## BEFORE THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING APPEAL BOARD



By motion dated February 23, 1977, the Department of Justice moved the Appeal Board to (i) require submtssion of affidavits prior to oral argument on Applicants' "Motion to Stay Pendente Lite The Attachment of Antitrust Condftions," and (if) reopen discovery on data underlying affidavits when filed. The Department's motion follows the Appeal Board's Order of February 15, 1977 which, inter alia, requested counsel to be prepared to address, with particularity at oral argument on March 9, 1977, the irreparable injury, if any, which Applicants or others may suffer as a result of the stay, or the denial of a stay, of antitrust conditions ordered pursuant to the initial decision (antitrust) below. Counsel was also asked to be prepared to address with particularity public interest considerations, and the details of any interconnections which would be required pursuant to the initial decision. In Supplementary Remarks, Mr. Sharfman indicated that 10 CFR 2.730 (b) and (c) contemplate
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the use of "affidavits or other evidence" in support of motions or answers. The Department asserts in its motion that unless it is able to examine in advance of argument Applfcants' affidavits and record citations, it will be unable to reply meaningfully to such authorities at argument. The Department also asserts that in order to respond to Applicants' affidavits it will require discovery of the underlying data and analyses. The Department requested the submission of affidavits, underlying data, and record citations on March 2, 1977.

On February 24, 1977, the Appeal Board informed the parties that it desired responses to the Department's motion by February 25, 1977.

Inasmuch as all parties are familiar with the evidentiary record, and the undertakings eventually ordered by the Board such as "meaningful access" to nuclear units, transmission services, reserve sharing, and other such matters were the subject of both factual and expert testimony during the evidentiary hearing, it is the Staff's position that the parties should solely rely on evidence of record to support their arguments. That would obviate the need for both re-opening discovery and filing affidavits while providing "other evidence" as contemplated by 10 CFR $£ 2.730$.

Accordingly, it is the Staff's position that the Department's motion be denied but that in order to afford the parties an opportunity to prepare
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such record citations in lieu of affidavits, the Staff would also propose that the parties exchange record citations on Friday, March 4, 1977.

Respectfully submitted,


Counsel for NRC Staff

Dated at Bethesda, Maryland this 25 the day of February 1977.
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[^0]:    1/ New interconnections necessitated by the license conditions were not discussed at the hearing except for the principle of apportioning the costs of interconnections. New interconnections may not be necessary if Applicants are correct in their renewed motion that there are no isolated electric entities in the CCCT. As to the use of affidavits in this proceeding, cf. Department's Motion pp. 3 and 4 with Applicants' response, p. 3, n. 3 .

