

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD

Before Administrative Judges:

Thomas S. Moore, Chairman  
Dr. Charles N. Kelber  
Dr. Peter S. Lam

In the Matter of

DUKE COGEMA STONE & WEBSTER  
(Savannah River Mixed Oxide Fuel  
Fabrication Facility)

Docket No. 070-03098-ML

ASLBP No. 01-790-01-ML

April 30, 2002

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

On February 12, 2002, the Licensing Board issued an order setting forth directives and a schedule for the conduct of discovery in Phase II of the proceeding. Shortly thereafter, DCS announced changes to its proposed Savannah River Mixed Oxide Fuel Fabrication Facility necessitating the preparation and filing of supplements to its environmental report and construction authorization request. Upon the joint motion of Intervenor GANE and BREDL noting that DCS's changes will delay the issuance of the final EIS and SER by approximately one year, the Board issued an order on March 7, 2002, cancelling the schedule set forth in paragraph 10 of the earlier order and indicating that it would revisit the schedule issue.

This Memorandum and Order, inter alia, sets a new discovery schedule. To ensure that there is no misunderstanding, this Memorandum and Order supercedes the entirety of the Board's February 12, 2002 order and generally reiterates the applicable provisions of the earlier order that remain in effect.

1. On February 6, 2002, the Commission issued CLI-02-04 in which it granted, in part, the petition for review of Duke Cogema Stone & Webster (DCS) seeking, inter alia, review of the Board's ruling admitting GANE contention 12. In granting review, the Commission also directed the Board to proceed no further on that contention. Accordingly, there shall be no discovery on GANE contention 12 pending further order of the Board.

2. In CLI-01-13, 53 NRC 478, 481 (2001), the Commission directed that there should be no discovery against the NRC Staff until the Staff issues the final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and the final Safety Evaluation Report (SER). Accordingly, there will be no discovery against the Staff pending further order of the Board.

3. Pursuant to the designation of both parties, GANE shall act as lead party on (a) consolidated GANE contention 5 and 8 consolidated with BREDL contention 9A; and (b) GANE contention 11 consolidated with BREDL contention 1E. As lead party, GANE shall be responsible for prosecuting these contentions.

4. Each party shall serve no more than two rounds of interrogatories for each admitted contention. All interrogatories shall be served by e-mail and grouped by contention with the contention number clearly marked. Any party seeking leave of the Board to serve a third round of interrogatories for any contention must demonstrate good cause for the additional round of interrogatories.

5. The parties must file and serve on all other parties any notices of deposition. Once deposition transcripts become available, they should be submitted immediately to deponents for review and any corrections made within ten (10) days.

6. All parties should make a good faith effort to identify by the date reflected in the schedule below, the experts who are expected to provide testimony for each admitted contention along with each expert's address, current employment, and relevant biographical information. The Board recognizes that circumstances may arise in which a party may need to

retain other or additional experts to provide testimony for one or more contentions after that date. In such circumstances, the party shall immediately provide the information noted above for any new expert and update any relevant outstanding interrogatory answers. In no event, however, may a party name an expert so late in the discovery process that it delays the proceeding or unduly prejudices another party.

7. The Board strongly advises the parties to treat the draft EIS and revised draft SER as nearly “final” documents for purposes of conducting disposition discovery on the admitted contentions. Any party waiting until the issuance of the final EIS and the final SER to conduct all or a majority of the depositions it plans to take must accept all risks attendant on such an approach. Moreover, regardless of the circumstances, the Board is unlikely to look favorably upon any request to extend the discovery period on already admitted contentions by a party who postpones taking depositions until the 45-day period after the issuance of the final EIS and SER. See CLI-01-13, 83 NRC at 485.

8. Any party filing a late-filed contention must, in addition to meeting the requirements of 10 C.F.R. § 2.714(b)(2), address each of the five factors set forth in 10 C.F.R. § 2.714(a)(1). All late-filed contentions shall be filed within 30 days of the initiating action, event, or document underlying the late-filed contention. For example, in circumstances where the issuance of a Staff or DCS document legitimately undergirds a late-filed contention, the Board will consider a contention filed within 30 days of the issuance of that document as presumptively meeting the good cause requirement of section 2.714(a)(1)(i). Absent extraordinary circumstances, a late-filed contention filed beyond the 30-day period will be found to lack good cause for the untimely filing. Finally, the Board reminds the Intervenors that they may need to file a late-filed contention or a late-filed amendment to an admitted contention if, for example, the scope, data, or conclusions set out in the draft EIS or the draft SER differ significantly from DCS’s environmental report or construction authorization request. Failure to file a new late-filed

contention or a late-filed amendment to an admitted contention may, upon a proper motion, result in the dismissal of an admitted contention.

9. The schedule set out below provides specific dates for various discovery steps through the date the Staff has stated it hopes to issue the final EIS and the final SER. If, at any time, the Staff determines that it will be unable to meet the currently projected dates for issuing the draft EIS and/or the draft SER, it shall immediately notify the Board and the other parties of the new projected dates for issuing those draft documents. In the event the Staff's newly projected dates are less than eight (8) days from the currently projected dates, there will be no schedule adjustment. If it appears, however, that the currently projected dates will slip by more than seven (7) days, the Staff shall immediately notify the Board and the other parties of the new dates, and the Board will consider whether it needs to develop a new schedule.

All discovery actions and other filings in the proceeding to be taken after the date of the actual issuance of the final EIS and SER shall follow the schedule set out in the Commission's referral order. See CLI-01-13, 53 NRC at 484-86. As all parties are aware, the Commission-directed schedule keys all actions to the date the Staff issues the final EIS and the SER. To ensure there is no misunderstanding, the Board will issue an order setting specific dates for all remaining actions once there is a firm date for the Staff issuance of the final EIS and SER.

10. Schedule:

May 17, 2002	Parties identify experts for each admitted contention.
May 31, 2002	Parties serve by e-mail first round of interrogatories.
June 28, 2002	Parties respond by e-mail to first round of interrogatories and identify and make available for copying any documents not in hearing file that their experts plan to rely on.
July 15, 2002	Projected date for DCS to submit supplement to its ER.
October 30, 2002	Projected date for DCS to submit supplement to its CAR.

December 6, 2002	Parties serve by e-mail second round of interrogatories.
January 31, 2003	Parties wishing to take oral depositions may begin filing notices of deposition.
February 24, 2003	Projected date for Staff issuance of draft EIS.
April 30, 2003	Projected date for Staff issuance of draft SER, Rev. 1.
August 29, 2003	Projected date for Staff issuance of Final EIS.
September 30, 2003	Projected date for Staff issuance of Final SER.
November 17, 2003	Discovery on currently admitted contentions must be completed.

It is so ORDERED.

FOR THE ATOMIC SAFETY  
AND LICENSING BOARD<sup>1</sup>

*/RA/*

---

Thomas S. Moore  
ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE

Rockville, Maryland

April 30, 2002

---

<sup>1</sup>Copies of this Memorandum and Order were sent this date by Internet e-mail transmission to (1) DCS; (2) the NRC Staff; (3) GANE; and (4) BREDL.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

In the Matter of )  
 )  
DUKE COGEMA STONE & WEBSTER ) Docket No. 70-3098-ML  
 )  
(Savannah River Mixed Oxide Fuel )  
Fabrication Facility) )

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that copies of the foregoing LB MEMORANDUM AND ORDER DATED APRIL 30, 2002 have been served upon the following persons by U.S. mail, first class, or through NRC internal distribution.

Office of Commission Appellate  
Adjudication  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Administrative Judge  
Thomas S. Moore, Chairman  
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel  
Mail Stop - T-3 F23  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Administrative Judge  
Charles N. Kelber  
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel  
Mail Stop - T-3 F23  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Administrative Judge  
Peter S. Lam  
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel  
Mail Stop - T-3 F23  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC 20555-0001

John T. Hull, Esq.  
Antonio Fernández, Esq.  
Office of the General Counsel  
Mail Stop - O-15 D21  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Donald J. Silverman, Esq.  
Steven P. Frantz, Esq.  
Marjan Mashhadi, Esq.  
Alex S. Polonsky, Esq.  
Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP  
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20004

Docket No. 70-3098-ML  
LB MEMORANDUM AND ORDER DATED  
APRIL 30, 2002

Glenn Carroll  
Georgians Against Nuclear Energy  
P.O. Box 8574  
Atlanta, GA 30306

Donald J. Moniak  
Blue Ridge Environmental Defense League  
P.O. Box 3487  
Aiken, SC 29802

Diane Curran, Esq.  
Harmon, Curran, Spielberg  
& Eisenberg, L.L.P.  
1726 M Street, NW, Suite 600  
Washington, DC 20036

[Original signed by Evangeline S. Ngbea]

---

Office of the Secretary of the Commission

Dated at Rockville, Maryland,  
this 30<sup>th</sup> day of April 2002