

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

Before Administrative Judges:

Thomas S. Moore, Chairman
Paul S. Ryerson
Richard E. Wardwell

In the Matter of

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

(High Level Waste Repository)

Docket No. 63-001-HLW

ASLBP No. 09-892-HLW-CAB04

September 30, 2009

CAB CASE MANAGEMENT ORDER #2

On June 19, 2009, the Chief Administrative Judge established Construction Authorization Board-04 (CAB-04) to preside over matters concerning discovery, Licensing Support Network (LSN) compliance, new or amended contentions, grouping or consolidation of contentions, scheduling, and case management matters relating to any of the foregoing in the proceeding involving the United States Department of Energy's (DOE's) application for construction authorization for a high-level waste repository at Yucca Mountain in Nye County, Nevada. On September 14 and 15, 2009, CAB-04 conducted a prehearing conference at the Las Vegas Hearing Facility primarily to discuss four sets of documents that bear upon discovery, contention grouping and consolidation, scheduling, and case management in this proceeding: (1) the parties' initial filings in response to CAB-01's March 20, 2009 order regarding the first prehearing conference; (2) the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) Staff's answer to this Board's July 2, 2009 order concerning scheduling; (3) the parties' filings in response to this Board's July 21, 2009 order concerning serial case management; and (4) the parties' filings in response to this Board's August 25, 2009 order concerning discovery and case management. During the prehearing conference, the Board directed the parties to meet and

confer in order to develop a proposed case management order for the first phase of this proceeding.

On September 23, 2009, the parties filed a proposed case management order in which all parties and interested governmental participants concurred.¹ On September 28, 2009, an unopposed joint motion was filed by the County of Inyo and the Joint Timbisha Shoshone Tribal Group to modify the proposed order by removing three groundwater-based contentions from first phase discovery (Joint Motion).² The Board appreciates the parties' efforts to reach agreement, and hereby grants the Joint Motion and adopts the proposed order with limited modifications. In Section A, for example, we provide that reply briefs shall be filed no later than 30 days after initial briefs are due (rather than filed) in order to simplify the calendaring of response dates. We have also made one significant language change in Section A, but only to express more clearly our understanding of the parties' intent: i.e., that the focus of discovery during the first phase shall be on contentions that relate to either SER Volume 1 or 3, but that the parties may also conduct discovery on other contentions if necessary or appropriate to lead to the production of admissible evidence associated with the prosecution or defense of a contention that is within the scope of SER Volume 1 or 3. The Board does not believe that any modifications should affect the overall balance of the discovery plan on which the parties have agreed.

Accordingly, pursuant to the Commission's October 17, 2008 notice of hearing and 10 C.F.R. § 2.319(g), (q), and (r), this Board issues this Case Management Order setting forth requirements and procedures applicable to the proceeding.

¹ Joint Submission of Proposed Case Management Order #2 (Sept. 23, 2009).

² Joint Motion by the County of Inyo and the Joint Timbisha Shoshone Tribal Group to Remove Three Groundwater-Based Contentions from Discovery During Phase I (Sept. 28, 2009).

A. Phase I Discovery

In light of the NRC Staff's plan to issue its Safety Evaluation Report (SER) serially and to schedule the issuance of SER Volume 1 in March 2010 and SER Volume 3 in September 2010, discovery in this proceeding will occur in phases. Phase I discovery is authorized to begin on October 1, 2009 (although depositions cannot commence until February 16, 2010, but can be noticed earlier), and end on November 30, 2010 (or two months after the NRC Staff issues SER Volume 3, whichever is later), with regard to the following admitted contentions:

- all safety and miscellaneous contentions concerning issues that relate to either SER Volume 1 or 3;
- all NEPA contentions (other than those involving DOE's additional groundwater analysis) concerning issues that relate in some manner to SER Volume 1 or 3; and
- all legal issue contentions that relate in some manner to SER Volume 1 or 3.

The Appendix to this Case Management Order identifies the specific contentions (safety, miscellaneous, NEPA, and legal issue) that will be addressed in Phase I. Except as otherwise expressly provided, there shall be no discovery on or litigation of any other contentions that are not specifically identified as included in Phase I until a schedule is established for those contentions by this Board. In admitting any new contentions to this proceeding, the Board will identify whether they shall be included in Phase I. However, parties may move this Board, upon good cause shown, to initiate discovery on contentions other than those identified in the Appendix to this Case Management Order or newly admitted Phase I contentions where necessary to preserve evidence that may be lost if such discovery is otherwise delayed.

Consistent with the requirements of 10 C.F.R. § 2.1018(b)(1), the parties may conduct discovery on contentions outside the scope of SER Volumes 1 and 3 during Phase I of this proceeding if necessary or appropriate to lead to the production of admissible evidence associated with the prosecution or defense of a contention that is within the scope of SER Volume 1 or 3. If contentions now subject to discovery in Phase I need to be adjudicated in

later phases of this proceeding, the parties may move this Board to continue discovery on those contentions as necessary or appropriate beyond the close of discovery for Phase I.

The contentions identified in the Appendix include legal issue contentions that will be addressed in Phase I. With regard to those legal issue contentions, the affected parties (i.e., the Applicant, the NRC Staff, and each party that filed, adopted, or joined in the contention) shall jointly file with this Board a proposed legal question for each such contention on or before October 6, 2009. If the affected parties cannot reach agreement on the wording of the legal question, they shall submit to this Board, on or before October 13, 2009, their respective proposed wording. The Board will then rule on the issues. Initial briefs shall be filed on all such legal issues by the affected parties 45 days after the Board's order. Any affected party's reply brief shall be filed no later than 30 days after initial briefs are due. Unless otherwise directed by the Board, no other filings shall be permitted.

Unless otherwise specified herein, all filings, notices, disclosures, and requests required by or permitted by this Case Management Order shall be via the EIE. Informal communications between counsel for the parties shall not be via the EIE or otherwise communicated to the Board. All parties' regulatory obligations regarding the LSN and the case management orders of the Advisory Pre-License Application Presiding Officer Board and Construction Authorization Boards 01, 02, and 03 remain in effect and are not affected by this Case Management Order.

B. Contention Consolidation and Grouping

Within ten days after the start of discovery of Phase I, the party intervenors shall propose, either individually or in groups or collectively, those contentions that should be consolidated for Phase I and those contentions that should be grouped for Phase I. For those contentions that are to be consolidated for Phase I, a lead party should be proposed. See La. Energy Servs., L.P. (National Enrichment Facility), LBP-04-14, 60 NRC 40, 71 (2004), aff'd, 60 NRC 619, 629 (2004); see also 10 C.F.R. § 2.309(f)(3).

The party intervenors shall consider contentions in Phase I that focus on a common subject matter or rely upon the same witness as candidates for grouping. Unlike consolidated contentions for which a lead party is identified, each contention that is grouped with other similar contentions for Phase I remains distinct and unique, and thus, each party intervenor is permitted to advocate or defend each of those contentions and participate in the discovery process for each of those contentions notwithstanding the identified groupings. Discovery related to grouped contentions shall be coordinated as discussed in Sections C.2 and C.3, infra.

Within 30 days after the start of discovery of Phase I, any party may file any objection to any proposed consolidation or grouping or may propose alternate consolidation or grouping. Reply filings shall be permitted within ten days of objections. The Board will issue an order setting forth the groupings or consolidations effective for Phase I. Any changes to any groupings or consolidations of contentions shall require leave of this Board for good cause shown.

C. Discovery Rules

1. Identification of Witnesses

Within ten days after the start of discovery of Phase I, each party (including NRC Staff, but only as to NEPA contentions and subject to the restrictions noted below) shall identify the witness(es) it intends to call at a hearing to provide testimony in support or defense of each contention subject to Phase I (hereinafter "Party Witnesses"). Every 60 days thereafter, each party (including NRC Staff, but only as to NEPA contentions and subject to the restrictions noted below) shall provide either an updated list of Party Witnesses or a certification that no additional Party Witnesses have been identified. No later than 120 days before discovery closes for Phase I, each party (including the NRC Staff, but only as to NEPA contentions and subject to the restrictions noted below) shall provide a final updated list of Party Witnesses, except as discussed below for "Other Witnesses." For each Party Witness that is identified, the following information shall be provided:

- name, affiliation, address, curriculum vitae, a general statement of the subject matter(s) that will be addressed, and a listing of the specific contention(s) that will be addressed;
- all relevant publications authored by witness in the previous ten years; and
- all cases in which the witness has provided testimony at trial or by deposition in the previous four years.

The foregoing information for Party Witnesses shall be provided even if similar information was previously provided, e.g., as part of any petition to intervene, any answer to any petition to intervene, or any response to any answer to any petition to intervene. No party may object to the deposition of any Party Witness so long as the deposition is limited to matters relating to admitted contentions or the subject matter identified as that to be addressed by the Party Witness. If a party fails to produce a Party Witness for deposition, if noticed, by the time discovery closes for Phase I, that party shall be precluded from calling that Party Witness at the hearing.

Within 30 days after the start of discovery of Phase I, each party (including the NRC Staff, but only as to NEPA contentions and subject to the restrictions noted below) shall identify any witness that it intends to depose if that witness was not previously identified as a Party Witness (hereinafter "Other Witnesses"). Every 60 days thereafter, each party (including the NRC Staff, but only as to NEPA contentions and subject to the restrictions noted below) shall provide either an updated list of Other Witnesses or a certification that no additional Other Witnesses have been identified. No later than 120 days before discovery closes for Phase I, each party (including the NRC Staff, but only as to NEPA contentions and subject to the restrictions noted below) shall provide a final updated list of Other Witnesses. Any party may object to the deposition of any Other Witness identified by moving for a protective order within ten days from the date of the notice of deposition. Once an Other Witness has been deposed,

any party may add that witness to their Party Witness list without the obligation to provide the information identified above and without regard to the 120-day final listing of Party Witnesses.

The NRC Staff is not required to respond to any discovery request or identify or produce any witness or potential witness pursuant to 10 C.F.R. § 2.709(a)(1) with respect to any matter related to any safety or miscellaneous contention subject to discovery during Phase I until ten days after the NRC Staff has issued the volume of the SER that relates to that particular contention. Within ten days after the issuance of a particular volume of the SER, the NRC Staff shall identify its Party Witnesses, and any Other Witnesses as necessary or appropriate, for that particular volume of the SER, and if less than 60 days remain for discovery, then any party (other than the NRC Staff) may reasonably notice their deposition without regard to the 60-day advance notice provision discussed in Section C.2, infra. With respect to those NEPA contentions that are subject to discovery during Phase I, NRC Staff is required to respond to those discovery requests and to identify and produce witnesses or potential witnesses pursuant to 10 C.F.R. § 2.709(a)(1), but only with respect to the NRC Staff's September 5, 2008 Adoption Determination Report.

To the degree that any party needs to identify new, additional, or replacement Party Witnesses or Other Witnesses, that party shall identify such witnesses as soon as practicable after the circumstance arises that prompts the need to secure such a witness. In no event may any party identify a witness so late in the discovery process that it delays the close of discovery or unduly prejudices another party.

2. Depositions

No deposition of any witness shall occur in Phase I before February 16, 2010. If counsel for any party seeks to depose any witness, prior to noticing the deposition, such counsel must confer in good faith with counsel who will defend the witness on matters involving, at a minimum, the date, location, and anticipated duration of the proposed deposition. Unless otherwise agreed among all involved counsel and the witness, all depositions shall be

scheduled with at least 60 days' prior notice. The preferred location for the deposition of a witness shall be that location that all counsel involved in the deposition and the witness mutually agree to be the most convenient, but if there is no agreement, then the location shall be, at the discretion of the counsel defending the witness, one of the following locations:

- in the metropolitan area of the city where the witness resides (at a location convenient to the witness) provided that city is located within the continental United States;
- in the office of the counsel defending the witness; or
- at a location in Las Vegas, Nevada for witnesses residing west of the Mississippi River or in Washington, D.C. for witnesses (or Rockville, Maryland for NRC Staff witnesses) residing east of the Mississippi River.

The length of the deposition of any one witness should be limited to no more than one seven-hour day (with an additional hour off for lunch), unless counsel involved in taking and defending the deposition collectively agree that additional time is needed to fairly examine the witness (e.g., where multiple parties will participate and examine the witness during the deposition or where the deponent will be testifying on matters involving several contentions or groups of contentions). If it is agreed that more than one day is required to fairly examine the witness, the deposition notice shall so state and estimate the amount of time required for the deposition. Absent agreement, the matter can be submitted to this Board for resolution. The party noticing the deposition shall be entitled to approximately five of the seven hours to examine the witness. The parties shall accord a high priority to avoiding multiple depositions of the same witness, while recognizing that some witnesses may have to be deposed more than once; however, in those situations where a second deposition of the same witness could occur, the counsel taking the deposition shall make a good-faith effort to avoid revisiting subject matter on which the witness already was deposed absent a showing of new information.

Pursuant to 10 C.F.R. § 2.1018(d), the depositions in this proceeding may proceed in any order that the counsel for the parties collectively agree in good faith is appropriate for that particular contention, group of contentions, or witness. Counsel for the parties should endeavor in good faith to sequence depositions on groups of contentions in a single window of time during the period of discovery.

Generally only one counsel for each party should examine or defend a witness in a deposition; however, more than one counsel may examine or defend a witness (although not simultaneously) in a deposition under the following circumstances:

- if a witness will be opining on more than one contention or group of contentions that necessitates the use of more than one attorney, although such issues shall be examined and defended sequentially; or
- if the deposition extends over more than one day and counsel availability is or becomes problematic (e.g., a witness from outside the United States is only available on specific dates, some of which conflict with the schedule of a single counsel examining or defending the witness).

In those circumstances in which more than one party expects to examine a witness in a deposition and their interests appear to be aligned, examining counsel should confer prior to the deposition to attempt to avoid or minimize repetitive questioning and unduly extend the time required to complete the deposition. The first counsel examining the witness will, to the extent feasible, conduct the majority of the deposition, and additional counsel examining the witness will limit their examination to questions not already addressed.

With the exceptions of responses that would require the public disclosure of privileged information, classified information, or information otherwise protected from public disclosure by a rule, a case management order, or a protective order by the NRC or its presiding officers, or where limited by order of the CAB or the Commission, the witness shall not be permitted, or instructed by counsel defending the witness, not to answer questions posed. It shall not be

permissible for counsel defending a witness to instruct the witness not to answer, or for the witness to refuse to answer a question on grounds including, but not limited to, that the question is outside the scope of this proceeding, is not material to this proceeding, or does not relate to a genuine dispute or issue involved in this proceeding. Upon ten days' advance notice (not through the EIE) to all counsel involved in a deposition, counsel for a party may participate in a deposition, including questioning a witness, by telephone or video conference, and any costs associated with such participation shall be borne by the counsel so participating.

For Party Witnesses and for those Other Witnesses currently employed by or currently acting as a contractor for the defending party, the cost associated with producing such witnesses, as well as the cost for time spent and expenses incurred by such witnesses in preparing for their examination, in attending the deposition, or in reviewing and if needed correcting the transcript of their examination shall be borne by the party defending the witness. For all remaining Other Witnesses, the party noticing the deposition shall be responsible for the costs specified in 10 C.F.R. § 2.1019(g). The party noticing a deposition shall also be responsible for the following costs:

- charges associated with the venue where the deposition is conducted unless the witness is produced in the office of the counsel defending the deposition, or as otherwise agreed by counsel noticing the deposition and counsel representing the witness;
- the use of a court reporter to record the deposition by stenographic means;
- the use of the videographer to videotape the deposition but only if the videographer is requested by counsel noticing the deposition (otherwise the party requesting the videographer shall be responsible for such costs);
- the production of the transcript of the deposition and associated exhibits, and any necessary corrections; and

- the filing of the transcript and associated exhibits as required by 10 C.F.R.

§ 2.1019(d).

Once the deposition transcript becomes available, it shall be submitted immediately to the counsel defending the witness, who shall forward the same to the witness for review and any correction. Review and any correction of the transcript shall be made within 20 days of the transcript becoming available. The procedural requirements of 10 C.F.R. § 2.1019(d) shall be followed.

3. Requests for Admission

Pursuant to 10 C.F.R. §§ 2.1018 and 2.708, each party may, without leave of this Board, file a request for admission as to either (i) the genuineness and authenticity of any relevant document, or (ii) the truth of any specified relevant matter of fact. Responses are required within 14 days. However, absent an agreement between the parties or leave of this Board in response to a motion for relief, no party may file requests for admission more than once for each group of contentions (with a limit of no more than five requests for any one contention), and no more than four sets of requests for admission may be filed by any party in any one calendar month.

4. Entry Upon Land for Inspection

The parties may make an entry upon land for inspection as authorized by 10 C.F.R. §§ 2.1018(a)(1)(ii) and 2.1020. The parties will provide courtesy copies of any request for entry upon land for inspection to all counsel. Any party may respond to a request for an entry upon land for inspection within ten days after the service of the request.

5. Document Production

Pursuant to 10 C.F.R. §§ 2.1018(a)(1)(i) and 2.1003, the production of documents from any party is limited to that which exists on the LSN with the following three exceptions:

- under 10 C.F.R. § 2.1018(a)(1)(iii), document access or production is required (if specifically requested) where only bibliographic header information has been

provided for nonprivileged, nonimageable documentary material (see 10 C.F.R. § 2.1003(a));

- under 10 C.F.R. § 2.1019(i), if requested, paper copies of additional documents in the possession of any deponent relevant to the subject matter of the deposition shall be brought to the deposition if not already electronically available; and
- additional document production is permitted in accordance with an applicable NRC regulation or an applicable case management order. See, e.g., PAPO Board Revised Second Case Management Order (Pre-License Application Phase Document Discovery and Dispute Resolution) (July 6, 2007) at 14-15 (unpublished); PAPO Board Third Case Management Order (Aug. 30, 2007) at 7 (unpublished).

None of the foregoing documents need be placed on the EIE. Subpoenas for the production of documents from non-parties may be issued pursuant to 10 C.F.R. § 2.1018(f)(3).

6. Interrogatories

Pursuant to 10 C.F.R. § 2.1018(a)(2), interrogatories are not permitted without leave of this Board upon a showing that the parties have engaged in informal, but unsuccessful, good-faith efforts to resolve a dispute in a timely fashion concerning the production of information. The Board encourages the parties to take advantage of informal requests for information of the type typically made in NRC adjudications and encourages the parties to be forthcoming in responding to those informal requests and producing information voluntarily. Neither the informal requests nor the information produced need be placed on the EIE; however, both informal requests and responses should be provided to counsel for all parties via email messages. If good-faith efforts to resolve disputes are not successful, this Board is willing to entertain formal requests for leave to serve interrogatories.

D. Dispute Resolution

The Board expects counsel to cooperate with each other in all aspects of the management of this unusually complex proceeding, to extend professional courtesy to all

parties, counsel, witnesses, and staff, and in general to be guided by principles of good faith.

The Board interprets counsels' remarks during the prehearing conference of September 14 and 15, 2009, as a commitment to abide by these principles.

Counsel for the parties shall engage in good-faith negotiations to resolve any disputes between them that may arise. The Board does not intend to appoint a discovery master at this time. In the event that counsel for the parties are unable to resolve their disputes following good-faith negotiations, counsel for the parties to the dispute shall contact the Board telephonically to resolve the dispute. In that regard, all counsel for the parties to the dispute should contact one of the Board's law clerks, Ms. Tucker at 301-415-5833 or Mr. Rotman at 301-415-7703, to identify the dispute for resolution. The Board will, if available, immediately resolve the dispute or promptly schedule another conference call to do so.

It is so ORDERED.

THE ATOMIC SAFETY
AND LICENSING BOARD

/RA/

Thomas S. Moore, Chairman
ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE

/RA/

Paul S. Ryerson
ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE

/RA/

Richard E. Wardwell
ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE

Rockville, Maryland
September 30, 2009

Appendix to Case Management Order

Contention Label	Contention Name	SER Volume
NEV-SAFETY-196	Description of Security Measures	1
CLK-SAFETY-002	The DOE's Failure to Analyze Missile Testing	3
CLK-SAFETY-003	The DOE Miscalculates Basaltic Magma Melting Depth	3
CLK-SAFETY-004	The DOE Ignores the Time Span of Basaltic Volcanism	3
CLK-SAFETY-005	The DOE Improperly Focuses on Upper Crustal Extension Patterns	3
CLK-SAFETY-006	The DOE Improperly Excludes the Death Valley Volcanic Field and Greenwater Range from Volcanism Calculations	3
CLK-SAFETY-007	The DOE Improperly Estimates Igneous Event Probability for 10,000 Years and 1,000,000 Years	3
CLK-SAFETY-008	The DOE Ignores 11-Million Year Volcanism Data and Instead Relies on Only 5-Million Year Volcanism Data	3
CLK-SAFETY-009	The DOE Fails to Consider Alternative Igneous Event Conceptual Models	3
CLK-SAFETY-010	The DOE Ignores Igneous Event Data Evaluated Since 1996 in the Total System Performance Analysis	3
CLK-SAFETY-011	The DOE Lacks Sufficient Geophysical Data to Support Its Volcanic Model	3
INY-NEPA-006	Failure to Adequately Describe and Analyze the Volcanic Field in the Greenwater Range in and Adjacent to Death Valley National Park Thus Failing to Assess the Potential Environmental Impacts Resulting from Igneous Activity that Could Disrupt the Repository	3
INY-SAFETY-003	Failure to Adequately Describe and Analyze the Volcanic Field in the Greenwater Range in and Adjacent to Death Valley National Park	3
JTS-NEPA-003	Repository Thermal Effects	3
JTS-NEPA-005	Infiltration Flux	3
JTS-NEPA-008	Future Climate	3
NEI-SAFETY-005	Excessive Conservatism in the Post-Closure Criticality Analysis	3
NEI-SAFETY-006	Drip Shields Are Not Necessary	3
NEV-NEPA-018	Overlap between NEPA and AEA	3
NEV-SAFETY-009	Increasing CO2 Levels on Future Climate Projections	3
NEV-SAFETY-010	Consideration of Forcing Functions on Future Climate Projections	3
NEV-SAFETY-011	Human-Induced Climate Changes on Prediction of the Next Glacial Period	3
NEV-SAFETY-012	Projections of Future Wetter Climate Conditions	3
NEV-SAFETY-013	Future Climate Projections Need to Include Extreme Precipitation Events	3
NEV-SAFETY-014	Precipitation Model	3
NEV-SAFETY-015	Alternative Precipitation Models and Weather Variables	3
NEV-SAFETY-016	Qualification of Climate and Infiltration Models	3
NEV-SAFETY-017	Calibration and Simulation of Precipitation Model	3
NEV-SAFETY-018	Use of Climate Data from the Analog Sites	3
NEV-SAFETY-019	Future Infiltration Projections Need to Include Reduced Vegetation Cover	3
NEV-SAFETY-020	Net Infiltration Alternative Conceptual Model	3
NEV-SAFETY-021	Infiltration Model and Changes in Soil and Rock Properties	3
NEV-SAFETY-022	Net Infiltration Model Water Balance	3
NEV-SAFETY-023	Evaluation of Alternative Net Infiltration Models	3
NEV-SAFETY-024	Precipitation Data in Net Infiltration Model	3
NEV-SAFETY-025	Site-Specific Data in Net Infiltration Model	3
NEV-SAFETY-026	Soil Properties Data in Net Infiltration Model	3
NEV-SAFETY-027	Rock Properties Data in Net Infiltration Model	3
NEV-SAFETY-028	Net Infiltration Model Rock Properties Uncertainty Analysis	3
NEV-SAFETY-029	Spatial Variability of Soils and Vegetation in Net Infiltration Model	3
NEV-SAFETY-030	Temporal Variability in Precipitation in Net Infiltration Model	3
NEV-SAFETY-031	Calibration of Net Infiltration Model	3
NEV-SAFETY-032	Use of Initial Conditions in Net Infiltration Model	3
NEV-SAFETY-033	Approach to Estimating Percolation	3
NEV-SAFETY-034	Representation of Storm Duration for Net Infiltration Modeling	3
NEV-SAFETY-035	Episodic Nature of Infiltration Fluxes in Net Infiltration Analysis	3

Contention Label	Contention Name	SER Volume
NEV-SAFETY-036	Corroboration of Model Results in Post-Model Validation of Net Infiltration Simulations	3
NEV-SAFETY-037	Net Infiltration Model Methodology	3
NEV-SAFETY-038	Parameter Correlations in Net Infiltration Model	3
NEV-SAFETY-039	Temperature Lapse Rate Verification	3
NEV-SAFETY-040	Parameter Uncertainty Treatment in Net Infiltration Model	3
NEV-SAFETY-041	Erosion FEP Screening	3
NEV-SAFETY-042	Validation of Unsaturated Zone Flow Model by Simulation of Natural Chloride Distribution in Pore Waters	3
NEV-SAFETY-043	Validation of Unsaturated Zone Flow Model by Carbon-14 Contents, Strontium Isotope Compositions and Calcite Mineral Precipitate Abundances	3
NEV-SAFETY-044	Flow in the Unsaturated Zone from Episodic Infiltration	3
NEV-SAFETY-045	Effects of Episodic Flow	3
NEV-SAFETY-046	Extreme Events Undefined	3
NEV-SAFETY-047	Physical Basis of Site Scale Unsaturated Zone Flow	3
NEV-SAFETY-048	Multi-Scale Thermal-Hydrologic Model	3
NEV-SAFETY-049	Models of Fluid Movement in the Unsaturated Zone	3
NEV-SAFETY-050	Alternative Discrete Fracture Flow Models	3
NEV-SAFETY-051	Potential Convective Self Organization of 2-Phase Flow	3
NEV-SAFETY-052	EBS and Near-Field Modeling Approach	3
NEV-SAFETY-053	Application of the Fracture Matrix Dual Continuum Model to All Unsaturated Zone Flow Processes	3
NEV-SAFETY-054	Constitutive Relationships in the Yucca Mountain Infiltration, Thermo-Hydrologic, and TSPA Models	3
NEV-SAFETY-055	Data for the Chemistry of Pore Waters in the Topopah Springs (TSw) Formation	3
NEV-SAFETY-056	Geochemical Interactions and Evolution in the Unsaturated Zone, Including Thermo-Chemical Alteration of TSw Host Rock	
NEV-SAFETY-057	Data for Near-Field Chemistry Models	3
NEV-SAFETY-058	Groundwater Samples in the Unsaturated Zone Sorption Tests	3
NEV-SAFETY-059	Groundwater Compositions Assumed	3
NEV-SAFETY-060	Empirical Site-Specific Data and the Near-Field Chemistry Model	3
NEV-SAFETY-061	Ambient Seepage into Emplacement Drifts	3
NEV-SAFETY-062	Thermal Seepage into Emplacement Drifts	3
NEV-SAFETY-063	Effect of Rock Bolts on Ambient Seepage	3
NEV-SAFETY-064	Effect of Rock Bolts on Thermal Seepage	3
NEV-SAFETY-065	Structural Control of Seepage in the Emplacement Drift	3
NEV-SAFETY-066	Attenuation of Seepage into Naturally Fractured Drift Walls	3
NEV-SAFETY-067	Evaluation of Uncertainties in Estimated Chemical Properties, Especially pH Values, of Evaporated Drift Brines	3
NEV-SAFETY-068	In-Drift Condensation on Mineral Dust	3
NEV-SAFETY-069	Coupled Seepage and Dust Deliquescence	3
NEV-SAFETY-070	THC Evolution of Near-Field Pre-Seepage Unsaturated Zone Water	3
NEV-SAFETY-071	Microbially Induced Water Chemistry Changes in the Incubator Zone	3
NEV-SAFETY-072	Characterization of Dust Sources	3
NEV-SAFETY-073	In-Drift Organic Contribution by Ventilation or Unsaturated Zone Water	3
NEV-SAFETY-074	Impact of Microbial Activity	3
NEV-SAFETY-075	Microbially Influenced Corrosion Model	3
NEV-SAFETY-076	Microbial Denitrification	3
NEV-SAFETY-077	Corrosion from Rock Bolt Seepage	3
NEV-SAFETY-078	Static Corrosion Tests on Alloy 22	3
NEV-SAFETY-079	Static General Corrosion Test Solutions	3
NEV-SAFETY-080	Localized Corrosion, Chloride Bearing Mineral Deposits and Hot Wall Effects	3
NEV-SAFETY-081	Hydrogen Uptake Resulting From General Corrosion	3
NEV-SAFETY-082	Corrosion of Thermally Oxidized Titanium	3
NEV-SAFETY-083	Adequacy of Methods of General and Localized Corrosion Testing of the Drip Shield	3

Contention Label	Contention Name	SER Volume
NEV-SAFETY-084	Use of Differential Weight Loss to Estimate Very Low Corrosion Rates	3
NEV-SAFETY-085	Declining Corrosion Rate over Time	3
NEV-SAFETY-086	Role of Rock Dust on Canister Surfaces in Localized Corrosion	3
NEV-SAFETY-087	Intergranular SCC Corrosion During Dry-Wet Cycle	3
NEV-SAFETY-088	Thermodynamics of Complex Deliquescent Salt Reactions During C-22 Corrosion	3
NEV-SAFETY-089	Inhibition of C-22 Corrosion by High Nitrate to Chloride Ratio	3
NEV-SAFETY-090	Effects of Rock Bolt on C-22 and Ti-7 Corrosion Reactions	3
NEV-SAFETY-091	Representativeness of C-22 and Ti-7 Corrosion Testing Methods	3
NEV-SAFETY-092	Impacts of Fluoride Due to Breach of HLW Containers	3
NEV-SAFETY-093	Natural Lead Reactions on C-22	3
NEV-SAFETY-094	Significance of Mineral Crusts in C-22 Corrosion	3
NEV-SAFETY-095	Peak Thermal Period Seepage and Corrosion	3
NEV-SAFETY-096	Salt Production and C-22 Corrosion Due to Heat-Pipe Conditions	3
NEV-SAFETY-097	Crevice Corrosion on C-22 Due to Drip Shield Corrosion Debris	3
NEV-SAFETY-098	Rate of Drip Shield Interconnection Corrosion	3
NEV-SAFETY-099	Boric Acid Production from HLW Dissolution	3
NEV-SAFETY-100	Ground Support Components and In-Drift Modeling	3
NEV-SAFETY-101	Sulfur Accumulation at the Metal-Passive Film Interface	3
NEV-SAFETY-102	Sulfur Accumulation and Localized Corrosion	3
NEV-SAFETY-103	Sulfur Accumulation and Stress Corrosion Initiation	3
NEV-SAFETY-104	Sulfur Accumulation and Stress Corrosion Propagation	3
NEV-SAFETY-105	Drip Shield Corrosion Environment	3
NEV-SAFETY-106	Waste Container Corrosion Environment	3
NEV-SAFETY-107	Electrochemical Reduction of Nitrate	3
NEV-SAFETY-108	Molten Salt Corrosion of the Canister	3
NEV-SAFETY-109	Molten Salt Corrosion of the Drip Shield	3
NEV-SAFETY-110	Rock Bolt Corrosion	3
NEV-SAFETY-111	HLW Waste Glass Dissolution	3
NEV-SAFETY-112	HLW Waste Glass Degradation	3
NEV-SAFETY-113	Competitive Sorption in the Unsaturated Zone	3
NEV-SAFETY-114	Applicability of Sorption Data	3
NEV-SAFETY-115	Matrix Diffusion	3
NEV-SAFETY-116	Saturated Zone Redox Conditions	3
NEV-SAFETY-117	Radionuclide Sorption in the Saturated Zone	3
NEV-SAFETY-118	Estimation of Uncertainties in Soil-to-Plant Transfer Factors	3
NEV-SAFETY-119	Estimation of Uncertainties in Animal Product Transfer Coefficients	3
NEV-SAFETY-120	RMEI Diet	3
NEV-SAFETY-121	Host Rock Geomechanical Properties	3
NEV-SAFETY-122	Screening of Drift Degradation FEPs	3
NEV-SAFETY-123	Durability of Ground Support	3
NEV-SAFETY-124	Welding of Alpha Beta Titanium Alloy to Unalloyed Titanium	3
NEV-SAFETY-125	Effectiveness of Stress Relief to Eliminate SCC or Hydrogen Effects	3
NEV-SAFETY-126	Properties of Dissimilar Metal Weld Joints between Grade 29 and Grade 7 Titanium	3
NEV-SAFETY-127	Hydrogen and ERTi-28 Filler Metal for Welded Joints Between Grade 29 and Grade 7 Titanium	3
NEV-SAFETY-128	Nuclear Code and Fabrication Quality Assurance Standards	3
NEV-SAFETY-129	Early Failure Mechanisms Associated with Titanium Fabrication	3
NEV-SAFETY-130	Drip Shield Emplacement Plan, Equipment, and Schedule	3
NEV-SAFETY-131	Rock Debris Removal	3
NEV-SAFETY-132	TEV Description	3
NEV-SAFETY-133	Drip Shield Gantry Description	3
NEV-SAFETY-134	Retrieval or Alternate Storage Description	3
NEV-SAFETY-136	Phased Ground Support Installation	3
NEV-SAFETY-137	Construction of the Emplacement Drifts	3
NEV-SAFETY-138	Description of the Ventilation System for the Repository Options Made in the TSPA-LA Regarding Waste Isolation	3

Contention Label	Contention Name	SER Volume
NEV-SAFETY-139	Description of Reasonable Emergencies	3
NEV-SAFETY-140	Engineered Barrier System Design Basis	3
NEV-SAFETY-141	Ground Support Descriptions	3
NEV-SAFETY-142	Standard Titanium Grades Considered	3
NEV-SAFETY-143	Available Drip Shield Design Information	3
NEV-SAFETY-144	Drip Shield Failure Mechanisms	3
NEV-SAFETY-145	Drip Shield Specifications	3
NEV-SAFETY-146	Reliance on Preliminary or Conceptual Design Information	3
NEV-SAFETY-147	Evaluation of Data Used in Drip Shield Failure Probability	3
NEV-SAFETY-148	Evaluation of Computational Procedure Used in Drip Shield Failure Probability	3
NEV-SAFETY-149	Deviations in Design and Waste Emplacement	3
NEV-SAFETY-150	Basaltic Magma Melting Depth	3
NEV-SAFETY-151	Time Span of Basaltic Volcanism	3
NEV-SAFETY-152	Focus on Upper Crustal Extension Patterns	3
NEV-SAFETY-153	Exclusion of Death Valley from Volcanism Calculations	3
NEV-SAFETY-154	Igneous Event Probability for 10,000 Years and 1,000,000 Years	3
NEV-SAFETY-155	11-Million Year vs. 5-Million Year Volcanism Data	3
NEV-SAFETY-156	Alternative Igneous Event Conceptual Models	3
NEV-SAFETY-157	Igneous Event Data in the TSPA	3
NEV-SAFETY-158	Geophysical Data in DOE's Volcanic Model	3
NEV-SAFETY-159	Propagation of Conceptual and Parametric Uncertainties through the Safety Assessment	3
NEV-SAFETY-160	Probability Density Functions Used in the TSPA	3
NEV-SAFETY-161	Critical Role of Drip Shield	3
NEV-SAFETY-162	Drip Shield Installation Schedule	3
NEV-SAFETY-163	Screening of Near-Field Criticality	3
NEV-SAFETY-164	Aggregation of Probability Distributions	3
NEV-SAFETY-165	Saturated Zone Expert Elicitation	3
NEV-SAFETY-166	Probabilistic Seismic Hazard Analysis Expert Elicitation	3
NEV-SAFETY-167	Probabilistic Volcanic Hazard Analysis Expert Elicitation	3
NEV-SAFETY-168	Retrieval Practicality	3
NEV-SAFETY-169	Deferred Retrieval Plans	3
NEV-SAFETY-170	Conservatisms and the PMA	3
NEV-SAFETY-171	PMA and QA	3
NEV-SAFETY-172	Inspection and Verification of TAD	3
NEV-SAFETY-173	Emplacement Drift Monitoring	3
WHI-NEPA-001	Failure of Environmental Impact Statements to Fully Disclose Consequences of Radiation Contaminated Tephra Deposition in Areas Other Than That Directly Applicable to the Reasonably Maximally Exposed Individual	3
WHI-NEPA-002	Failure of Environmental Impact Statements to Fully Disclose the Consequences of Atmospheric Transport of Radionuclides in Volcanic Gases	3
WHI-NEPA-003	Failure of Environmental Impact Statements to Discuss Means to Mitigate Adverse Impacts of Radiation Contaminated Tephra Deposition in Areas Other Than That Directly Applicable to the Reasonably Maximally Exposed Individual	3
WHI-NEPA-004	Failure of Environmental Impact Statements to Discuss Means to Mitigate diverse Impacts of Atmospheric Transport of Radionuclides in Volcanic Gases	3

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

In the Matter of)
)
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY)
)
(High-Level Waste Repository))
)

Docket No. 63-001-HLW

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that copies of the foregoing CAB CASE MANAGEMENT ORDER #2, dated September 30, 2009, have been served upon the following persons by Electronic Information Exchange.

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board (ASLBP)
Mail Stop T-3F23
Washington, DC 20555-0001

CAB 01

William J. Froehlich, Chair
Administrative Judge
wjf1@nrc.gov

Thomas S. Moore
Administrative Judge
tsm2@nrc.gov

Richard E. Wardwell
Administrative Judge
rew@nrc.gov

CAB 02

Michael M. Gibson, Chair
Administrative Judge
mmg3@nrc.gov

Alan S. Rosenthal
Administrative Judge
alan.rosenthal@nrc.gov or rsnthl@verizon.net

Nicholas G. Trikouras
Administrative Judge
ngt@nrc.gov

CAB 03

Paul S. Ryerson, Chair
Administrative Judge
psr1@nrc.gov

Michael C. Farrar
Administrative Judge
mcf@nrc.gov

Mark O. Barnett
Administrative Judge
mob1@nrc.gov or mark.barnett@nrc.gov

ASLBP (continued)

CAB 04

Thomas S. Moore, Chair
Administrative Judge
tsm2@nrc.gov

Paul S. Ryerson
Administrative Judge
psr1@nrc.gov

Richard E. Wardwell
Administrative Judge
rew@nrc.gov

Anthony C. Eitrem, Esq., Chief Counsel
ace1@nrc.gov

Daniel J. Graser, LSN Administrator
djg2@nrc.gov

Zachary Kahn, Law Clerk
zxk1@nrc.gov

Erica LaPlante, Law Clerk
eal1@nrc.gov

Matthew Rotman, Law Clerk
matthew.rotman@nrc.gov

Katherine Tucker, Law Clerk
katie.tucker@nrc.gov

Joseph Deucher
jhd@nrc.gov

Andrew Welkie
axw5@nrc.gov

Jack Whetstine
jgw@nrc.gov

Patricia Harich
patricia.harich@nrc.gov

Sara Culler
sara.culler@nrc.gov

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY (High Level Waste Repository) Docket No. 63-001-HLW
CAB CASE MANAGEMENT ORDER #2

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Office of the Secretary of the Commission
Mail Stop O-16C1
Washington, DC 20555-0001
Hearing Docket
hearingdocket@nrc.gov

U.S. Department of Energy
Office of General Counsel
1000 Independence Avenue S.W.
Washington, DC 20585
Martha S. Crosland, Esq.
martha.crosland@hq.doe.gov
Nicholas P. DiNunzio, Esq.
nick.dinunzio@rw.doe.gov
James Bennett McRae
ben.mcrae@hq.doe.gov
Cyrus Nezhad, Esq.
cyrus.nezhad@hq.doe.gov
Christina C. Pak, Esq.
christina.pak@hq.doe.gov

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Office of Commission Appellate Adjudication
Mail Stop O-16C1
Washington, DC 20555-0001
OCA Mail Center
ocaamail@nrc.gov

For U.S. Department of Energy
Office of Counsel, Naval Sea Systems Command
Nuclear Propulsion Program
1333 Isaac Hull Avenue, SE
Washington Navy Yard, Building 197
Washington, DC 20376
Frank A. Putzu, Esq.
frank.putzu@navy.mil

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Office of the General Counsel
Mail Stop O-15D21
Washington, DC 20555-0001
Margaret J. Bupp, Esq.
mjb5@nrc.gov
Christopher Chandler, Esq.
ccc1@nrc.gov
Karin Francis, Paralegal
kxf4@nrc.gov
Adam Gendelman, Esq.
adam.gendelman@nrc.gov
Joseph S. Gilman, Paralegal
jsg1@nrc.gov
Daniel W. Lenehan, Esq.
dwl2@nrc.gov
Andrea L. Silvia, Esq.
alc1@nrc.gov
Mitzi A. Young, Esq.
may@nrc.gov
Marian L. Zabler, Esq.
mlz@nrc.gov
OGC Mail Center
OGCMailCenter@nrc.gov

U.S. Department of Energy
Office of General Counsel
1551 Hillshire Drive
Las Vegas, NV 89134-6321
Jocelyn M. Gutierrez, Esq.
jocelyn.gutierrez@ymp.gov
George W. Hellstrom, Esq.
george.hellstrom@ymp.gov
Josephine L. Sommer, Paralegal
josephine.sommer@ymp.gov

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY (High Level Waste Repository) Docket No. 63-001-HLW
CAB CASE MANAGEMENT ORDER #2

For U.S. Department of Energy
USA-Repository Services
Yucca Mountain Project Licensing Group
1160 N. Town Center Drive, Suite 240
Las Vegas, NV 89144
Stephen J. Cereghino, Licensing/Nucl Safety
stephen_cereghino@ymp.gov
Jeffrey Kriner, Regulatory Programs
jeffrey_kriner@ymp.gov

For U.S. Department of Energy
USA-Repository Services
Yucca Mountain Project Licensing Group
6000 Executive Boulevard, Suite 608
North Bethesda, MD 20852
Edward Borella, Sr Staff, Licensing/Nuclear Safety
edward_borella@ymp.gov

For U.S. Department of Energy
Talisman International, LLC
1000 Potomac St., NW, Suite 300
Washington, DC 20007
Patricia Larimore, Senior Paralegal
plarimore@talisman-intl.com

Counsel for U.S. Department of Energy
Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20004
Clifford W. Cooper, Paralegal
ccooper@morganlewis.com
Lewis M. Csedrik, Esq.
lcshedrik@morganlewis.com
Jay M. Gutierrez, Esq.
jgutierrez@morganlewis.com
Charles B. Moldenhauer, Esq.
cmoldenhauer@morganlewis.com
Brian P. Oldham, Esq.
boldham@morganlewis.com
Thomas D. Poindexter, Esq.
tpoindexter@morganlewis.com
Alex S. Polonsky, Esq.
apolonsky@morganlewis.com
Thomas A. Schmutz, Esq.
tschmutz@morganlewis.com
Donald J. Silverman, Esq.
dsilverman@morganlewis.com
Shannon Staton, Legal Secretary
sstaton@morganlewis.com
Annette M. White, Esq.
Annette.white@morganlewis.com
Paul J. Zaffuts, Esq.
pzaffuts@morganlewis.com

Counsel for U.S. Department of Energy
Hunton & Williams LLP
Riverfront Plaza, East Tower
951 East Byrd Street
Richmond, VA 23219
Kelly L. Faglioni, Esq.
kfaglioni@hunton.com
Donald P. Irwin, Esq.
dirwin@hunton.com
Stephanie Meharg, Paralegal
smeharg@hunton.com
Michael R. Shebelskie, Esq.
mshebelskie@hunton.com
Belinda A. Wright, Sr. Professional Assistant
bwright@hunton.com

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY (High Level Waste Repository) Docket No. 63-001-HLW
CAB CASE MANAGEMENT ORDER #2

Counsel for State of Nevada
Egan, Fitzpatrick, Malsch & Lawrence, PLLC
1750 K Street, NW, Suite 350
Washington, DC 20006
Martin G. Malsch, Esq.
mmalsch@nuclearlawyer.com
Susan Montesi:
smontesi@nuclearlawyer.com

Counsel for State of Nevada
Egan, Fitzpatrick, Malsch & Lawrence, PLLC
12500 San Pedro Avenue, Suite 555
San Antonio, TX 78216
Laurie Borski, Paralegal
lborski@nuclearlawyer.com
Charles J. Fitzpatrick, Esq.
cfitzpatrick@nuclearlawyer.com
John W. Lawrence, Esq.
jlawrence@nuclearlawyer.com

Nevada Agency for Nuclear Projects
Nuclear Waste Project Office
1761 East College Parkway, Suite 118
Carson City, NV 89706
Steve Frishman, Tech. Policy Coordinator
steve.frishman@gmail.com
Susan Lynch, Administrator of Technical Prgms
szeeee@nuc.state.nv.us

Bureau of Government Affairs
Nevada Attorney General
100 N. Carson Street
Carson City, NV 89701
Marta Adams, Chief Deputy Attorney General
madams@ag.nv.gov

Counsel for Lincoln County, Nevada
1100 S. Tenth Street
Las Vegas, NV 89017
Annie Bailey, Legal Assistant
baileys@lcturbonet.com
Eric Hinckley, Law Clerk
erichinckley@yahoo.com
Bret Whipple, Esq.
bretwhipple@nomademail.com

Lincoln County District Attorney
P. O. Box 60
Pioche, NV 89403
Gregory Barlow, Esq.
lcd@lcturbonet.com

Lincoln County Nuclear Oversight Program
P.O. Box 1068
Caliente, NV 89008
Connie Simkins, Coordinator
jcciac@co.lincoln.nv.us

For Lincoln County, Nevada
Intertech Services Corporation
PO Box 2008
Carson City, NV 89702
Mike Baughman, Consultant
bigboff@aol.com

Counsel for Nye County, Nevada
Ackerman Senterfitt
801 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, #600
Washington, DC 20004
Robert Andersen, Esq.
robert.andersen@akerman.com

Counsel for Nye County, Nevada
530 Farrington Court
Las Vegas, NV 89123
Jeffrey VanNiel, Esq.
nbrjdv@gmail.com

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY (High Level Waste Repository) Docket No. 63-001-HLW
CAB CASE MANAGEMENT ORDER #2

Nye County Regulatory/Licensing Advisor
18160 Cottonwood Rd. #265
Sunriver, OR 97707
Malachy Murphy, Esq.
mrmurphy@chamberscable.com

Nye County Nuclear Waste Repository Project
Office (NWRPO)
1210 E. Basin Road, #6
Pahrump, NV 89060
Zoie Choate, Secretary
zchoate@co.nye.nv.us
Sherry Dudley, Admin. Technical Coordinator
sdudley@co.nye.nv.us

Clark County, Nevada
500 S. Grand Central Parkway
Las Vegas, NV 98155
Phil Klevorick, Sr. Mgmt Analyst
klevorick@co.clark.nv.us
Elizabeth A. Vibert, Deputy District Attorney
Elizabeth.Vibert@ccdανv.com

Counsel for Clark County, Nevada
Jennings, Strouss & Salmon
8330 W. Sahara Avenue, #290
Las Vegas, NV 89117
Bryce Loveland, Esq.
bloveland@jsslaw.com

Counsel for Clark County, Nevada
Jennings, Strouss & Salmon
1700 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Suite 500
Washington, DC 20006-4725
Elene Belte, Legal Secretary
ebelele@jsslaw.com
Alan I. Robbins, Esq.
arobbins@jsslaw.com
Debra D. Roby, Esq.
droby@jsslaw.com

Eureka County, Nevada
Office of the District Attorney
701 S. Main Street, Box 190
Eureka, NV 89316-0190
Theodore Beutel, District Attorney
tbeutel.ecda@eurekanv.org

Counsel for Eureka County, Nevada
Harmon, Curran, Spielberg & Eisenberg, LLP
1726 M. Street N.W., Suite 600
Washington, DC 20036
Diane Curran, Esq.
dcurran@harmoncurran.com
Matthew Fraser, Law Clerk
mfraser@harmoncurran.com

Eureka County Public Works
PO Box 714
Eureka, NV 89316
Ronald Damele, Director
rdamele@eurekanv.org

Nuclear Waste Advisory for Eureka
County, Nevada
1983 Maison Way
Carson City, NV 89703
Abigail Johnson, Consultant
eurekanrc@gmail.com

For Eureka County, Nevada
NWOP Consulting, Inc.
1705 Wildcat Lane
Ogden, UT 84403
Loreen Pitchford, Consultant
lpitchford@comcast.net

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY (High Level Waste Repository) Docket No. 63-001-HLW
CAB CASE MANAGEMENT ORDER #2

Counsel for Churchill, Esmeralda, Lander,
and Mineral Counties, Nevada
Armstrong Teasdale, LLP
1975 Village Center Circle, Suite 140
Las Vegas, NV 89134-6237
Jennifer A. Gores, Esq.
jgores@armstrongteasdale.com
Robert F. List, Esq.
rlist@armstrongteasdale.com

Esmeralda County Repository Oversight Program-
Yucca Mountain Project
PO Box 490
Goldfield, NV 89013
Edwin Mueller, Director
muellered@msn.com

Mineral County Nuclear Projects Office
P.O. Box 1600
Hawthorne, NV 89415
Linda Mathias, Director
yuccainfo@mineralcountynv.org

For City of Caliente, Lincoln County, and
White Pine County, Nevada
P.O. Box 126
Caliente, NV 89008
Jason Pitts, LSN Administrator
jayson@idtservices.com

White Pine County, Nevada
Office of the District Attorney
801 Clark Street, #3
Ely, NV 89301
Richard Sears, District Attorney
rwsears@wpcda.org

White Pine County Nuclear Waste Project Office
959 Campton Street
Ely, NV 89301
Mike Simon, Director
wpnucwst1@mwpower.net

For White Pine County, Nevada
Intertech Services Corporation
PO Box 2008
Carson City, NV 89702
Mike Baughman, Consultant
bigboff@aol.com

Counsel for Caliente Hot Springs Resort LLC
John H. Huston, Attorney at Law
6772 Running Colors Avenue
Las Vegas, NV 89131
John H. Huston, Esq.
johnhhuston@gmail.com

Counsel for Inyo County, California
Berger, Silverman & Gephart
233 E. Carrillo Street, Suite B
Santa Barbara, CA 93101
Michael Berger, Esq.
mberger@bsqlaw.net
Robert Hanna, Esq.
rshanna@bsqlaw.net

Counsel for Inyo County, California
Greg James, Attorney at Law
710 Autumn Leaves Circle
Bishop, CA 93514
E-Mail: gljames@earthlink.net

Inyo County Yucca Mountain Repository
Assessment Office
P. O. Box 367
Independence, CA 93526-0367
Alisa M. Lembke, Project Analyst
alembke@inyocounty.us

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY (High Level Waste Repository) Docket No. 63-001-HLW
CAB CASE MANAGEMENT ORDER #2

California Department of Justice
Office of the Attorney General
1300 I Street, P.O. Box 944255
Sacramento, CA 94244-2550
Susan Durbin, Deputy Attorney General
susan.durbin@doj.ca.gov
Michele Mercado, Analyst
michele.Mercado@doj.ca.gov

California Department of Justice
Office of the Attorney General
1515 Clay Street, 20th Floor, P.O. Box 70550
Oakland, CA 94612-0550
Timothy E. Sullivan, Deputy Attorney General
timothy.Sullivan@doj.ca.gov

California Department of Justice
300 S. Spring Street, Suite 1702
Los Angeles, CA 90013
Brian Hembacher, Deputy Attorney General
brian.hembacher@doj.ca.gov

California Energy Commission
1516 Ninth Street
Sacramento, CA 95814
Kevin, W. Bell, Senior Staff Counsel
kwbell@energy.state.ca.us

Nuclear Energy Institute
Office of the General Counsel
1776 I Street, NW Suite 400
Washington, DC 20006-3708
Michael A. Bauser, Esq.
mab@nei.org
Anne W. Cottingham, Esq.
awc@nei.org
Ellen C. Ginsberg, Esq.
ecg@nei.org

Counsel for Nuclear Energy Institute
Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw Pittman LLP
2300 N Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20037-1122
Jay E. Silberg, Esq.
jay.silberg@pillsburylaw.com
Timothy J.V. Walsh, Esq.
timothy.walsh@pillsburylaw.com
Maria D. Webb, Senior Energy Legal Analyst
maria.webb@pillsburylaw.com

Counsel for Nuclear Energy Institute
Winston & Strawn LLP
1700 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006-3817
William A. Horin, Esq.
whorin@winston.com
Rachel Miras-Wilson, Esq.
rwilson@winston.com
David A. Repka, Esq.
drepka@winston.com
Carlos L. Sisco, Senior Paralegal
csisco@winston.com

Native Community Action Council
P.O. Box 140
Baker, NV 89311
Ian Zabarte, Member of Board of Directors
mrizabarte@gmail.com

Counsel for Native Community Action Council
Alexander, Berkey, Williams & Weathers LLP
2030 Addison Street, Suite 410
Berkeley, CA 94704
Curtis G. Berkey, Esq.
cberkey@abwwlaw.com
Rovianne A. Leigh, Esq.
rleigh@abwwlaw.com
Scott W. Williams, Esq.
swilliams@abwwlaw.com

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY (High Level Waste Repository) Docket No. 63-001-HLW
CAB CASE MANAGEMENT ORDER #2

For Joint Timbisha Shoshone Tribal Group
3560 Savoy Boulevard
Pahrump, NV 89601
Joe Kennedy, Executive Director
joekennedy08@live.com
Tameka Vazquez, Bookkeeper
purpose_driven12@yahoo.com

Counsel for Joint Timbisha Shoshone Tribal Group
Fredericks, Peebles, & Morgan LLP
1001 Second St.
Sacramento, CA 95814
Felicia M. Brooks, Data Administrator
fbrooks@ndnlaw.com
Ross D. Colburn, Law Clerk
rcolburn@ndnlaw.com
Sally Eredia, Legal Secretary
seredia@ndnlaw.com
Darcie L. Houck, Esq.
dhouck@ndnlaw.com
Brian Niegemann, Office Manager
bniegemann@ndnlaw.com
John M. Peebles, Esq.
jpeebles@ndnlaw.com
Robert Rhoan, Esq.
rrhoan@ndnlaw.com

Counsel for Joint Timbisha Shoshone Tribal Group
Godfrey & Kahn, S.C.
One East Main Street, Suite 500
P. O. Box 2719
Madison, WI 53701-2719
Julie Dobie, Legal Secretary
jdobie@gklaw.com
Steven A. Heinzen, Esq.
sheinzen@gklaw.com
Douglas M. Poland, Esq.
dpoland@gklaw.com
Hannah L. Renfro, Esq.
hrenfro@gklaw.com
Jacqueline Schwartz, Paralegal
jschwartz@gklaw.com

Counsel for Joint Timbisha Shoshone Tribal Group
Godfrey & Kahn, S.C.
780 N. Water Street
Milwaukee, WI 53202
Arthur J. Harrington, Esq.
aharrington@gklaw.com

[Original Signed by Linda D. Lewis]
Office of the Secretary of the Commission

Dated at Rockville, Maryland
this 30th day of September 2009