

Official Transcript of Proceedings
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: Status Conference ITMO David Geisen

Docket Number: IA-05-052

DOCKETED
USNRC

Location: (telephone conference)

August 23, 2006 (11:05pm)

OFFICE OF SECRETARY
RULEMAKINGS AND
ADJUDICATIONS STAFF

Date: Thursday, August 17, 2006

Work Order No.: NRC-1217

Pages 148-175

NEAL R. GROSS AND CO., INC.
Court Reporters and Transcribers
1323 Rhode Island Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 234-4433

TEMPLATE = SECY-032

SECY-02

1 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

2 + + + + +

3 NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

4 + + + + +

5 ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD

6 + + + + +

7 -----X

8 IN THE MATTER OF: :

9 DAVID GEISEN : Docket Number:

10 ENFORCEMENT PROCEEDING : IA-05-052

11 JOINT STATUS CONFERENCE :

12 -----X

13
14 Thursday,

15 August 17, 2006

16
17 The teleconference came to order, pursuant
18 to notice, at 1:00 p.m.

19 BEFORE:

20 JUDGE MICHAEL FARRAR

21 JUDGE E. ROY HAWKENS

22 JUDGE NICHOLAS TRIKOURAS

23
24
25
NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 APPEARANCES:

2 On Behalf of Mr. Geisen:

3 RICHARD A. HIBEY, ESQ.

4 CHARLES McALEER, ESQ.

5 of: Miller & Chevalier, Chartered

6 655 Fifteenth Street, N.W.

7 Suite 900

8 Washington, D.C. 20005-5701

9 (202) 625-5800

10
11 On Behalf of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

12 SARA BROCK, ESQ.

13 MICHAEL SPENCER, ESQ.

14 Office of the General Counsel

15 Mail Stop 0-15-D21

16 Washington, D.C. 20555-0001

17 (301) 415-8393

18
19 ALSO PRESENT:

20 TIM MATTHEWS

21 DANIEL HORNER, McGraw Hill

22 MARY BEATTY

23 LISA CLARK

24
25 **NEAL R. GROSS**

 - COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

(1:05 p.m.)

JUDGE HAWKENS: Let's go on the record on Thursday, August 17th. We're here for a prehearing conference call in the Geisen matter.

Would the counsel for Mr. Geisen identify themselves?

JUDGE FARRAR: I'm here at -- this is Mike Farrar. I'm the Board Chairman. I'm here at NRC Headquarters with Judge Hawken. Judge Trikonouras is on another line calling in, which will limit us in our ability to confer with each other before any decisions, but I don't think anything controversial is coming up today.

Counsel for Mr. Geisen?

MR. HIBEY: This is Richard Hibey for Mr. Geisen.

MR. McALEER: Also for Mr. Geisen Charles McAleer and Matthew Reinhard.

JUDGE HAWKENS: McAleer, I think this is the first time you've been on the phone with us. Welcome to the proceeding. We've seen your filings.

For the Staff?

MS. BROCK: Hi. Sara Brock and Michael Spencer are representing the Staff, and Mary Beatty

NEAL R. GROSS

--COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 and Lisa Clark, also from our office, are with us on
2 the call.

3 JUDGE HAWKENS: All right. Thank you, Ms.
4 Brock.

5 Mr. Matthews, do you want to identify
6 yourself, please?

7 MR. MATTHEWS: Sure. This is Tim Matthews
8 of Morgan, Lewis & Bockius here monitoring the
9 proceeding for First Energy.

10 JUDGE FARRAR: All right. Is there anyone
11 else on the line who has not been identified?

12 (No response.)

13 All right. Then, let's go ahead. If Mr.
14 Daniel Horner calls in -- he is a reporter for McGraw
15 Hill -- he has written some stories, at least one
16 story on the case, for Inside NRC. And we informed
17 him that since, unlike court proceedings, prehearing
18 conference, we have a transcript, and if it was -- it
19 would be in open court with observers that he would be
20 permitted to observe but not to participate.

21 And, Mr. Matthews, that's I guess pretty
22 much the same for you, since you're not formally a
23 party.

24 Judge Hawken I mentioned is here with me.
25 I think last time we were on the phone he was the

1 junior Justice here, but as of June 30th or so is now
2 the Chief Judge of the entire panel. So if you catch
3 me being more deferential to him than I used to be,
4 you're probably correct.

5 On the motion -- the Geisen motion to
6 compel production of a non-redacted copy of the Office
7 of Investigations report, we have your motion filed
8 August 11th. As I understand it, a response is due
9 around the 21st from the Staff, a reply from Mr.
10 Geisen, if any, would be August 28th. We had asked
11 you before to reserve Wednesday, September 6th in the
12 afternoon for a possible oral argument.

13 Based on our looking at the motion, it
14 looks like it will be a complicated enough question
15 that we will want to have oral arguments. We will get
16 back to you on a precise time. I assume we'll start
17 around 1:00 or 1:30, and we will let you know by the
18 end of August if on reading the two additional filings
19 that are due to come in we determine that one side or
20 the other has clearly the better of it, and we don't
21 need argument.

22 But I think that's unlikely, so you can
23 pretty much not just pencil but ink in Wednesday,
24 September 6th, for the oral argument. Is that date
25 all right with everybody? Any problems that would

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 cause?

2 MS. BROCK: Your Honor, from the Staff,
3 the date is fine. We were wondering if we could
4 potentially do the argument in the morning. We're
5 currently scheduled to have, in a related matter,
6 depositions in Cleveland the next day.

7 JUDGE FARRAR: I think we had a -- if I
8 remember right, we had a problem with Judge Trikouras
9 and his travel back from somewhere. Nick, is --

10 JUDGE TRIKOURAS: I might be able to do it
11 at approximately 10:30. If need be, I can do it at
12 10:00.

13 JUDGE FARRAR: Would that help the Staff?

14 MS. BROCK: This is Sara Brock for the
15 Staff. Yes, 10:00 or 10:30 would help us quite a bit,
16 actually.

17 JUDGE FARRAR: Mr. Hibey? Or Mr. McAleer?

18 MR. HIBEY: We'll be there, Your Honor.
19 This is Richard Hibey.

20 JUDGE FARRAR: Okay. Then, let's -- who
21 just came on the line?

22 MR. HORNER: This is Daniel Horner. I'm
23 a reporter with McGraw Hill Nuclear Publications.

24 JUDGE FARRAR: Right, Mr. Horner. I
25 previously told -- this is Judge Farrar. I previously

1 told the parties that you had asked to be on the call,
2 and explained to them that while that wouldn't
3 ordinarily be done in a judicial conference call, our
4 proceedings are -- could have been held live, and you
5 certainly would have been permitted to be an observer
6 there, if we were in the courtroom. So we welcome you
7 as an observer, but of course not as a participant.

8 MR. HORNER: Well, thank you very much,
9 and I apologize for being a little bit late getting
10 on.

11 JUDGE FARRAR: That's all right. What
12 we're doing right now is talking about a date for
13 likely oral argument on a motion to compel -- Mr.
14 Geisen's motion to compel production of the Staff's
15 Office of Investigations report.

16 Judge Trikouras, do you think you could be
17 here by -- well, we'll work that out later, and so it
18 will start at either 10:00 or 10:30, depending on
19 Judge Trikouras' schedule. And we'll get word to you
20 before the end of August on that.

21 But I think, Mr. McAleer, you had filed an
22 agreed-to motion after the fact to exceed the page
23 limits, and of course we will grant that when we write
24 this up.

25 MR. McALEER: Thank you, Your Honor, and

1 I would also like to thank NRC Staff for their consent
2 to that motion and appreciate the Board's ruling.

3 JUDGE FARRAR: All right. Thank you, sir.

4 MS. BROCK: I'm not -- this is Sara Brock
5 for the Staff. Can I just ask one clarifying question
6 on the page limit?

7 JUDGE FARRAR: Yes.

8 MS. BROCK: We are making every effort to
9 make our response under 10 pages, but in -- with the
10 lengthy motion, we -- we're over that. We're
11 wondering, while we'll try to keep it under 10 pages,
12 if we could also file something no more than 15 pages?

13 JUDGE FARRAR: Right. That will be no
14 problem. In fact, usually when we grant a motion like
15 this before the fact, it's accompanied with a -- you
16 know, with a consent it's accompanied by a deal where
17 the other side gets the same privilege. So don't even
18 bother filing a motion. We will put in our little
19 order summarizing this conference that Mr. McAleer's
20 motion is granted and that you will have the same
21 leeway.

22 MS. BROCK: Thank you.

23 JUDGE FARRAR: Thank you. We had called
24 this conference primarily to go over the parties'
25 joint status report, which had a discovery schedule

1 which while agreed upon looked a little bit long to
2 us. And we wanted to just find out what's behind that
3 before we pass upon it.

4 Before we get to that, is there anything
5 new in the criminal case? Last I heard you were
6 supposed to file motions October 20th? Is --

7 MR. HIBEY: That's the only date out
8 there, Your Honor.

9 JUDGE FARRAR: Okay. And to the extent
10 that there is exchange of documents in that case, that
11 has already happened?

12 MR. HIBEY: We have received material from
13 the Government. I expect we'll be receiving more,
14 from time to time we get some, but the -- shall we
15 say, the larger universe of material I think has been
16 turned over to us. We're working through it.

17 JUDGE FARRAR: All right. Refresh me. Do
18 you have any reciprocal obligations?

19 MR. HIBEY: We have reciprocal
20 obligations. They are continuing in nature.

21 JUDGE FARRAR: Okay.

22 MR. HIBEY: So they're out there.

23 JUDGE FARRAR: If you file the motions
24 October 20th, is it still way too early to know what
25 you're looking at in terms of the District Court's

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 docket for a trial date?

2 MR. HIBEY: Yes.

3 JUDGE FARRAR: Okay.

4 MR. HIBEY: At least from our standpoint,
5 we've had no engagement with the trial Judge to this
6 point.

7 JUDGE FARRAR: All right.

8 MR. HIBEY: So I don't know exactly what
9 his calendar is like. I believe he is a Senior Judge.

10 JUDGE FARRAR: Okay. All right. Thank
11 you, Mr. Hibey.

12 Then, let's turn directly to the discovery
13 matter. On page 4 of your joint status report that
14 you filed at the beginning of August, you lay out a
15 schedule. And if I recall the Commission's
16 milestones, you're looking at roughly four months for
17 discovery, I think in the Miller Moffitt case allowed
18 five months, and this seems to be somewhat longer and
19 a little bit indefinite. Maybe one of you can help us
20 with it.

21 For example, you have -- in the Miller
22 Moffitt case they did not separate fact from expert
23 discovery. Here you do. What's the difference in the
24 cases, and how long would that expert discovery take?

25 MS. BROCK: This is Sara Brock from the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 NRC Staff. I think I may be in the best position to
2 address that. The Staff has essentially agreed to
3 whatever the various different parties have asked for,
4 since we feel like it's their expedited hearing and
5 their need. So Mr. McAleer asked for the separate
6 expert discovery, so I agreed to that.

7 Now, in terms of the length of time for
8 the Miller Moffitt proceedings, I can tell you -- and
9 I mentioned to Ms. Penny that I would probably mention
10 this on the call -- at least with respect to Mr.
11 Moffitt we are going to have to file a motion to
12 extend discovery, because we literally can't fit in
13 all the necessary depositions.

14 JUDGE FARRAR: All right. All right. So
15 this is not -- so if I understand what you just said,
16 it's the targets of the investigations that are
17 driving the schedule, and you're accommodating their
18 need.

19 MS. BROCK: Yes.

20 JUDGE FARRAR: So you didn't make any
21 attempt to achieve consistency in the two, as I
22 understand it.

23 MS. BROCK: In terms of the schedules of
24 them, no.

25 JUDGE FARRAR: Okay, good. Then, that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 explains some of it.

2 Mr. Hibey, what did you have in mind with
3 expert discovery as opposed to fact discovery? What
4 does that mean in this kind of case?

5 MR. HIBEY: Well, I think, Your Honor,
6 that the thinking was that in the event there was
7 expert testimony to be offered it traditionally, at
8 least in the traditional civil litigation experience,
9 is discovery which is taken after fact discovery has
10 concluded.

11 And so in -- with that experience in mind,
12 but without specifically having an expert in mind, we
13 felt that the way to order the discovery was to do it
14 in that fashion -- get the facts, and then if there is
15 expert testimony to be elicited by either side, expert
16 reports would be submitted and discovery taken
17 accordingly.

18 JUDGE FARRAR: All right. Of course, most
19 of our proceedings, unlike the enforcement
20 proceedings, involve almost exclusively expert
21 testimony with, you know, people trying to predict,
22 you know, what will happen in future occurrences. I
23 guess I had assumed that we would have only fact
24 witnesses in this case, but I think what you're saying
25 is the discovery, the experts, would not be an overly

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 long process if there are any experts.

2 MR. HIBEY: I think that's -- I think you
3 state it well. That's exactly true. I'm not so sure
4 that this is a case that will turn at all on the
5 testimony of experts, but we don't know that.
6 Certainly we don't know that at this point. We don't
7 know what the intentions of the Staff are in that
8 respect. And so this is our way of dealing with that
9 prospect.

10 JUDGE FARRAR: All right. Fine. Thank
11 you both for that explanation.

12 Now, turning then back to the fact
13 discovery, Miller Moffitt's proceeding where they were
14 doing the whole thing in about five months, although
15 I understand from what Ms. Brock just said that in
16 Moffitt they may need more time, discovery here has
17 been going on for a considerable period already.

18 And that middle paragraph on page 4,
19 paragraph, I guess, 2 of your motion, makes me a
20 little nervous because we're talking about not only
21 waiting until after our ruling on the motion to compel
22 before you launch depositions but your waiting for
23 any appeal of the Board's ruling, and presumably -- I
24 mean, I would hope our ruling will be so well reasoned
25 no one will want to appeal it.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 Obviously, people can go to the
2 Commission. I suppose in certain kinds of cases there
3 could be interlocutory review to a court from the
4 Commission's ruling. So is going ahead with
5 depositions -- I'd hate to put depositions off while
6 that matter got -- I mean, it could be a two- or
7 three-year deal. And meanwhile, Mr. Hibey, the clock
8 is running against your client who is the subject of
9 this order that was immediately effective.

10 Is there any way we can deal with that
11 differently so -- or are you really saying that you
12 can't do depositions, or it's fruitless to do
13 depositions, or duplicative if you don't have that
14 report?

15 MR. HIBEY: The report is a central
16 document. I, frankly, would think that it would
17 enable us to sharpen our focus to the point where
18 depositions -- the number of depositions would not
19 increase, that we might more efficiently be able to
20 focus on those depositions we want to take once we
21 have the fullness of the information that's on paper
22 before us.

23 So I didn't -- our side, I would say, did
24 not look upon that provision regarding deposition
25 notice to unduly protract the situation. It was

1 simply a way of assuring that the depositions we chose
2 to notice would be against the background of all the
3 information that lawfully is available to us going
4 into those depositions.

5 JUDGE FARRAR: All right. Let me ask you,
6 is that the only document that we're likely to see a
7 motion to compel on, or are you working through all of
8 the other privileges?

9 MR. HIBEY: We're working through the
10 others. We cannot escape the significance, if you
11 will, of the OI report. And we wanted -- and we
12 wanted to, if you will, tee that up immediately upon
13 our realization that we had needs which we've
14 articulated in our motion to compel.

15 However, as we work through the other
16 material in the case, there are documents the
17 existence of which has now been made apparent to us.
18 And from our search of the universe of materials that
19 have been provided to us, we don't have them. So
20 we're going to be undertaking from time to time, as we
21 identify these materials, an effort to secure them
22 from the Staff.

23 The Staff might very well agree to turn
24 the material over or not. And depending upon the
25 basis for their declination to do so, it might require

1 us to move forward with other motions for -- to compel
2 production. But that is not to say that when we find
3 these it would somehow cause us to push back
4 continually the deposition practice that we all know
5 we're going to engage in. So it's just that this is
6 a big document.

7 JUDGE FARRAR: Right. So for purposes of
8 the depositions, the OI report is the -- is the key
9 document.

10 MR. HIBEY: It's a triggering document to
11 date.

12 JUDGE FARRAR: Okay. Ms. Brock, did you
13 want to weigh in on this?

14 MS. BROCK: Yes. The only thing I would
15 add -- again, we agreed to the schedule that Mr.
16 McAleer and Mr. Hibey proposed. Obviously, we don't
17 view the OI report as central. Well, we -- we don't
18 view the portions of the OI report that we withheld as
19 central to being able to take depositions or even as
20 relevant. But that goes more to the -- our response
21 to the motion to compel on that.

22 JUDGE FARRAR: Right.

23 MS. BROCK: That being said, we're happy
24 to agree to whatever schedule that we can meet that
25 the Defendant wants.

1 We may be filing some motions to compel.
2 We have yet to receive a single document from Mr.
3 Geisen in mandatory disclosure. So we're asking for
4 what we need in discovery, and there may be more
5 discovery disputes to come, depending on the results
6 of that. But that's why we wanted to defer those
7 disputes and see how many of them could be worked out
8 through the exchange of written interrogatories and
9 document requests.

10 And to the extent that there are more
11 documents that Mr. Geisen's attorneys believe we
12 haven't provided, of course, you know, we're an open
13 agency, we want to provide as much information that we
14 can as possible. We continue to endeavor every time
15 we find something new to go ahead and turn it over.

16 JUDGE FARRAR: All right. For example, I
17 think we received a CD today.

18 MS. BROCK: Yes.

19 JUDGE FARRAR: I'm not in my office, so I
20 don't know what's on it, but we received a CD today.
21 And I think since I've been away, we've received at
22 least one other.

23 MS. BROCK: If I could speak to that, what
24 happened, which I think that all the parties are aware
25 of, is that the agency was notified in July of 2006

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 that FENOC had identified more documents. And when we
2 were provided with those, we moved quickly to turn
3 them over to the parties, and in fact were informed
4 that FENOC attorneys had given them directly to -- the
5 documents directly to the Defendant.

6 And coming out of those, our Office of
7 Investigations did an additional interview, and we
8 turned the transcript of that interview over within
9 two weeks of receiving the transcript, as required by
10 2.336. So that's why there have been a few more
11 documents coming along.

12 JUDGE FARRAR: Let me ask this about the
13 document and the oral argument. In the other cases
14 I've been on we never had a motion to compel an
15 investigatory report, so I'm new to this type of
16 issue.

17 Given that the time schedule for
18 depositions turns on how fast -- partly on how fast we
19 get our decision out, we would like to target the end
20 of -- if we have oral argument on September 6th,
21 target the end of September to issue a decision, and
22 because the document is so important we would want it
23 to be a more thoroughly written than abbreviated
24 ruling.

25 Would we -- is it ever done, or would it

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 make sense, that we would see the document in camera
2 before the argument? Would that help us write a
3 better, faster decision, or is that just not the way
4 the law is practiced?

5 MR. HIBEY: We were prepared to suggest
6 that in this phone call. We anticipated the Court's
7 desire to move the case along. And, of course, that's
8 helpful to --

9 THE COURT REPORTER: Please identify
10 yourself.

11 JUDGE FARRAR: That's Mr. Hibey.

12 MR. HIBEY: I'm sorry. Forgive me. This
13 is Richard Hibey. And we thought that perhaps if the
14 conversation vectored in a certain direction we would
15 ask the Court if it would exceed to looking at the
16 material even before the argument date.

17 JUDGE FARRAR: Ms. Brock, what do you --
18 and I'm not saying we're committed to that. It's a
19 genuine question. You know, is that a sensible
20 approach that would -- that would help us write a
21 faster, better decision, or is that something the
22 Staff would be opposed to?

23 MS. BROCK: The Staff has no objection to
24 providing the unredacted version of the OI report to
25 the Board for an in camera review. The sensitivity of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 the redacted portions of the OI reports -- the great
2 majority of it is allegations that were not
3 substantiated. So we don't generally -- it's a much
4 longer report than you might get in a typical
5 enforcement case, because it focused on so many
6 different things.

7 JUDGE FARRAR: How many pages -- how long
8 is it?

9 MS. BROCK: I'm confirming this. I
10 believe it's 230 pages.

11 JUDGE FARRAR: Okay. That's good enough.

12 MS. BROCK: But we have no objection -- I
13 mean, if Mr. Baker's attorneys want you to view it, we
14 have no objection to it. It's potentially a -- from
15 the Staff's perspective, we have no objection.

16 JUDGE FARRAR: Could you get -- if we --
17 and we will not decide that today. Judge Trikouras
18 and Judge Hawkens and I will confer on that. But
19 would you be -- if we did want it, would you be able
20 to give us a version that would indicate what
21 redactions you wanted to make, but we could still see
22 how those read? In other words, rather than blacking
23 something out, you would -- or give us a redacted and
24 a non-redacted, so we could instantly see what the
25 controversy is about?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 MS. BROCK: Yes. We can -- I think we can
2 do that. Mr. Geisen's motion has attached to it the
3 redacted version.

4 JUDGE FARRAR: Oh, okay.

5 MS. BROCK: And we can provide you the
6 unredacted version.

7 JUDGE FARRAR: That would be fine.

8 MS. BROCK: We can do that. I mean, we
9 could do that tomorrow.

10 JUDGE FARRAR: Well, don't do it yet. Let
11 us confer and make sure it's something that we do want
12 to do. But it -- then it may make sense and help us
13 come to grips with the case more readily. Thank you.
14 Appreciate, Mr. Hibey, that that was going to be your
15 suggestion, and, Ms. Brock, for agreeing to it.

16 Well, then, with that, we -- if we got a
17 decision out before the end of September, and if there
18 were no appeal, then that would trigger your notices
19 of deposition, is that correct?

20 MR. HIBEY: Yes, sir.

21 JUDGE FARRAR: And you're still on -- your
22 status report said you would file written discovery on
23 September 1st and have it answered by September 30th.

24 MR. HIBEY: Yes, Your Honor.

25 JUDGE FARRAR: So if we had our decision

1 out by September 30th, and everyone said what a
2 wonderful decision it was and took no appeals, then
3 we'd be ready to launch into the depositions?

4 MR. HIBEY: Yes, sir.

5 JUDGE FARRAR: Okay. Ms. Brock, is that
6 correct?

7 MS. BROCK: Yes. And we're just noticing
8 that October 1st and September 30th are a Saturday and
9 a Sunday.

10 JUDGE FARRAR: I'm just, you know, more or
11 less --

12 MS. BROCK: I think we did put that in our
13 status report, though.

14 JUDGE FARRAR: Yes, that's -- you know,
15 then, I think with those understandings and your
16 explanations of what's been happening, then we would
17 be in a position to approve your -- the schedule you
18 submitted in your joint report, so we'll -- as part of
19 our order confirming what happened here, a) we will
20 approve that schedule.

21 I have one other item we wanted to
22 discuss, which involves this case indirectly and the
23 other cases directly. Before I get to that, is there
24 anything else either counsel would like to bring up?

25 MS. BROCK: Nothing from the Staff, Your

1 Honor.

2 MR. HIBEY: Nothing here.

3 JUDGE FARRAR: Mr. Hibey?

4 MR. HIBEY: Nothing here, Your Honor.

5 JUDGE FARRAR: Okay, fine. Thank you.

6 The other night we got a motion from Mr.
7 Geisen to quash his deposition in the Miller Moffitt
8 case, and obviously Ms. Penny is not here on the call,
9 so we don't want to talk too much about this, but you
10 have an agreement in this proceeding, the Geisen
11 proceeding, to do all depositions later.

12 We had a little bit of concern when we saw
13 the motion that you -- by doing the Geisen deposition
14 in the Miller Moffitt case now that that's kind of
15 inconsistent with your agreement here. And I suppose
16 we -- when the Staff files what I assume will be an
17 opposition in the Miller Moffitt case to the motion to
18 quash the deposition, they will address that
19 inconsistency, particularly since I seem to remember
20 a recent proceeding where the Staff said one
21 proceeding shouldn't go forward because discovery
22 could be misused and be used in that proceeding to get
23 around the restrictions in another one.

24 Would you all be good enough to address
25 that in your brief in response to the motion -- in the

1 Miller Moffitt case to quash the Geisen deposition?

2 MS. BROCK: Sure. I'm not sure that I'm
3 following --

4 JUDGE FARRAR: Okay. When the Government
5 brought them -- asked us to delay the Geisen
6 enforcement case pending the outcome of the criminal
7 case, because Mr. Geisen could use the discovery
8 process in the enforcement case to get around the
9 limited discovery in the criminal case.

10 Just glancing and not forming any
11 conclusions about the recent motion, it's like you're
12 using -- a person might perceive that you're using the
13 discovery in the Miller Moffitt case to get around an
14 agreement you have in the Geisen case. I mean, you do
15 have an agreement with Mr. Geisen in his case not to
16 do depositions until later, as we have just discussed
17 the last half hour or so?

18 MS. BROCK: Right. I guess -- I think
19 that -- do you want me to address that now, or do you
20 want me just to address that in writing?

21 JUDGE FARRAR: Probably better in writing,
22 since Ms. -- I don't know what Ms. Penny's position
23 is. That's not this case. It's the Miller Moffitt
24 case. I don't know what her position is, but I just
25 wanted to alert you that that struck us as something

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 that ought to be addressed. How you -- this may be
2 the first time we've had to reconcile the three
3 proceedings, and, you know, how they move forward,
4 because you do have a schedule in Miller Moffitt that
5 you're trying to adhere to.

6 MS. BROCK: I think that's the
7 complicating factor here, Your Honor.

8 JUDGE FARRAR: Is just the schedule.

9 MS. BROCK: Trying to move those cases
10 along to hearing.

11 JUDGE FARRAR: Yes.

12 MS. BROCK: As quickly as possible.

13 JUDGE FARRAR: Okay. But if you can -- or
14 another suggestion might be the Board has noted
15 privately and orally and in writing with appreciation
16 the cooperative spirit that has been exhibited between
17 the Staff and Ms. Penny in the Miller Moffitt case,
18 and the Staff and Mr. Hibey and his group in the
19 Geisen case.

20 And maybe this is something for the three
21 of you -- the staff, Ms. Penny, and Mr. Hibey -- to
22 get together and figure out how do you move the cases
23 along, and at the same time, you know, reconcile the
24 various needs while not slowing one case or the other
25 down unduly.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 So if you -- maybe then if you want to,
2 Ms. Brock, trigger those discussions, and if it looks
3 like they are successful, we haven't issued an order
4 saying when you should -- you know, changing the rules
5 on when you should reply to this motion to quash. We
6 certainly would look favorably on a motion and your
7 time to reply, because you and the two counsel were,
8 you know, working out a mutually agreeable situation.
9 That might -- if that works, that would save you
10 having to write a reply brief.

11 MS. BROCK: Well, yes. Thank you, Your
12 Honor, I appreciate that. We've had a fair amount of
13 discussions. I think we're just kind of between a
14 rock and a hard place on it. But if we -- if we think
15 that any further discussions can be fruitful, we'll
16 certainly work on that.

17 JUDGE FARRAR: Okay. Then, we'll leave
18 that to you. That's your option, but rest assured
19 that if you do go that direction we would look
20 favorably on a motion to extend your briefing time --

21 MS. BROCK: Okay.

22 JUDGE FARRAR: -- in response. And that
23 deposition is September 11th?

24 MS. BROCK: Yes.

25 JUDGE FARRAR: If we start to run up

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 against that date, and we have to, you know,
2 temporarily postpone the deposition because you all
3 are working on something else, you know, that's fine,
4 too.

5 MS. BROCK: Okay.

6 JUDGE FARRAR: You let us know what your
7 preference is on that, and we'll make sure -- next
8 time anyone talks to Ms. Penny, please pass the gist
9 of this on to her, and we will make sure she gets a --
10 this portion of the transcript, so she can see what we
11 were talking about.

12 All right. With that kind of collateral
13 matter out of the way, is there anything else anyone
14 would like to bring up?

15 (No response.)

16 Judge Trikouras, anything from you?

17 JUDGE TRIKOURAS: Not at this time, Judge
18 Farrar.

19 JUDGE FARRAR: Then, we'll talk later, you
20 and Judge Hawken and I, about the -- whether we want
21 to see that report or not.

22 Anything, Mr. Hibey, anything else?

23 MR. HIBEY: Nothing from this end, Your
24 Honor. Thank you.

25 JUDGE FARRAR: And Ms. Brock?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 MS. BROCK: No, thank you.

2 JUDGE FARRAR: Thank you all for
3 participating in this. Mr. Matthews, Mr. Horner, we
4 were happy to have you on the line.

5 And at this point, then, we will terminate
6 the call and go off the record. Thank you very much.

7 (Whereupon, at 1:42 p.m., the proceedings
8 in the foregoing matter were adjourned.)
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the attached proceedings
before the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission
in the matter of:

Name of Proceeding: David Geisen Status
Conference

Docket Number: IA-05-052

Location: Teleconference

were held as herein appears, and that this is the
original transcript thereof for the file of the United
States Nuclear Regulatory Commission taken by me and,
thereafter reduced to typewriting by me or under the
direction of the court reporting company, and that the
transcript is a true and accurate record of the
foregoing proceedings.



Charles Morrison
Official Reporter
Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc.

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com