of that ---

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: You can do that. (Laughter.)

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: My inclination would be to consider seriously a modified version of the GPU plan, and by modified I would have to have some clarity on what Arnold's position is, it wasn't clear, and I would say since Ross is in question, let's take Ross out. That would be one approach.

I wanted to understand Fred's question a little bit more. You said we are shirking our responsibility by not proposing something?

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: Well, there are a couple of questions. One is what we owe to the utility in terms of being straightforward about what our sense is. We may

not have anything approaching a consensus on what our opinion is on the question of management integrity and is this going to drag on and on and are we continually going to find reasons to defer a decision on this to the point where you are hitting them with a glove fist really and not with the straight story in saying in effect that this just isn't going to work and there has got to be some major change. That is what worries me, for example, about qualifiers that give the impression that it could go either way, and a timetable, it would worry me about another modification of the GPU plan.

It also, once again, allows us to avoid the policy decision of do we really want to get into management questions in detail.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Well, it is not in detail. It is the very opposite of detail. You are really dealing with the overall issue, because going about and asking about this or that person, whether Ross lied and was he in fact working at TMI and all that sort of stuff, that is getting into detail.

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: Yes, that is what I am saying.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Well, maybe we agree and maybe we are separated by our agreement.

(Laughter.)

•

11 -

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: The reason that I think it is a good idea, assuming the Commission sees some merit in it, in at least suggesting the possibility of some alternatives is that they don't know from their part whether it is worth getting into any of these other possibilities and now they are just going to get up some other blind alley. Is the Commission then saying they go off and they will contract with somebody and they will come back in and the Commission will say no, we didn't have that in mind at all.

If we indeed think that is a simpler route, and I do, then I think you have to indicate you are willing to entertain it at any rate or some other possibilities, whatever other changes you think are possibilities. Because otherwise they will come in or they will butcher their organization or something and come in and you tell them no, you really have to get something else.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Well, all that we can do is respond to proposals. I am sure they say that is our starting point and now what didn't you like about it, and I have a feeling we have to tell them what we didn't like about it.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: We probably don't see eye to eye down the line on this one, but my own feeling is that we have kind of gone past these proposals when you

talking about particular persons in or out and so on.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: We are talking about principals.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: I think the staff has gotten past that point. That is what I sense. They really are uncomfortable. A lot of things have come out and they had assumed that -- well, I guess things have come out which seemed to have surprised them. Harold was surprised at various reports that were shown to him, and so on and so forth, after they had gone down the line for three years and testified in favor of restart and stood there arm in arm with GPU in the hearing and I think at this point they really don't want to be doing that any more and I don't think we are going to get favorable statements from the staff.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: What do you propose we do?

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Well, I think the most powerful thing we can do which is pretty simply and that is to put out a schedule.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: But I think without some words, I don't think we are doing any of the parties a service.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Well, the words that

I would use in here would be to say that the major question

in the schedule was whether when you get to the middle of '84 you feel you have got to open a hearing or not. If you don't, you are going to decide some time, and you may be a few months off, but decisions will be in this middle period. Well, I don't know. But if the results of the investigations are that things look markedly worse, then it is going to be longer. You are beyond the dotted line, and I don't know that you can say an awful lot more than that.

MR. ZERBE: If you think there is some possibility of significantly shortening that situation though, you would want to have some words to that effect that you were ---

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: The only possibility is if the Commission would choose to approve the plan for say the completion of the investigations or whatever. The Commission can certainly do it. It would surprise me, but the Commission is certainly free to do that.

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: I can't believe that anybody here really believes that it will be short.

COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: That what will be short? COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: That the process will be shortened.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Then we would take some other action.

25

24

1

2

3

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

ř

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: I think at best about all you can say is that under the best of all possible conditions if there isn't a need to reopen the hearing, a decision might be reached sometime about the middle of next year.

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: That is why I am saying is it unfair to the utility to even give that impression at any level.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: Of if you do, just make it clear that if it isn't under the best of all possible conditions you have to expect the potential for lengthy delays beyond that.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: But I think this chart does that.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Even in my proposal this chart was going out.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: I guess I am concerned that I don't think we will put something out when you are not here, and I am concerned that as a parctical matter it puts us into the middle of November. You know, if you are really going to go into the question of what they might do and the kinds of hints and signals you are sending, we are going to want to be very careful how we write that and we will be wringing or hands here and massaging the piece of paper for some time.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: You may have one alternative that is general and one that tries to deal with it. I think we need to deal with the GPU proposal.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: What I am saying is we can still do that, but at least let's get this off our back, so to speak. That will set them thinking and we can take a little longer.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: What sort of words would you put with this?

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: I frankly think it doesn't need anything because it says additional potential hearings, and it does have a dotted line.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Yes, I think it should have some words.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: What I would say is that if these investigations don't require any further action and a decision somewhere in the middle of '84 or thereafter is a possibility, and if it does, it is going to be out here at the end of the page. I don't think it is more than a paragraph. You could type it right on here.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: I would rather have a little cover letter, memo or letter. Shall we try to get OGC and OPE to put something together by tomorrow that would permit us to transmit this?

MR. PLAINE: I assume now we are not writing a paper. You are just going to issue this sort of informally.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Within the context of the statement.

COMMISSSIONER GILINSKY: With a couple of sentences.

MR. PLAIN: Is that what you want?

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: I think we have basic

consensus here at least on the next step. My concern, and I guess I am groping here myself for what we ought to do, but somehow I feel that we owe it to the parties involved to make clear, one, that the time table can be long in this process and, secondly, if we are prepared to say this that in fact the management issue could keep you shut down. I just think that those are messages that they deserve to hear however this Commission feels about the issue and might vote on the issue.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Well, I think the latter part comes through if you look at the chart.

(Laughter.)

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: That is the part that --COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: --- where the dotted
lines keep going.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Can we agree that you will try to prepare the context in the statement and see if you can't circulate it so that we get agreement.

say that if you wanted to even go beyond that you can notify people or put them on notice that we may go farther than that, that the Commission is prepared to consider alternatives, alternative management approaches that might reduce the time period and that the Commission would provide additional guidance on that in the future, if you want to at least leave open the door rather than ---

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: I like that additional point.

MR. PLAINE: YOu mean as a footnote to this?

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: As part of the explanation.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: No, no. I think it takes a cover memo that says that ---

MR. PLAINE: Well, I would appreciate if you would restate what you think this cover memo should be because we have been hearing a lot of cross things and I am not quite clear. Do you mind taking a minute and telling us?

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: That we appear to be on a course that would result in a schedule such as attached in the enclosed document or on the attachment, that we believe that the parties should be aware of this and we would be looking for possible ways of reaching a decision prior to the completion of all of the items on here and we will be back with some guideance on how we might achieve that.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Jim said it a little differently. It gets a little tricky when you say you are going to shorten it because some people are immediately going to be rushing in here or going to the courts or something.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: I was trying to pick up Jim's words and I couldn't remember them, not specifically.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: The way he said it it sounded fine to me, but if there is any question about agreeing on those, I think I would just prefer to --CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Oh, I think we all want to

agree.

Jim, if you could spend a little bit of time maybe could you help and work with Herzel.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: Sure

MR. PLAINE: All right.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: I would suggest that we try to get that out while I am still here.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Then I would suggest also that while on a travel status it might be a good idea to look at that GPU proposal and see what comments you might have on it and also what you might see as a way of proceeding beyond this first step.

MR. LEVI: Let me ask one additional question on publishing the schedule. Under hardware issues it mentions a hearing requirement on This issue is before the Commission for review. Do you want to tell the parties there is a possibility of a hearing?

MR. MONTGOMERY: It is under the ALAB 729 review line towards the bottom.

MR. ZERBE: It is just a comment on here that perhaps should be left off, or that whole dotted section.

MR. LEVI: Since you are mainly concerned with management, do you want to include hardware?

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Well, I think they should know if that if there is a hearing required before restart on the steam generator, it extends the time frame. That is one issue.

Ŧ

| 1 | COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: Under |
|----|--|
| 2 | just say if hearing required. |
| 3 | MR. LEVI: Fine. |
| 4 | CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: What are we to do on 729? |
| | Are we to make a decision? |
| 5 | MR. ZERBE: Yes, you have a paper before you now, |
| 6 | October 3rd. |
| 7 | CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Now let's say if we |
| 8 | develop anything an it can wait until I get back, I would |
| 9 | appreciate it. If there is something that requires action, |
| 10 | I am reachable by phone and I would also appreciate your |
| 11 | working with my staff. |
| 12 | MR. PLAINE: But this you want out before you |
| | leave. |
| 13 | CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: I would like to try to. |
| 14 | MR. PLAINE: All right. |
| 15 | CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: All right. Thank you |
| 16 | very much. |
| 17 | We will stand adjourned. |
| 18 | (Whereupon, at 12:38 p.m., the meeting adjourned.) |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| | |
| 21 | |