

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD**

**09-892-HLW-CAB04
Thomas S. Moore, Chairman
Paul S. Ryerson
Richard E. Wardwell**

In the Matter of:)	August 14, 2009
)	
U.S. Department of Energy)	
)	Docket No. 63-001
(High Level Waste Repository)	
Construction Authorization Application))	
)	

**JOINT MOTION BY THE COUNTY OF INYO, THE STATE OF NEVADA, THE
STATE OF CALIFORNIA, NYE COUNTY, THE JOINT TIMBISHA SHOSHONE
TRIBAL GROUP AND THE NATIVE COMMUNITY ACTION COUNCIL FOR
AN EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE NEW OR AMENDED CONTENTIONS**

INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to 10 C.F.R. § 2.323, the County of Inyo, the State of Nevada, the State of California, Nye County, the Joint Timbisha Shoshone Tribal Group, and the Native Community Action Council request that the Construction Authorization Board (CAB04) grant an extension of time to the parties to file new or amended contentions that are based upon the Department of Energy’s (“DOE”) “*Analysis of Postclosure Groundwater Impacts for a Geologic Repository for the Disposal of Spent Nuclear Fuel and High Level Radioactive Waste at Yucca Mountain, Nye County, Nevada*” (“Analysis of Postclosure Groundwater Impacts”), which was recently released.

DISCUSSION

Pursuant to Section 114(f) the Nuclear Waste Policy Act, DOE prepared environmental impacts statements (EISs) to evaluate the potential environmental impacts associated with the construction, operation and permanent closure of a high-level radioactive waste geologic repository at Yucca Mountain, Nevada. The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (“NRC”) Staff conducted a review to determine whether it was practicable to adopt the EISs in accordance with criteria stated in 10 C.F.R. § 51.109(c). On September 5, 2008, based upon its review, the NRC Staff concluded that DOE’s 2002 EIS and DOE’s 2008 Repository Supplemental EIS did not adequately characterize the potential impact of the proposed action on groundwater and from surface discharges. Accordingly, the NRC Staff found that further supplementation was needed to ensure the EISs are adequate. In its determination, NRC Staff stated that if DOE were to develop the supplement, DOE would follow its own requirements and procedures; but, if NRC Staff were to prepare the supplement, the supplement would be prepared in accordance with NRC regulations in 10 C.F.R., part 51 and with NUREG-1748.

On October 24, 2008, DOE announced its intent to “...prepare a Supplemental to the ‘Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Geologic Repository for the Disposal of Spent Nuclear Fuel and High Level Radioactive Waste at Yucca Mountain, Nye County, Nevada (DOE/EIS-0250F, February 2002) (Yucca Mountain Final EIS), and the Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for the Geologic Repository for the Disposal of Spent Nuclear Fuel and High Level Radioactive Waste at Yucca Mountain, Nye County, Nevada (DOE/EIS-0250F-S1 July 2008) (Repository SEIS).’”

DOE also announced on October 24, 2008, that a Draft Supplement would be available in the spring of 2009, that its availability would be announced in the Federal Register, there would be a public comment period on the document, that DOE would conduct a public hearing during the comment period, and that DOE would respond to comments on the Draft Supplement in preparing the final supplement by the fall of 2009.

By letter dated July 30, 2009, DOE informed the NRC Staff that “DOE has decided not to complete the Supplement, but rather has used the material prepared for the Supplement to develop the enclosed *Analysis of Postclosure Groundwater Impacts for a Geologic Repository for the Disposal of Spent Nuclear Fuel and High Level Radioactive Waste at Yucca Mountain, Nye County, Nevada* (Analysis of Postclosure Groundwater Impacts).” By letter dated August 5, 2009, DOE’s counsel provided DOE’s July 30, 2009 letter and the Analysis of Postclosure Groundwater Impacts to this Board and to counsel for the parties.

Pursuant to sections B.1 and B.2 of CAB Case Management Order #1 (January 29, 2009), the parties have 30 days from the date that new information becomes available to file a motion to file new or amended contentions. Since DOE’s release of the Analysis of Postclosure Groundwater Impacts could be considered “new information,” it could be argued that the parties are required to file a motion to file new or amended contentions by the end of this month or shortly thereafter. However, it is unclear how NRC will proceed with respect to DOE’s Analysis of Postclosure Groundwater Impacts. There are several options for how NRC Staff might proceed, but a logical option would be for NRC Staff to announce that DOE’s Analysis is unacceptable since it was not prepared in compliance with DOE’s October 28, 2008 Notice of Intent (or in compliance with the National

Environment Policy Act) and, that pursuant to the procedures of part 51 and NUREG-1748, NRC Staff will prepare a draft supplement for public comment and then a final supplement, both of which would include an independent NRC Staff evaluation of the groundwater impacts taking DOE's evaluation into account.

The parties should not be required to file new or amended contentions until NRC has announced how it will proceed. If no extension of time is granted, some of the parties may be compelled to prepare new or amended contentions that are based upon DOE's July 30 and July 31 letters and its Analysis of Postclosure Groundwater Impacts. Thereafter, if NRC were to determine that a draft and a final supplement will be prepared, some of the parties might be compelled to prepare yet another set of amended contentions once a final supplement is issued. Thus, the absence of an extension of time would subject the Petitioners to significant and unnecessary expenditures of time and money.

Accordingly, good cause exists to grant the parties an extension of time to file new or amended contentions which are based upon new analysis of postclosure groundwater impacts until 60 days after NRC Staff formally announces or otherwise advises the parties how it will proceed with respect to DOE's Analysis of Postclosure Groundwater Impacts. Nothing in this motion should be construed as precluding a party from filing a future motion for an extension of time or for other relief.

Pursuant to 10 C.F.R. § 2.323(b), on August 9, 2009, the undersigned counsel, via email, contacted counsel for DOE, the other parties in this proceeding, and Lincoln and Eureka Counties (Interested Governmental Participants) ("IGPs") to resolve the issues raised by this motion. The State of Nevada, the State of California, Nye County, Nevada, the Joint Timbisha Shoshone Tribal Group, and the Native Community Action Council

stated that they would join the motion as moving parties. Following the exchange of several emails and telephone conversations, on August 13, 2009, DOE said that it has no objection to the granting of the motion. The NRC Staff has stated that it has no position on the motion, but the NRC Staff reserves the right to file a response to the motion. All other counsel have indicated that they have no objection to the filing of the motion.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons discussed above, the joint motion for an extension of time for the parties to file a motion to file new or amended contentions which are based upon DOE's Analysis of Postclosure Groundwater Impacts should be granted. New or amended contentions would be due 60 days after NRC Staff formally announces or otherwise advises the parties how it will proceed with respect to DOE's Analysis of Postclosure Groundwater Impacts. The granting of this motion should not be construed as precluding a party from filing a future motion for an extension of time or for other relief.

Respectfully submitted,

/Signed electronically by/

Greg James

Counsel for the County of Inyo

710 Autumn Leaves Circle

Bishop, California

Telephone: 760-873-6838

Facsimile: 760-873-7095

Email: gregjames@earthlink.net

Dated at Bishop, California
this 14th day of August, 2009

**CERTIFICATE OF COUNSEL
PURSUANT TO 10 C.F.R. § 2.323(b)**

I hereby certify that on August 9-13, 2009, I contacted counsel for all parties and Lincoln and Eureka Counties (IGPs). The initial contact was via email with follow-up contacts via email and telephone. The State of Nevada, the State of California, Nye County, Nevada, the Joint Timbisha Shoshone Tribal Group, and the Native Community Action Council stated that they would join the motion as moving parties. No party opposed the motion. Counsel for the NRC Staff stated that the Staff would not take a position on the motion, but would reserve the right to file a response. Counsel for the DOE stated that DOE has no objection to the granting of the motion.

/Electronically Signed by/
Greg James
August 14, 2009

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

BEFORE THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARDS

In the Matter of)	Docket No.	63-001-HLW
)		
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY)	ASLBP Nos.	09-876-HLW-CAB01
)		09-877-HLW-CAB02
(High-Level Waste Repository))		09-878-HLW-CAB03
)		09-892-HLW-CAB04

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that copies of the “**JOINT MOTION BY THE COUNTY OF INYO, THE STATE OF NEVADA, THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, NYE COUNTY, THE JOINT TIMBISHA SHOSHONE TRIBAL GROUP AND THE NATIVE COMMUNITY ACTION COUNCIL FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE NEW OR AMENDED CONTENTIONS**” in the above-captioned proceeding have been served on the following persons this 14th day of August, 2009, by Electronic Information Exchange.

CAB 01

William J. Froehlich, Chairman
Thomas S. Moore
Richard E. Wardwell
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555-0001
E-mail: wjf1@nrc.gov
tsm2@nrc.gov
rew@nrc.gov

CAB 02

Michael M. Gibson, Chairman
Alan S. Rosenthal
Nicholas G. Trikourous
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555-0001
E-mail: mmg3@nrc.gov
axr@nrc.gov
ngt@nrc.gov

CAB 03

Paul S. Ryerson, Chairman
Michael C. Farrar
Mark O. Barnett
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555-0001
E-mail: psr1@nrc.gov
mcf@nrc.gov
mob1@nrc.gov
mark.barnett@nrc.gov

CAB 04

Thomas S. Moore, Chairman
Paul S. Ryerson
Richard E. Wardwell
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555-0001
E-mail: tsm2@nrc.gov
psr1@nrc.gov
rew@nrc.gov

Office of the Secretary
ATTN: Docketing and Service
Mail Stop: O-16C1
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555
E-mail: HEARINGDOCKET@nrc.gov

Office of Commission Appellate Adjudication
ocaamail@nrc.gov

Charles J. Fitzpatrick, Esq.
John W. Lawrence, Esq.
Egan, Fitzpatrick, Malsch & Lawrence PLLC
12500 San Pedro Avenue, Suite 555
San Antonio, TX 78216 E-mail:
cfitzpatrick@nuclearlawyer.com
jlawrence@nuclearlawyer.com

Martin G. Malsch, Esq.
Egan, Fitzpatrick & Malsch, PLLC
1750 K Street, N.W. Suite 350
Washington, D.C. 20006
E-mail: mmalsch@nuclearlawyer.com

Brian W. Hembacher, Esq.
Deputy Attorney General
California Attorney General's Office
300 South Spring Street
Los Angeles, CA 90013
E-mail: brian.hembacher@doj.ca.gov

Timothy E. Sullivan, Esq.
Deputy Attorney General
California Department of Justice
1515 Clay Street, 20th Flr.
P.O. Box 70550
Oakland, CA 94612-0550
E-mail: timothy.sullivan@doj.ca.gov

Kevin W. Bell, Esq.
Senior Staff Counsel
California Energy Commission
1516 9th Street
Sacramento, CA 95814
E-mail: kwbell@energy.state.ca.us

Bryce C. Loveland
Jennings Strouss & Salmon, PLC
8330 W. Sahara Avenue, Suite 290
Las Vegas, NV 89117-8949
Email: bloveland@jsslaw.com

Alan I. Robbins, Esq.
Debra D. Roby, Esq.
Jennings Strouss & Salmon, PLC
1700 Pennsylvania Ave, NW Suite 500
Washington, D.C. 20005
E-mail: arobbins@jsslaw.com
droby@jsslaw.com

Donald J. Silverman, Esq.
Thomas A. Schmutz, Esq.
Thomas C. Poindexter, Esq.
Paul J. Zaffuts, Esq.
Alex S. Polonsky, Esq.
Lewis Csedrik, Esq.
Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20004
E-mail: dsilverman@morganlewis.com
tschmutz@morganlewis.com
tpoindexter@morganlewis.com
pzaffuts@morganlewis.com
apolonsky@morganlewis.com
lcsedrik@morganlewis.com

Malachy R. Murphy, Esq.
18160 Cottonwood Rd. #265
Sunriver, OR 97707
E-mail: mrmurphy@chamberscable.com

Robert M. Andersen
Akerman Senterfitt
801 Pennsylvania Avenue N.W., Suite 600
Washington, DC 20004 USA
E-mail: robert.andersen@akerman.com

Martha S. Crosland, Esq.
Angela M. Kordyak, Esq.
Nicholas P. DiNunzio
James Bennett McRae, Esq.
U.S. Department of Energy
Office of the General Counsel
1000 Independence Avenue, S.W.
Washington, DC 20585
E-mail: martha.crosland@hq.doe.gov
angela.kordyak@hq.doe.gov
nick.dinunzio@rw.doe.gov
ben.mcrae@hq.doe.gov

George W. Hellstrom
U.S. Department of Energy
Office of General Counsel
1551 Hillshire Drive
Las Vegas, NV 89134-6321
E-Mail: george.hellstrom@ymp.gov

Jeffrey D. VanNiel, Esq.
530 Farrington Court
Las Vegas, NV 89123
E-mail: nbridvn@gmail.com

Susan L. Durbin, Esq.
Deputy Attorney General
1300 I Street
P.O. Box 944255
Sacramento, CA 94244-2550
E-mail: susan.durbin@doj.ca.gov

Frank A. Putzu
Naval Sea Systems Command Nuclear
Propulsion Program
1333 Isaac Hull Avenue, S.E.
Washington Navy Yard, Building 197
Washington, DC 20376
E-mail: frank.putzu@navy.mil

John M. Peebles
Darcie L. Houck
Fredericks Peebles & Morgan LLP
1001 Second Street
Sacramento, CA 95814
E-mail: jpeebles@ndnlaw.com

Ellen C. Ginsberg
Michael A. Bauser
Anne W. Cottingham
Nuclear Energy Institute, Inc.
1776 I Street, N.W., Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20006
E-mail: ecg@nei.org
mab@nei.org
awc@nei.org

David A. Repka
William A. Horin
Rachel Miras-Wilson
Winston & Strawn LLP
1700 K Street N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
E-mail: drepka@winston.com
whorin@winston.com
rwilson@winston.com

Jay E. Silberg
Timothy J.V. Walsh
Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw Pittman LLP
2300 N Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20037-1122
E-mail: jay.silberg@pillsburylaw.com
timothy.walsh@pillsburylaw.com

Gregory L. James
710 Autumn Leaves Circle
Bishop, California 93514
Email: gljames@earthlink.net

Arthur J. Harrington
Godfrey & Kahn, S.C.
780 N. Water Street
Milwaukee, WI 53202
E-mail: aharring@gklaw.com

Steven A. Heinzen
Douglas M. Poland
Hannah L. Renfro
Godfrey & Kahn, S.C.
One East Main Street, Suite 500
P.O. Box 2719
Madison, WI 53701-2719
E-mail: sheinzen@gklaw.com
dpoland@gklaw.com
hrenfro@gklaw.com

Robert F. List, Esq.
Jennifer A. Gores, Esq.
Armstrong Teasdale LLP
1975 Village Center Circle, Suite 140
Las Vegas, NV 89134-6237
E-mail: rlist@armstrongteasdale.com
jgores@armstrongteasdale.com

Diane Curran
Harmon, Curran, Spielberg, & Eisenberg,
L.L.P.
1726 M Street N.W., Suite 600
Washington, D.C. 20036
E-mail: dcurran@harmoncurran.com

Ian Zabarte, Board Member
Native Community Action Council
P.O. Box 140
Baker, NV 89311
E-mail: mrizabarte@gmail.com

Richard Sears
District Attorney No. 5489 White Pine
County District Attorney's Office
801 Clark Street, Suite 3
Ely, NV 89301
E-mail: rwsears@wpcda.org

Donald P. Irwin
Michael R. Shebelskie
Kelly L. Faglioni
Hunton & Williams LLP
Riverfront Plaza, East Tower
951 East Byrd Street
Richmond, VA 23219-4074
E-mail: dirwin@hunton.com
mshebelskie@hunton.com
kfaglioni@hunton.com

Curtis G. Berkey
Scott W. Williams
Rovianne A. Leigh
Alexander, Berkey, Williams, & Weathers
LLP
2030 Addison Street, Suite 410
Berkley, CA 94704
E-mail: cberkey@abwwlaw.com
swilliams@abwwlaw.com
rleigh@abwwlaw.com

Bret O. Whipple
1100 South Tenth Street
Las Vegas, Nevada 89104
E-mail: bretwhipple@nomademail.com

Gregory Barlow
P.O. Box 60
Pioche, Nevada 89043
E-mail: lcda@lcturbonet.com

Connie Simkins
P.O. Box 1068
Caliente, Nevada 89008
E-mail: jcciac@co.lincoln.nv.us

Dr. Mike Baughman
Intertech Services Corporation
P.O. Box 2008
Carson City, Nevada 89702
E-mail: bigoff@aol.com

Michael Berger
Robert S. Hanna
Attorney for the County of Inyo
233 East Carrillo Street Suite B
Santa Barbara, California 93101
E-mail: mberger@bsglaw.net
rshanna@bsglaw.net

Dated: August 14, 2009

/Signed (electronically) by/

Greg James
710 Autumn Leaves Circle
Bishop, California 93514
(760) 873-6838