

Transcript of Proceedings NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

DISCUSSION OF MANAGEMENT/ORGANIZATION
AND INTERNAL PERSONNEL MATTERS

CLOSED MEETING
Exemptions Nos 2 and 6

Tuesday, September 13, 1983

Pages 1-78

8809300125 680916 PDR FDIA CUMMINGS84-61 PDR Prepared by:
ANN TIPTON
Office of the Secretary

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

DISCUSSION OF MANAGEMENT/ORGANIZATION AND INTERNAL PERSONNEL MATTERS

CLOSED MEETING

Exemptions Nos. 2 and 6

Room 1130 1717 H Street, N. W. Washington, D. C.

Tuesday, September 13, 1983

Pursuant to Notice, the Commission met in closed session at 2:10 o'clock, p.m.

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:

NUNZIO PA'LADINO, Chairman of the Commission VICTOR GILINSKY, Commissioner THOMAS ROBERTS, Commissioner JAMES ASSELSTINE, Commissioner FREDERICK BERNTHAL, Commissioner

time. The chief fault I can find on Cummings has to do with Hoyt and Aloot's allegation that he tried to conceal the fact that he had discussed this one report with Region III and, aside from the others, I don't find they are problems where, I would say, he should be dismissed. I don't find them. This is the only one that comes close enough to that and I'm not sure that we have all the facts or maybe we have as many facts as we're going to get.

Cummings points out that, as evidence of the fact that he didn't try to conceal this matter, is the fact that there are asterisks showing that changes had been made in the report as a result of going to the Region and getting input. However, the evidence that Helen Hoyt and Sive Aloot have indicates that the asterisks were put on there after he had signed off on the report. If that's the case, it does make me a little bit nervous.

However, it's the concealment that would give me the problem. I think on the matter of whether or not he should go back to people he interviewed to check on the adequacy of interviews, I'd say that's something we cou'd speak to and could counsel him on.

I come down to where I don't think there is enough in here to take action against Cummings. Remember, aside from finding no evidence of bad faith, it says, "Moreover, we cannot conclude that the conduct of senior

NRC officials with respect to the Zimmer investigation violate any statutory regulatory requirement applicable to this agency, nor do we find any clear evidence of the intent on any employees' part to purposefully subvert the Commission's regulatory or enforcement mission." Those are pretty strong statements and, when they come to counseling him, they don't hit very hard. They talk more about the relephone line, they talk about the hot line -- wait a minute, I'm sorry -- wrong page.

It says, "James Cummings, as a senior official in OIA, failed to exercise the high degree of judgment which should be required of a senior Commission official. We recognize that James Cummings has no monitoring function over an IE investigation but, as a quasi-inspector general, he was derelict in his duty to keep OIA alert to the status of a sensitive investigation with known health, safety, and criminal circumstances."

I think the point: that are made there are pretty well refuted by Cummings. I'm surprised they don't treat is more detail the one that comes out as the item of concern, at least when it comes to counseling.

I also considered the balance between trying to counsel Cummings in the areas that are discussed in this report or getting him better on track or just trying to go out and get a new person. I think the balance comes out

in favor of trying to keep him and counseling him to better effectiveness.

I also think that Bill Dircks' memo has a number of important, philosophical points that we ought to consider, but they apply more to Stello and Keppler than they do to Cummings.

Anybody else want to go next?

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: I'll go next. You did pretty good until the end, Joe.

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: I don't get the opportunity

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: I would have go last, first -- whatever way. That's the price of being the Chairman.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: I'll go in the same order that you did. I agree with the point that Vic made. I think we have to say whether we agree or disagree with the principal findings that Helen Hoyt and Aloot made on the people.

*

Calaria23

In Cummings, I agree with Joe. I find considerably more troubling than the other two. I'm not terribly concerned about not returning the phone calls and



taking his vacation and not having somebody follow up on returning phone calls to Applegate, but I'm very troubled by the reviewing with the regional people the investigation report and the interviews and I think it's important that it wasn't just the interviews that were reviewed with those people but the summary of the investigation report which was reviewed with those people, too, and I find troubling Helen Hoyt's conclusion that he did attempt to conceal the fact that Schnebeling had clearly directed that the changes weren't to be indicated in the report.

I think it was bad investigative practice. I think it was the same kind of investigative practice that Cummings, himself, had criticized in the regional offices in the case of Hayward Tyler and also (Narbeck). I think the supporting interviews show just about everybody else, even Schnebeling, in Cummings' office was opposed to doing that -- going out and reviewing the report with the regional people -- and I think the fact that Cummings asked Helen Hoyt for an opportunity to review this report before it went to the Commission is an indication that he still has a problem with that.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Incidentally, I wonder if that comes from this char function where the auditor's reports are sent to the people that have been audited for

7 8

any comment, suggested change. GAO does it.

feel an investigation is fundamentally different from an audit. I think it's a bad investigation practice. It's one thing to show somebody a transcript of an interview and say, "Is this an accurate representation of what you said?" And a record review of anything in there that is just incorrect imaroperly transcribed or reported, but it's quite another to take a summary of the report itself and say, "Now I'm going to read you the report and you tell me if there are anythings in there which you disagree with or that you think are wrong and ought to be changed, and then I'm going to make those changes and make sure that they are not reflected in the report."

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: This is the Region IV problem.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: Yes.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Worse.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: Worse because these are the people who criticized Region IV for doing it and yet did the same thing.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: But do you agree, going back and having them lopk at what was presumed to have been the testimony obtained from the interview --

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: I don't have a problem

with that but, even there, I think good investigating practice dictates what you do is you make it clear to everybody that that was done and you make it clear that any changes that were made were based upon that review, but I think it's pretty clear, in this case, that Cummings went beyond that and he made an effort to keep it secret.

Release

I guess my own view ca what to do about

Cummings, to a certain extent, goes back to other items that we've already discussed before. My own view is that this is a further indication to me that Cummings is not the right person for this job. I think, when you look at the Applegate FOIA request business, when you look at his handling of our dealings with the Justice Department on the Hartman allegations, the lack of documentation of those discussions with Justice, and when you look at this report -- particularly the regional review of the draft report -- it just reinforces my view that Cummings is not the right person for that job and we ought to figure out some way to move him from that job. I just don't think he ought to continue.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: You know, we have taken action on the FOIA report. That doesn't mean we can't add to a litany of things.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: That's right.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: We did assess, though, that

on the audit --

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Let's see, that one isn't over. It's not over.

not be, but we did not find great fault, or any fault, with his other function which I gather is two-thirds of his job and I think a number of the reports on the investigations have been good reports.

I took a look at this last one that OIA made that seemed to me like a good report. I'm not an expert. So, we've got to be careful that, again, we don't take a particular instance and say, well, this plus that is indicative of a person that is not doing his job. I think he does try to do his job. I am concerned about this concealment angle, I've got to admit that. That's the that troubles me the most and I guess a little bit of that same worry was associated with the FOIA request.

On balance, though, you've come down here, and I've said all I have to say.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: I think that this report, particularly when viewed in light of the other two items that we have been dealing with with Cummings fairly recently, just reinforces my view, although I'll be quite candid and say I had that view before, $\pm ec$

COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: But you might think

4 5

that's fair to cut through everything. Water can't cut us.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: You can remove him to a non-sensitive SES position.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: You say the FOIA is not finished. I'd like to make sure that you're thinking the same thing that I'm thinking or vice versa.

on the FOIA admonishment is his request. He never settled whether or not he wants these tapes.

COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: I'd like to answer that.
CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Is that what --

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Well, he's left open how he's going to react to our action and the fact that he has left it open this way. I'd find it to reflect badly on him.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: It wasn't just the -COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: It was quite an unsatisfactory response on his part, in my view, because he went
to war with the Commission and then he said. "Well. let me
think about it." He didn't say. "I'm sorry. I shouldn't
have done that. It was stupid of me to do this."

commissioner Asselstine: That's right. He just said, "Hold my request in abeyance until I decide if I want to do something further.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: You're thinking the same thing I'm thinking. Okay. I just wanted to see if there was anything more.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: I guess that finishes what I want to say.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Who wants to go next?

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: I agree with every ming.

Jim has said.

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: It's your turn. I'm the most junior member.

COMMISSIONER ROBERTS:

unfortunately, Cummings has destroyed any degree of confidence in this room.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Any degree? No, I don't agree.

COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: I only say for myself.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: I sure have.

1 2 3

8 9

here. I don't think you can take one particular. I think you did earlier on and that's fine, but I just think he's a loose cannon, now, and without getting into the substance of it, this stuff about -- what's the latest thing about Malsch and American Express? Forget the merits of that which is another issue. I think he showed incredibly bad judgment but I think he's out there -- he's a loose cannon.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: He's over-reacting.

COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: Of course he is.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: I was going to call him in and counsel him on it and then I said, "Well, if I start to counsel him on these things and the Commission takes a stronger position, it would appear, in my counseling, that I'm doing what the Commission ants to do." So I've been gun-shy, also, which may be an over-reacting. That's why I'm anxious to get going with whatever decision we're going to make.

I think, on the over-reaction, that's where counseling could very much help.

COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: I'm not sure there is anything there to be counseled.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: If he were a division head somewhere, it's one thing, or if he were in charge of

cy something

handing out contracts on waste disposal, that' one thing, but this is an extremely sensitive position and one in which a person in whom the Commission has just got to have confidence. You know, this isn't the kind of thing you decide -- you know, even if there weren't a majority for having him go, I just don't think you can keep a person in a position like that unless he really has the substantial confidence of the Cormission.

COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: I have to say I reached that conclusion but I had to be realistic.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: So what are you saying? You think he ought to be removed?

COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: Yes, I kind of think that. Now, how's that for a half-assed answer. I just think he's destroyed himself. I think we gave him some opportunity, but still.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: I don't know. We dealt fairly mildly with him on the other case.

COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: Oh, Victor, we don't think like a career bureaucrat.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Considering the situation, he could have just come in and said, "Well, okay --"

COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: We gave him a real bad bos

time, I think. Am I wrong?

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Not compared to what you

2 3

5 6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Syc

might ha	ve done. I think he could have very easily come
in here	and said, "Gentlemen, I accept the criticism. I
wish it	hadn't happened." Gone around, shaking hands with
everybod	y in the room and said, "Look, I want to work with
you."	
	COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: That would have solved
the prob	lem.
	COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: Sure. For me, it would.
	CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: But when he kept that last
sentence	in there
	COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: No, that's not what he

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Yes, he did, sure.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: He then wrote a letter.

He threatened you; he threatened us. He basically threatened a court case and he's gathering the evidence.

insisted on the tapes.

called him that he reluctantly said, "Well, I'm still willing to try to work with you."

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: No. I think in my conversation with him it was a more forthright willingness to work with us. He does take criticism very hard, as many of us do.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: And he's not very smart

3

4 5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

21

23

22

24

or else he would not have gotten himself into this situation.

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: Well, that's the final indictment.

(Laughter.)

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Let's see. How do I write this down?

COMMISSIONER ROBERTS:

Now, Cummings -- I've given you my view. That's a whole different thing.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: I was trying to write down whether you felt he ought to be --

COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: I think I will reluctantly conclude that he should not continue in that position for a variety of reasons, and I was not of that

3 4

view prior to this last round.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: I think we have to be prepared to explain to him why we've reached this conclusion.

COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: I think so.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: As a matter of fact, I think he ought to be alerted that this is the way the Commission is coming out and give him a chance to be heard. I think we have to do that so we don't give the appearance that our actions are so summary that we don't give people a chance to respond.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Now, wait a minute.

because you've got a whole organization and if I, working somewhere else, got the feeling that a colleague about whom maybe I don't the details was summarily treated. I'd be worried. I'd say, "If that's the way the Commission hardles their personnel problems, well, maybe this isn't a good place to work." And I do think we have to keep in mind all the people we do have here and I think to treat the case equitably you have to hear him out.

confidential Commission position and, to have that position, you have to retain the confidence of the Commission. It seems to me that it is an adequate answer that you no

longer have retained the confidence of the Commission.

Now, he is in the SES. One of the advantages of the SES is that the managers in this agency have some flexibility in where they put people, and I think this is a case where that pught to be exercised.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: I'm not saying we have a public meeting with Cummings, but we ought to have Cummings heard.

commissioner Roberts: I have a procedural question. Is there any question that we're entitled to do this?

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: I don't think so.

COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: Is there any question?

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: I don't think there's any question.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: I thought that's what you were addressing.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: No, I'm talking about good, sound personnel practice to go tell a person what action we're contemplating or about to take or are taking. Give him a chance to tell you any other information that he might feel appropriate for you to consider and then confirm a decision.

commissioner Roberts: I'm not -- if you're saying we ought to bring in here and confront him

4

5

7

9

8

10

12

sorry?

14

13

15

17

18

20

21

z2

23

24

with the facts and say, "Now, have you got anything that's going to change our minds," I think you're just going to dig a deeper hole.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: You meant Cummings.

COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: Cummings.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: just because the tapes on. That's the least I would do.

COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: Well, I don't have any problem with that. Let me ask you this, I'm the sole perpetrator. If this action is taken --

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: What's the action, I'm

COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: Proposing that we can Cummings, is that not what we're saying?

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Well, I don't know what you mean. We remove im from the job.

do with him. I think, dictates also the rights. McDermott probably knows better than I do. If you are going to move him within the agency and keep him in some other SES position, it's my understanding you can move him without any reason at all. Say, "We're just not confident within you in that position. We want you in some other position, and that's our decision." We don't have to give any reasons at all.

4 5

COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: No explanation is common assets of specific commissioner assets and I think we have to then come up with a set of specific

COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: What does he do -- go to the Merit Protection Board, or something?

OMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: That's right.

ways we could proceed. One way we could do it is -- I've got to leave the caveat that I would like to hear him out. but them we decide we remove him from being Director of OIA, we appoint an acting director -- it might be Messenger, although he's more strongly audit. I guess maybe solely audit, but at least he seems to have exhibited sound judgment and the audit reports are good and maybe, in large part, because of him, but we have other options as to who to put in there, but we might move him out and move Messenger acting, and then put Cummings somewhere else.

Then you have to start a procedure to replace Cummings. That could take six months.

COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: dould I ask a question?

Suppose the Commission decides to remove him from his present duties, can we turn around and say, "Here, Mr. Executive Director for Operations, here is an SES employee. Find a spot for him in the agency." Can you do that?

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: Sure.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: Yes. Or we can even pick the spot.

CHAIRMAN PALLAD NO: We can pick the spot.

COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: I'm sure we could.j

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: I've been thinking, what kind of spot could we put hom in? I mentioned this one to Jim. He has primarily been in investigations. So he's MCS talents, presumably, are investigations.

COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: Now, wait a minute. Who

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: He's talking about

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: I'm talking about Cummings.

COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: Thought his background was audit.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Well but he's also been investigations and audit. He's been critical of investigation reports. Let me finish. I'm trying to be constructive. I'm not trying to force anything down

7 8

6

10

4

12

14

15

17

18

19

21

22

24

25

anybody's throat. I'm open to any other suggestions, incidentally.

To move him out of OIA; to assist in reviewing the adequacy of the investigations. He would be doing this for Hayes, in seeing whether or not they should have interviewed Arnold in addition to somebody also, or do the criticizing that normally comes afterwards, do it beforehand. That could be constructive for 'en Hayes.

I'm goins on the premise we take advantage of whatever his talends are and put them to use. That's one way to put them to use. I'm open to any other suggestions.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: You're determined to get yourself into trouble.

(Laughter.)

CHAIRMAN PAULADINO: Tell me where else you'd put him. Go on the premise that you want to -- you've got him. You want to put him to use and you want to put him to use where he has talents. Now, where do you come out?

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: First of all, it seems to me that Jim is going to want to leave the agency.

CHAIRMAN PALLACINO: Well, that's another way of proceeding.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: And it will take a little while and it's just a matter of finding a place for

tration.

him while he negotiates a job in some other part of the Government, as he presumably will do, and I think that's perfectly reasonable. I don't think he ought to be on the street. We'll work something out. I don't see any big problem. He can be special assistant to will Dircks, that's what he can be.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: Maybe find a spot for him doing something on the administration side.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Yes.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: Office of Adminis-

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: I have another concern.

Here, he just issued a report on whether or not there was collusion at TMI-2 and, a short time afterwards, we fire him.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: I wouldn't worry.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Well, I worry about such things. It says, "Ah ha, they didn't like that he found no collusion."

COMMISSIONER SILINSKY: Did he fin. no collusion?

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Yes, he found no collusion.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: We're not firing him

because he didn't find collusion.

"HAIRMAN PALLADINO: I appreciate that. : say

you've got to --

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: No one it ren going to

COMMASSIONER ASSELSTINE: : + ...

COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: Oh, I don't know. I

would not think an, thing, today.

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: If he had found collusion and we fired him.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Well, either way.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: No.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: I am.

the more I think the OI business, is, I guess the rort causes of a lot of my concerns about Cummings are in the investigations side. I think you're going to create more problems by putting him in OI.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Is it possible to break

COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: To do what?

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Break up OIA.

CHAIRMAN PALLADING: And make it audit and put all investigations under Ben Hayes. That was another --

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Well --

COMMISCIONER ROBERTS: But you've got to have an internal oversight.

OIA.

then.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: I wouldn't do that.
CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Then I wouldn't break up

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: That doesn't help you,

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: But I could see, if you divide OI so that it has a section which is externally.

That may work.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: It seems to me you don't have to cross every "t" and dot every "i." Basically, the important thing is if, in fact, the Commission doesn't have confidence in Cummings, he cught to be told that. I think, as a result of that, he is not going to want to stay here. He'll want to look for another job, it seems to me that, once that has been said to him, ught not to continue in his investigating role but ought to be in someother capacity, perhaps, doing some special job for however long it takes for him to move. He can be attached to Bill Dircks' office, he can be attached somewhere else. I don't think it's a big problem. He'll get his salary.

COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: What are your views?

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: Nobc 's asking.

COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: Well, asking.

(Laughter.)

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: I think we ought to have

your views.

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: I thought I might get away with it.

COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: No, not a chance.

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: I feel like I've just walked into a group of people who have reading a Dickens' novel for three years and followed every character and I just picked up the book.

I certainly don't know the background of all this as well as the rest of you do. I have a question. I gather, in the case of Cummings, this is not the straw that broke the camel's back, or is it? Or is it the two by four that broke the camel's back?

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: You say you don't -
COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: Well, I don't know. It

depends on how you look at it.

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: Is It the straw that broke the camel's back or the two by four? Is there a history of difficulties with him? I gather there is.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: The only history I know of is the FOIA request where we took action. Then comes this one. Then, interlaced with the FOIA request, is his reaction that gives us some cause for concern. And those are the three things I would know about.

I don't think it's either the straw or the two

by four that broke the camel's back.

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: But something in between, though. If it were this incident taken alone, then I probably would, just from reading the materials to the extent I have, be somewhat more lenient, but it clear to me that it's not just this incident and, therefore -- look, I'm largely going to accept your management judgment on that, I think, Joe,

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: \Let me find out what you

want to do on Cummings because \ 'm doing more of what you

7 8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

want to do than what I would want to do.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Maybe we better talk to Cummings.

(Laughter.)

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: I think I've always represented the Commission as honestly as I could, but I would propose, first, to discuss with Dircks the fact that this would be an action where we would turn him over to him and so he can think about it. That was one thing.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Now, wait a minute. I would not discuss this with Dircks. We should -CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Well, if we're going to

shift --

we've got to talk to Cummings. This is not an action in which Dircks has any say.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: He doesn't have any say except (nat we are going to give him the problem.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: It's not a problem.

COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: We need a sequential one.

I think step one is tell Cummings that he no longer enjoys the confidence of the Commission. Is that not an accurate portrayal?

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Right.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: That's right.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Does that mean as of that day or is it the moment I tell him that he's no longer Director or do I tell him the Commission would be willing to meet with him to hear any additional remarks he might have to make and, depending on the results of that meeting, we would confirm this position, if that is what still maintain at 2.

confrontational guy. I assume you'd have a caufrontation

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: He may or may not. I don't know.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: But what do you want me to tell him? As of that moment, he is no longer the Director of OIA or would you be willing to hear him? I think, we ought to hear him.

COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: I have no objection to hearing him.

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: I'm willing to hear him, I guess.

COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: I don't think it's going to accomplish anything.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: We can do it in a matter of a couple of days.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Well, I think you ought to tell him that he doesn't enjoy the confidence of a

majority of the Commission. The Commission would like him to step down but would like to talk to him -- or, if he would like to talk to the Commission, the Commission would be pleased to talk with him. about it.

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: Leave him the option.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Yes, I would propose we leave him the option.

that what we contemplate is him staying on in the agency in some other capacity until he finds a suitable atch. The that's fine, and if he wanted to move on, that's okay, too.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: All right. Then I'm going to tell him that. Again, I'll probably write it all out.

Not because I would read it but because, having written it.

out, I don't mess the words.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: And there is no intent to do him in personally, or anything like that, but the situation has reached the point where we don't feel he can occupy that position.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: \ Well, these things just

24

25

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: The best I could do is possibly tomorrow morning, if I get out of here soon.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: Well, tomorrow morning is fine.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Maybe I can. Maybe I can at least talk to Cummings.

tor. really the important - -

COMMISSIONER ASSELSTINE: That's right.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: If I, for some reason, can't do it tomorrow morning, you'll know. I don't know if I'll have time to tell you what I'm going to say, but I'll tell you what I said.

(Laughter.)

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: And it will be along the lines you indicated.

COMMISSIONER GILINSKY: I hope the result is the same.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Oh, yes. Anything more that we should touch on this afternoon?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: I need a vote to withhold the tape.

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: Say it loud enough so the



tape can hear it.

(Chorus of ayes.)

COMMISSIONER BERNTHAL: Unanimous.

CHAIRMAN PALLADINO: All right. Thank you. Why don't we stand adjourned.

(Whereupon, the foregoing meeting was adjourned at 3:50 o'clock, p.m.)

Cos

Ma