Official Transcript of Proceedings

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title:

Crow Butte Resources, Inc.

(In Situ Leach Facility)

Docket Number:

40-8943-MLA

DOCKETED **USNRC**

January 25, 2008 (9:46am)

Location:

Teleconference

OFFICE OF SECRETARY **RULEMAKINGS AND** ADJUDICATIONS STAFF

Date:

Wednesday, January 23, 2008

Work Order No.: NRC-1987

Pages 375-414

NEAL R. GROSS AND CO., INC. **Court Reporters and Transcribers** 1323 Rhode Island Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20005 (202) 234-4433

1	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
2	NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
. 3	+ + + + +
4	ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD PANEL
5	+ + + +
6	:
7	IN THE MATTER OF:
8	CROW BUTTE RESOURCES, INC. : Docket No.
9	: 40-8943
10	(In Situ Leach Facility) :
. 11	:
12	
13	Wednesday, January 23, 2008
14	Teleconference
15	
16	The above entitled matter convened,
17	pursuant to notice, at 3:00 p.m.
18	
19	
20	BEFORE:
21	ANN MARSHALL YOUNG, Chair, Administrative Judge
22	RICHARD E. COLE, Administrative Judge
23	FRED W. OLIVER, Administrative Judge
24	
25	
ſ	

1	APPEARANCES:
2	On Behalf of the Applicant, Crow Butte Resources:
3	MARK McGUIRE, ESQ.
4	605 South 14 th Street
5	Suite 100
6	Lincoln, Nebraska 68508
7	
8	TYSON R. SMITH, ESQ.
9	Of: Winston & Strawn LLP
10	1700 K Street, NW
11	Washington, DC 20006
12	
13	On Behalf of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission:
14	ANDREA Z. JONES, ESQ.
15	MARCIA SIMON, ESQ.
16	Office of the General Counsel
17	Mail Stop 15 D21
18	U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
19	Washington, D.C. 20555-0001
20	(301) 415-2246 (Ms. Jones)
21	(301) 415-1117 (Ms. Barkman)
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	STEPHEN COHEN
2	Project Manager
3	Mail Stop 7 E18
4	U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
5	Washington, D.C. 20555-0001
6	(301) 415-7182
7	
8	On Behalf of the Petitioners, Thomas Cook, Individual;
9	Slim Buttes Agricultural Development Corporation; and
10	Western Nebraska Resources Council:
11	DAVID FRANKEL, ESQ.
12.	P.O. Box 3014
13	Pine Ridge, South Dakota 57770
14	
15	On Behalf of the Petitioners, Debra White Plume and
16	Owe Aku:
17	BRUCE ELLISON, ESQ.
18	P.O. Box 2508
19	Rapid City, South Dakota 57709
20	
21	Also Present:
22	JACOB FROHMAN
23	RICHARD KATSENBERG
24	LARRY TEAHON
25	JOHANNA THIBAULT
	NEAL R. GROSS

1	P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S
2	3:07 p.m.
3	JUDGE YOUNG: All right, this is Judge
4	Young. Welcome everyone. I think we've all
5	identified ourselves to the Court Reporter and if
6	you'll do it like the last Court Reporter did, you'll
7	list all those present. I'm talking to the Court
8	Reporter now. Do we need to have everyone identify
9	themselves again?
10	THE REPORTER: I have the list. I have
11	the list made already of everyone who's present, so
12	it's up to you whether you want them to identify
13	themselves on the record but I already know who's
14	present.
15	JUDGE YOUNG: Okay, well, just let's go
16	through it one more time.
17	THE REPORTER: Okay.
18	JUDGE YOUNG: This is Judge Young. And
19	maybe have each person say their own names so that it
20	will be easier to identify voices.
21	JUDGE COLE: Yeah, this is Judge Richard
22	Cole, C-o-l-e.
23	JUDGE OLIVER: This is Fred Oliver.
24	JUDGE YOUNG: Going to the staff next.
25	MS. JONES: Andrea Jones, for the NRC

-1	staff.
2	MS. SIMON: This is Marcia Simon, also for
3	the NRC staff.
4	MR. COHEN: This is Stephen Cohen, Project
5	Manager for Crow Butte, NRC staff.
6	JUDGE YOUNG: This is Judge Young. Did
- 7	the staff have anyone else? I can't recall?
8	MS. JONES: No, Judge, that's it.
9	JUDGE YOUNG: Okay, moving to the
10	Applicant.
11	MR. SMITH: This is Tyson Smith for Crow
12	Butte Resources.
13	MR. McGUIRE: This is Mark McGuire for
14	Crow Butte Resources.
15	MR. TEAHON: Larry Teahon, Crow Butte
16	Resources.
17	JUDGE YOUNG: And then for the
18	Petitioners?
19	MR. FROHMAN: This is Jake Frohman for the
20	Petitioners.
21	MR. ELLISON: Bruce Ellison for
22	Petitioners Debra White Plume and Owe Aku.
23	MR. FRANKEL: And David Frankel for Tom
24	Cook, Western Nebraska Resources Council and Slim
25	Buttes Agricultural Development Corporation.

1	JUDGE YOUNG: This is Judge Young again.
2.	Mr. Frohman, I'm not sure what's your actual role
3	with regard to the Petitioners and Mr. Ellison and Mr.
4	Frankel, you can also help clarify. I thought you
5	were more or less just observing or
6	MR. FRANKEL: Mr. Frohman is assisting in
7	note-taking and in helping with some research. He's
8	not an attorney of record, your Honor, but he's
9	serving more in a paralegal capacity for us.
10	MR. FROHMAN: That's correct.
11	THE REPORTER: This is the Court Reporter,
12	I'm sorry, who's speaking?
13	MR. FRANKEL: That was David Frankel, I
14	apologize, David Frankel.
15	THE REPORTER: Thank you.
16	JUDGE YOUNG: Okay, thank you. All right,
17	if everyone this is Judge Young again. If everyone
18	has received our notice of today, we've listed the
19	items to address that we that I found that we
20	needed to address. After the issuance of that, there
21	were a couple of other things that came up. One was
22	I'm not sure I mentioned in there whether the parties
23	wanted to provide any additional briefing on the
24	terrorism cases. So that can be a possible number 8.

And then also, pardon me, we didn't know

25

1	whether the petitioners had any plans to file an
2	amended contention. We didn't list that as a separate
3	item. Mr. Ellison or Mr. Frankel, do you have any
4	intention to file an actual amended contention or
5	well, do you have any intention to do that?
6	MR. FRANKEL: This is David Frankel. Your
7	Honor, that's not something that we've had a chance to
8	confer on.
9 .	JUDGE YOUNG: We're having a hard time
10	hearing you here.
11	MR. FRANKEL: (Inaudible).
12	JUDGE YOUNG: I still didn't understand.
13	Are you on a speaker phone maybe?
14	MR. ELLISON: Your Honor, this is Bruce
15	Ellison. I believe that
16	MR. FRANKEL: I'm trying to get the best
17	place to stand. I'm on a mobile phone. Can you hear
18	me now, your Honor?
19	JUDGE YOUNG: Yes, that's good.
20	MR. FRANKEL: Okay, I was saying that Mr.
21	Ellison and I have not had a chance to confer with our
22	clients on that. We definitely observed the manner in
23	which the Judge reframed some of our contentions and
24	if it would be helpful, we can file amended
25	contentions but we just haven't had a chance to talk

about that, your Honor.

2

3

4

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

JUDGE YOUNG: Well, the reason I raised it

was because after I drew up this list, I think I saw

a reference to it, but the reason for numbers 1 and 2

on the list were to address the submission of Exhibits

A and B. So that Exhibits A and B would be in the

nature of an amendment to the support for the first

and second contentions, I guess, and also to the

extent that they were raised for standing.

On the contention issue, as you recall, we

those would need to meet the requirements of 10 CFR

had some discussion about whether the submission of

Section 2.309(f)(2) or also Section 2.309(c). So I

was not actually trying to suggest that you do file an

amended contention but I think the way we were looking

at it was the submission of Exhibits A and B were in

the nature of an amendment to Contentions 1 and 2.

So unless you indicate that you do want to

file an amended contention in addition to that, which

would bring up a whole other set of issues depending

upon what that was, I guess we would just go into

setting deadlines for the things listed, but if anyone

wants to file anything on the terrorism issue --

MR. ELLISON: Judge Young, if I may, this

is Bruce Ellison.

1	JUDGE YOUNG: Okay.
- 2	MR. ELLISON: If we would be able to have
3	a week for Mr. Frankel, Mr. Frohman and I to confer
4	with our clients regarding any possible amended
5	contentions, that would be appreciated.
6	JUDGE YOUNG: Do you see any need to
7	well, I guess we could do that and then also go ahead
8	and set deadlines for the things that we have here.
9	MR. ELLISON: Yes, ma'am.
10	JUDGE YOUNG: Okay.
11	MR. ELLISON: But if we could at least
12	have an opportunity to talk about this specific issue
13	and certainly we have other things we already know
14.	about.
15	JUDGE YOUNG: So you would notify us and
16	all parties within a week whether you intend to file
17	any amended contentions.
18	MR. ELLISON: Right. Does that sound like
19	enough time, Dave and Jake?
20	MR. FRANKEL: Yes, David Frankel, yes.
21	MR. ELLISON: Okay, please.
22	JUDGE YOUNG: Okay. I'm going to this
23	is Judge Young again. When there are pauses, it's
24	just when I'm writing notes to myself. All right,
25	then let me just ask all parties, does the list in

1	today's notice include everything with the addition of
2	the terrorism cases, any briefing on that, that anyone
3	wanted to provide or are there any other things that
4	we need to add to the list or delete from the list for
5	that matter?
6	MS. JONES: Judge, this is Andrea Jones
7	for the NRC staff. I did have a question about Number
8	7 and when you said omitting from the list, I was kind
9	of curious about the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty,
10	the IAEA.
11	JUDGE YOUNG: The way I came up with this
12	list was I just read through the transcript quickly
13	and there was one place in the transcript, I can try
14	to find it, where Mr. Smith indicated that he could
15	provide the citation.
16	MR. SMITH: And this is Tyson Smith. I
17	have those citations with me today. I'm happy to
18	provide those whenever we get to that to Number 7.
19	MS. JONES: Okay.
20	JUDGE YOUNG: Okay, so that was actually
21	one that was one of the quicker ones.
22	MS. JONES: Okay.
23	JUDGE YOUNG: There were several things
24	where people said, "Well, I can provide this or that",
25	and so that was one of those. Anything else that we
- 11	

need to add or take off the list?

.

Okay, well, it looks like there are basically two categories or maybe three. One and two are one category, and those are the ones relating to Exhibits A and B. Did we just get someone new on the call? Did we lose someone? Well, we'll go on. This is still Judge Young.

We just -- as we discussed last week, the NRC staff and the Applicant have the right to file responses to the substance of the Exhibits A and B and in addition to address the issue of whether and the extent to which the filing of the exhibits meets the requirements of 10 CFR, Section 2.309(f)(2) and/or Subsection (c) and also address which ones of those sections are applicable and to the extent you wish, also to address the issue of the relevance of the exhibits and the filing times on the outstanding.

And then there would be time for the Petitioners to file replies to the staff and Applicant's responses which would be -- the responses would be in the nature of responses to the proposed amendment to the contention found in Exhibits A and B and insofar as they were offered to provide additional support for Contentions A and B and then replies on those. That would be one category.

1	I've noticed some beeping going on. Is
2.	there anyone
3	MR. FRANKEL: This is David Frankel, your
4	Honor. I dropped off the call and called back from a
5	different phone. So, I apologize.
6	JUDGE YOUNG: I'm glad you said that. I
7	was afraid we might be losing people or something like
8	that. The second category of items would be items
9	where there would be actual briefs, the main one being
10	the treaty, treaty law and the UN declaration.
11	Then 5 and 6 are also briefing issues.
12	Then the next category would be the Petitioner's
13	supplemental statements from the members of WNRC. Did
14	that include all the I think that was the only
15	organization for which the staff asked for
16	supplemental statements. Am I right?
17	MR. FRANKEL: This is David Frankel. I
18	believe that's right, your Honor. Yes.
19	JUDGE YOUNG: Okay, and the staff agrees
20	with that, too. I think Ms. Simon was the one who
21	raised that. You agree with that?
22	MS. SIMON: Yes, your Honor, this is
23	Marcia Simon.
24	JUDGE YOUNG: Okay. And then the
25	citations which Mr. Smith says he can provide right

1	away. So shall we propose dates or do any of you have
2	specific proposals on the dates for any of these?
3	MR. FRANKEL: Your Honor, this is David
4	Frankel. On the brief concerning the treaties and the
5	indigenous issues, we the rights to consultation
6	and the other tribal law and Indian law issues, we're
7	going to need some time, more time on that than on
8	some of the others just because it's such a broad area
9	and we want to be clear on making sure that we at
10	least mention the various items that came up during
11	the hearing.
12	There were several and as your Honor
13.	noted. So I think we would need at least four weeks
14	to do that one.
15	JUDGE YOUNG: This is Judge Young, we just
16	lost you for a minute when there was another beeping.
17	Did someone else join us?
18	MR. KATSENBERG: Yes, I just joined.
19	Richard Katsenberg.
20	JUDGE YOUNG: Okay, and are you with any
21	of the parties or just listening?
22	MR. KATSENBERG: Listening in.
23	JUDGE YOUNG: Okay. On the briefs, I
24	guess this is Judge Young again. I would suggest
25	that we have simultaneously filing of briefs by all

1	parties and then another date for all parties to reply
2	to the briefs of the other parties. And so that would
3	apply to Number 3, Number I'm sorry, Number 3,
4	Number 5, Number 6 and then if the parties want to,
5	the terrorism issues.
6	Let me just ask, does any participant or
7.	do any participants want to brief the terrorism issues
8	any further? I'm hearing no response. Can I assume
9	that that means no party wants to brief the terrorism
LO	issue any further?
11	MS. JONES: Judge, this is Andrea Jones
12	for the staff. At this point in time, I think we're
L3	okay on our end.
L4	MR. SMITH: This is Tyson Smith for Crow
L5	Butte. We don't believe any additional briefing is
L'6	necessary on the terrorism issue.
L7	JUDGE YOUNG: And the Petitioners agree?
18	MR. FRANKEL: This is David Frankel for
L9	the three Petitioners I represent. We don't feel any
20	additional briefing on the terrorism
21	JUDGE YOUNG: Okay, we can cross that one
22	off. It never was on in the first place anyway.
23	Okay, so for Numbers 5 and 6, do the do the
24	participants those seem like they would not take
25	quite as long as the treaty and indigenous rights

issues. Do I hear any disagreement with that?

MR. SMITH: Your Honor, this is Tyson.

Smith for Crow Butte. I guess we're not. We're a little unclear about how -- you know, in what context these issues are raised. We're not sure that they're really -- you know, there were no complaints regarding -- from any of the parties regarding notice. There's no contentions that really relate to this issue, nor to the license transfer issue and to the extent that was an issue from you know, some years ago, that's a question of enforcement rather than an issue regarding this license amendment.

So I think in our view, we're -- while we're happy to brief it, I think you know, I've got a couple of citations here where the Commission made clear that a notice isn't required for materials licensing actions. Perhaps we can dispense with that today.

JUDGE YOUNG: That would be fine. If no one wants to brief any given issue, then we're not going to force you to.

MR. FRANKEL: Your Honor, this is David Frankel for the Petitioners. We would object to that on a couple of grounds. The company, obviously, is not aware of the consultation responsibilities that it

1.	has and we have we're gathering the information
. ,2	from Mr. Harvey Whitewoman, who has confirmed that he
3	was an administrative assistant to an individual named
4	Johnson Holy Rock, who had no authority to bind the
5	tribe and that contrary to Mr. Smith's assertions at
6	the hearing, in fact, there was no resolution at the
7	tribal level and so we
8	JUDGE YOUNG: Excuse me, Mr. Frankel, let
9	me interrupt you for a second. This is Judge Young.
10	Which number on the list are you addressing right now?
11	MR. FRANKEL: I'm referring to the need to
12	brief the indigenous rights issue.
13	JUDGE YOUNG: No, no, that was not I
14	was not suggesting that that one not be briefed. That
15	one, I think, we do think needs to be briefed. I was
16.	talking
17.	MR. FRANKEL: The license transfer issue?
18	JUDGE YOUNG: The license transfer issue
19	and the license amendment issue. I think Mr. Smith
20	said that he could provide some citations. Let me
21	MR. FRANKEL: I believe Mr. Smith gave a
22	legal opinion at the hearing that no public hearing or
23	filings were required to transfer an NRC materials
24	license. We find that hard to believe, so we'd be
25	interested in seeing Mr. Smith's citations in writing.

1	MS. JONES: Judge, this is Andrea Jones
2	for the staff. I have to I sort of have to concur
3	with Mr. Smith. This was not again, it was really
4	not an issue that was raised by the Petitioners and so
. 5	I don't understand why Mr. Frankel would be
6	complaining about it at this stage in the game.
7	I just I'm not really sure that it's
8	really relevant to the issues that they are raising.
9	JUDGE YOUNG: Let me back up for a minute.
10	Let me just back up and again, the way this list was
11	arrived at was going through the transcript, so what
12	I can do is go to the places in the transcript where
13	these issues arose. The supplemental statements, I
14	think, Ms. Simon requested those. The let's see.
15	MR. FRANKEL: This came up in the context,
16	your Honor, of our contention concerning the foreign
17	ownership of Cameco and we made specific reference in
18	the corrected petition to
19	THE REPORTER: Is this Mr. Frankel?
20	MR. FRANKEL: the ownership of the
21	project not being stated accurately.
22	THE REPORTER: Excuse me. Is this Mr.
23	Frankel?
24	MR. FRANKEL: Yes.
25	THE REPORTER: Thank you.
	NEAL R. GROSS

392 JUDGE YOUNG: Okay, let me -- just give me 1 time to go through -- I have tabs on the pages of the 2 transcript and I can -- let's -- before we get into 3 any argument on this, and I'm not --4 DR. SACHS: Yes, ma'am. 5 JUDGE YOUNG: On the rule on whether an 6 7 amendment to a materials license requires notice of opportunity for hearing, I asked Ms. Simon if she 8 could provide that and she said that she would. 9 and then I think later -- that was on page 17 -- I'm 10 sorry 130 and 131 of the transcript and I think there 11 was also a reference on page 173. 12 Then let's see. 13 (Pause) 14 JUDGE YOUNG: On the license transfer, on 15 16 page 348 of the transcript I asked the staff, I said, "With the reactors there's a license transfer, if 17 there is a license transfer, there's opportunity for 18 a hearing" and referred back to the fact that you had 19 20

agreed to give it some authority on the right to a hearing with the license amendment for a materials license and I think the staff said that they would provide the same thing with regard to the license transfer.

And then right after that was when Mr.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

21

22

23

24

25

Smith agreed to provide the citations about being permitted to provide -- to supply uranium only to countries that have signed a nuclear non-proliferation treaty and are subject to the International Atomic Energy Agency. So those are more citations. So I probably should not have said briefs on Number 5.

And the staff -- maybe we could just say,
"The staff could provide the citations for Number 5
and Mr. Smith could provide the citations on Number 7.
And it might be best if you do those just in writing
and we can set a short deadline for that. Sometimes
in transcripts, no offense to the Court Reporter, but
we don't always get the exact citation form right, so
it might be good to file those in writing.

On the status of NUREGS as being in the nature of law, guidance and/or fact, that's something that I think if the parties want to file briefs, you can file briefs but I don't think we're going to require you to file briefs. And Mr. Frankel, in view of what I've just said, are you arguing that you want more than what I've just listed?

MR. FRANKEL: Yes, your Honor. David Frankel here. My recollection of the hearing was that we expressly stated a dispute with the company, that it should have disclosed its ownership, that that

to improve this as well. It was something that did

1

. 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

come up.

MR. SMITH: Your Honor, this is Tyson Smith. I mean, this issue of a license transfer which if it was necessary at all would have taken place eight years ago, it's unrelated in any way, shape or form to the current license amendment for North Trend Expansion Area and it's clearly outside the scope of this proceeding. We don't see any need for briefing or an opportunity for response on this. You know, there's no basis for a contention, no genuine dispute in law or fact about this. Simply disputing an issue doesn't make an admissible contention.

JUDGE YOUNG: Okay.

MS. JONES: Judge, this is Andrea Jones for the NRC staff. The Petitioners never -- they never cited any particular regulatory requirement, any particular statutory requirement for this and again, this is for a license -- the issue of a license transfer, as I recall, this was just a question that your Honor was asking but I don't recall that even that very specific argument was even made.

JUDGE YOUNG: Okay, let me just -- this is

Judge Young again. Let me just interject here. The

purpose of this conference call is simply to set some

deadlines. So I don't want to open up argument on

NEAL R. GROSS

1 various issues. 2 MS. JONES: Understood. 3 JUDGE YOUNG: On the issue of the right or lack of right or provision for notice of opportunity 4 5 for hearing with regard to amendment of materials, 6 licenses and transfer of materials licenses, the staff had agreed in response to my request to provide 7 8 citations to authority for that. I had asked the 9 question. 10 Once you provide the authority if the 11 Petitioners want to file a response, providing any 12 authority to the contrary, I think that would be 13 appropriate and we can set deadlines for that. But I 14 don't want to open up argument on -- legal argument on 15 those issues at this time. It's just simply a matter 16 of what is the law on it. 17 So, that takes care of Number 5 and Number 18 7. It seems like the original deadlines for the staff 19 on Number 5 and for the Applicant on Number 7 could 20 probably be a week from today, do you think? 2.1 MR. SMITH: This is Tyson Smith for Crow 22 One week is fine for the citations in Number 23 7. 24 Your Honor, this is Marcia MS. SIMON: 25 Simon for the NRC staff. One week is fine for Number

2

.3

4

5

6

7

8

. 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

5 also.

JUDGE YOUNG: Okay, so today is the 23rd, that would be January 30th. And we'll put that for both of those and then if the Petitioners want to provide any response, providing any law to the contrary of what the staff provides, would a week after that be sufficient for the Petitioners?

MR. ELLISON: Well, your Honor, this is Bruce Ellison. I start four-days of evidentiary

Bruce Ellison. I start four-days of evidentiary hearings in a habeas murder case in Ohio on the 30th. They're going the 30th, 31st, and then the following Monday and Tuesday. So if -- with a week, I would be getting it as I start my hearing and it would be practically impossible for any meaningful response in a week, at least on -- you know, for me.

JUDGE YOUNG: When do you think would be a good time for you?

MR. ELLISON: Well, ma'am, if I could have a number of days past that week, because I'm not going to be getting back until the 5th, possibly the 6th.

JUDGE YOUNG: Okay, what about the 11th?

MR. ELLISON: That would be wonderful.

JUDGE YOUNG: Okay, so the 11th for the Petitioner's response, February 11th. Okay, then on the Petitioner's Supplemental Statement, how much time

NEAL R. GROSS

1 do you need to get those together? 2 MR. FRANKEL: A week would be fine, your 3 Honor, David Frankel speaking. JUDGE YOUNG: So January 30th? 4 5 MR. FRANKEL: Yes, your Honor, that would 6 be fine. Great, okav. On any --7 JUDGE YOUNG: 8 briefs on the status of NUREGs, did any party -- did 9 any of the participants want to brief Number 6? 10 mean, we -- this is not going to be a requirement. This is an issue that we can deal with ourselves but 11 12 if anyone wants to file a brief on the status of 13 NUREGs as being in the nature of law, let us know and we'll set a deadline. I mean, let us know now. 14 15 MR. FRANKEL: This is David Frankel. Mr. Ellison, you were the one who referred to that and 16 17 there was some discussion of it, so I'm going to defer 18 to you on that. So do you have any position on that? 19 MR. ELLISON: Well, I guess what I'd like 20 to encourage is I'd like for us to have further 21 discussion. If we could have again, that deadline 22 until the 11th, your Honor, if we're going to file 23 anything further, that we would do so on that date and obviously, if we don't then there wouldn't be any need 24 25 for a response.

JUDGE YOUNG: Okay, any problem with that? MR. ELLISON: Will that work, Mr. Frankel? Yeah, that works for us. MR. FRANKEL: JUDGE YOUNG: Okay. Now, on the law relating to the treaties and the UN declaration of indigenous rights, you had asked for one month which would take us to February 22nd. MR. SMITH: Your Honor, this is Tyson Smith for Crow Butte. Again, with regard to -- it's not clear to us why it is necessary to do any briefings on this treaty or these water rights. know, we think they raise issues that are outside the scope of the NRC's jurisdiction in this matter, which is limited to the Atomic Energy Act and NEPA and doesn't go to the United States' international obligations that may have undertaken. In this regard, I guess, you know, we're not really sure how it's going to tilt NRC's decision, but if we think that there's some need for further guidance on this, I think this is the type of issue that raises a significant and novel legal and policy

that might warrant certification to

Commission for their thoughts on the matter before the

parties have to invest significant resources and time

and effort in drafting some legal brief and it's

the

issue

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

.2

unclear exactly what we're supposed to be focusing on in this area, what the issues are.

DUDGE YOUNG: This is something that I believe I had asked for because in the filings that we had as of last week, there were references to the treaties and there were references to the UN Declaration of Indigenous Rights. So what we'd like to do is give the parties an opportunity to file any briefs on these issues to us and then we may or may not decide, depending upon what we get and what our own research shows may or may not decide to certify a question to the Commission. But I don't want to get into arguments on the merits of it at this point. Simply to, as I said before, set a deadline.

So if we could have everyone file any briefs that you would like to file on those issues insofar as they're relevant to the arguments that have already been raised in the filings and in the oral argument. Do that by February 22nd and then any responses by a week after that, February 29th. And then that would leave --

MR. SMITH: This is Tyson Smith for Crow Butte again. Could we -- I'm just looking for a little -- you know, just a brief on treaties and water rights seems a little amorphous and I guess we're a

1	little unclear about what exactly the legal issue is
2	beyond, you know, those that we've raised in terms of
3	these issues being outside the scope of the proceeding
4	or outside the zone of interest test for standing.
5	And so is that what you're looking for is just, you
6	know, restating what we've said previously at the pre-
7	hearing conference or is this more of a just some
8	dissertation on you know, what these treaty rights
9	mean more generally? Any guidance you could give us
10	on how to frame this would be very helpful. I think
11	it's a little unclear to us.
12	JUDGE YOUNG: Right. I'd suggest the
13	first thing you do is go back and read the transcript
14	and you'll see how it came up in our discussion last
15	week. The second thing I think you should do is that
16	the issues arose in the context of the discussion of
17	Contention C, I believe.
18	MS. JONES: That is correct, Judge.
19	JUDGE YOUNG: Were there contentions where
20	the I think it's only Contention C.
21	MS. JONES: Well, I'm going to let Ms
22	it did come up in the context of Contention C and it
23	came
24	THE REPORTER: Excuse me, is this Ms.
25	Jones?

1	MS. JONES: the water issues and
2.,	THE REPORTER: Excuse me, who is speaking?
3	MS. SIMON: Your Honor, it actually it
4	came up in both the
5	THE REPORTER: Excuse me, who is speaking?
6	This is the Court Reporter.
7	JUDGE YOUNG: Excuse me, hold on, hold on.
8	Hold on, the Court Reporter just the first person
9	that was speaking was Ms. Jones, I believe.
10	MS. JONES: Yes, it was. I apologize for
11	that.
12	THE REPORTER: Ms. Jones.
13	JUDGE YOUNG: Ms. Simon, was that you that
14	just
15	MS. SIMON: Yes, this is Marcia Simon.
16	The Fort Laramie treaties came up in both Petitioner's
17	replies. I don't have the replies right here with me
18	but I think they came up also in other context outside
19	just Contention C. I think they were raised in I
20	guess kind of a claim that the land where the
21	operation is located is still within the land
22	belonging to the Sioux Indians under those treaties.
23	JUDGE YOUNG: Right, I think you're right.
24	It may have come up with regard to water rights. I
25	think that's it. And I can actually go to the

12

13

14

15

16

17

1.8

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

transcript myself again if we need to do that but I suggest you see where it's arisen and see how it was discussed in the transcript. And the reason for asking for briefing on this is obviously, this is a sort of unusual issue of law and so we're going to be doing research on it and whatever edification the parties would like to provide on this to us insofar as it's relevant to the issues before us, provided by the deadline stated and then if you want to respond to anything provided by any other parties, that would be a week later.

MR. McGUIRE: Judge, this is Mike McGuire. If I can offer an observation or a suggestion; would it make any sense to bifurcate the issues here and what I have in mind would be the Commission's jurisdiction to entertain substantive discussions of treaties or the United Nations Declarations. I have the jurisdictional question separated from whatever substantive part would be here because I don't -- pardon me --

JUDGE YOUNG: Mr. McGuire, I think again you're getting into the merits. To the extent that you want to argue jurisdictional issues, put them in your brief, okay?

MR. McGUIRE: All right, thank you.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	JUDGE YOUNG: Let's not complicate this
2	more than it needs to be at the outside. If you see
3	issues, raise them.
4	MR. McGUIRE: All right, that's fine.
5	JUDGE YOUNG: We're not making any pre-
6	judgments on the relevance of any of this. We want to
7	give you the opportunity and ask from you any
8	edification that you want to provide, any arguments
9	that you want to make on the issues.
10	MR. McGUIRE: Thank you. I was trying in
11	good faith to make it more clear, but fine, we can do
12	it that way, certainly.
13	JUDGE YOUNG: I think jurisdictional
14	issues may be part of what you want to brief to us,
15	but
16	MR. McGUIRE: Definitely.
17	JUDGE YOUNG: I don't think we're going
18	to decide those today. Today is simply to schedule
19	deadlines.
20	MR. McGUIRE: Yeah, and I was merely
21	stressing, I guess, two deadlines, a jurisdictional
22	one and then a substantive one depending on where the
23	jurisdictional one goes, but you have a different
24	approach in which this obviously is perfectly fine.
25	Thank you.

. 1

JUDGE YOUNG: I think if we can keep it as simple as -- the simpler the better in terms of numbers of deadlines and so forth. Now, we get back to the numbers 1 and 2. First of all, a week from now on January 30th, the Petitioners are going to notify us and all parties whether they intend to file any amended contentions.

If you do, and let me just say this, if you do keep in mind that this is not sort of an open door to amend your contention in whatever way you see fit. What we're required to look to here is whether the provisions of 10 CFR Section 2.309(c) or 2.309(f)(2) or I think the staff has argued in some circumstances both would come into play, whether there are any circumstances that would fall under either of those two sections that would permit the filing of an amended contention at this point.

If you think you have something that would meet the requirements of either or both of those sections, then that would be what you would let us know about a week from today and I think probably we would need to set a deadline then for any contention or amended contention that were filed pursuant to that.

The one thing I think it would be good to

avoid is if we're going to set deadlines for the staff to file responses to Exhibits A and B and to the timeliness of them under the sections of the rules that I just cited to you, and then another deadline for replies to that, then I don't -- I don't think we want to have a dual track of a new amended contention based on those documents that would then set up another series of deadlines for responses and replies.

So I guess Mr. Ellison and Mr. Frankel, when you say you want to consult as to whether to file any amended contentions, what are you thinking about? Can you give some insight into what kind of amended contention you would be wanting to file?

MR. FRANKEL: This is David Frankel, your Honor. Frankly, we would just like to confer between ourselves and our clients in a privileged context and from the standpoint of not at all wanting to delay the Court's or complicate the Court's scheduling, we'd be willing to, you know, have a -- if we do file an amended contention, perhaps we could do that within a fairly short period of time after the 30th, say one week after that so that we could keep things on track. Would that suit your Honor?

JUDGE YOUNG: Well, Mr. Frankel, the confusion that I'm having right now and what I'm

1 trying to learn from you is, when you're talking about 2 an amended contention, are you talking about something 3 that would be based on Exhibits A and B or something 4 separate from that? 5 MR. FRANKEL: No, we would not be talking 6 about any new material or new information, your Honor. 7 I have, frankly, not even had a chance to read the 8 entire transcript yet. So I just want to make sure 9 that I'm able to answer the question on our intention 10 concerning an amended contention definitively and with 11 an appropriate amount of time to consider it. 12 that's what I wanted to do with Mr. Ellison and our 13 clients over the next few days is make sure we weren't 14 missing something on that. 15 JUDGE YOUNG: Okay, let me just ask you 16 again. Are you talking about filing an amended 17 contention that would be related to Exhibits A and B? 18 MR. ELLISON: Your Honor, this is Bruce 19 Ellison. It would seem to me that the question arose 20 at the beginning of our -- of this telephonic hearing 21 about that perhaps we needed to do that to incorporate 22 A and B. 23 JUDGE YOUNG: No, I didn't mean to suggest 24 that you needed to. What we wanted to know -- I 25 noticed a place in the transcript where you mentioned

amended contention or contentions. 1 2 MR. ELLISON: Yes. 3 JUDGE YOUNG: My question was simply whether you planned to and since today was the day 4 that we set to discuss deadlines, I wanted to know if 5 you plan to, let's set a deadline for that. 6 7 MR. ELLISON: Right. 8 JUDGE YOUNG: And my question now is to 9 avoid having dual tracks, addressing the same or 10 similar issues, the question is simply, if you were to decide to file an amended contention, would it be 1.1 12 based on Exhibit A and/or B or something else? 13 MR. ELLISON: I would think it would be based upon A and B. It might also be based upon the 14 15 issue that arose as to the licensing notice that came up during the course of the hearing. And so that all 16 17 of the issues that -- we want to make sure -- it's 18 kind of like -- and again, I profess my ignorance, but it kind of like would be conforming a complaint to --19 20 or having or modifying a complaint or amending a 21 complaint to conform to the evidence. Right, except that the 22 JUDGE YOUNG: 23 amendment -- the contention amendment provisions are much different than that. 24 25 MR. ELLISON: And we would like to look at

1 them, if we may.

JUDGE YOUNG: Well, here's the problem. The purpose of today's telephone conference is to set deadlines. You filed your Exhibits A and B last week, so one of the main things that we want to set a deadline on is the time for the staff and applicant to file responses to those. Maybe we should just go ahead and do that.

MR. ELLISON: Yes.

JUDGE YOUNG: And then if you do file another contention, we'll just -- maybe there's no way to avoid -- because I don't want to hold up --

MR. FRANKEL: May I interject, your Honor, this is David Frankel? I think what you're heading towards here would suit us just fine. Just set the deadline for the responses to those Exhibits A and B and we know that we all want to discuss them in the context of the late filing and the rules concerning supporting information that we reference. And we still can stick to a deadline of January 30th to advise the Court and the parties in the event we have any intention of filing an amended contention so that we can close off that issue.

JUDGE YOUNG: Okay, all right, then for th staff and applicant, how soon can you file your

1	responses, both substantive and on the timeliness
2	aspects of Exhibits A and B?
3	MS. JONES: Judge, this is Andrea Jones
4	for the staff. Are you specifically asking in
5	response to any potential filing by the Petitioners?
6	JUDGE YOUNG: No, I'm asking with regard
7	to Exhibits A and B that were filed last week.
8	MS. JONES: Okay. Perhaps maybe two
9	weeks.
10	JUDGE YOUNG: Okay.
11	MS. JONES: Is that okay?
12	JUDGE YOUNG: Would that work for you, Mr.
13	Smith and Mr. McGuire?
14	MR. SMITH: Yeah, this is Tyson Smith for
15	Crow Butte. That time frame is accessible for us.
1,6	JUDGE YOUNG: Okay, so that would be
17	February 5 th . All right, and then could the
18	Petitioners file a response a week after that or do
19	you need two weeks?
20	MR. FRANKEL: Two weeks would be great,
21	your Honor, David Frankel speaking.
22	JUDGE YOUNG: All right.
23	MS. JONES: Judge, this is I'm sorry,
24	this is Andrea Jones again for the staff. I have a
25	very special request. I just realized the February
1	

1	5 th falls around a religious holiday for me
2	JUDGE YOUNG: Okay.
3	MS. JONES: which I'm scheduled to be
4	out of state at that time and I was wondering if
5	everyone would be okay if we maybe pushed it back just
6	a few more days.
7	JUDGE YOUNG: Okay, what suggest a day.
8	MS. JONES: Perhaps the Friday.
9	JUDGE YOUNG: February 8 th ?
10	MS. JONES: Yeah, that gives me time to
11	get back into Washington, DC.
12	JUDGE YOUNG: Okay, all right February 8 th
13	for the number one, the responses to Exhibits A and B
L4	and actually I'm thinking replies under the rules
L5	normally hold on a second. Are they seven days or
16	ten days?
L7	MR. SMITH: This is Tyson Smith for Crow
18	Butte. It's seven days for replies to contentions,
19	although I guess amended contentions there's not
20	necessarily and opportunity for reply but I think
21	seven days would be appropriate.
22	JUDGE YOUNG: Actually, it's seven days
23	for replies to responses, so okay, so actually, so
24	Mr. Frankel and Mr. Ellison, February 15 th , I think
25	would be the normal date for replies. Can you live

1	with that?
2	MR. FRANKEL: This is David Frankel. Yes,
3	your Honor.
4	JUDGE YOUNG: Okay, and then meanwhile on
5	January 30 th , you're going to inform us whether you
6	intend to file any new or amended contentions. If you
7	do, you were saying you could file them then a week
8	after that which would be February 30 th ? I'm sorry,
9	excuse me, February 6 th .
10	MR. FRANKEL: Mr. Ellison, how do you feel
11 -	about that?
12	MR. ELLISON: That would be fine.
1.3	JUDGE YOUNG: Okay, so February 6 th and
14	then if anything is filed, then the responses to that
15	let me look again at the rules, answers are 25 days
16	although if we could shorten that a bit, I'm looking
17	forward to our schedule in some other cases. How soon
18	could the staff and applicant get responses in to
19 [.]	anything that might be filed on the 6th?
20	MS. JONES: I'm sorry, Judge, on the 6 th
21	what exactly would they be filing? I'm sorry, the
22	amended contention?
23	JUDGE YOUNG: Right, if on January 30 th ,
24	petitioners indicate that they are going to be filing
25	any new or amended contentions, then those that or

1	those contention or contentions is or amended
2	contentions as the case may be, would be due February
3	6 th . Then how soon could the staff and applicant get
4	in responses to anything that might or might not be
5	filed on February 6 th ?
6	MS. SIMON: Your Honor, this is Marcia
7 .	Simon. I'm going to suggest, what about February
8 .	22 nd , which is the same day as the briefs on the
9	treaties are due?
10	JUDGE YOUNG: All right, and then a week
11	after that would be February 29 th for replies to that.
12	Can everyone live with those dates?
13	MR. SMITH: This is Tyson Smith for Crow
14	Butte. Those are acceptable.
15	MR. FRANKEL: David Frankel for
16	petitioners, yes, your Honor.
17	JUDGE YOUNG: And Mr. Ellison, are you all
18	right with that?
19	MR. ELLISON: Yes, ma'am.
20	JUDGE YOUNG: Okay, have we left out
21	anything?
22	JUDGE OLIVER: Judge Oliver, what about
23	Number 4? Fred Oliver.
24	JUDGE YOUNG: The supplemental statements
25	are January 30 th .

1	JUDGE OLIVER: Okay.
2	JUDGE YOUNG: Anything else? Well, we
3	appreciate your time and attention to all these things
4	today. We will look forward to hearing from you on
5	all of them. If anything else comes up, we will be
6'.	unavailable the first week of February but we will be
7	available for most of next week and then from
8	starting February 11 th or 12 th on, we will be available
9	if anything else arises.
10	Judge Cole, can you think of anything
11	else?
12	JUDGE COLE: I have nothing further.
13	JUDGE YOUNG: Judge Oliver?
14	JUDGE OLIVER: No.
15	JUDGE YOUNG: All right, well, then thank
16	you all very much and I will get an order out tomorrow
17	confirming all these dates. Ms. Thibault, can you
18	think of anything else that we may have overlooked?
19	MS. THIBAULT: No, I think we've covered
20	everything.
21	JUDGE YOUNG: Okay, thank you all.
22	(Whereupon, at 3:59 p.m. the above-
23	entitled matter concluded.)
24	

CERTIFICATE

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

Name of Proceeding: Crow Butte Resources, Inc.

(In Situ Leach Facility)

Docket Number:

40-8943

Location:

Teleconference

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.

Katherine Sykova Official Reporter

Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc.