UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Before the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board

In the Matter of	;	
NUCLEAR ENGINEERING COMPANY, INC.) Docket No.	27-39
(Sheffield, Illinois Low-Level Radioactive Waste Disposal Site)		

MOTION BY NUCLEAR ENGINEERING COMPANY, INC. TO COMPEL INTERVENORS SCHIELER, ET AL., AND COUNTY OF BUREAU TO ANSWER NECO'S INTERROGATORIES AND TO COMPEL PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS

Background

Pursuant to the Prehearing Conference Order and Order Setting Time for Discovery entered by the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board ("Licensing Board" or "Board") in the captioned proceed. ... September 9, 1980, Nuclear Engilsering Company, Inc. ("NECO") now moves to compel answers to interrogatories and production of documents on the part of Intervenors Schieler, et al., and County of Bureau.

The Board's Order specifically required that any opjections to discovery be filed by October 20, 1980, and that all discovery as to which there was no objection be furnished by November 1, 1980. To date, NECO has received neither objections, answers nor any other discovery response from

8011190 35

503 0/1

^{1/} Each intervenor was served with separate interrogatories and requests for production of documents by NECO on October 10, 1980. Motion by NECO to Compel the State of Illinois to Answer at 1-2 (filed November 15, 1980).

Intervenors Schieler, <u>et al</u>., or the County of Bureau. Nor has any request for an extension of time, oral or written, been received.

Argument

Under the circumstances, both intervenors have failed to comply with the discovery Order of this Board. There is obviously no basis upon which either intervenor can possibly object to or otherwise oppose NECO's discovery at this time. The authorities which NECO has cited with respect to the responsibilities of parties in complying the the NRC discovery rules and Board orders in NECO's concurrently filed Motions to Compel are equally applicable here. For the sake of brevity, NECO hereby incorporates those pleadings by reference, to which the Board is respectfully referred for a complete discussion of the points upon which NECO relies. It is also noted that, on their face, all of NECO's discovery requests to each intervenor are relevant to the subject matter of this proceeding or reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence as required by 10 C.F.R. §2.740(b)(1).

^{2/} See generally Motion by NECO to Strike State of Tillinois' Objection to Discovery (filed October 30, 1980); Motion by NECO to Compel State of Illinois' Answers to Requests for Admissions and Interrogatories and to Compel Production of Documents (filed November 15, 1980); Motion by NECO to Compel NRC Staff Answers to NECO's Requests for Admissions and Interrogatories and to Compel Production of Documents (filed November 15, 1980).

Conclusion

For the reasons discussed more fully above, NECO's

motion to compel should be granted against each intervenor.

Respectfully submitted,

CONNER & MOORE

Tray B. Conner, Jr. 18MR

Troy B. Conner, Jr.

Robert M. Ralen

Robert M. Rader Counsel for NECO

November 15, 1980