



Enclosure 1

UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

AUG 14 1985

Docket Nos: 50-445/446

FACILITY: COMANCHE PEAK STEAM ELECTRIC STATION

APPLICANT: TEXAS UTILITIES ELECTRIC COMPANY

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF MEETING HELD ON JUNE 28, 1985 -
COMANCHE PEAK INTIMIDATION PANEL WITH APPLICANT
AND INTERVENOR

An open meeting was held on Friday, June 28, 1985 between the Comanche Peak (CP) Intimidation Panel and representatives of the CP Intervenors Group (CASE) and representatives of the Applicants (TUGCO) for the CP site. This meeting was transcribed and a copy of the transcript is being provided as an enclosure. The purpose of the meeting was to enable each of the groups to provide final arguments regarding alleged intimidation issues at Comanche Peak.


The Applicant made the opening remarks and the Intervenors Group then made their statement. The Applicant's representatives were then allowed a short rebuttal statement. The Applicant's representatives began their presentation with their definition of intimidation. They referenced the original Study Team Report and argued that there was no climate of intimidation at CP based on the small number of alleged incidents of intimidation. They also offered examples regarding management's efforts to detect intimidation at the CP site. The Applicant's representatives, then addressed each of the alleged incidents of intimidation and provided their arguments as to why these alleged incidents did not constitute intimidation. Finally, the Applicant's representatives addressed the numerous efforts, (SAFETEAM, Hotline, Supervisor Training, etc.) which had been implemented by the Applicant's representatives to improve the perceptions that employees had of management on the site.

The Intervenors Group stated that they continue to believe that the Intimidation Panel should meet with individual alleged. They argued that the NRC's iterative process through SSER-11 shows that something is wrong at CP, and that Docket 2 shows where this came from. The Intervenors Group addressed specific cases of alleged intimidation and gave arguments as to how these cases show that CP is different from other sites, and that CP management failed to support complaints from their employees. They noted that many complaints had to be resolved by TRT because they had not been resolved by management.

The Intervenors Group, also stated that the Intimidation Panel's methodology was flawed because there was no indication that it was looking at the entire regulatory record, and they were concerned that it may not be looking at alleged intimidation of crafts personnel. They also indicated that the root cause of the intimidation issues must be addressed.

8508220044 850814
PDR ADOCK 05000445
T PDR

In rebuttal the Applicant's representative argued that the TRT findings do not extrapolate back to intimidation; that of all the intimidation allegers, only the Stiners testified that they did not do their job properly; and that even if one accepts all of the alleged incidents of intimidation as true, there are still not enough of them to infer a climate of intimidation.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Annette Vietti-Cook". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned above the printed name.

Annette Vietti-Cook
Comanche Peak Project
Division of Licensing
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Attachment:
Transcript