

RAS 3114

Official Transcript of Proceedings

DOCKETED
USNRC

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

2002 JAN -2 PM 12: 05

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
RULEMAKINGS AND
ADJUDICATIONS STAFF

Title: Duke Cogema Stone and Webster
Savannah River MOX Fuel Fabrication
Facility

Docket Number: 70-3098-ML

Location: (telephone conference)

Date: Thursday, December 20, 2001

Work Order No.: NRC-151

Pages 420-480

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 APPEARANCES:

2 On Behalf of the Applicant, Duke Cogema Stone &
3 Webster LLC:

4 DONALD SILVERMAN, ESQ.

5 ALEX S. POLONSKY, ESQ.

6 of: Morgan, Lewis & Bockius

7 1800 M Street, NW

8 Washington, DC 20036-5861

9 (202) 467-7502

10

11 On Behalf of the Intervenor, Georgians Against
12 Nuclear Energy:

13 GLENN CARROLL

14 Georgians Against Nuclear Energy

15 P. O. Box 8574

16 Atlanta, GA 30306

17 (404) 378-4263 (Facsimile)

18

19 DIANNE CURRAN, ESQ.

20 of: Harmon, Curran, Spielberg

21 & Eisenberg, LLP

22 1726 M Street, NW

23 Suite 600

24 Washington, DC 20036

25 (202) 328-3500

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 APPEARANCES:

2 On Behalf of the Intervenor, Blue Ridge
3 Environmental Defense League:

4 DONALD MONIAK
5 P.O. Box 3487
6 Aiken, GA 29802
7 (803) 644-6953

8
9 On Behalf of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

10 MITZI A YOUNG, ESQ.
11 of: Office of General Counsel
12 Nuclear Regulatory Commission
13 Room 15 E12
14 One White Flint North
15 Rockville, MD 80521
16 (301) 415-1523

17
18 ALSO PRESENT:

19 TIM JOHNSON, NRC
20 ANDREW PERSINKO, NRC

21
22
23
24
25

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

(9:01 a.m.)

1
2
3 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: This is Judge
4 Moore, with me is Judge Lam. In the future, it would
5 be appreciated if the staff and intervenors would
6 watch the clock, you've been keeping others waiting.

7 MS. CURRAN: I was unaware that we had to
8 call in. It seems like previously we've been called.
9 I don't know when we were noticed on this but I
10 apologize.

11 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: It would be
12 appreciated if, starting with the staff, if you'd all
13 identify yourself for the Court Reporter, please.

14 MS. YOUNG: Hi, this is Mitzi Young
15 representing the NRC staff. With me are Joseph Gitter
16 and Tim Johnson and Drew Persinko. Oh, I'm sorry, Joe
17 Gitter's not here, I'm sorry.

18 MR. SILVERMAN: This is Don Silverman and
19 Alex Polonsky representing Duke Cogema Stone &
20 Webster.

21 MS. CARROLL: This is Glenn Carroll from
22 Georgians Against Nuclear Energy. Not in this
23 location but on the call is Dianne Curran who is our
24 legal advisor.

25 MR. MONIAK: This is Don Moniak with Blue

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Ridge Environmental Defense League.

2 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Thank you.
3 Just for your information, the Board will not be
4 available next week in light of DCS's motion for
5 reconsideration. If anyone is going to be seeking
6 extension time, we will take that matter up right now.

7 MS. CARROLL: Thank you. This is Glenn
8 Carroll. We wanted to request an extension till
9 January 9th. Would you like to hear our reasons?

10 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Please.

11 MS. CARROLL: Well, Dianne, our legal
12 advisor, has the 'flu and another deadline this week,
13 and then Dianne and Dr. Lyman are both out of town
14 from Christmas through New Year's.

15 MR. MONIAK: I was going to request until
16 January 3rd because of the holiday season simply.

17 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Who just
18 spoke?

19 MR. MONIAK: Don Moniak.

20 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Thank you,
21 Mr. Moniak. Ms. Young, do you have anything on this?

22 MS. YOUNG: The subject matter of the
23 motion again, Judge?

24 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: I'm sorry,
25 Ms. Young, I can't hear you. Would you repeat what

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 you said please?

2 MS. YOUNG: The intervenors are requesting
3 extension of time with respect to which filing, Judge?

4 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: To the DCS
5 motion for reconsideration and then the alternative
6 certification through the Commission.

7 MS. YOUNG: Right now isn't that deadlined
8 around January 2nd anyway? Or have I miscalculated
9 it?

10 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Mr.
11 Silverman, you can probably tell us that, I have not
12 calculated it.

13 MR. SILVERMAN: Well, the intervenors are
14 due ten days after the filing and, Sir, that I believe
15 is the 27th. I don't recall whether the staff gets an
16 extra five days, perhaps ten days.

17 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Sorry, didn't
18 you file on the 7th, I'm sorry, I have the wrong month
19 in front of me on the calendar.

20 MS. YOUNG: Filing was the 17th.

21 MR. SILVERMAN: We filed on the 17th,
22 your Honor, and ten days by my count is the 27th.

23 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: All right. Do
24 you have any objection to an extension on this, Mr.
25 Silverman?

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MR. SILVERMAN: Your Honor, we wouldn't
2 oppose the BREDL extension until the 3rd, we'd rather
3 not have an extension until I believe the 9th. The
4 primary rationale is that, as you know, the terrorism
5 impact on NEFA is already before the Commission on the
6 fuel storage case and it's important that your
7 decision be made as soon as possible on that.

8 Should you decide to refer that to the
9 Commission, it would be best to do that as soon as
10 possible, so we'd like to keep the ball rolling but we
11 wouldn't object to an extension to the 3rd.

12 MR. MONIAK: Judge Moore, this is Don
13 Moniak from BREDL. I just want to point out I have
14 less work to do, that's why I only cited the 3rd, too.

15 MS. CURRAN: Judge Moore, this is Dianne
16 Curran. I'm the person who will be responsible for
17 helping GANE respond to this motion. It's 28 pages
18 long and I had for a long time planned to take a
19 vacation with my family during Christmas week, and to
20 file something on the 3rd I would have to spend a
21 certain amount of time preparing, you know, helping
22 GANE to prepare. This is quite a bit of argument here
23 that needs to be responded to so it doesn't do us much
24 good to have an extension till the 3rd.

25 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Well in light

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 of the timing of the filing and recognizing the
2 inherent difficulty this time of year, let's have all
3 responses due on the 7th of January, 2002 and if the
4 Board wishes to hear argument, it will do so on the
5 8th. And we will let you know on the 7th whether we
6 wish to have a telephone conference and hear argument
7 on the 8th.

8 MR. SILVERMAN: What time then would the
9 filing deadline be?

10 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Close of
11 business on the 7th.

12 MR. SILVERMAN: Because usually it's
13 midnight, your Honor, that's why I'm asking.

14 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Well, let's
15 make it close of business.

16 MS. CURRAN: Can you give us the time?

17 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Four thirty
18 is the official business hours of the NRC.

19 MS. CURRAN: Okay.

20 MR. SILVERMAN: Thank you.

21 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: And we will
22 notify you that evening by e-mail whether we wish to
23 have an argument on the 8th.

24 MS. CARROLL: At what time? Do you want
25 to set a time on the 8th?

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Yes. It
2 would be three o'clock in the afternoon. All right,
3 I wanted to get that out of the way.

4 Turning to the matters of scheduling for
5 discovery, first question for Ms. Young and the staff,
6 I have four dates and I frankly cannot remember where
7 I obtained them for the projected dates for the draft
8 and final SER and draft of final EIS. Those dates are
9 for the SER, 4/30/02 and the final 9/30/02, and for
10 the EIS the draft 2/25/02 and the final EIS 9/30/02.

11 Ms. Young, are those dates still operative
12 and will they hold?

13 MS. YOUNG: These are dates the staff is
14 working towards, Judge Moore.

15 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Okay. So for
16 planning purposes, scheduling purposes then, those
17 dates are the usable dates?

18 MS. YOUNG: That's correct.

19 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Okay, fine.

20 MR. POLONSKY: Judge Moore, this is Mr.
21 Polonsky. Could you clarify, did you say 4/3/02 or
22 4/30/02?

23 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: For the SER
24 draft the date I have is 4/30 -- three zero/02.

25 MR. POLONSKY: Thank you.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Ms. Young,
2 you might just fill me in. I have had these marked on
3 the calendar, were these announced on your web site?

4 MS. YOUNG: That's correct.

5 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Okay, that's
6 where they came from.

7 Second question, Ms. Young, the hearing
8 file, you have now filed it. What is the staff's plan
9 for supplementing the hearing file? What turnaround
10 time on each entry?

11 MS. YOUNG: Are you saying with respect to
12 issuance of these later documents, or the
13 correspondence?

14 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Each and
15 every piece of paper you're going to supplement the
16 hearing file with, what's your turnaround time going
17 to be?

18 MS. YOUNG: Generally, depending on how
19 voluminous it is, it's either five to ten days.

20 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: You'll have
21 to do better. Why can't it be done in three?

22 MS. YOUNG: Again, the size of the
23 document, Judge Moore. But, you know, for a piece of
24 paper like a letter three days is not a problem.

25 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: I think that

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 would be helpful if the staff --

2 MS. YOUNG: We're talking business days,
3 of course.

4 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Do any of the
5 parties wish to address this issue?

6 MR. MONIAK: Yes. This is Don Moniak from
7 Blue Ridge Environmental Defense League.

8 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Yes, Mr.
9 Moniak?

10 MR. MONIAK: Were we notified by e-mail or
11 anything of the hearing file and where is it?

12 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Ms. Young?

13 MS. YOUNG: My understanding is that that
14 file was observed by the Project Office.

15 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: By the NRC
16 staff then?

17 MS. YOUNG: Right, but not the Office of
18 General Counsel. That's what John Hull arranged
19 before his departure on business this week.

20 MS. CARROLL: When can we expect to
21 receive it?

22 MS. YOUNG: You haven't gotten anything
23 yet?

24 MR. MONIAK: I haven't. Don Moniak from
25 BREDL, I have not received anything that I can find.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: All right.
2 Ms. Young, as soon as this telephone conference you
3 will immediately check to see the status of that. If
4 it has not been served you will re-serve it by Federal
5 Express to these people.

6 MS. YOUNG: All right, Judge Moore.

7 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: I received
8 it. Mr. Silverman, have you received it?

9 MR. SILVERMAN: We have not.

10 MR. MONIAK: Judge Moore, this is Don
11 Moniak, were we supposed to receive at least notice
12 that it was filed? I understood it was to be posted
13 on the NRC web site.

14 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: I'm sorry,
15 Mr. Moniak, the notice or the entire thing?

16 MR. MONIAK: Either. I'd have to look at
17 the rules, I know somewhere in the rules some part of
18 it has to be posted to the NRC.gov. I don't have it
19 in front of me though.

20 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Well, Mr.
21 Moniak, I believe the rule on the hearing file merely
22 indicates that they can incorporate by reference and
23 address if it's already available electronically, an
24 electronic address.

25 MS. YOUNG: I don't have that electronic

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 address with me today but I'll get that to the parties
2 as soon as I can.

3 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: You will get
4 that to them today, Ms. Young.

5 I received a box containing a dozen or so
6 volumes earlier this week, I believe it was Tuesday,
7 and I assumed at that time as it was delivered to me
8 and each of the other Board members, it had gone out
9 to all the parties. But Ms. Young, you will check and
10 if it has not, you will do it by Federal Express. If
11 it has gone out, you will find out and notify the
12 parties when they will be receiving it. If by chance
13 it went by slow boat, you will need to reconsider your
14 decision and perhaps re-serve it.

15 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE LAM: Judge Lam. The
16 volume of material, two boxes of documents?

17 MS. YOUNG: That's correct.

18 MR. MONIAK: Two boxes, what size? Don
19 Moniak.

20 MS. YOUNG: Xerox box sizes.

21 MR. MONIAK: That's not much considering
22 what we've received already.

23 MS. YOUNG: No, in terms of reproducing
24 that if it's somewhere in transit.

25 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: I was just

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 thinking, Ms. Young, there will be a reproduction
2 problem. What we will do is you check on it, inform
3 by e-mail the Board and the parties what the status of
4 it is and then if it has not been served you must do
5 it immediately. And you should go ahead and do it by
6 Federal Express if it's not been served because you've
7 already had plenty of time to reproduce it.

8 MS. YOUNG: Certainly.

9 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: If it is lost
10 and can't be traced, then we'll determine the most
11 expeditious course of action and just let me know by
12 close of business today.

13 MS. YOUNG: All right, we will do that.

14 MR. MONIAK: This is Don Moniak from
15 BREDL. If that's the case, if we could receive by e-
16 mail as soon as possible, meaning today, an index to
17 the hearing file, just titles, bibliography, whatever,
18 if that arrives it could be that we don't need you to
19 copy everything.

20 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Ms. Young, is
21 an index, can it be posted or is that not possible?

22 MS. YOUNG: I'm sure an index can be
23 posted. Not having worked with the service of this
24 document, Mr. Hull handled that, I'm a little ignorant
25 about the details but I'll certainly find them out

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 today.

2 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Okay.
3 Understand.

4 MS. CARROLL: This is Glenn Carroll. GANE
5 is not nearly as computer savvy as BREDL so we require
6 the boxes of documents.

7 MS. YOUNG: Oh you'll have the documents.
8 Right now where they are is the question.

9 MS. CARROLL: I just wanted you to know
10 you need to, we need that.

11 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Let's move
12 on, please.

13 MS. CARROLL: Judge Moore, we do have some
14 concerns with the hearing file but not what you
15 raised, which was timing, so I held that in reserve.

16 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: I'm sorry,
17 Ms. Carroll, you're too obtuse for me this morning.

18 MS. CARROLL: I'm sorry. We did have some
19 concerns with the hearing file but they weren't
20 related to the time issues that you just raised, so if
21 we're closing out the hearing file topic, then I do
22 have some things to say but I think they apply more to
23 the --

24 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Well let's
25 address any questions on the hearing file right now.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Ms. Carroll, go ahead.

2 MS. CARROLL: Yes, if I am to review it
3 carefully I'm a little frightened that it's two Xerox
4 boxes of material, but we are very concerned about its
5 completeness and now, more than ever, we think it'll
6 take a couple of months to straighten it out to make
7 sure it's complete. So I expect we may have some
8 document discovery but not perhaps right away.

9 And also there'll be issues about
10 protections for proprietary, which we've already
11 engaged in but we're not sure how the staff is
12 planning to handle proprietary information for us, but
13 also safeguards and classified information.

14 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Right. Ms.
15 Young, in the material that's served there should not
16 be any safeguards, classified or proprietary
17 information in the hearing file. Is that correct?

18 MS. YOUNG: That's correct. Otherwise we
19 require a protective order to release such things.

20 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Yes. Is
21 there such material that should be in the hearing file
22 and is only noted in the index because of its status
23 as protected, safeguards or classified?

24 MS. YOUNG: Let me confer with the staff,
25 I'm not familiar with the file, Judge Moore.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Unfortunately, the people in this room did
2 not work assembling the hearing file but it's my
3 understanding in general and NRC practice that we have
4 both proprietary and non-proprietary versions of
5 documents, and I would assume that the non-proprietary
6 version was included as part of the hearing file. So
7 the answer to your question is, yes, there is
8 proprietary information that was not put in the
9 hearing file.

10 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: But it is
11 noted in the index that it is proprietary and the non-
12 proprietary version is included?

13 MS. YOUNG: Well, not having seen the
14 index I can't answer that question.

15 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: All right.

16 MS. CARROLL: But since GANE has signed
17 the non-disclosure agreement, then is it safe to
18 assume the proprietary version was sent to us?

19 MS. YOUNG: When did you sign it?

20 MS. YOUNG: This was August I think.

21 MR. MONIAK: July.

22 MS. YOUNG: I'll have to reach Mr. Hull by
23 phone today and find out exactly what --

24 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Right. If
25 there are any problems with proprietary information in

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 the hearing file, please notify me and we'll deal with
2 it directly.

3 MS. CARROLL: Thank you, Judge Moore.

4 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Yes?

5 MR. MONIAK: Don Moniak. Judge, in terms
6 of proprietary information, there's one issue in that
7 the last, there's a voluminous response to a request
8 for additional information that was sent out
9 September, early September, and there was
10 inadvertently put in some proprietary information.
11 However, the staff determined that some of the
12 information was not proprietary and DCS had 30 days to
13 respond to that. Is this the time for the staff and
14 everybody else to be aware that, we'd like to know
15 what the status of that information that was not
16 proprietary is.

17 MR. SILVERMAN: I'm not familiar with that
18 at all, this is Mr. Silverman, what you're referring
19 to.

20 MR. MONIAK: I will put it in writing in
21 an e-mail after this. Is that okay? That is a
22 question.

23 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: No. What I'd
24 like, let's go ahead to discovery for a moment. Most
25 of the matters, such as the one you just raised, Mr.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Moniak, can and should be resolved among the parties
2 without the necessity of formal motions with the
3 Board.

4 MR. MONIAK: Okay.

5 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: And when I
6 schedule an order after the first of the year, after
7 we deal with schedule, I will reiterate what I'm now
8 telling you that it will not be appreciated if you all
9 do not resolve these matters. And, indeed, I will
10 require you in any motion filed involving a discovery
11 matter to reiterate that you have attempted, and
12 failed, to resolve the issue amicably among
13 yourselves.

14 So you will be required to do that before
15 you can come to me because most of this can all be
16 worked out and the Board, frankly, expects all of you
17 to cooperate with one another and to resolve these and
18 not let it deteriorate where we move into the motion
19 practice and protective orders and motions to compel.

20 That said, Mr. Moniak, Mr. Silverman, Ms.
21 Young, Ms. Carroll, Ms. Curran, you should be working
22 out these matters, such as the one that Mr. Moniak
23 just raised.

24 MR. MONIAK: Understood.

25 MS. CARROLL: Your Honor, there was one

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 more item I have on the hearing file that's rather
2 large and has already not been resolved in phone
3 conversations. And that is that the operating license
4 application, according to the schedule that also
5 states when the SER and the EIS will be released,
6 states that DCS is expected to apply for their
7 operating license in late July. And we need to
8 establish up front that this document will be included
9 in the hearing file and that it is relevant.

10 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Well, no, Ms.
11 Carroll it is not; well, without getting ahead, we
12 will be issuing, in all probability, a memorandum, an
13 order dealing with your motion, GANE motion to dismiss
14 or in the alternative to hold the proceeding in
15 abeyance. One of the Board members, hopefully, will
16 be returning to the office from I believe they were in
17 Charlotte on one of the Duke cases and when Judge
18 Kelter returns, hopefully we'll be issuing and
19 resolving that motion.

20 At this point, on the face of it, in light
21 of what the Commission's notice has previously
22 indicated, that will be on a separate -- that being
23 the DCS's application for operating authority -- will
24 be on a separate track in a separate hearing file.

25 MS. CARROLL: Well, your Honor, since it

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 appears that it's not evident to you that this meets
2 the criteria in -- 2.740, as a relevant document which
3 is the standard for the hearing file, then may we have
4 the opportunity to present a written brief containing
5 this concept?

6 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Well, once we
7 resolve your motion to dismiss, we can take that up.

8 MS. YOUNG: Judge Moore, I believe the
9 hearing file talks about documents relevant to the
10 pending application.

11 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Correct.

12 MS. YOUNG: And all correspondence related
13 to the pending application. I don't believe that that
14 document would come within the scope of that.

15 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: And Mr.
16 Silverman I believe you'll be in concurrence with the
17 staff on this?

18 MR. SILVERMAN: Yes, sir.

19 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Ms. Carroll,
20 it appears that that is correct and that that
21 proceeding, as indicated by the Commission, is a
22 separate proceeding and not part of this proceeding.
23 So to bring that license application into this hearing
24 file, would appear not necessary and therefor also
25 it's not relevant.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MS. YOUNG: But Judge Moore, that doesn't
2 mean the document would be unavailable to Ms. Carroll
3 when it's issued, it will be available through ADAMS.

4 MS. CARROLL: Well, but the thing is is
5 that that might be satisfactory except that it will be
6 held up internally at the NRC for review and it looked
7 like it wouldn't be issued until an obvious milestone,
8 which is September 30, which is when discovery would
9 open on the NRC. We haven't decided yet how DCS would
10 be affected, but assuming it would be as voluminous or
11 more so than the CAR, there's no way that we will be
12 able to absorb that, deal with discovery and, frankly,
13 it blows my mind that all these smart people don't
14 think it's relevant. It's the operating life for what
15 we plan to -- what could be more relevant?

16 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Ms. Carroll,
17 Ms. Curran, on that matter if you feel you must, file
18 appropriate papers and the Board will deal with them,
19 but on the face of it it would appear not to be on
20 this track and if it's available to you for sources,
21 you may wish to pursue those other sources.

22 MS. CARROLL: Well, our main interest is
23 in having it available to us on the same date that
24 it's made available to the NRC. Maybe it's less
25 important whether it's officially part of the hearing

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 file than that it be available to us as a party to the
2 CAR proceeding.

3 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Ms. Carroll,
4 file, if you feel you must, appropriate papers.

5 MS. CARROLL: Okay.

6 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Anything
7 else?

8 MS. CARROLL: Not on the hearing file.

9 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: We'll move
10 directly then to the discovery schedule. I will be
11 setting the schedule after the first of the year,
12 shortly after the first of the year, reiterating in
13 part what I've said about cooperation and reviewing
14 those efforts in any filings which were dealing with
15 discovery.

16 Second, is the filing of a proposed
17 schedule by DCS, accurate in the sense that he says
18 there are two issues on which you couldn't agree, the
19 period for taking depositions and the date on which
20 all experts must be named. Is that the crux of the
21 disagreement among the parties?

22 MS. CARROLL: That and then a less central
23 point which is a proposal actually shapes the
24 discovery schedule. We see a possibility for a third
25 round of interrogatories.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Mr.
2 Silverman.

3 MR. POLONSKY: Correct. If these two
4 issues are resolved then either there is room for a
5 third round or there is not room for a third round.

6 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: All right.
7 As I will make plain in the discovery schedule order,
8 the Board wishes you all to begin immediately, which
9 would be the time over the next several weeks. The
10 clock has started as of this telephone conference on
11 your time for preparing interrogatories. I will set
12 the schedule.

13 Are you in agreement, all of you, that two
14 rounds in any event of interrogatories is appropriate?

15 MS. CARROLL: I'd like Dianne to pipe up
16 if not, but I think we feel that would be sufficient.

17 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Right.
18 You've noted a third round and if I understood Mr.
19 Silverman just moments ago, he indicated that that
20 would be dependent of the time line of the schedule.

21 MR. POLONSKY: That was Mr. Polonsky. I'm
22 sorry I didn't identify myself earlier but that's
23 correct.

24 MS. CARROLL: And what I'm trying to say
25 is we feel very strongly about the freedom to

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 establish experts for a longer period and the need to
2 consolidate depositions, which is mainly a function of
3 how much money GANE can hope to come up with to
4 conduct all of this.

5 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Well, late
6 filed contentions are possible, and a late file
7 contention may require a new expert, that kind of
8 thing of course would not be precluded under any
9 schedule. Would recognizing now that you would have
10 that ability, does that change your view as the time
11 for naming experts?

12 MS. CARROLL: Well, I want to make clear
13 that the way we read 2.740, it protects the parties
14 from trying to spring surprise experts out at the late
15 minute. We think that obligates us to identify our
16 experts as we identified them. So that, given our
17 resources, and we just don't see any reason, I mean
18 it's strategically advantageous to us to identify our
19 experts early on to go through discovery with us, but
20 we are loath to get into a lot of complication and
21 opposition to introducing experts, and February 15,
22 which is proposed by DCS, is just too soon for us.

23 So we want to avoid legal complications.

24 MR. POLONSKY: Your Honor, this is Mr.
25 Polonsky.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Yes, Mr.
2 Polonsky.

3 MR. POLONSKY: From what you've stated it
4 appears that February 15 might be too late in your
5 mind but, in any event, we believe that experts need
6 to be identified for each admitted contention before
7 interrogatories can be useful, so that they should be
8 geared directly towards an individual.

9 Now GANE has identified certain experts
10 that they use for admission of contentions but they
11 clearly can identify others for testimony and
12 specifically on issues like seismic, which are not
13 being brought up right now for reconsideration or
14 appeal, those are highly technical specific issues and
15 any interrogatories would need to be directed to an
16 expert. And we would need to know who that expert is
17 in order to draft interrogatories for that admitted
18 contention, for example.

19 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Mr. Polonsky,
20 wouldn't the answers to a first round of
21 interrogatories necessarily reveal the expert at that
22 time?

23 MR. POLONSKY: Well, based on informal
24 conversations, and I would like to give credit to GANE
25 and BREDL for all of us trying to work this out before

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 we got to this conference call, but it appears that
2 even after a first or second round that GANE may not
3 have identified who that expert is, and a response to
4 an interrogatory could be we have not identified an
5 expert at this time. And to us that would not be a
6 useful good use of our time.

7 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Okay. Let's
8 go to the end and work backwards. Are we all
9 agreed that the 28th of February 2003 is the date on
10 which the Board's final decision will issue in this
11 case?

12 MR. POLONSKY: This is Mr. Polonsky.
13 Assuming that the schedule for deliverables by the NRC
14 staff remains the same, if you're talking about 135
15 days after, yes, we agree.

16 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Well the
17 staff I trust, Mr. Polonsky, is working under the same
18 admonition of the Commission that this will be
19 completed within approximately two years of when you
20 filed your --

21 MS. YOUNG: Application.

22 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: The
23 application, yes.

24 MS. YOUNG: That's correct.

25 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: So with that

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 assumption and we'll hope it's not a large one, then
2 any hearing session would take place at the very end
3 of 2002.

4 MS. CARROLL: By my calculation, your
5 Honor, it was September 30 being the date that that
6 135 days begins, then it would be, our hearings would
7 be around the middle of February and perhaps you would
8 issue a decision at the end of February.

9 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: February of
10 2003?

11 MS. CARROLL? February of 2003.

12 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Mr. Polonsky,
13 where is the math error here?

14 MR. POLONSKY: We are assuming that the
15 paper presentations will be sufficient and that an
16 oral presentation may not be required. If that's the
17 case, then February 2003 is the date that the Board
18 could issue a decision. If not, then Ms. Carroll is
19 correct, that 2003 February would likely be the date
20 that an oral presentation would start in accordance
21 with the --

22 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: I'm sorry,
23 and before that where are you finding that difference?

24 MS. CARROLL: I can explain that, your
25 Honor, I believe. There is the schedule that was

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 posted by the staff of the milestones and we are still
2 working with that on the SER and the EIS schedule.
3 But the CRI 01-13, the Commission Order, established
4 some differences in the schedule and they linked oral
5 arguments to the final EIS, establishing it as 135
6 days after.

7 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: I see. But
8 that would not be, the discovery schedule with the
9 possible exception of late filed contentions, that
10 would be aimed at the final SER and the EIS. The rest
11 of the discovery can all be concluded well in advance
12 of the dates of the filings of those documents. Do we
13 have general agreement on that?

14 MR. POLONSKY: This is Mr. Polonsky.
15 Absolutely. We thought you were talking about the
16 entire duration of the entire proceeding.

17 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Well, the
18 problem I have with GANE's approach is the Board is
19 very loath to agree to issuing a discovery schedule
20 that would put all the depositions in such a short
21 time period. It is the Board's view that the draft
22 EIS and the draft SER should, for all intents and
23 purposes, be treated as if they are final documents
24 for discovery purposes.

25 MS. CURRAN: This is Dianne Curran. Judge

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Moore, can I respond on the issue of the depositions?

2 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Yes.

3 MS. CURRAN: This is just based on
4 experience of when you're looking, the depositions to
5 me, it seems like there's two very crucial parts of
6 discovery. One is document discovery and the other is
7 depositions. The interrogatories can be helpful but
8 not nearly as helpful as those other two parts. And
9 when you are spending the money that it requires to
10 take depositions, the time to do it is when the case
11 is at its most, the preparation is at its most fully
12 developed.

13 I think given that the NRC staff is
14 reviewing this application, that their evaluation has
15 a major effect on the application on both the safety
16 and environmental side, it is most efficient and
17 effective if one can do the depositions together so
18 that you basically fly your experts to a given
19 location once and you prepare your experts to look at
20 the whole array of what's out there in terms of the
21 other side's case.

22 And I don't personally feel that we could
23 be as effective as we need to if we are having to take
24 depositions several months before we have the staff's
25 ultimate conclusions about the application, because

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 you want to be able to ask the applicant about, you
2 know, the staff's conclusions. You want to be able to
3 ask the staff about the applicants, you want your
4 experts to be able to look at the whole, and I've
5 never been in a case where we were not able to do
6 that.

7 Aside from being very expensive for us, I
8 just can't see how it would be very effective.

9 MS. YOUNG: Judge Moore, I think Ms.
10 Curran is remembering the days of NRC practice before
11 the NRC became a lot more conscious of deadlines and
12 schedules. It has been found in a number of cases
13 that discovery has proceeded in advance of documents
14 being produced by the staff, including in one I was
15 involved in in the mid-90s, the Vogtle proceeding.
16 There was considerable discovery before the staff came
17 out with any piece of paper on any position in the
18 proceeding.

19 So this not unusual. It's an effort to
20 make sure that the things that can be handled and
21 discovered and the positions of the parties revealed,
22 can be treated on an expeditious basis and then those
23 matters that are left which are -- findings in the
24 environmental and safety documents could be treated at
25 a later date.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 And I understand that the Commission's
2 ruling in CRI 01-13 envisioned it to the extent that
3 it talked about late filed contention discovery only
4 transpiring 80 days from issuance of the final EIS and
5 SER.

6 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Mr. Polonsky,
7 do you wish to address anything on this issue, other
8 than what you've already put in your paper?

9 MR. POLONSKY: Just to concur with the NRC
10 staff that if additional discovery is required, then
11 there is an opportunity for late filed contentions.

12 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Mr. Polonsky,
13 while you're there before I turned back to Ms. Curran
14 and Ms. Young, in your view, late filed contentions
15 after the SER, final SER and EIS or for that matter
16 contentions in the draft SER and EIS, do you believe
17 30 days is an appropriate time period for late filed
18 contentions after those documents?

19 MR. POLONSKY: After they are issued?
20 After they are issued, yes.

21 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Ms. Young?

22 MR. POLONSKY: If I might, your Honor, the
23 entire document is not going to need to be reviewed.
24 I think there are specific contentions that have been
25 brought out and to the extent that late filed

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 contentions are likely to relate to those, those
2 particular sections of the document can be reviewed
3 and contentions can be based on that.

4 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Ms. Young?

5 MS. YOUNG: Judge Moore, I've got a
6 concern. To the extent you're talking about --

7 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Who is this
8 please?

9 MS. YOUNG: This is Ms. Young.

10 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Okay, Ms.
11 Young. I didn't recognize your voice, go ahead.

12 MS. YOUNG: No problem. I've got a
13 concern. To the extent that you would envision a
14 schedule which would have intervenors filing
15 contentions 30 days after a draft document --

16 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Well, no. My
17 thought was that that would be the window in which
18 late filed contentions would be considered to meet the
19 good cause timeliness quite clearly of the late filed
20 contentions standards.

21 MS. YOUNG: But 30 days from a draft
22 document, Judge Moore? That's what's confusing me
23 because it could be that issues that intervenors would
24 be concerned about that may be apparent from the draft
25 would be totally resolved by the time the file is

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 issued and there would be a lot of needless resources
2 expended addressing such contention.

3 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: I didn't have
4 in mind requiring anyone to file them, what I was
5 merely saying is that a reasonable period in which to
6 expect file filed contentions that would relate to
7 those documents, assuming the party wished to file
8 them.

9 MS. CARROLL: Well, I'm confused because
10 I thought I heard you say 30 days from the final.

11 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Both the
12 draft and the final, I said.

13 MS. CARROLL: Oh both opportunities, I
14 see.

15 MR. POLONSKY: Your Honor, if we could,
16 when you do address this, if you could clarify that a
17 good cause showing still needs to be shown for any
18 late filed contention, even if filed within the 30
19 days.

20 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Yes, but Mr.
21 Polonsky, as a practical matter, documents have to be
22 reviewed and if we just generally set the mark that
23 after 30 days, it essentially forces it all to get
24 done in 30 days for late filed contentions. I fully
25 recognize that the standards have to be met. But if

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 we are in agreement that that's the target, then I
2 wanted each party's view on the reasonableness of that
3 window.

4 MR. POLONSKY: Thank you for the
5 clarification.

6 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Ms. Curran,
7 Ms. Carroll, do you think that 30 days, assuming you
8 wish to file a late file contention because of new
9 information in either a draft or a file document, is
10 a reasonable period of time?

11 MS. CARROLL: What do you think, Dianne?

12 MS. CURRAN: Yes, I think it is.

13 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Okay. The
14 Board will take all of this into account in issuing a
15 schedule right after the first of the year, but you
16 should not waste the days, starting today, in working
17 toward your first set of interrogatories. The Board
18 is loath to schedule a third round of interrogatories
19 because, frankly, I don't see why it can't be done in
20 two, recognizing that any late filed contentions would
21 require discovery on them.

22 MS. CURRAN: Judge Moore, this is Dianne
23 Curran. It doesn't seem likely that a third round of
24 interrogatories would be needed, but I guess what we'd
25 like to do is just leave open the potential that if

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 they were, if there's time, that we could make some
2 kind of a showing as quickly as we could.

3 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Well, I'd
4 never close it in a -- showing good cause that it's
5 necessary, the Board would consider. But to put it
6 into the schedule I think is probably unnecessary.

7 MS. CARROLL: Your Honor, this is Glenn
8 and I want to point out something and Don Silverman
9 can correct me or Alex if I miss the changed. They've
10 maintained their desire, DCS has maintained its desire
11 to hold the depositions prior to September 30. In
12 previous conversations they did say that it was
13 acceptable for them if GANE and BREDL consolidated all
14 their depositions at the end.

15 And I want to point that out and is that
16 still okay with you guys?

17 MR. POLONSKY: The submittal that we sent
18 in, Glenn, gave you that option, but DCS does not want
19 to be restricted itself in taking depositions.

20 MS. CARROLL: But you don't mind if we
21 choose to do all those at the end? You're still in
22 that position?

23 MR. POLONSKY: We are, but we don't
24 believe that an extension should be granted just
25 because you choose to consolidate them all at the end.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 You do so at your own risk.

2 MS. CARROLL: You're talking about our
3 note about believing that the 45 days discovery
4 against NRC staff is too short?

5 MR. POLONSKY: That's right. We think at
6 that time you find that it is too short that you
7 wouldn't be granted an extension for any type of
8 discovery that you left till the last minute.

9 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Mr. Polonsky,
10 there's also the risk that your experts might not be
11 available at that time isn't there?

12 MR. POLONSKY: Well, that's certainly
13 possible.

14 MS. CARROLL: Why would that be?

15 MR. POLONSKY: Maybe they're out of town
16 for six weeks.

17 MS. CARROLL: So depending on what
18 schedule is set for deposition, so it's incumbent on
19 the parties to guarantee the availability of their
20 witnesses?

21 MS. POLONSKY: Well that's why we would
22 confer and try and organize a schedule where witnesses
23 would be available, but it may not be necessarily
24 convenient for you or Dianne, and it may not be
25 convenient for us. We have to recognize that.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: And would it
2 be helpful if you held further discussions among
3 yourself to try to come to full agreement on a
4 complete schedule, or are you past the point where you
5 think it would do any good at all just to order it?

6 MR. POLONSKY: This is Mr. Polonsky. At
7 this point, we have made a good faith effort and we
8 have had good discussions, as evident of what we
9 submitted to you, but at this time DCS would prefer if
10 you just set a schedule.

11 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Okay. Ms.
12 Carroll, Ms. Curran, do you concur in that?

13 MS. CARROLL: Yes, but it's a sticking
14 point, neither of us will budge.

15 MS. CURRAN: Judge Moore, this is Dianne
16 Curran. There's just one more point I just want to be
17 clear on. In terms of this date for identifying
18 expert witnesses, our concern about this is we think
19 that we're going to be identifying experts fairly
20 early because all of our contentions require some kind
21 of expert assistance. As we develop our case, which
22 you know we have a considerable amount of time to do
23 this, what we're concerned about is not being
24 penalized if we find that we need to add experts
25 later.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 That's our principal concern on the
2 deadline for identifying experts, not that we wouldn't
3 be prepared to identify experts early but that there's
4 some penalty that would kick in if we didn't have them
5 all at a certain point. And we think that putting
6 that date close to the time of depositions is
7 reasonable.

8 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Mr. Polonsky,
9 I can't fathom that you can name all your experts up
10 front and might not need one later. What would you do
11 with that situation?

12 MR. POLONSKY: The same principles that
13 applies to them applies to us. We would hope that
14 that there's a good faith effort to identify parties
15 up front and identify those experts informally to each
16 other if it needs to be set, and we would prefer it to
17 be set in a schedule, we'd like it to be. Clearly, a
18 set of interrogatories raise issues that the current
19 experts that have been retained cannot answer, or
20 other issues arise where --

21 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Or an expert
22 becomes unavailable or something, you must get a new
23 expert. And you fully anticipate that in what you've
24 proposed I assume?

25 MR. POLONSKY: That's correct.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Okay.

2 MR. POLONSKY: I think some clarification
3 would be useful from the Board as to the procedure of
4 how, for example, additional interrogatories would
5 need to be filed against new experts if they are
6 identified at a late date. Or if you could just
7 clarify that now.

8 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: What would be
9 your suggestion, Mr. Polonsky?

10 MR. POLONSKY: I guess it all depends on
11 what that expert is being proposed to espouse. It
12 would be very difficult for us to take the deposition
13 of an expert if that expert has been identified after
14 all the rounds of interrogatories have expired.

15 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Yes, I
16 understand. Ms. Curran, what would you propose in
17 that regard?

18 MS. CURRAN: Well, we're always under an
19 obligation to update our responses to interrogatories,
20 so the moment a new expert comes on and we think
21 that's what you would do, I guess I'm, to me it just
22 seems that there should be an alternate deadline just
23 before deposition for identifying anybody who's going
24 to be at the hearing and supplementing all discovery
25 responses.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 I've had that in the past and it works
2 fine.

3 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Ms. Young,
4 the staff didn't feel the necessity to propose a
5 schedule, even though there will be discovery after
6 the SER and the final SER and EIS of the staff, or
7 it's possible. Do you wish to state anything, even
8 though you did not file a proposed schedule?

9 MS. YOUNG: Well, Judge Moore, we talked
10 to counsel for DCS and made sure that the end of
11 discovery against the staff was noted in the
12 consolidated schedule.

13 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: The problem
14 often arises or we'd like to avoid, is that those
15 staff witnesses who might be, or staff individuals who
16 might be deposed would not be available. What steps
17 is the staff prepared to make to make sure that
18 doesn't happen in this case?

19 MS. YOUNG: You mean not available at the
20 time of discovery?

21 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Yes, after
22 that, because it's going to be a very small window
23 after the final SER and final EIS.

24 MS. YOUNG: Well, generally speaking, the
25 EDO is involved in selecting individuals who are

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 offered for depositions and the staff will do a best
2 effort to make sure those people are available.

3 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: But there is
4 the element in the selection that they must be
5 involved and knowledgeable in the process.

6 MS. YOUNG: That's correct.

7 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: And as a
8 practical matter, it doesn't do any good to send in
9 the third string that doesn't know the playbook,
10 simply because the first string or the second string
11 are unavailable.

12 What am I saying is because of that short
13 window, are there steps that can be taken to assure
14 that those staff people will be available, the likely
15 ones? And you know who they will be well in advance.

16 MS. YOUNG: Right. Knowing that in
17 advance, having a Board order that sets those
18 schedules, people will adjust their schedules except
19 for family emergencies.

20 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Well we, of
21 course, understand that.

22 MS. YOUNG: And, unfortunately, we're not
23 so deep in staff that we have a third string around
24 here.

25 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Thank you,

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Ms. Young.

2 Does anyone have any other matters?

3 MR. POLONSKY: DCS does not.

4 MS. YOUNG: I have a question from the
5 staff, Judge Moore.

6 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Yes, Ms.
7 Young.

8 MS. YOUNG: Will all copies of notices of
9 depositions be filed on the dockets, so if the staff
10 wanted to attend they've got sufficient notice by DCS,
11 or intervenors?

12 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: That would be
13 something that the parties may wish to work out
14 amongst themselves, but it would be surprising if they
15 didn't. Does anyone have an objection to filing the
16 notices?

17 MR. POLONSKY: No, not DCS.

18 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Ms. Curran?

19 MS. CURRAN: No.

20 MR. MONIAK: No.

21 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Then all
22 parties should file notices of depositions and, of
23 course, all the interrogatories and the interrogatory
24 answers may I assume that you're all prepared to serve
25 them on all parties or not?

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MS. YOUNG: Yes, on all parties. The
2 staff normally does that.

3 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Mr. Polonsky,
4 the applicant doesn't have any difficulty with that do
5 they?

6 MR. POLONSKY: No.

7 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: And Ms.
8 Curran, you don't have any difficulty with that, do
9 you?

10 MS. CURRAN: No.

11 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Mr. Moniak?

12 MR. MONIAK: No.

13 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: All right.
14 Now one further thing, Mr. Polonsky do you anticipate
15 any significant number of either documents or material
16 during any deposition that would be proprietary,
17 involve proprietary safeguards or classified
18 information?

19 MR. POLONSKY: Under the first contention
20 possibly.

21 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: All right.
22 Now you recognize that we will have to put into effect
23 special procedures if we're going to be dealing with
24 safeguards or, most especially, classified
25 information. And all of you are aware of that.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MR. POLONSKY: Yes.

2 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: All right.
3 So the one thing that must be done up front is that
4 everyone remain aware of it so that it isn't a matter
5 of fixing, putting the cat back in the bag after the
6 cat is out. And so I would ask you all to keep that
7 in mind, and on those matters I would hope that you
8 would come to the Board earlier rather than later if
9 a problem arises.

10 And it's not my intention to try to
11 anticipate what we'll do with that information. The
12 Board would appreciate it when the problem looks like
13 it's going to arise, then we will set the course for
14 dealing with it. Is that agreeable with all of you as
15 probably the most efficient way to deal with those
16 problems?

17 MS. CARROLL: Dianne?

18 MS. CURRAN: Yes.

19 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Mr. Polonsky,
20 will that fully protect your client's interest?

21 MR. POLONSKY: Yes, I think so although --

22
23 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Ms. Young,
24 will that protect the staff's interest.

25 MS. YOUNG: No objections.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Okay.
2 Proprietary information, the GANE through Ms. Curran
3 has one designated expert they use in preparing
4 contentions, have already signed affidavits of non-
5 disclosure. And nothing further would be needed to be
6 done with them. Do you agree with that, Mr. Polonsky?

7 MR. POLONSKY: I would just like to
8 clarify. I think Glenn can you confirm that you also
9 signed an affidavit?

10 MS. CARROLL: Yes, I did.

11 MR. POLONSKY: Oh so there are three
12 parties who are members of GANE who currently have.

13 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: And you see
14 no reason why that is insufficient for proprietary
15 information for the rest of this case?

16 MR. POLONSKY: We would like to review the
17 text of the protective order.

18 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Sorry, that's
19 why I was asking because I don't have it in front of
20 me and I frankly don't remember.

21 MR. SILVERMAN: You know, we have no
22 problem with the concept as long as, we should
23 probably review text as a housekeeping matter, your
24 Honor, and if it does need to be tweaked to make sure
25 it's sufficiently broad, we may want to do that.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Okay, let's
2 do that and, hopefully, it can be done without the
3 need to do affidavits that could only be done with the
4 protective order itself, if that's possible.

5 Mr. Moniak, you opted not to receive
6 proprietary information.

7 MR. MONIAK: At this point, yes.

8 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: And your
9 admitted contentions probably don't involve that
10 material. Or safeguards or potential for classified
11 information. So in all likelihood, you would not be
12 involved in any such matters in the future involving
13 either classified or safeguards information.

14 MR. MONIAK: No, that's true.

15 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Okay.

16 MR. MONIAK: However --

17 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Late filed
18 contentions obviously could change all that.

19 MR. MONIAK: Yes.

20 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: All right.
21 If no one has anything else --

22 MS. CARROLL: I have one kind of random
23 question here that came up, this is Glenn. There was
24 a newspaper article in which a public relations guy
25 with DCS said that they expected to break ground in

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 mid-2002. Wouldn't they be unable to begin
2 construction until after this CAR proceeding?

3 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: I'm sorry,
4 Ms. Carroll, I have no idea what the implications of
5 what you just said are.

6 MS. CARROLL: Did you not understand my
7 question?

8 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Frankly, no,

9 MR. CARROLL: Oh okay. Can construction
10 on the MOX factory begin before this proceeding is
11 completed?

12 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Ms. Carroll,
13 I can't foresee the future. But Mr. Polonsky, do you
14 know what she's talking about?

15 MR. SILVERMAN: Yes, this is Mr.
16 Silverman, I understand the question.

17 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Do you know
18 anything about a press release?

19 MR. SILVERMAN: Glenn forwarded to us an
20 article from the Charlotte Observer I think, Ms.
21 Carroll?

22 MS. CARROLL: Yes.

23 MR. SILVERMAN: And it's not a quote but
24 there is a statement in there written by the reporter
25 regarding DCS plans to break ground. I've looked at

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 it but I haven't conferred with my client about it.
2 It's a news article, it's not a quote.

3 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Okay.

4 MS. CARROLL: But that doesn't really
5 matter I suppose. It just raised the question for me
6 because I assumed that construction couldn't begin
7 until this proceeding had been completed, and raised
8 doubts in my mind.

9 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Well, I
10 frankly don't know the answer to that. If
11 appropriate, if you put something in front of us that
12 raises the question that requires answering, the Board
13 will deal with it. But I would be surprised to learn
14 -- there may well be a procedure for some kind of
15 early site preparation. I frankly don't know, but
16 these are the kinds of things, Ms. Carroll, that I
17 hope that you will be able to deal with DCS on
18 directly and receive answers directly on and then you
19 can take the appropriate steps, legal steps if you
20 think they're necessary.

21 MS. CARROLL: We hope.

22 MS YOUNG: Judge Moore, maybe you're
23 missing something in the discussion but it's my
24 understanding that under subpart L, the staff could
25 issue the issue the construction authorization and

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 that would remain effective during the pendency of the
2 proceeding. But Ms. Carroll and other intervenors
3 would be aware of that decision when it's made.

4 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: And that is
5 applicable for a part 70 plutonium proceeding?

6 MS. YOUNG: I think those are procedures
7 that the Commission would follow here, yes. Subpart
8 L.

9 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: But that
10 can't occur before the staff would issue a
11 construction authorization?

12 MS. YOUNG: Right. Just as the hydro
13 proceeding which you're familiar with, if the staff
14 makes a finding to issue the license authorization,
15 then that becomes effective and --

16 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Does the
17 staff currently have such a plan?

18 MS. YOUNG: If the information becomes
19 available at the time we complete the EIS and the SER,
20 we could do that.

21 MS. CURRAN: Well, since there's no
22 license application in this case it raises an
23 interesting question that I'm sure we'll be dealing
24 with.

25 MS. YOUNG: Well the license application

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 I'm referring to is a construction authorization
2 request.

3 MS. CURRAN: Well you said that isn't a
4 license application.

5 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Let's not
6 argue this, the motion to dismiss any further today.
7 If no one -- what would be stated Ms. Young is that if
8 the staff plans to take such action, notify the
9 parties of it as soon as that information is available
10 is something that at least as a courtesy to the
11 parties and the Board would be greatly appreciated.

12 MS. YOUNG: Certainly, we can do that.

13 MR. MONIAK: This is Don Moniak from
14 BREDL. The only thing I can think of is that DCS
15 could be applying for an exemption to start some
16 construction work and we'd ask to be notified of that
17 if it happens and hopefully what you said will happen.

18 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: This is not
19 a matter that we need to concern ourselves with today.

20 If no one has anything else, the Board
21 will issue a scheduling order for discovery after the
22 1st of the year, after next week, and I have granted
23 an extension until I believe it was January 7th for
24 any responses to the applicant's motion for
25 reconsideration of the Board's contention and standing

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 ruling and if the Board will hold oral argument it
2 will be three o'clock on the 8th of January.

3 If there's nothing further, I --

4 MS. YOUNG: Judge Moore, this is Mitzi
5 Young from the staff.

6 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Yes, Ms.
7 Young?

8 MS. YOUNG: Two things. One, your order
9 made clear that the discovery schedule that has been
10 agreed upon primarily concerns discovery for non staff
11 parties. Is that correct?

12 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Yes, Ms.
13 Young.

14 MS. YOUNG: Okay. The second thing is we
15 ran around to find out what happened to the hearing
16 file during this call and I've been informed that the
17 boxes were sent to our mailroom for mailing only by
18 first class mail as early as Friday and then Monday
19 for DCS, but through some miscommunication the boxes
20 did not leave NRC offices until yesterday.

21 I have in my hand a copy of the letter
22 which includes the index. I will e-mail that to the
23 parties as soon as I get off this call, and that index
24 includes about 75 documents and there is an indication
25 with respect to a number of documents that the non-

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 proprietary version was included in the hearing file.

2 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Okay. And
3 because they only went out yesterday and you used
4 first class mail --

5 MS. YOUNG: The delivery time is going to
6 vary depending upon the location.

7 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: So it could
8 be as much as two weeks?

9 MS. YOUNG: No, no, first class mail is
10 normally three to five days depending, but I don't
11 know about the Christmas rush.

12 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Well that is
13 the problem.

14 MS. CARROLL: Your Honor, I'd like to
15 point out one thing. GANE will need a proprietary
16 version and I'm not sure, you know, we worked this out
17 with DCS and we have doubts that the NRC may not be
18 clear on this so it sounds like in some that's the
19 proprietary version and we would welcome a Fed Ex
20 copy.

21 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Well, the
22 only thing that would need to be done, Ms. Carroll, is
23 those documents that are proprietary, after everyone
24 has a chance to check to make sure that the current
25 protective order and affidavits of non-disclosure

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 fully cover all this, would need to be provided to you
2 not the entire hearing file reduplicated.

3 MS. YOUNG: Judge Moore, is it Ms.
4 Carroll's understanding that under the agreement with
5 DCS she gets those documents directly? Is she asking
6 to get them again from the staff? I guess I'm
7 confused.

8 MS. CARROLL: We'll automatically serve
9 the proprietary version because we have the non-
10 disclosure agreement.

11 MS. YOUNG: Okay, but the staff
12 distributed the hearing file which only has the non-
13 proprietary version, it would be another version of a
14 document you already have.

15 MS. CARROLL: Well there are two points in
16 my comment here and one is we would welcome a Fed Ex
17 copy because we would like to have that right away.
18 And I thought that, at the same time, I would mention
19 it would be appropriate to send us the proprietary
20 version.

21 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Ms. Carroll,
22 it will take the staff, this is Thursday, there's no
23 way the staff with Monday and Tuesday being holidays
24 next week, can send that to reproduction and get it
25 before next Wednesday into the hands of Fed Ex.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 That's a fact of life.

2 MS. CARROLL: I misunderstood your earlier
3 comment I guess.

4 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: It has been
5 mailed.

6 MS. YOUNG: It has been mailed. We will
7 get an e-mail version of the correspondence, the cover
8 letter with the index, to everyone today.

9 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: And if you
10 have not received it in due course, and I apologize
11 for the staff's --

12 MS. YOUNG: Yes, the staff apologizes,
13 Judge Moore. I wasn't involved in this.

14 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: -- procedure
15 here that didn't ensure that this material went out
16 earlier. But, nevertheless, if it has not been
17 received by Wednesday, the day after Christmas, if you
18 would notify Ms. Young by e-mail or telephone call,
19 the staff will then make every effort to put one in
20 the mail immediately to you by Fed Ex. Is that
21 reasonable, Ms. Young?

22 MS. YOUNG: Yes, that's reasonable but
23 let's clarify for a minute. Is Ms. Carroll expecting
24 to get a proprietary version from the staff or a
25 document she already received from applicants?

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Mr. Polonsky,
2 I do frankly not recall how the protective order and
3 affidavits of non-disclosure are set up. Previously,
4 that information came from you to the intervenor, did
5 it not?

6 MR. POLONSKY: Yes, and we have done so on
7 three separate occasions for three individual
8 representatives.

9 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: So the
10 proprietary information will not come from the staff,
11 it will come from you.

12 MR. POLONSKY: I believe that all
13 proprietary versions of the CAR and a proprietary
14 financial statement were already mailed to them, and
15 I believed at follow up conversations that they
16 received them.

17 MR. SILVERMAN: And we sent them the
18 proprietary versions of our answers to the RAI. There
19 may possibly be some additional documents in the
20 hearing file, of course, on this perhaps that are
21 proprietary that we perhaps have not sent to the
22 intervenors.

23 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: What would be
24 the most efficient way to deal with those, Mr.
25 Silverman?

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MR. SILVERMAN: Well I'm concerned, the
2 hearing file should be complete so, clearly, the
3 hearing file should identify all documents that are
4 relevant. If we can work out the tweaking of the
5 protective order, I'd like to think about it, but it
6 may be that we can provide those documents directly to
7 --

8 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: That I think
9 would be certainly the most efficient and probably
10 involve the least opportunity for error. And could
11 that be done with the cooperation of the staff with
12 its index and you, the applicant, as quickly as
13 possible so that any documents that haven't been
14 turned over by the first week of the New Year, those
15 can be turned over assuming once again we don't have
16 to go through any further steps on the affidavits of
17 non-disclosure.

18 MR. POLONSKY: This is Mr. Polonsky. We
19 can review the index the minute it comes in, identify
20 any proprietary documents that have not yet been
21 provided to GANE and provide those documents.

22 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: That would be
23 most helpful.

24 Okay, if there's nothing further I'm sorry
25 this has taken as long as it has.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MR. POLONSKY: One other issue and it is
2 very minor.

3 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: And this is
4 Mr. Polonsky.

5 MR. POLONSKY: I'm sorry. If you wouldn't
6 mind addressing the issue, just by mention, of lead
7 parties in your order.

8 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Thank you.

9 MR. POLONSKY: Can we come to an
10 agreement?

11 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Well, that is
12 something in the first instance that I would
13 appreciate if GANE and BREDL would work out. Do you
14 have anything on that that you would like to say, Ms.
15 Curran or Ms. Carroll?

16 MS. CARROLL: We do intend to work it out.
17 We've been scrambling, as you can imagine, since all
18 this discovery started working so we've had a
19 preliminary conversation about it but we do need to
20 work it out and we embrace the lead party concept and
21 will inform you we just definitely did not --

22 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: All right.
23 Can you do that by the first week of the New Year?

24 MR. MONIAK: Absolutely.

25 MS. CARROLL: Is that possible, Dianne?

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MS. CURRAN: For me it may be difficult
2 but I think it's something that, hopefully, that you
3 can work out, but if we need more time we'll ask for
4 it. We'll certainly try to make that and it could be
5 any time within that first week so up till the, oh man
6 the fourth.

7 MS. YOUNG: Judge Moore, would it be
8 appropriate to indicate that in the January 7th
9 filing?

10 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: I'm sorry,
11 Ms. Young. Oh in response --

12 MS. YOUNG: This is in response to motion
13 to reconsider, could the parties notify us in that
14 filing?

15 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: That will be
16 fine.

17 MR. MONIAK: That will be very convenient,
18 too. Thank you.

19 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: All right, if
20 there's nothing --

21 MS. CURRAN: Judge Moore, I do have one
22 more thing. This is Dianne Curran. We have filed
23 yesterday a motion for stay of discovery pending a
24 ruling on the motion to dismiss. Can you give us any
25 more sense of when you might be likely to rule on the

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 motion to dismiss? I know you said you were waiting
2 for --

3 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: We're waiting
4 for our colleague.

5 MS. CURRAN: And do you think it might be,
6 I mean he's probably coming back, he's back today or
7 tomorrow.

8 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: I'm hopeful
9 that he is returning today and we will see him this
10 afternoon. If not, we will be making every effort to
11 issue it tomorrow, assuming Judge Kelper returns from
12 North Carolina.

13 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE LAM: This is Judge
14 Lam. More likely than not, Judge Kelper will not be
15 in the office today but we expect to see him tomorrow.

16 MS. CURRAN: So it's likely that an order
17 will come out tomorrow?

18 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: Correct.

19 MS. CURRAN: Okay.

20 ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE MOORE: I'm afraid to
21 ask if anyone has anything else, so I will just end
22 this now and your next filing will be due on the 7th
23 of January and the Board will notify you immediately
24 that day if it wishes to have any oral argument on the
25 8th.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Thank you very much and that concludes the
2 matter today.

3 (Whereupon, the above-titled matter went
4 off the record at 10:20 a.m.)

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

NEAL R. GROSS

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

CERTIFICATE

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

Name of Proceeding: Duke Cogema & Webster
Savannah River MOX Fuel
Fabrication Facility

Docket Number: 70-3098-ML

Location: Rockville, MD

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 as recorded on tape(s) provided by the NRC.



Jonathan Zilinski
Official Transcriber
Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc.