

May 23, 2005

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

BEFORE THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD

In the Matter of	)	IA-05-021
	)	
ANDREW SIEMASZKO	)	ASLBP No. 05-839-02-EA
	)	
	)	
	)	

APPLICATION FOR A TEMPORARY STAY TO PRESERVE THE STATUS QUO

INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to 10 C.F.R. § 2.342(f) the Staff of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (Staff), moves the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board for an immediate temporary stay of the Order (Granting Licensee's Hearing Request) dated May 19, 2005 (Order), and resultant obligations pursuant to 10 C.F.R. § 2.336(b), to preserve the status quo pending a ruling on the NRC Staff Motion to Delay the Proceeding dated May 17, 2005 (Staff Motion). Pursuant to 10 C.F.R. § 2.342(f) and 2.323(b) counsel for the Staff attempted to contact counsel for Mr. Siemaszko to attempt to resolve the issue. However, Staff counsel was unable to reach Mr. Siemaszko's counsel.

BACKGROUND

On April 21, 2005, the Staff issued an "Order Prohibiting Involvement in NRC-Licensed Activities" to Mr. Siemaszko. 83 Fed. Reg. 22719 (2005).<sup>1</sup> On April 22, 2005 Mr. Siemaszko filed his "Request for a Hearing in Response to Order Prohibiting Involvement in NRC-Licensed Activities" (Hearing Request). On May 11, 2005 the Hearing Request was referred to the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel. This Atomic Safety and Licensing Board (Board)

---

<sup>1</sup> A more detailed background is given in the Staff Motion filed on May 17, 2005.

was established on May 18, 2005. On May 19, 2005 the Board issued an Order which granted Mr. Siemaszko's hearing request and required the parties to supply the Board with dates they were available to argue the Staff Motion (as well as other pre-hearing matters) during the week of June 13, 2005. See Order at 2. Pursuant to 10 C.F.R. § 2.336(b) the Staff must produce all documents supporting the Staff's review of the proposed action within thirty (30) days of the order granting a request for hearing. Since the Board granted the Hearing Request on May 19, 2005, the Staff is required to produce its documents no later than June 20, 2005.<sup>2</sup> For the reasons set forth below, the Staff moves for an temporary stay of the Order, and resultant Staff obligations under 10 C.F.R. § 2.336(b) until the Board has ruled on the Staff Motion.

#### DISCUSSION

In extraordinary cases a presiding officer is allowed to grant a temporary stay to preserve the status quo without waiting for filing of any answer. See 10 C.F.R. § 2.342(f). The standards for granting such a stay are the same as the traditional stay standards found in 10 C.F.R. § 2.342(e). The instant case, involving the release of Staff documents that were referred to the Department of Justice for consideration of criminal prosecution, is one of the extraordinary situations contemplated by the rule. A temporary stay is necessary here to prevent irreparable injury to the criminal proceeding. Once the documents are released, the damage cannot be undone. See *e.g. Georgia Power Co. (Vogtle Electric Generating Plant, Units 1 and 2)*, CLI-94-05, 39 NRC 190, 193 (1994) (adverse impact of release of documents otherwise held in confidence is "irreparable and could not be alleviated through future review..."). Granting a temporary stay in the instant case will avoid irreparable injury to the United States, will not harm other parties, and is in the public interest. Additionally, there is a

---

<sup>2</sup> June 18, 2005 is thirty days from the date of the Order. However, since June 18, 2005 is a Saturday the Staff is required to produce by Monday June 20, 2005. See 10 C.F.R. § 2.306 (computation of time).

strong likelihood that the Staff will prevail on the Motion to Delay.

1. Irreparable Injury

The factor which is most crucial to the granting of a temporary stay is the question of irreparable injury to the movants if the stay is not granted. See *Alabama Power Co.* (Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant, Units 1 & 2), CLI-81-27, 14 NRC 795, 797 (1981). In the instant case, the Staff has demonstrated irreparable injury. The requirements of 10 C.F.R. § 2.336(b) are broad. The Staff is required to produce “all documents (including documents that provide support for, or opposition to, the application or proposed action) supporting the NRC staff’s review of the application or proposed action that is the subject of the proceeding; [and] any NRC staff documents (except those documents for which there is a claim of privilege or protected status) representing the NRC staff’s determination on the application or proposal that is the subject of the proceeding.” See 10 C.F.R. § 2.336(b)(3 & 4). This obligation runs from the Order granting the Hearing Request. Subsequent to the filing of the Staff Motion to Delay the Proceeding, the Board granted the Hearing Request. If the Staff is required to produce documents prior to a ruling on the Staff Motion, the interests of the United States will be irreparably injured. If a temporary stay is not granted, the Staff will be required to produce the Office of Investigations Report and other documents no later than June 20, 2005.

2. Harm to Other Parties and Public Interest

In the instant application, the Staff is solely requesting a Stay of the Board Order such that the Staff obligations under 10 C.F.R. § 2.336(b) are not triggered until such time as the Board rules on the Staff Motion to Delay. The requested temporary stay to preserve the status quo will not harm the other parties since it is brief in nature. The stay is within the public interest in that it will allow for a ruling on the Staff Motion.

3. Likelihood of Prevailing on the Merits

The need to demonstrate success on the merits varies according to the tribunal's assessment of other factors that must be considered in determining if a stay is warranted. See *Public Service Co. Of Indiana, Inc.* (Marble Hill Nuclear Generating Station, Units 1 & 2), ALAB-437, 6 NRC 630, 632 (1977) citing *Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission v. Holiday Tours*, 559 F.2d 841 (D.C. Cir. 1977). Tribunals may issue stays when there is a difficult legal question and the equities in the case suggest that the status quo should be maintained. See *Holiday Tours* at 844-845. In the instant case, the Staff believes that it has made a strong case on the merits, in its Motion. The Commission has historically delayed administrative enforcement proceedings when the same subject matter is being reviewed for potential criminal action. See e.g. *Oncology Services Corp.*, CLI-93-17, 38 NRC 44 (1993). However, it is not necessary for the Board to prejudge the outcome of the Motion to Delay in order to grant the Staff's application for a temporary stay.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons the Staff submits that a temporary stay to preserve the status quo is appropriate and necessary in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

**/RA/**

Sara E. Brock  
Counsel for NRC Staff

Dated at Rockville, Maryland  
this 23<sup>rd</sup> day of May, 2005

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

BEFORE THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD

In the Matter of ) IA-05-021  
)  
ANDREW SIEMASZKO ) ASLBP No. 05-839-02-EA  
)  
)  
)

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that copies of "APPLICATION FOR A TEMPORARY STAY TO PRESERVE THE STATUS QUO" in the above captioned proceeding have been served on the following persons by deposit in the United States mail; through deposit in the Nuclear Regulatory Commission internal mail system as indicated by an asterisk (\*); and by electronic mail as indicated by a double asterisk (\*\*) on this 23<sup>rd</sup> day of May, 2005.

Administrative Judge \* \*\*  
Lawrence McDade, Chair  
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel  
Mail Stop: T-3 F23  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC 20555-0001  
E-mail: [lqm1@nrc.gov](mailto:lqm1@nrc.gov)

Administrative Judge \* \*\*  
E. Roy Hawkens  
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel  
Mail Stop: T-3 F23  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC 20555-0001  
E-mail: [erh@nrc.gov](mailto:erh@nrc.gov)

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  
E-mail: [psl@nrc.gov](mailto:psl@nrc.gov)

Billie Pirner Garde \* \*\*  
Sandy Shepherd  
Clifford & Garde  
1707 L Street, NW, Suite 500  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
E-mail: [bpgarde@aol.com](mailto:bpgarde@aol.com)  
[sshepherd@cliffordgarde.com](mailto:sshepherd@cliffordgarde.com)

Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel \*  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Mail Stop: T-3 F23  
Washington, D.C. 20555

Office of Commission Appellate Adjudication \*  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Mail Stop: O-16 C1  
Washington, D.C. 20555

Adjudicatory File \*  
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Mail Stop: T-3 F23  
Washington, D.C. 20555

Office of the Secretary \* \*\*  
Attn: Rulemaking and Adjudications Staff  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Mail Stop: O-16 C1  
Washington, D.C. 20555  
E-mail: [hearingdocket@nrc.gov](mailto:hearingdocket@nrc.gov)

David Lochbaum \* \*\*  
Nuclear Safety Engineer  
Union of Concerned Scientists  
1707 H Street NW, Suite 600  
Washington, D.C. 20006  
E-mail: [dlochbaum@ucsusa.org](mailto:dlochbaum@ucsusa.org)

Sandy Buchanan \* \*\*  
Executive Director  
Ohio Citizen Action  
614 W. Superior Avenue, Suite 1200  
Cleveland, OH 44113  
E-mail: [sbuchanan@ohiocitizen.org](mailto:sbuchanan@ohiocitizen.org)

Jonathan Rund  
Board Law Clerk  
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel  
Mail Stop: T-3 F23  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC 20555-0001  
E-mail: [jmr3@nrc.gov](mailto:jmr3@nrc.gov)

*/RA/*

---

Sara E. Brock  
Counsel for NRC Staff