

ORIGINAL

UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

IN THE MATTER OF:

DOCKET NO: 50-352 OL
50-353 OL

PHILADELPHIA ELECTRIC COMPANY

(Limerick Generating Station,
Units 1 and 2)

TELEPHONE CONFERENCE

LOCATION: WASHINGTON, D. C.

PAGES: 21353 - 21378

DATE: WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 3, 1986

TR-01
0/1

ACE-FEDERAL REPORTERS, INC.

Official Reporters
444 North Capitol Street
Washington, D.C. 20001
(202) 347-3700

8609050077 860903
PDR ADDCK 05000352
T PDR

NATIONWIDE COVERAGE

2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
BEFORE THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD

-----x
In the Matter of: :
: :
PHILADELPHIA ELECTRIC COMPANY : Docket No. 50-352 OL
: 50-353 OL
(Limerick Generating Station, : TELEPHONE CONFERENCE
Units 1 and 2) :
-----x

Room 402
Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.
444 North Capitol Street, N.W.
Washington, D. C.

Wednesday, September 3, 1986

The telephone conference in the above-entitled matter
convened at 3:14 p.m.

BEFORE:

JUDGE HELEN F. HOYT, Chairman
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D. C.

JUDGE JERRY HARBOUR, Chairman
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D. C.

-- continued --

APPEARANCES:

2

On behalf of Philadelphia Electric Company;

3

4

TROY B. CONNER, JR.,
Conner & Wetterhahn, P.C.
1747 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20006

5

6

On behalf of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania;

7

MARK GOODWIN
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania
Emergency Management Agency
Room B-151
Transportation & Safety Building
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania

8

9

10

On behalf of Graterford Correctional Institution
Inmates;

11

12

ANGUS R. LOVE, ESQ.
Montgomery County Legal Aid Service
107 East Main Street
Norristown, Pennsylvania 19401

13

14

On behalf of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Staff;

15

16

BENJAMIN H. VOGLER, ESQ.
Deputy Antitrust Counsel
Office of the Executive
Legal Director
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory
Commission
Washington, D. C. 20555

17

18

19

Also present:

20

Mr. Otto

21

22

23

24

25

1 OMTbur

P R O C E E D I N G S

2 JUDGE HOYT: Thank you, Operator. Thank you for
3 joining in this call this afternoon.

4 The call concerns ALAB 845, which the Appeal
5 Board issued on August 28th, 1986. Does everyone have that
6 served on them properly?

7 VOICES: Yes.

8 JUDGE HOYT: Let's see, if no one has it, please
9 answer then. I think that would be the easiest way.

10 MR. GOODWIN: I don't have it. This is
11 Mr. Goodwin. I don't have it, your Honor, since the
12 majority of the work in that area has been handled by
13 Mr. Otto for Department of Corrections.

14 JUDGE HOYT: I think this is Mr. Goodwin, isn't
15 it?

16 MR. GOODWIN: Right. Mr. Goodwin.

17 JUDGE HOYT: Yes, Mr. Goodwin, I think that it
18 was served on Mr. Otto, and that is the reason it was not
19 served on you if I understand the way in which the Appeal
20 Board has served this.

21 MR. GOODWIN: Right, and that is fine with me.
22 Like I said, they have been the primary, the lead agency for
23 the Commonwealth. So I am sure that is why it was served on
24 them and not on me.

25 JUDGE HOYT: Very well. I don't think there is

I OMTbur

1 any prejudice then.

2 The reason for the call is that the Board has
3 determined that it must handle this appeal apparently more
4 quickly than it has anticipated that would be possible.

5 We have determined that the date of September the
6 22nd is about the only date on which this Board can hear the
7 remand, and in setting it up for the hearings on that date,
8 we will have to take some short cuts, considering that
9 discovery will begin today on the matters in 845 that the
10 Appeal Board addressed.

11 The second thing is that we can do that by not
12 requiring any prefiled testimony. However, I believe,
13 Mr. Otto, that the burden is going to be mostly upon you
14 because if we don't go with prefiled testimony we are going
15 to have to at least give the Prisoners' Counsel an
16 opportunity to know who those witnesses are and an
17 opportunity to depose them or to in some way have discovery
18 on those witnesses.

19 How soon do you feel that you could put together
20 your witness list for the counsel for the Prisoners,
21 Mr. Otto?

22 MR. OTTO: Judge Hoyt, quite candidly, we just
23 received the order yesterday, and we have begun work on it.

24 JUDGE HOYT: Let me suggest a date to you then,
25 Mr. Otto. Could you do it by September the 12th? That

OMTbur

1 would be Friday, a week from this coming Friday.

2 MR. OTTO: Okay, the Commonwealth -- this is
3 Mr. Otto again for the court reporter -- we will have our
4 witness list to Mr. Love on Friday, September 12th.

5 JUDGE HOYT: All right. Mr. Love?

6 MR. LOVE: Yes.

7 JUDGE HOYT: Mr. Love, that will give you
8 approximately a week and two weekends to handle that witness
9 list, that list of witnesses and to do your interviewing in
10 that length of time. I think it is pretty set who the
11 witnesses will be, more than likely.

12 If Mr. Otto can get some information to you
13 sooner than that, I would urge him to do so.

14 MR. LOVE: Can I ask a question relevant to the
15 issue that is before us?

16 JUDGE HOYT: Is this Mr. Love?

17 MR. LOVE: Yes.

18 JUDGE HOYT: Yes, yes.

19 MR. LOVE: I was wondering if Mr. Otto is going
20 to go along with the manpower mobilization plan as it now
21 stands; i.e., the pyramiding system dependent upon
22 commercial phone lines, or whether he is going to alter it
23 in light of the comments in the opinion.

24 JUDGE HOYT: Well, this is Judge Hoyt. I wonder
25 if we could approach that a little bit differently,

I OMTbur

1 Mr. Love, and try it this way.

2 The plan itself -- and I don't have the reference
3 to the plan here, and this Board does not have a copy of the
4 Graterford plan. I wonder, Mr. Otto, can you in some way,
5 without disclosing anything that is classified -- and please
6 tell me if it is, if I am getting in an area where I
7 shouldn't be -- if the notification system is clearly laid
8 out in the Graterford plan. I must confess my recollection
9 is not that good of it.

10 MR. OTTO: This is Mr. Otto for the court
11 reporter.

12 MR. CONNER: Hello. This is Conner. If Mr. Otto
13 is speaking, we can't hear him.

14 JUDGE HOYT: Well, he wasn't speaking,
15 Mr. Conner. That is the reason you didn't hear him. I
16 think he is just coming on now.

17 MR. OTTO: Yes, this is Mr. Otto again.

18 My recollection is that the actual notification
19 system itself is really contained in and is a part of our
20 general emergency plan that we use for, shall we say,
21 every day kind of emergencies and would be used and is
22 referenced to in the Graterford radiological emergency
23 response plan just as using that plan for this plan, too. I
24 mean, there was no need to create a totally new and
25 different notification system, at least in our point of

1 OMTbur

view at the time we put the plan together.

2 JUDGE HOYT: I think that perhaps answers your
3 question, Mr. Love.

4 MR. LOVE: Yes.

5 MR. CONNER: I am sorry, this is Conner again. I
6 heard Mr. Otto talking, but I couldn't tell what he said.

7 MR. VOGLER: This is Mr. Vogler. We couldn't
8 hear Mr. Otto either.

9 JUDGE HOYT: Very well. Let me see. Mr. Otto,
10 are you using a speaker phone?

11 MR. OTTO: No, ma'am.

12 JUDGE HOYT: Well, then would you repeat what you
13 just said to us, and will you say it just a bit louder so
14 that the other parties can hear it?

15 MR. OTTO: This is Mr. Otto again.

16 What I said was that the pyramid manpower call-up
17 system is contained in an emergency plan that is used for
18 other emergencies at the Graterford institution, and the
19 radiological emergency response plan just refers to that
20 process that is already in place, and that was in response
21 to a request -- to your question as to whether or not the
22 notification system, the specifics of it, were in the
23 radiological emergency response plan.

24 JUDGE HOYT: Does everyone have that?
25 Mr. Conner?

1 OMTbur

MR. CONNER: Yes, I heard that fine.

2

JUDGE HOYT: Mr. Vogler.

3

MR. VOGLER: Yes.

4

5

While I have the speaker phone here, the speaker's position here, I was wondering if that witness list could be made available to our FEMA witnesses as well.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

JUDGE HOYT: Oh, yes, it certainly was my intent to indicate that it should be made available to everyone on that date, but I was mostly concerned about it being available to Mr. Love on that day and before if possible to give the Prisoners' counsel as much leeway as possible to meet our September the 22nd hearing date.

13

14

Yes, you understand, Mr. Otto, that the witness list would be served on all the parties?

15

16

MR. OTTO: Certainly, Judge Hoyt.

17

18

JUDGE HARBOUR: This is Judge Harbour. I just had a question.

19

20

Does Mr. Love anticipate putting on any witnesses?

21

22

23

24

25

MR. LOVE: Well, that was why I asked the initial question regarding whether it was going to be the same system or not. If it is the same system, I may be able to rely on the remarks already in the record with regard to Rick Brown, which was cited in the opinion, and I may

OMTbur

1 attempt to update that. I understand a new system has been
2 in place, and I may try to get some information from an AT&T
3 technician. That would be about all I would contemplate at
4 this time.

5 JUDGE HOYT: Very well. Does anyone else have
6 any other questions?

7 MR. CONNER: This is Conner.

8 Mr. Brown, as we are reconstructing it, testified
9 in another phase of the emergency plan contentions which, in
10 relation to the points relied upon by the Appeal Board, was
11 not relevant to those earlier contentions. So if
12 Mr. Brown's testimony is to be relied upon by the inmates,
13 we certainly would want him available for
14 cross-examination.

15 MR. LOVE: Well, I will do what I can in that
16 regard.

17 MR. CONNER: Stated conversely, we would object
18 to any use of Mr. Brown's testimony for this remand at issue
19 unless he were available for cross-examination.

20 JUDGE HOYT: I believe that given the length of
21 time between the time that Mr. Brown testified and that his
22 testimony concerned another township, I think all of those
23 things mitigate against using his prior testimony in this
24 particular hearing to resolve these issues.

25 I would also like to point out to you, Mr. Love,

OMTbur

1 that the testimony of Mr. Brown was cited only insofar as
2 any problem might result from the mobilization contention
3 that we are going to hear, what effect, if any, the
4 resolution of that issue has on the EPE, which is the way
5 the Appeal Board put it.

6 I think that is on page 41 of the 846 remand --
7 845, whichever it is -- 845.

8 All right, I think also that it must be
9 understood at this point that the resolution of the manpower
10 mobilization contention is going to have to impact upon
11 whether or not we hear anything concerning the EPE. I think
12 the threshold for any testimony on the EPE, Mr. Love, is
13 whether or not the manpower mobilization contention has been
14 carried by the Prisoners or not.

15 MR. LOVE: I would agree with that.

16 JUDGE HOYT: Yes, very well.

17 MR. VOGLER: Judge Hoyt?

18 JUDGE HOYT: Yes.

19 MR. VOGLER: This is Ben Vogler for the Staff.

20 I would like -- I am going to have to get back
21 with FEMA to see about the 22nd of September.

22 JUDGE HOYT: Well, Mr. Vogler, of course we would
23 have to urge that upon you, but this is the only date that
24 would be available for us.

25 MR. VOGLER: I understand.

1 OMTbur

JUDGE HOYT: Yes.

2

3

4

MR. VOGLER: And do I understand at the very beginning that the testimony will be live rather than prefiled?

5

6

7

8

9

JUDGE HOYT: That is correct, and the only way in which to do that is to have some exchange of witness list sometime prior to that so we will know -- so the parties will at least be alerted as to who and what will be coming up in the hearing itself.

10

MR. VOGLER: I understand.

11

JUDGE HOYT: Yes.

12

13

14

15

There were a couple of points that I wanted to be sure that we get in this record, and I think that possibly you, Mr. Otto, will be the one we have to rely on to do this.

16

17

18

19

The Appeal Board apparently had some misgivings as to what the definition of the dedicated line was. I wish you would be sure to have that established on the upcoming record.

20

21

22

23

24

Back to my notes here just a moment, I want it to be clearly understood that the contention that we are going to rehearing is that contention that had been previously filed by the Prisoners raising the manpower issue. So it has been clearly stated before.

25

I think there were only two grounds that we had

I OMTbur

1 accepted this -- strike that. That was another matter I
2 have, the reference to the two issues.

3 As the Appeal Board has put it on page 8 of this
4 remand, the contention -- and they state it as follows:

5 "The contention clearly raises an
6 issue that can be a proper subject
7 for the litigation in an operating
8 license pleading, the adequacy of
9 the communication system to be used
10 in the event of an emergency."

11 That is the total communication package,
12 including the call-up system.

13 I believe there may be some other testimony in
14 the record -- and I must confess, Mr. Otto, I don't recall
15 what it was at the time, but I remember we did discuss some
16 of these problems of the rail systems and the various other
17 methods of release notification at a conference. I believe
18 it was on March 22nd, 1985. There was a state lease
19 network. I am pretty sure that it was included in there.
20 And the rail, if applicable, should be also included in your
21 presentation.

22 That, I think, would meet the problems of the
23 remand.

24 Are there any other questions?

25 MR. CONNER: Judge Hoyt, this is Troy Conner.

OMTbur

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

JUDGE HOYT: Yes.

MR. CONNER: we were focusing more on the definition of the contention that the Appeal Board had stated at the top of page 15, which to some extent seemed to limit the general discussion on page 8. So at the bottom of page 13, they start out by saying:

"We are once again faced with determining the effect of this action."

Whoops, I am sorry, I was reading in the wrong place. At the bottom of page 14.

"It is only the adequacy of this notification in the event of an overload of the telephone network that is in question."

And that would seem to suggest that unless there were an overload the Appeal Board does not think that there would be an inadequacy.

JUDGE HOYT: Does anyone else have an input on this?

MR. LOVE: I think earlier they say something that --

JUDGE HOYT: Is this Mr. Love?

MR. LOVE: Yes. Excuse me. Mr. Love speaking.

JUDGE HOYT: All right.

OMTbur

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

MR. LOVE: I think they say earlier that it goes beyond, in the event of an overload, which the initial decision stated was unlikely, and they said something to the effect that that was not sufficient to say that that was unlikely.

MR. CONNER: Could we have that reference?

MR. LOVE: One moment.

(Pause.)

OMT/bc

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

JUDGE HOYT: Would that be on page 9, Mr. Love?

MR. LOVE: Page 11, footnote 12.

JUDGE HOYT: All right.

MR. LOVE: The alleged characterization of the alleged communications problem as unlikely is if were not supported in the record.

And it goes on to state that it doesn't take into account a fast-developing action in scenario.

JUDGE HOYT: I believe, Mr. Connor, that the adequacy of the communications system could be used in the event of emergency, as I cited to you from page 8 of the remand, is the -- and that's the total communication system.

I don't believe this is limited only to the overload at all. I did not get that sense in reading the remand. If some other party did -- let's try Mr. Vogler.

Do ou have any sense of that, Mr. Vogler?

MR. VOGLER: We feel that a better definition is on page 8.

JUDGE HOYT: Yes, I think so.

Does that answer your question then, Mr. Connor?

MR. CONNOR: Oh, yes. We simply wanted to make sure that everybody was in agreement and understood the ground rule. And that's fine with us.

JUDGE HOYT: Yes. I think that the remand goes

OMT/bc

1 much further than just the over. I think that was merely
2 one part of it.

3 Do we have anything else? Let's start out with
4 Mr. Vogler first.

5 MR. VOGLER: My only problem is the minute we end
6 this conference call is to get back on with FEMA in
7 Philadelphia to see if they will be available on the 22nd,
8 bearing in mind the Board's statement about the only
9 available hearing date.

10 They told me originally that they were busy until
11 October the 11th.

12 JUDGE HOYT: I realize that, Mr. Vogler, that
13 they have some particular internal problems at FEMA that we
14 need not go into here.

15 But I think also that there are commitments of
16 the Board Members to other matters and I think the fact that
17 they are right there in Philadelphia, where we will have the
18 hearings --

19 MR. VOGLER: I understand. And also the fact
20 that the testimony is live. But I am dealing with another
21 government agency.

22 JUDGE HOYT: I understand that. I understand
23 that, Mr. Vogler.

24 MR. VOGLER: Other than that, the staff has no
25 problem.

OMT/bc

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

JUDGE HOYT: Right.

Mr. Otto?

MR. OTTO: No. We have nothing else, your Honor.

JUDGE HOYT: All right. Mr. Otto, I want you to be sure to understand that we would like that witness list on September 12th, no later. However, if you can give Mr. Love some additional information prior to that time, some partial information, I guess would be the better phrase, I would urge you to do so, to give him an opportunity for all the discovery that he may request of you.

I think that would certainly expedite the matter.

Mr. Love, do you have anything?

MR. LOVE: I was just going to say what you say in that I would like to have the opportunity for discovery, especially if there is some kind of change from the initial plan.

And if Mr. Otto is willing to cooperate, I don't think there will be any problem.

JUDGE HOYT: I want to be sure also, Mr. Love, do you need to see the plan again, the security plan?

MR. LOVE: No. But the plan that he referred to, the general emergency plan, might be helpful.

JUDGE HOYT: Well, I think that you probably have

OMT/bc

1 that available anyway, don't you?

2 MR. LOVE: Well, I'll have to go through it. I
3 don't know for a fact one way or the other.

4 JUDGE HOYT: All right. If you can get that
5 particular part of the plan of your normal emergency
6 procedures that you talked about with us, Mr. Otto, to
7 Mr. Love, that might help matters move along a little bit
8 more quickly.

9 MR. OTTO: This is Mr. Otto again.

10 Your Honor, that's a confidential plan that we use
11 for regular kinds of emergencies.

12 JUDGE HOYT: Oh, I'm sorry. I didn't understand
13 that.

14 MR. OTTO: The only part of that plan that's
15 being used is the system of a pyramid callup kind of idea,
16 where one individual calls other individuals, and that kind
17 of thing. And that would be the only relevance that plan
18 would have to any of the proceedings before this...before
19 the Board.

20 JUDGE HOYT: Well, I still think that if that is
21 what you've decided, I think you're going to have to make
22 that secret information available to the counsel, Mr. Otto.

23 If you do and you need a protective order, that's
24 fine. We can go that route. If it that may be a
25 desensitized portion of your total normal emergency plan as

OMT/bc

1 opposed to the radiological emergency plan, then I see no
2 reason why you couldn't make it available to him in
3 request.

4 But, of course --

5 MR. OTTO: Could I ask a clarifying question?

6 JUDGE HOYT: Yes.

7 MR. CONNOR: It is to the effect is there
8 anything about the so-called Pyramid System in this general
9 plan that hasn't already been put in the record, I guess by
10 Mr. Zimmerman's testimony?

11 And if so, I see no need for producing a
12 confidential plan.

13 MR. OTTO: This is Mr. Otto. Superintendant
14 Zimmerman's testimony regarding how the actual mechanics of
15 the callup system works are all that would be contained in
16 this general emergency plan.

17 The general emergency plan obviously has the
18 names and the phone numbers. But, other than that,
19 Superintendant Zimmerman's testimony discussed the actual
20 way that it would work.

21 And, therefore, anything in the documents would
22 not be, in our opinion, required to be produced.

23 MR. LOVE: Mr. Love. I don't want the whole
24 plan...we've been through this before.

25 MR. OTTO: Sure.

OMT/bc

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

MR. LOVE: But if there are relevant sections regarding this communication system, I would prefer that they were produced. Just that section. Not the entire plan.

And we'd be happy to submit to a protective order on that.

JUDGE HOYT: Let me put it to you this way. We'll go along with practically everything you said there, with the opportunity for you to examine that particular portion of the emergency plan under a protective order.

MR. LOVE: Fine.

JUDGE HARBOUR: This is Judge Harbour.

I was just wondering, another possibility, a plan with the names and telephone numbers deleted, first of all, could that be released by the -- I mean, that portion of it -- could that be released by Greaterferd?

And, second, would that be adequate for Mr. Love's purposes?

MR. LOVE: I'm Mr. Love. Yes, that would be adequate.

MR. OTTO: I would have to check. That sounds like something -- this is Mr. Otto -- that sounds like something we might be able to do. I would have to check with my super, you know, my supervisors.

But the section that talks about the plan without

OMT/bc

1 the names and phone numbers may be something we could
2 produce.

3 JUDGE HOYT: Does that complete our discussion on
4 that point?

5 (No response.)

6 JUDGE HOYT: All right. Anything else, Mr. Love?

7 MR. LOVE: Well, once again, I would like to note
8 my objections for the record of the expedited nature of the
9 hearing. It was my initial understanding, the reason we did
10 it the first time was because of the pending license. And
11 now that that matter has been resolved, I don't see the need
12 for an expedited hearing.

13 But I'm not going to --

14 JUDGE HOYT: Well, then I go back to again,
15 Mr. Love, to what I tried to say in the beginning and,
16 apparently, I didn't make clear to you.

17 The reason that we have selected this date lies
18 in three facts, really. One is the only available date that
19 the members of this Board, who had other prior commitments
20 on their dockets.

21 Judge Harbour in Seabrook, Judge Cole in the
22 Breakwood case. I have them in Seabrook.

23 That is the only date on which we could all agree
24 we could stand to have the hearing. And when I say that
25 that is the only date, I'm talking about that's the only

OMT/bc

1 date between now and probably sometime in January, 1987.

2 I did not want this issue to go so long on the
3 remand without doing something to solve it. If we had to go
4 quickly, then September the 22nd is the only date.

5 Otherwise, it may very well be well into 1987
6 before this issue could ever be remanded...I mean,
7 resolved.

8 MR. LOVE: I understand that. I just wanted to
9 put that on the record, and...

10 JUDGE HOYT: All right. Secondly -- now I'm
11 going to give you the full story now. You wanted to have
12 the full story.

13 MR. LOVE: I'm sorry. Go ahead.

14 JUDGE HOYT: Secondly, the only date on which we
15 could find any hearing time available -- that is, a room for
16 it -- in Philadelphia, and we had to go out and take on the
17 conference room at the Holiday Inn, where we had one of
18 these hearings once before.

19 Space in Philadelphia is at a premium. And that
20 is the only time in which we could possibly do it. At the
21 downtown Holiday Inn on, I believe it's Walnut Street.

22 And we confided in one another that the one-day
23 hearing apparently would be the appropriate procedure, and
24 the one day that we could all stand was September the 22nd.
25 And that is the day on which we could get the hearing room.

OMT/bc

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

MR. LOVE: What if we can't complete it in one day?

JUDGE HOYT: If we can't complete it in one day, we'll go into the night until we do complete it.

MR. LOVE: All right. I'll be there.

JUDGE HOYT: The other reason is that I don't think, although there is a need from the remand, and reading the remand itself, in any remand is the principle that it should be solved, the remand problem should be solved as quickly as possible.

And that is what we intend to do. That's the full explanation of why we're going with September 22nd.

MR. LOVE: Thank you.

JUDGE HOYT: Very well.

Anything else, Mr. Otto? Did I cover you? Or Mr. Connor?

MR. CONNOR: Two very minor points. Mr. Rader will be handling this case, and he is participating in this call. We do not at this time expect to have any witnesses. But, if we do, we will of course notify all the parties by the 12th.

JUDGE HOYT: Very well.

All right. Mr. Vogler?

MR. VOGLER: Staff has nothing further, your Honor.

1 OMT/bc

1 JUDGE HOYT: Very well.

2 That completes all we had concerning the remand
3 on Greaterferd. However, there is one additional matter
4 that does not concern you, Mr. Love. You're welcome to
5 listen in to the rest of the conversation, however.

6 Yesterday, the Appeal Board received a
7 communication from Mr. Frank R. Ramono. There is no
8 indication on the copy that was sent to me by the Appeal
9 Board that this particular document entitled Air and Water
10 Pollution Control Responds to Testimony Relating to Remand
11 Hearing on Availability of Bus Drivers for Owen J. Roberts
12 and Spring Ford's School Districts was ever served on the
13 other parties.

14 Do you have that, Mr. Connor?

15 MR. CONNOR: We have just received the filing by
16 Mr. Ramono. We don't have anything from the Appeal Board.

17 JUDGE HOYT: The only thing that came down from
18 the Appeal Board was an order which said that they had
19 received it, and the substance of it being in a very brief
20 paragraph:

21 "This pleading is apparently mislabeled as it
22 concerns a matter now pending before the License Board in
23 this proceeding."

24 So that's how the Appeal Board felt about it.

25 MR. LOVE: I'm sorry. I can't say anything more

OMT/bc

1 on it.

2 JUDGE HOYT: Very well. I just wanted to be sure
3 you had received it.

4 Mr. Vogler, have you received it?

5 MR. VOGLER: Like Mr. Connor, or as with
6 Mr. Connor, we received Mr. Ramono's pleading this morning.
7 But we have nothing from the Appeal Board.

8 JUDGE HOYT: Very well. The order will --

9 MR. VOGLER: I take it, we're not going to get
10 any from the Appeal Board --

11 JUDGE HOYT: The order was dated September the
12 3rd. And I take it, it will be served.

13 MR. CONNOR: Oh, it was an order?

14 JUDGE HOYT: Yes, it was an order of the Appeal
15 Board.

16 I beg your pardon?

17 MR. CONNOR: Nothing. I was just thinking about
18 part two.

19 JUDGE HOYT: Well, that's -- I didn't think that
20 probably this had come to everybody's attention, so I wanted
21 to be sure it had.

22 Mr. Goodwin, this does concern you. Do you have
23 that?

24 MR. GOODWIN: No, your Honor. I haven't seen any
25 pleadings yet. As soon as we're done with this

1 OMT/bc

1 conversation, I can see if it's come in this afternoon.

2 But, as of right now, I haven't seen it.

3 JUDGE HOYT: Very well.

4 MR. LOVE: Would that be Mr. Otto's area, or
5 Mr. Goodwin's area?

6 JUDGE HOYT: It would be in Mr. Goodwin's area,
7 because Mr. Otto did not participate in the remand on the
8 drivers for the Owen J. Robertson thing.

9 Judge Harbour, do you have anything?

10 JUDGE HARBOUR: No.

11 JUDGE HOYT: Very well. Thank you very much for
12 your participation in this call. We have nothing further.
13 This record is now closed.

14 (Whereupon, at 3:47 p.m., the Teleconference was
15 concluded.)

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CERTIFICATE OF OFFICIAL REPORTER

This is to certify that the attached proceedings before the UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION in the matter of:

NAME OF PROCEEDING: PHILADELPHIA ELECTRIC COMPANY
(Limerick Generating Station,
Units 1 and 2)

TELEPHONE CONFERENCE

DOCKET NO.: 50-352 OL 50-353 OL

PLACE: Washington, D. C.

DATE: Wednesday, September 3, 1986

were held as herein appears, and that this is the original transcript thereof for the file of the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

(sigt)
(TYPED)

Joseph R. Maggio

JOSEPH R. MAGGIO
Official Reporter
ACE-FEDERAL REPORTERS, INC.
Reporter's Affiliation