Official Transcript of Proceedings NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title:

Crow Butte Resources, Inc.

Pre-hearing Conference

Docket Number:

40-8943; ASLBP No.: 07-859-03-MLA-BD01

Location:

(telephone conference)

Date:

Tuesday, July 7, 2009

Work Order No.:

NRC-2953

Pages 664-685

DOCKETED USNRC

July 13, 2009 (2:00pm)

OFFICE OF SECRETARY RULEMAKINGS AND ADJUDICATIONS STAFF

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

Templete duy - 032

1	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
2	+ + + +
3	NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
4	+ + + +
5	ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD PANEL
6	+ + + +
7	PRE-HEARING CONFERENCE
8	
9	In the Matter of:
10	CROW BUTTE RESOURCES INC. Docket No. 40-8943-MLA
11	(In-situ Leach Uranium ASLBP No.
12	Recovery Facility, 07-859-03-MLA-BD01
13	Crawford, Nebraska)
14	
15	,
16	Tuesday, July 7, 2009
17	
18	The above-entitled conference convened
19	telephonically, pursuant to notice, at 2:00 p.m.
20	Eastern `Daylight Time.
21	BEFORE:
22	THE HONORABLE ANNE YOUNG, Administrative Judge
23	(Chair)
24	THE HONORABLE FRED OLIVER, Administrative Judge
25	THE HONORABLE RICHARD COLE, Administrative Judge
	NEAL R. GROSS

1	APPEARANCES:
2	On Behalf of Petitioner Western Nebraska
3	Resources Council:
4	DAVID C. FRANKEL, Esquire
5	P.O. Box 3014
6	Pine Ridge, South Dakota 57770
7	(308) 430-8160
8	
9	SHANE ROBINSON, Esquire
10	2814 East Olive Street
11	Seattle, Washington 98122
12	(206) 465-4740
13	On Behalf of Petitioner Oglala Sioux Tribe:
14	ELIZABETH MARIA LORINA, Esquire
15	522 7th Street, Suite 202
16	Rapid City, South Dakota 57701
17	(605) 716-6355
18	On Behalf of Petitioner Oglala Delegation of
19	the Black Hills-Sioux Treaty Council:
20	THOMAS J. BALLANCO, Esquire
21	Harmonic Engineering
22	945 Taraval Avenue, #186
23	San Francisco, California 94116
24	
25	

1	APPEARANCES (Continued):
.2	On Behalf of the Applicant:
3	TYSON R. SMITH, Esquire
4	Winston & Strawn
5	101 California Street
6	San Francisco, California 94111
7.	(415) 591-6874
8	
9	MARK D. McGUIRE, Esquire
10	McGuire & Norby
11	605 South 14th Street, Suite 100
12	Lincoln, Nebraska 68508
13	(402) 434-2390
14	On Behalf of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission:
15	BRETT KLUKAN, Esquire;
16	CATHERINE MARCO, Esquire; and
17	CHRISTINE JOACHIM BOOTE, Esquire
18	Office of the General Counsel
19	Nuclear Regulatory Commission
20	Mail Stop O-15D21
21	One White Flint North
22	11555 Rockville Pike
23	Rockville, Maryland 20852
24	ALSO PRESENT:
25	JOHANNA THIBAULT, ASLBP Law Clerk
	1

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

1	P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S
2	(3:05 p.m.)
3	CHAIRPERSON YOUNG: This is Anne Marshall
4	Young, Chair of the Licensing Board. I have with me
5	Judge Richard Cole and Judge Brett Oliver and a law
6	clerk, Johanna Thibault.
7	Did we just get someone new? Did someone
8	join us? Are people still with us?
9	MR. FRANKEL: David Frankel here, Your
10	Honor.
11	CHAIRPERSON YOUNG: Okay. There was a
12	mysterious beep. Let's just start with the NRC and
13	then the petitioners and then the applicant and have
14	everyone who is present identify yourselves.
15	MR. KLUKAN: Your Honor, this is Brett
16	Klukan for the NRC staff I am listening on a
17	different line and Catherine Marco and Christine
18	Jochim Boote.
19	CHAIRPERSON YOUNG: And for the
20	petitioners?
21	MR. FRANKEL: David Frankel here, Your
22	Honor, for Western Nebraska Resources Council. And
23	also I have with me Shane Robinson on the phone. And
24	we'll also cover for Mr. Ellison concerning Owe Aku
25	and Debra White Plume.

1	CHAIRPERSON YOUNG: Thank you.
2	MS. LORINA: Elizabeth Lorina, the Oglala
3	Tribe.
4	MR. BALLANCO: Tom Ballanco for the Oglala
5	Delegation of the Black Hills-Sioux Treaty Council.
6	MR. SMITH: For then for Crow Butte
7	Resources, we have Tyson Smith. And also on the line
8	is Mark McGuire and Emily Duncan.
9	- CHAIRPERSON YOUNG: Okay. Anyone else?
10	(No response.)
11	CHAIRPERSON YOUNG: Thank you for all
12	being available today. Really, what we would like to
13	do today is address a schedule for the proceeding and
14	to get input from all of the parties on that. We
15	would also like to just touch on the nature of the
16	participation and interaction between the various
17	petitioners on the remaining contentions in this case.
18	We would like to hear from you all as to
19	whether any of you see any interaction between this
20	case and the case involving the Crow Butte license
21	renewal application.
22	As far as the schedule goes, our general
23	tendency is to for the schedule that may not have
24	specific dates other than those which we know. And
25	our approach is based on the fact that sometimes

1 triggering dates can change. And so our approach 2 would be to approach it in somewhat the same way that the model milestones do; in other words, using the 3 staff issuance of the SER and the NEPA documents as 4 triggering further time lines after that. 5 One way in which we might adapt a little 6 7 bit would be to set any deadlines for motions for summary disposition a bit earlier so that there will 8 9 be adequate time between those getting to them and rulings on them and hearings that might still be held 10 after rulings on any motions for summary disposition. 11 I guess the first thing would be to ask 12 13 the staff, what is your current expectation as to the issuance date for your documents? 14 Your Honor, this is Brett 15 MR. KLUKAN: The environmental review documents, we still 16 17 predict finishing that around December of 2009. 18 The SER, as I think in our last update we 19 indicated that date twisted a little. So it's now mid Fall 2009, so around possibly October or November time 20 21 frame. CHAIRPERSON YOUNG: All right. The next 22 23 thing I would be interested in hearing is whether any 24 of the parties see any other issues than those we have listed that it would be appropriate to address today. 25

MR. FRANKEL: David Frankel, Your Honor. I remind the Board -- and I had a brief conversation with Tyson about this in Denver last week. We are going to appeal this. The decision was arbitrary and

capricious. So we expect to prevail on the field. We

would ask you to consider that.

And I apologize for a premature motion to stay. I thought that the earlier ruling had some persuasiveness possibly. And so I didn't mean to frustrate any of the parties' time or resources, but I would ask either whether the Board would be open to a motion to reconsider or a motion to stay now that this Commission decision has come down or, in the alternative, clarify whether the Board is making a final ruling on that issue so that we would be free, then, to take it up at the Eighth Circuit with a motion to stay.

CHAIRPERSON YOUNG: Well, I think that you are asking us to give you a sort of an anticipatory ruling on a motion that is not really before us. If you want to renew your motion or to file a new motion, I think the thing to do would be to go ahead and file that at this point and make it specific to the current circumstances.

MR. FRANKEL: Thank you, Your Honor.

NEAL R. GROSS

1 David Frankel here. I will comply with the rule 323 2 and contact counsels and file a new motion. 3 you. 4 CHAIRPERSON YOUNG: Now, I think we would 5 like to -- well, let me back up. Are there any other 6 issues besides those and the ones that Mr. Frankel 7 just raised? 8 MR. SMITH: Your Honor, this is Tyson 9 Smith for Crow Butte Resources. As you know, the 10 Commission's decision triggered one of the events in 11 an earlier stay motion you had issued regarding 12 mandatory disclosures. So we will be in the process 13 of preparing those. 14 I have communicated with some of the 15 parties. And I am hopeful that we will be able to 16 agree on some mandatory disclosure protocols that 17 govern our disclosures and may impact the timing by a 18 week or so. 19 And hopefully this is something we can all 20 agree on. I volunteer to take the lead on that. 21 we'll be sending that via letter to you all once I 22 have had a chance to speak with all the parties. 23 So I don't think there is anything you 24 need to do now, but I just wanted to let you know that 25 that was out there.

CHAIRPERSON YOUNG: Very good. Actually, that is one of the things that we would have addressed on the schedule. And, to whatever degree, all the parties can get together and, in effect, suggest a proposed schedule among all of you with the understanding that obviously this motion per se may be

But assuming that, arguendo, that were not to be granted, if all the parties wanted to get together and come up with a joint proposed schedule, you would be free to do that. And that would be we would appreciate that.

The mandatory disclosures are now in effect. And so what you are proposing, Mr. Smith, unless anyone else objects I think would be a good course to get us started on those.

We have all heard what the staff just said, namely late October or November for the SER and December for the environmental review document. Under the model milestones, 30 days after issuance of each of those, we see the deadline for any new contentions based on either or both of those. So I just want to advise all parties of that at this point.

Are there any other particular considerations that any party thinks should be taken

NEAL R. GROSS

into account in drawing up this schedule? 1 2 (No response.) 3 CHAIRPERSON YOUNG: Hearing none, going to assume the answer is no. Have the parties 4 5 talked at all about a proposed schedule? Have you 6 talked together about this at all? 7 MR. SMITH: This is Tyson Smith for Crow Butte Resources. I don't believe that we have 8 9 specifically discussed the schedule for the balance of 10 the hearing. You know, I don't think we have 11 discussed any of the events that would take place after the issuance of the SER and EIS. 12 13 CHAIRPERSON YOUNG: Does anybody have 14 anything that you would like to bring out at this 15 point about the schedule? We have indicated that we would generally follow these model milestones except 16 that we would want to set a deadline for summary 17 18 disposition motions earlier so that those could 19 receive adequate attention by the parties and by the 2.0 Board. 21 Any other particular aspects of 22 schedule that might vary from the model milestones that any party would like to propose or raise in any 23 24 way? 25 MR. FRANKEL: Judge, David Frankel with a **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	quick question. It seems like a large portion of the
2	30 days from the issuance is going to fall in the
3-	middle of the holiday season. And I wonder if we
4	might be allowed a blackout period, say, from maybe
5	the 18th of December to January 4th or something like
6	that just so that no parties have to work through
7	religious observance times or holiday times.
. 8	CHAIRPERSON YOUNG: Is there any objection
9	to that?
10	(No response.)
11	CHAIRPERSON YOUNG: Can we assume by
L2	silence that there is no objection to that approach?
L3	MR. SMITH: This is the applicant. We
L4	have no objection to that approach.
L5	MR. KLUKAN: This is Brett Klukan, Your
L6 ·	Honor, for the staff. We have no objection.
L7	MS. LORINA: Elizabeth Lorina for Oglala
L8	Sioux Tribe. I have no objections.
L9 .	CHAIRPERSON YOUNG: All right. And,
20	again, obviously we don't know what the ultimate
21	issuance dates are. The staff has given us their best
22	estimate, but those might move on into the future.
3	But hearing no objection to that approach,
24	I think that that makes sense. And we can basically
25	toll the time during that time period if the final

1 date would have any impact on it. Let's see. Anything else on the schedule 2 3 that the parties would like to share with us at this 4 point? 5 (No response.) 6 CHAIRPERSON YOUNG: Okay. Next guestion. 7 With regard to the actual handling or presentation of 8 evidence, both through the written testimony, prefiled 9 testimony and any oral presentations, have the various petitioners gotten together and worked out how you 10 11 want to handle this? 12 MR. FRANKEL: David Frankel. Your Honor, 13 could we step back for just a quick second to the 14 prior question about any other issues? There was one -15outstanding issue that I never heard back from Owe 16 Aku, Debra White Plume, or Bruce Ellison on after sending messages to them. And it has to do with 17 18 obtaining the affidavit of David House. 19 Apparently they were in touch with him by 2.0 21 22

phone and fax, but I didn't see anything get filed. And I have left it to them to file that. I handled the Dr. Anders' one. It doesn't appear that anything was filed.

CHAIRPERSON YOUNG: I think you are talking about the renewal proceeding on that, right?

NEAL R. GROSS

23

24

25

MR. FRANKEL: Oh, I am. I'm sorry, Your 1 2 I apologize for my confusion. 3 CHAIRPERSON YOUNG: That is okay. We are 4 going to get to the interaction between the two in a minute. For now, just on the issue of the parties and 5 6 your interaction with each other on presentation of 7 testimony and other evidence, have you consulted with each other? And do you have a proposed approach that 8 9 you want to take? MR. FRANKEL: Your Honor, David Frankel. 10 We have not consulted specifically, but we have always 11 12 found cooperation with each other. We have not 13 prepared anything specifically. 14 CHAIRPERSON YOUNG: It might be a good 15 idea, and it's sort of easier to think about the idea of presentation of evidence being handled by the 16 17 attorney for one party or having the attorney for one party take the lead counsel role. 18 19 In a subpart L proceeding, you don't 20 really -- the situation is a little bit different 21 since most of the evidence needs to be presented in 22 writing. 23 But to the extent that we can avoid 24 duplication and you can work together to try to 25 consolidate your presentation of evidence, I think

that would probably be helpful to everyone concerned 1 2 and make the proceeding go forward more efficiently. • 3. So I guess we would ask you, see if you 4 can come up with a proposed plan on how you will do 5 that or maybe it would just resolve itself by your indicating to us that you have agreed to make that 6 7 effort. 8 I guess from a practical standpoint, the 9 question would be, are we going to be receiving one 10 submissions, written joint of 11 submissions, from all the petitioners together or do 12 any of the petitioners wish to make separate written 13 submissions? 14 MR. FRANKEL: David Frankel, Your Honor. First of all, on behalf of the petitioners I represent 15 -- and I believe the counsels for the others can chime 16 17 in -- we will certainly work together to avoid duplication, number one. 18 Number two, I think we can consult with 19 20 each other and get back to the Board and the parties 21 with a suggested lead counsel after we have had a chance to talk amongst ourselves and assess our 22 23 resources in that regard. CHAIRPERSON YOUNG: All right. Can you 24 25 anticipate how soon you might be able to advise us on

that?

MR. FRANKEL: How about no later than July 25th unless you need it earlier? I could commit to an earlier date if you'd like.

CHAIRPERSON YOUNG: No. July 25th is fine. Anything else on that issue of the parties and their interaction?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON YOUNG: The next issue, then, would be the interaction between, if any, the two proceedings. And given that they do involve different actual physical locations, there would not necessarily be any interaction. But I guess we wanted to flush out whether any of the parties thought that there might be some interaction between the proceedings.

MR. SMITH: This is Tyson Smith for the applicant. I don't believe we think that there is much interaction between these two proceedings. The North Trend issues relate to the area at the North Trend site; whereas, the license renewal issues relate to the area of the license renewal site.

I mean, obviously there's maybe some overlap in terms of background information, but the specific technical issues will be site and location-specific. So we don't believe that there is

NEAL R. GROSS

1 much -- we may be able to reuse some material, but I 2 don't think there's much overlap in the actual 3 proceeding. 4 CHAIRPERSON YOUNG: Anyone disagree with 5 that 6 MR. FRANKEL: David Frankel, Your Honor. 7 I think it depends on how the appeal ends up. If the 8 government's motion to dismiss on appeal in the 9 renewal succeeds, then I think what Mr. Smith said is pretty close to how I would see it. 10 11 However, if the Eighth Circuit denies that 12 motion and our appeal goes forward, then I think, you 13 know, the issues we raise in the appeal bring in a host of issues not contemplated by Mr. Smith's 14 15 response. 16 CHAIRPERSON YOUNG: Well, obviously keep 17 us informed if anything happens. Whatever happens, keep us informed. 18 19 MR. FRANKEL: All right. Yes, ma'am. 20 David Frankel. Just one more point. Just so that 21 this Board knows the -- we are filing our final papers 22 in that July 20th or so. And so I would think well 23 before any of the SER or the environmental report is 24 issued, well before that, everyone will know probably 25 where we stand with the Eighth Circuit.

1	CHAIRPERSON YOUNG: Okay. Would July 25th
2	give the parties enough time? Since Mr. Frankel
3	suggested that for advising us on where the
4	petitioners are on their interaction, would all of the
5	parties see July 25th as a reasonable day for a
6	deadline for
7	MS. MARCO: This is Ms. Marco. For the
8	staff, we would need a bit more time than that.
9	CHAIRPERSON YOUNG: Well, I hadn't
10	actually finished saying what it was a deadline for,
11	but
12	MS. MARCO: I hit my speakerphone. So
13	that may be a problem.
14	CHAIRPERSON YOUNG: Okay. What I was
15	going to say is for all the parties to get together
16	and see whether you can submit a joint proposed
17	schedule to the Board, if that is what you wanted more
18	time for, just how much time would the staff need?
19	MS. MARCO: That is correct. I'm sorry
20	about that, Your Honor.
21	CHAIRPERSON YOUNG: That is all right.
22	How much time do you think you would need? And who
23	was that just speaking?
24	MS. MARCO: This is Catherine Marco.
25	CHAIRPERSON YOUNG: Okay.

1	MS. MARCO: We're all in different
2	locations.
3	CHAIRPERSON YOUNG: Right. July 25th is
4	a Saturday anyway. What would the staff propose is a
5	good date for that? Hello? Is the staff still with
6	us?
7	MS. MARCO: Yes. We are still.
8	MR. FRANKEL: David Frankel back on the
9	call.
10	CHAIRPERSON YOUNG: I just asked what date
11	would be a good date for the parties, good deadline
12	for the parties, to submit a joint proposed schedule
13	or to the extent that you cannot agree to your
14	separate proposals as to a schedule for the
15	proceeding.
16	I would like to give you a full
17	opportunity to provide us with your points of view on
18	this. And we are waiting to hear back from the staff,
19	who had indicated that July 25th would not provide
20	enough time for that if I understood that correctly.
21	MS. MARCO: That is right. I believe
22	probably mid August. I don't see based on when our
23	documents would be available anyway, I think that
24	would be a fair time.
25	CHAIRPERSON YOUNG: Okay. Anyone disagree

	with that: boes anybody want to share your two tents
2	on it?
3	(No response.)
4	CHAIRPERSON YOUNG: So let's see. Mid
5	August. We could say August 14th or 17th. Any
6	preference?
7	(No response.)
8	CHAIRPERSON YOUNG: Let's say August 14th.
9	I may actually be unavailable during some of that
10	time. So if you wanted a later date than that, you
11	can have that. Otherwise if August 14th works for
12	everybody, we'll leave it at that.
13	Do any of the parties have any other
14	issues that you would like to address today?
15	(No response.)
16	CHAIRPERSON YOUNG: Mr. Frankel, when can
17	we expect to receive your motion? There may
18	MR. FRANKEL: How about
19	CHAIRPERSON YOUNG: There may be a
20	deadline set in the I think it was when was
21	MR. FRANKEL: How about by next well,
22	I'm sure there was a deadline. Well, no. I don't
23	know that there is, but I could get it in by next
24	week.
25	CHAIRPERSON YOUNG: Your deadline would be
- 1	1

1	past if we counted the ten days from the June 25th
2	issuance of CLI 09-12. I suggest you go ahead and
. 3	file it as soon as possible. And then we'll just get
4	responses unless
5	MR. FRANKEL: Your Honor, David Frankel
6	speaking. How about I'll get it in by the end of this
7	week?
8	CHAIRPERSON YOUNG: Which would be July
9	10th
10	MR. FRANKEL: Tenth or if any party wants
11	it in earlier, I appreciate the accommodation and I
12	can get it in within two days if any party wants. It
13	would be substantially similar to what I previously
14	filed.
15	CHAIRPERSON YOUNG: Any of the other
16	parties what do the staff and the applicant have to
17	say on that?
18	MR. SMITH: This is Tyson Smith for the
19	applicants. I think that's fine. We'll respond to
20	the motion whenever it comes in.
21	MR. KLUKAN: This is Brett Klukan for the
22	staff. I concur with the applicant, Your Honor.
23	CHAIRPERSON YOUNG: All right. So we'll
24	leave that July 10th. Obviously we should probably
25	say that that should not be construed as in any way

1	stating any viewpoint on any arguments that any of the
2	parties might make.
3	MR. FRANKEL: And could you repeat that
4	date? It kind of clicked out on me for a second, Your
5	Honor. David Frankel speaking.
6	CHAIRPERSON YOUNG: You had asked for July
7	10th. So we'll just say July 10th. And what I had
8	> said after that was that it would not be appropriate
9	for us by agreeing to that date and setting that
10	deadline for that to be construed as in some way
11	stating any viewpoint or opinion on any arguments that
12	any party might make as to the timeliness of it.
13	MR. FRANKEL: David Frankel, Your Honor.
14	Thank you. I understand.
15	CHAIRPERSON YOUNG: All right. Anything
16	else?
17	(No response.)
18	CHAIRPERSON YOUNG: I don't think we have
19	anything else. We appreciate your availability today
20	again. And we look forward to hearing from you.
21	Three dates that I have down would be July 10th, July
22	25th for the advice on interaction of the petitioners,
23	and then August 14th for a possible joint proposed
24	schedule or separate proposed schedules. If there's
25	nothing further, then that would did someone just

1	join us?
2	(No response.)
3	CHAIRPERSON YOUNG: If there's nothing
4	further, then that would conclude this conference.
5	(Whereupon, the foregoing matter was
6	concluded at 3:32 p.m.)
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	,
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

CERTIFICATE

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

Crow Butte Resources, Inc.

Name of Proceeding: Pre-Hearing Conference

Docket Number: 40-8943

ASLBP No.: 07-859-03-MLA-BD01

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.

John Mongoven

Official Reporter

Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc.