June 13, 2000 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA <sup>00</sup> JUN 19 P4 :46 NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

DOCKETED USNRC

Before the Atomic	Safety and	Licensing Board
In the Matter of	)	
PRIVATE FUEL STORAGE L.L.C.	) ) )	Docket No. 72-22-ISFSI

# APPLICANT'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF THE BOARD'S DENIAL OF THE APPLICANT AND STAFF MOTIONS TO STRIKE PORTION OF TESTIMONY OF MICHAEL SHEEHAN ON UTAH CONTENTION S

)

Applicant Private Fuel Storage L.L.C. ("Applicant" or "PFS") files this motion for reconsideration of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board's ("Board") denial on June 12, 2000<sup>1</sup> of the motions of the Applicant and the NRC Staff to strike part of the pre-filed testimony of Michael F. Sheehan, Ph.D. on Contention Utah S.<sup>2</sup> The Applicant asks the Board to reconsider its decision in light of the fact that Dr. Sheehan's testimony on the vintage of the data underlying PFS's decommissioning cost estimates necessarily calls into question the validity of the estimates themselves, even though PFS and the State of Utah agreed in their stipulation regarding Utah S that the cost estimates, as opposed to the year's dollars in which they were provided and their potential future escalation, would no longer be an issue in this proceeding.<sup>3</sup>

Template = SECY-041

(Private Fuel Storage Facility)

KAS 1836

SECY-02

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Memorandum and Order (Ruling on In Limine Motions and Providing Administrative Directives) (June 12, 2000), at 4-5.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Prefiled Testimony of Michael F. Sheehan, Ph.D. on Behalf of the State of Utah Regarding Contention Utah S (May 15, 2000) ["Sheehan Utah S"]; Applicant's Motion to Strike Portions of Testimony of Michael Sheehan on Utah Contention S (May 31, 2000); NRC Staff's Motion in Limine to Exclude Portions of Prefiled Testimony of Michael F. Sheehan, Ph.D. Regarding Utah Contention S (May 31, 2000).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Joint Motion by the State of Utah and the Applicant to Approve Stipulation for the Hearing of Utah Contention S ["Joint Motion"] (Apr. 7, 2000), Attachment A, Basis 4, <u>approved by</u> Memorandum and Order (Granting Joint Motion to Approve Stipulation on Contention Utah S and Outlining Administrative Matters) (May 1, 2000).

Dr. Sheehan's testimony, in response to Questions 8, 19, and 20, questions the vintage of the cost data underlying PFS's decommissioning cost estimates (as opposed to the year's dollars in which PFS provided the estimates). Sheehan Utah S at 6, 10-11. In other words, the State is seeking to challenge the validity of the underlying cost data (by virtue of its age at the time the estimate was made) that PFS used to calculate that the costs of decommissioning the Private Fuel Storage Facility would be \$17,000 per spent fuel storage cask used there plus \$1,631,000 for the site.<sup>4</sup> If the State is allowed to challenge PFS's underlying cost data on the grounds of age, then the State effectively would be allowed to challenge PFS's estimates of \$17,000 per cask and \$1,631,000 for the site.<sup>5</sup> The State and PFS, however, explicitly agreed that:

Basis 4 of Contention S is modified such that the State does <u>not</u> contest whether the cost to decommission an individual storage cask is \$17,000 or whether the cost to decommission the remainder of the ISFSI, apart from the storage casks, is \$1,631,000.

Joint Motion at 3 (emphasis added).

Thus, PFS respectfully requests that the Board reconsider its June 12 decision and

strike the part of Michael Sheehan's testimony on Utah S concerning the vintage of the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> <u>Id.</u> at 10-11. <u>See also</u> Deposition of Michael Sheehan (May 4, 2000) at 124-25 (Question and Answer from bottom of page 124 and top of page 125 reproduced as Attachment A hereto). Dr. Sheehan explains his assertion (in the context of PFS's O&M cost estimates) that PFS's cost estimates provided in 1997 dollars may be inaccurate in that they may have been derived in prior years and then escalated forward to 1997 dollars by a factor of inflation that did not take into account real changes in the costs of the specific goods and services up to 1997. In the context of decommissioning, such an assertion constitutes a direct challenge to PFS's cost estimates of \$17,000 per cask and \$1,631,000 for the site.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> PFS used the cost data to directly calculate that the costs of decommissioning the Private Fuel Storage Facility would be \$17,000 per spent fuel storage cask used there plus \$1,631,000 for the site. See PFS License Application, App. B, at 4-2 to 4-6.

data underlying PFS's decommissioning cost estimates as outside the scope of Utah S as agreed upon by PFS and the State of Utah.

Respectfully submitted,

Jay E. Silberg Ernest L. Blake, Jr. Paul A. Gaukler SHAW PITTMAN 2300 N Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20037 (202) 663-8000 Counsel for Private Fuel Storage L.L.C.

June 13, 2000

## Attachment A

From pp. 124-125 of Deposition of Michael Sheehan (May 4, 2000)

Q. Is there any deficiency in these costs as we see in the O&M costs other than what we've described so far as estimating them up in 2002 and 2003 and subsequent dollars? You say it would be better, but is there any deficiency in terms of, as far as you're concerned, using the 1997 dollars and escalating them?

A. Well, it's not just 1997 dollars, it's the 1997 estimate. Remember, the estimate here could have been based on somebody went out and got a bid in 1990 and just ran that up into 1997 dollars, but it would still be based on a 1990 bid. Just because this is in

125

1 1997 dollars doesn't mean that the estimate was based in It only means that the dollars being used to 1997. 2 3 describe the estimate are 1997 dollars. The actual -- when somebody went out and said, 4 "How much do legal fees cost," and if they went out and 5 6 surveyed the market in 1990 and just used the CPI to upgrade that to 1997, it's probably wrong because legal 7 fees have probably gone up more than the rate of 8 inflation between those years. So it would be much 9 10 better and much more accurate to go out and see what the legal fees are in 2000 and the price of concrete in 2000 11

12 and go from there because your error function is going 13 to diverge more and more and adjusting for the year is 14 not going to catch that.

## UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

#### Before the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board

In the Matter of	)	
	)	
PRIVATE FUEL STORAGE L.L.C.	)	Docket No. 72-22
	)	
(Private Fuel Storage Facility)	)	ASLBP No. 97-732-02-ISFSI

#### **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that copies of the "Applicant's Motion for Reconsideration of the Board's Denial of the Applicant and Staff Motions to Strike Portion of Testimony of Michael Sheehan on Utah Contention S" was served on the persons listed below (unless otherwise noted) by e-mail with conforming copies by U.S. mail, first class, postage prepaid, this 13th day of June 2000.

G. Paul Bollwerk III, Esq., Chairman Administrative Judge Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, D.C. 20555-0001 e-mail: <u>GPB@nrc.gov</u>

Dr. Peter S. Lam Administrative Judge Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, D.C. 20555-0001 e-mail: <u>PSL@nrc.gov</u> Dr. Jerry R. Kline Administrative Judge Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, D.C. 20555-0001 e-mail: JRK2@nrc.gov; kjerry@erols.com

 \* Susan F. Shankman Deputy Director, Licensing & Inspection Directorate, Spent Fuel Project Office Office of Nuclear Material Safety & Safeguards U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, D.C. 20555 Office of the Secretary U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, D.C. 20555-0001 Attention: Rulemakings and Adjudications Staff e-mail: <u>hearingdocket@nrc.gov</u> (Original and two copies)

Catherine L. Marco, Esq. Sherwin E. Turk, Esq. Office of the General Counsel Mail Stop O-15 B18 U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, D.C. 20555 e-mail: pfscase@nrc.gov

John Paul Kennedy, Sr., Esq. Confederated Tribes of the Goshute Reservation and David Pete 1385 Yale Avenue Salt Lake City, Utah 84105 e-mail: john@kennedys.org

Diane Curran, Esq. Harmon, Curran, Spielberg & Eisenberg, L.L.P. 1726 M Street, N.W., Suite 600 Washington, D.C. 20036 e-mail: DCurran.HCSE@zzapp.org

\*Richard E. Condit, Esq. Land and Water Fund of the Rockies 2260 Baseline Road, Suite 200 Boulder, CO 80302

\* By U.S. mail only

 \* Adjudicatory File Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, D.C. 20555-0001

Denise Chancellor, Esq. Assistant Attorney General Utah Attorney General's Office 160 East 300 South, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor P.O. Box 140873 Salt Lake City, Utah 84114-0873 e-mail: dchancel@state.UT.US

Joro Walker, Esq. Land and Water Fund of the Rockies 2056 East 3300 South, Suite 1 Salt Lake City, UT 84109 e-mail: joro61@inconnect.com

Danny Quintana, Esq. Skull Valley Band of Goshute Indians Danny Quintana & Associates, P.C. 68 South Main Street, Suite 600 Salt Lake City, Utah 84101 e-mail: quintana@xmission.com

kon bli

Paul Gaukler

Document #: 946111 v.1