UNITED STATES OF AMERICA NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

BEFORE THE COMMISSION

)	
In the Matter of)	Docket No. 63-001-HLW
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY)	ASLBP No. 09-892-HLW-CAB04
(License Application for Geologic Repository at Yucca Mountain)))))	April 16th, 2010

AIKEN COUNTY'S RESPONSE TO TWO PETITIONS FOR INTERLOCUTORY REVIEW

Two parties, the Department of Energy ("DOE") and Nye County, have asked this Commission to exercise its inherent authority to conduct an immediate interlocutory review of the Memorandum and Order (Suspending Briefing and Consideration of Withdrawal Motion) ("M&O"), issued by the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board ("Licensing Board") on April 6, 2010, in the Yucca Mountain repository licensing proceeding. Aiken County has petitioned to intervene in the proceedings.

As a preliminary matter, Aiken County recognizes that it is inappropriate for a party to ask the Commission to exercise its inherent review authority, because allowing such requests from parties to a licensing proceeding undercuts the integrity of the Commission's procedures.¹

¹ As a majority of the Commission agreed in *In re Entergy Nuclear Vt. Yankee*, 65 N.R.C. 1 (2007), the Commission's inherent authority to supervise licensing proceedings is not grounds for a party's own request Commission review. See *id.* at 7 (dissenting opinion of Commissioners Lyons and Jaczko: "The Commission's supervisory authority does not constitute grounds for a *party's own request* for appellate review."); *id.* at 8 (concurring opinion of Commissioners Merrifield and McGaffigan: "We agree with the dissent that the Commission's inherent supervisory authority does not constitute grounds for a party's review.").

As the dissent in *In re Entergy Nuclear Vt. Yankee* noted, "[w]ere it otherwise, there would be no limit to the kinds of arguments parties could legitimately present on appeal, and particularly on interlocutory appeal -- a result at odds with the Commission's oft-expressed intent to limit the availability of such appeals. Thus, the exercise

Without condoning attempts by other parties to fashion a new avenue of appeal to the Commission, Aiken County finds two of the assertions in the requests for review warrant a response in order to ensure that the Commission is not misinformed about the status of proceedings before the Court of Appeals or other issues.

First, both petitions confuse the issue of what is being challenged in federal court by Aiken County. Aiken County is specifically challenging DOE's final decision to withdraw its license application. The finality of DOE's decision does not depend on ratification by any other agency besides the DOE. The DOE's decision to withdraw it license application is a final decision of DOE. As the Licensing Board properly recognized, the NWPA vests original jurisdiction over civil actions related to the DOE's statutory duty to apply for licensure in the United States Courts of Appeals. M&O at 9-10.

Second, both petitions assume that the DOE's motion to withdraw involves little more than a blind application of a federal regulation, specifically 10 C.F.R. § 2.107. *See* DOE Petition for Interlocutory Review at 6; Nye County Petition for Interlocutory Review at 10. DOE supports this assumption by quoting a portion of a federal statutory provision: "The Commission shall consider an application for a construction authorization for all or part of a repository in accordance with the laws applicable to such applications...." *Id.* n.1 (quoting 42 U.S.C. § 10134(d)).

_

of this authority at the request of a party undercuts the integrity of the Commission's procedures." *id.* at 7 (N.R.C. 2007)(footnote omitted). *See also Carolina Power & Light Co.*, 51 NRC 297, 299 (2000) ("And the Commission itself may exercise its discretion to review a licensing board's interlocutory order if the *Commission* wants to address a novel or important issue. . . . However, the Commission's decision to do so in any particular proceeding stems from its inherent supervisory authority over adjudications and in no way implies that parties have a right to seek interlocutory review on that same ground.")(emphasis in original).

However, consideration of DOE's motion to withdraw its license application does not involve a routine application of federal regulations. This is apparent when the statutory provision cited by DOE is read further than what was quoted:

The Commission shall consider an application for a construction authorization for all or part of a repository in accordance with the laws applicable to such applications, except that the Commission shall issue a final decision approving or disapproving the issuance of a construction authorization not later than the expiration of 3 years after the date of the submission of such application [extendable up to 12 months with certain reporting requirements].

42 U.S.C. § 10134(d)(emphasis added). The NWPA clearly dictates that NRC procedures should be used except to the extent their application jeopardizes the fulfillment of NRC's duty to render a final approval or disapproval of the construction authorization within three years. This forbids interpretation of a regulation in such a way as to preclude final approval or disapproval, *i.e.* by granting withdrawal. To suggest that consideration of DOE's motion to withdraw requires nothing more than a mechanical employment of 10 C.F.R. § 2.107, which doesn't seem to contemplate denial of a motion to withdraw an license application,² is erroneous. The Licensing Board correctly noted that "no agency adjudicatory tribunal has addressed this issue in the context of the unique NWPA." M&O at 11.

-

² In *In re Sequoyah Fuels Corp.*, 38 N.R.C. 304 (1993), the Atomic Safety & Licensing Board cast doubt on the "contention that the Commission, and thus the Presiding Officer, has discretion to deny an improper request for withdrawal of a license application." The Board noted that "If a withdrawal request comes after the issuance of a hearing notice, 10 C.F.R § 2.107 interposes no obstacle to an applicant's ability to withdraw a renewal application. The only discretion in play here involves the possible imposition of terms or conditions to accompany such a withdrawal." *Id.*

Respectfully submitted,

HAYNSWORTH SINKLER BOYD, P.A.

Signed (electronically) by

Thomas R. Gottshall, D.S.C. # 2406

tgottshall@hsblawfirm.com

Thomas R. Loudall

P. O. Box 11889

Columbia, SC 29211-1889

(803) 779-3080

April 16th, 2010

Attorneys for Petitioner Aiken County

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

BEFORE THE COMMISSION

		
In the Matter of)	Docket No. 63-001-HLW
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY)	ASLBP No. 09-892-HLW-CAB04
(License Application for Geologic Repository at Yucca Mountain))	
Repository at Tucca Mountain))	
)	

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that copies of **AIKEN COUNTY'S RESPONSE TO TWO PETITIONS FOR INTERLOCUTORY REVIEW** in the above-captioned proceeding have been served on the following persons this 16th day of April, 2010, by Electronic Information Exchange.

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

A TTN: Docketing and Service Mail Stop: 0-

16C1

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission

Washington, D.C. 20555

E-mail: HEARINGDOCKET@nrc.gov

Martin G. Maisch, Esq.

Egan, Fitzpatrick & Maisch, 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@doLca.gov

Office of Commission Appellate Adjudication ocaamail@nrc.gov

Timothy E. Sullivan, Esq.

Deputy Attorney General California Department of

Justice 1515 Clay Street., 20th Fir.

P.O. Box 70550

Oakland, CA 94612-0550

E-mail: timothy.sullivan@doLca.gov

Charles J. Fitzpatrick, Esq. John W. Lawrence, Esq.

Egan, Fitzpatrick, Maisch & Lawrence PLLC 12500 San Pedro Avenue, Suite 555

San Antonio, TX 78216

E-mail: cfitzpatrick@nuclearlawyer.com jlawrence@nuclearlawyer.com

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

Alan I. Robbins, Esq.
Debra D. Roby, Esq.
Jennings Strouss & Salmon, PLC
1350 I Street, NW Suite 810
Washington, D.C. 20005-3305
E-mail: arobbins@jsslaw.com
drobv@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.
Raphael P. Kuyler, 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 Icsedrik@morganlewis.com rkuyler@morganlewis.com

Malachy R. Murphy, Esq. 18160 Cottonwood Rd. #265 Sunriver, OR 97707

E-mail: mrmurphy@chamberscable.com

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

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.helistrom@ymp.gov

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

Robert M. Andersen Akerman Senterfitt

801 Pennsylvania Avenue N.W., Suite 600

Washington, DC 20004 USA

E-mail: robert.andersen@akerman.com

Shane Thin Elk Fredericks Peebles & Morgan, LLP 3610 North

163rd Plaza

Omaha, Nebraska 68116 E-mail: sthinelk@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: eca@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

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@naw.mil

John M. Peebles Darcie L. Houck

Fredericks Peebles & Morgan LLP

1001 Second Street Sacramento, CA 95814

E-mail: jpeebles@ndnlaw.com dhouck@ndnlaw.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@aklaw.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 iaores@armstronateasdale.com

Jay E. Silberg Timothy JV Walsh Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw Pittman LLP 2300 N Street, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20037-1122

E-mail: iav.silberg@pilisburvlaw.com

timothy.walsh@pillsburvlaw.com

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

Arthur J. Harrington Godfrey & Kahn, S.C.

780 N. Water Street Milwaukee, WI 53202

E-mail: aharring@gklaw.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: cberkev@abwwlaw.com
swilliams@abwwlaw.com
rleigh@abwwlaw.com

Bret O. Whipple 1100 South Tenth Street Las Vegas, Nevada 89104

E-mail: bretwhipple@nomademail.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: Icda@lcturbonet.com

Michael L. Dunning
Andrew A. Fitz
H. Lee Overton
State of Washington
Office of the Attorney G

Office of the Attorney General

P.O. Box 40117

Olympia, WA 98504-0117 E-mail: MichaeID@atg.wa.gov

AndyF@atg.wa.gov; Lee01@atg.wa.gov

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

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@bsalaw.net

Don L. Keskey, Esq.

Public Law Resource Center PLLC

505 N. Capitol Avenue Lansing, MI 48933

E-mail: donkeskev@publiclawresourcenter.com

James Bradford Ramsay, Esq.

National Association of Regulatory Utility

Commissioners

1101 Vermont Avenue NW, Suite 200

Washington, DC 20005 E-mail: <u>iramsav@naruc.org</u> **Connie Simkins** P.O. Box 1068 Caliente, Nevada 89008

E-mail: icciac@co.lincoln.nv.us

Kenneth P. Woodington Davidson & Lindemann, PA 1611 Devonshire Drive P.O. Box 8568 Columbia, SC 29202

E-mail: kwoodington@dml-Iaw.com

Signed (electronically) by

Momas R. Lottalall

Thomas R. Gottshall HAYNSWORTH SINKLER BOYD, P.A. tgottshall@hsblawfirm.com P. O. Box 11889 Columbia, SC 29211-1889 (803) 779-3080 Attorneys for Petitioner Aiken County