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

Before Administrative Judges:

Michael M. Gibson, Chairman Dr. Gary S. Arnold Dr. Randall J. Charbeneau

In the Matter of

NUCLEAR INNOVATION NORTH AMERICA LLC

(South Texas Project Units 3 and 4)

Docket Nos. 52-12-COL and 52-13-COL

ASLBP No. 09-885-08-COL-BD01

May 5, 2011

## MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

(Denying Motion for Continuance of Evidentiary Hearing)

On April 22, 2011, Intervenors moved to continue the evidentiary hearing and related deadlines, including prehearing filings of which the first is due May 9, 2011. Both Applicant and Staff oppose the motion, although only Applicant filed an answer in opposition.

In support of its motion, Intervenors argue that because the Commission extended the time in which it may take sua sponte review of this Board's decision in LBP-11-07,<sup>3</sup> Intervenors cannot be certain if the Commission will review the decision, much less when the Commission might issue a ruling. According to Intervenors, time and resources associated with preparing for

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Intervenors' Motion to Continue Evidentiary Hearing (Apr. 22, 2011) at 1 (Motion). The Board and parties previously agreed to a schedule for evidentiary filings, beginning with written statements due by May 9, 2011, and culminating with an evidentiary hearing on August 17–19, 2011. Tr. at 1239-40.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Nuclear Innovation North America LLC's Answer to Intervenors' Motion to Continue Evidentiary Hearing (May 2, 2011) at 1.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Commission Order (Apr. 15, 2011) at 1 (unpublished).

an approaching August 17-19, 2011 hearing may be wasted if the Commission rules inadmissible one of the two remaining contentions.<sup>4</sup>

Intervenors styled their motion as a motion for continuance, common in federal and state court for postponing a hearing or trial until a later day.<sup>5</sup> Typically, such motions are filed in response to some unforeseeable event, such as the absence of a party,<sup>6</sup> counsel,<sup>7</sup> witness or evidence,<sup>8</sup> or unfair surprise and prejudice caused by an opposing party.<sup>9</sup> Although the Commission's rules of procedure do not expressly contemplate such motions, Boards have entertained them.<sup>10</sup>

However, where, as here, a party seeks to postpone indefinitely an evidentiary hearing as well as all prehearing filings, the moving party must address and justify the stay according to the four equitable criteria of 10 C.F.R. § 2.342(e).<sup>11</sup> They are (1) whether the moving party has

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Motion at 2-3.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> <u>See, e.g., Aruba Bonaire Curacao Trust Co. Ltd. v. Comm'r of Internal Revenue,</u> 777 F.2d 38, 43 (D.C. Cir. 1985); <u>Fontenot v. Upjohn Co.</u>, 780 F.2d 1190, 1194 (5th Cir. 1986); <u>General Motors Corp. v. Gayle</u>, 951 S.W.2d 469, 476 (Tex. 1997).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> Harvey v. Andrist, 754 F.2d 569, 572 (5th Cir. 1985).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> Smith-Weik Mach. Corp. v. Murdock Mach. & Eng'g Co., 423 F.2d 842, 844-45 (5th Cir. 1970).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> Indus., Invs. and Agencies (Bahamas), Ltd. v. Panelfab Intern. Corp., 529 F.2d 1203, 1213 (5th Cir. 1976).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> Conway v. Chem. Leaman Tank Lines, Inc., 687 F.2d 108, 112 (5th Cir. 1982).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup> <u>Cleveland Elec. Illuminating Co.</u> (Perry Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-841, 24 NRC 64, 76 n.37 (1986); <u>South Carolina Elec. and Gas Co.</u> (Virgil C. Summer Nuclear Station, Unit 1), ALAB-642, 13 NRC 881, 888 n.6 (1981); <u>Perry</u>, LBP-82-13, 15 NRC 527, 527 (1982); <u>Wisconsin Elec. Power Co.</u> (Point Beach Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2), LBP-82-10, 15 NRC 341, 345-46 (1982).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>11</sup> Although section 2.342 expressly speaks to "stays of decisions," we adopt the Commission's guidance that "the section 2.342(e) standards simply restate commonplace principles of equity universally followed when judicial (or quasi-judicial) bodies consider stays or other forms of temporary injunctive relief." Shieldalloy Metallurgical Corp. (License Amendment Request for Decommissioning of the Newfield, New Jersey Site), CLI-10-08, 71 NRC \_\_\_, \_\_\_ n.25 (slip op. at 7 n.25) (Jan. 7, 2010) (quoting Entergy Nuclear Vermont Yankee, LLC, and Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc. (Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station), CLI-06-08, 63 NRC 235, 237 n.4 (2006)).

made a strong showing that it is likely to prevail on the merits; (2) whether the party will be irreparably injured unless a stay is granted; (3) whether the granting of a stay would harm other parties; and (4) where the public interest lies.<sup>12</sup>

Intervenors' motion addresses only one of these equitable criteria, irreparable injury, and even then only indirectly. Intervenors claim that because the Staff has filed a petition for review with the Commission to overturn this Board's admission of contention CL-2, Intervenors' resources will be wasted preparing to adjudicate their contention if the Commission ultimately deems the contention inadmissible.<sup>13</sup>

The law is clear that litigation expenses associated with preparing for a hearing are precisely the type of resource expenditure that petitioners are expected to undertake when they intervene in the NRC hearing process. Longstanding Commission precedent dictates that "litigation expenses, even substantial unrecoupable cost[s] do[] not constitute irreparable injury" justifying a stay. Accordingly, Intervenors motion is denied.

It is so ORDERED.

FOR THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD

/RA/

Michael M. Gibson, Chairman ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE

Rockville, Maryland May 5, 2011

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>12</sup> 10 C.F.R. § 2.342(e).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>13</sup> Motion at 2-3.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>14</sup> <u>See, e.g., Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc.</u> (Indian Point, Units 2 and 3), CLI-09-06, 69 NRC 128, 136 (2009).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>15</sup> Id. at 135.

## UNITED STATES OF AMERICA NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

In the Matter of	
NUCLEAR INNOVATION NORTH AMERICA LLC (NINA)	Docket Nos. 52-012-COL and 52-013-COL
(South Texas Project Units 3 and 4)	) ) )

## **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that copies of the foregoing MEMORANDUM AND ORDER (DENYING MOTION FOR CONTINUANCE OF EVIDENTIARY HEARING) have been served upon the following persons by the Electronic Information Exchange.

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

Michael M. Gibson, Chair Administrative Judge

E-mail: michael.gibson@nrc.gov

Gary S. Arnold Administrative Judge

E-mail: <a href="mailto:gary.arnold@nrc.gov">gary.arnold@nrc.gov</a>

Randall J. Charbeneau Administrative Judge

E-mail: Randall.Charbeneau@nrc.gov

Katie Tucker, Law Clerk
E-mail: <a href="mailto:katie.tucker@nrc.gov">katie.tucker@nrc.gov</a>
Jonathan C. Esser, Law Clerk
E-mail: <a href="mailto:jonathan.esser@nrc.gov">jonathan.esser@nrc.gov</a>

Office of the General Counsel U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Mail Stop - O-15 D21 Washington, DC 20555-0001

Sara Kirkwood, Esq. Maxwell Smith, Esq. Michael Spencer, Esq. Jody Martin, Esq. Anthony C. Wilson, Esq. Andrea Silvia, Esq. Joseph Gilman, Paralegal E-mail: marian.zobler@nrc.gov sara.kirkwood@nrc.gov ioseph.gilman@nrc.gov maxwell.smith@nrc.gov michael.spencer@nrc.gov jody.martin@nrc.gov anthony.wilson@nrc.gov andrea.silvia@nrc.gov

Marian Zobler, Esq.

OGC Mail Center : OGCMailCenter@nrc.gov

Office of Commission Appellate
Adjudication
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Mail Stop: O-16C1

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

E-mail: hearingdocket@nrc.gov

Docket Nos. 52-012-COL and 52-013-COL MEMORANDUM AND ORDER (DENYING MOTION FOR CONTINUANCE OF EVIDENTIARY HEARING)

Morgan, Lewis & Bockius, LLP 1111 Pennsylvania Ave., NW Washington, DC 20004 Counsel for the Applicant Stephen J. Burdick, Esq. Steven P. Frantz, Esq. Alvin Gutterman, Esq. John E. Matthews, Esq. Kathryn M. Sutton, Esq. Charles B. Moldenhauer, Esq. Mary Freeze, Assistant E-mail:

sburdick@morganlewis.com sfrantz@morganlewis.com; agutterman@morganlewis.com jmatthews@morganlewis.com ksutton@morganlewis.com cmoldenhauer@morganlewis.com mfreeze@morganlewis.com Sustainable Energy and Economic
Development (SEED) Coalition
Diane Curran
Harmon, Curran, Spielberg, &
Eisenberg, LLP
1726 M Street N.W., Suite 600
Washington, DC 20036
E-mail: dcurran@harmoncurran.com

Sustainable Energy and Economic Development (SEED) Coalition Robert V. Eye, Esq. Brett A. Jarmer, Esq. April Middleton, Assistant Kauffman & Eye 112 SW 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Suite 202 Topeka, Kansas 66603

E-mail: <a href="mailto:bob@kauffmaneye.com">bob@kauffmaneye.com</a>
E-mail: <a href="mailto:april@kauffmaneye.com">april@kauffmaneye.com</a>

Southwest Workers' Union Lanny Alan Sinkin, Esq. 1801 Westlake Drive #212 Austin, Texas 78746

E-mail: lanny.sinkin@gmail.com

Sustainable Energy & Economic
Development (SEED) Coalition
Eliza Brown, Clean Energy Advocate
1303 San Antonio #100
Austin, Texas 78701

E-mail: eliza.seedcoalition@gmail.com

[Original signed by Nancy Greathead]
Office of the Secretary of the Commission

Dated at Rockville, Maryland this 5<sup>th</sup> day of May 2011