

NUREG-0750

Vol. 47

Index 2

INDEXES TO NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION ISSUANCES

January – June 1998



U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Available from

Superintendent of Documents
U.S. Government Printing Office
P.O. Box 37082
Washington, DC 20402-9328

A year's subscription consists of 12 softbound issues,
4 indexes, and 2-4 hardbound editions for this publication.

Single copies of this publication
are available from
National Technical Information Service
Springfield, VA 22161

Errors in this publication may be reported to the
Office of the Chief Information Officer
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001
(301-415-6844)

NUREG-0750
Vol. 47
Index 2

INDEXES TO NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION ISSUANCES

January – June 1998

U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Prepared by the
Office of the Chief Information Officer
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001
(301-415-6844)

Foreword

Digests and indexes for issuances of the Commission (CLI), the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel (LBP), the Administrative Law Judges (ALJ), the Directors' Decisions (DD), and the Decisions on Petitions for Rulemaking (DPRM) are presented in this document. These digests and indexes are intended to serve as a guide to the issuances.

Information elements common to the cases heard and ruled upon are:

- Case name (owner(s) of facility)
- Full text reference (volume and pagination)
- Issuance number
- Issues raised by appellants
- Legal citations (cases, regulations, and statutes)
- Name of facility, Docket number
- Subject matter of issues and/or rulings
- Type of hearing (operating license, operating license amendment, etc.)
- Type of issuance (memorandum, order, decision, etc.)

These information elements are displayed in one or more of five separate formats arranged as follows:

1. Case Name Index

The case name index is an alphabetical arrangement of the case names of the issuances. Each case name is followed by the type of hearing, the type of issuance, docket number, issuance number, and full text reference.

2. Headers and Digests

The headers and digests are presented in issuance number order as follows: the Commission (CLI), the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel (LBP), the Administrative Law Judges (ALJ), the Directors' Decisions (DD), and the Decisions on Petitions for Rulemaking (DPRM).

The header identifies the issuance by issuance number, case name, facility name, docket number, type of hearing, date of issuance, and type of issuance.

The digest is a brief narrative of an issue followed by the resolution of the issue and any legal references used in resolving the issue. If a given issuance covers more than one issue, then separate digests are used for each issue and are designated alphabetically.

3. Legal Citations Index

This index is divided into four parts and consists of alphabetical or alpha-numerical arrangements of Cases, Regulations, Statutes, and Others. These citations are listed as given in the issuances. Changes in regulations and statutes may have occurred to cause changes in the number or name and/or applicability of the citation. It is therefore important to consider the date of the issuance.

The references to cases, regulations, statutes, and others are generally followed by phrases that show the application of the citation in the particular issuance. These phrases are followed by the issuance number and the full text reference.

4. Subject Index

Subject words and/or phrases, arranged alphabetically, indicate the issues and subjects covered in the issuances. The subject headings are followed by phrases that give specific information about the subject, as discussed in the issuances being indexed. These phrases are followed by the issuance number and the full text reference.

5. Facility Index

This index consists of an alphabetical arrangement of facility names from the issuance. The name is followed by docket number, type of hearing, date, type of issuance, issuance number, and full text reference.

CASE NAME INDEX

CONAM INSPECTION, INC.

CIVIL PENALTY; FIRST PREHEARING CONFERENCE ORDER (Telephone Conference, 1/14/98);
Docket No. 30-31373-CivP (ASLBP No. 98-735-01-CivP) (EA 97-207) (License No. 12-16559-01)
(Order Imposing Civil Monetary Penalty); LBP-98-2, 47 NRC 3 (1998)

HYDRO RESOURCES, INC.

MATERIALS LICENSE; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; Docket No. 40-8968-ML; CLI-98-4, 47 NRC
111 (1998); CLI-98-8, 47 NRC 314 (1998); CLI-98-9, 47 NRC 326 (1998)

MATERIALS LICENSE; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER (Granting Temporary Stay of Staff Licensing
Action and Ruling on Motions); Docket No. 40-8968-ML (ASLBP No. 95-706-01-ML); LBP-98-3, 47
NRC 7 (1998)

MATERIALS LICENSE; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER (Denying Petition to Intervene and Setting
Schedules); Docket No. 40-8968-ML (ASLBP No. 95-706-01-ML); LBP-98-4, 47 NRC 17 (1998)

MATERIALS LICENSE; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER (Denying Motion for Stay and Request for
Prior Hearing, Lifting of Temporary Stay, Denying Motions To Strike and for Leave To Reply);
Docket No. 40-8968-ML (ASLBP No. 95-706-01-ML); LBP-98-5, 47 NRC 119 (1998)

MATERIALS LICENSE; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER (Ruling on Petitions and Areas of Concern;
Granting Request for Hearing; Scheduling); Docket No. 40-8968-ML (ASLBP No. 95-706-01-ML)
(Re: Leach Mining License); LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 261 (1998)

MATERIALS LICENSE; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER (Denial of Motion to Disqualify Presiding
Officer); Docket No. 40-8968-ML (ASLBP No. 95-706-01-ML) (Re: Leach Mining and Milling
License); LBP-98-11, 47 NRC 302 (1998)

MATERIALS LICENSE; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER (ENDAUM and SRIC's Motion for
Reconsideration of LBP-98-9); Docket No. 40-8968-ML (ASLBP No. 95-706-01-ML) (Re: Leach
Mining and Milling License); LBP-98-14, 47 NRC 376 (1998)

INTERNATIONAL URANIUM (USA) CORPORATION

MATERIALS LICENSE AMENDMENT; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; Docket No. 40-8681-MLA
(Alternate Feed Material); CLI-98-6, 47 NRC 116 (1998)

LOUISIANA ENERGY SERVICES, L.P.

MATERIALS LICENSE; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER (Addressing NEPA Contentions); Docket No.
70-3070-ML; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 77 (1998)

MATERIALS LICENSE; ORDER; Docket No. 70-3070-ML; CLI-98-5, 47 NRC 113 (1998)

NORTH ATLANTIC ENERGY SERVICE CORPORATION

REQUEST FOR ACTION; DIRECTOR'S DECISION UNDER 10 C.F.R. § 2.206; Docket No. 50-443
(License No. NPF-86); DD-98-3, 47 NRC 71 (1998)

NORTHEAST UTILITIES

REQUEST FOR ACTION; DIRECTOR'S DECISION UNDER 10 C.F.R. § 2.206; Docket Nos. 50-245,
50-336, 50-423, 50-213 (License Nos. DPR-21, DPR-65, NPF-49, DPR-61); DD-98-1, 47 NRC 23
(1998)

REQUEST FOR ACTION; DIRECTOR'S DECISION UNDER 10 C.F.R. § 2.206; Docket Nos. 50-245,
50-336, 50-423 (License Nos. DPR-21, DPR-65, NPF-49); DD-98-4, 47 NRC 381 (1998)

NORTHERN STATES POWER COMPANY

REQUEST FOR ACTION; DIRECTOR'S DECISION UNDER 10 C.F.R. § 2.206; Docket Nos. 50-282,
50-306, 72-10; DD-98-2, 47 NRC 37 (1998)

CASE NAME INDEX

CASE NAME INDEX

- POWER INSPECTION, INC.
ENFORCEMENT ACTION; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER (Dismissing Case); Docket No. 30-20644-CivP (ASLBP No. 98-157-02-CivP) (Re: Order Imposing Civil Monetary Penalty); LBP-98-6, 47 NRC 140 (1998)
- PRIVATE FUEL STORAGE, L.L.C.
INDEPENDENT SPENT FUEL STORAGE INSTALLATION; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; Docket Nos. 72-22-ISFSI, 72-22-ISFSI-PFS; CLI-98-7, 47 NRC 307 (1998)
INDEPENDENT SPENT FUEL STORAGE INSTALLATION; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER (Rulings on Standing, Contentions, Rule Waiver Petition, and Procedural/Administrative Matters); Docket No. 72-22-ISFSI (ASLBP No. 97-732-02-ISFSI); LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)
INDEPENDENT SPENT FUEL STORAGE INSTALLATION; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER (Denying Motion for Reconsideration); Docket Nos. 72-22-ISFSI, 72-22-ISFSI-PSP (ASLBP Nos. 97-732-02-ISFSI, 97-732-02-ISFSI-PSP); LBP-98-8, 47 NRC 259 (1998)
INDEPENDENT SPENT FUEL STORAGE INSTALLATION; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER (Ruling on Motions for Reconsideration of LBP-98-7); Docket No. 72-22-ISFSI (ASLBP No. 97-732-02-ISFSI); LBP-98-10, 47 NRC 288 (1998)
INDEPENDENT SPENT FUEL STORAGE INSTALLATION; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER (Ruling on State of Utah Physical Security Plan Contentions); Docket No. 72-22-ISFSI (ASLBP No. 97-732-02-ISFSI); LBP-98-13, 47 NRC 360 (1998)
- SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY, *et al.*
REQUEST FOR ACTION; DIRECTOR'S DECISION UNDER 10 C.F.R. § 2.206; Docket Nos. 50-361, 50-362; DD-98-5, 47 NRC 390 (1998); DD-98-6, 47 NRC 396 (1998)
- TRANSNUCLEAR, INC.
EXPORT LICENSE; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; Docket Nos. 11004997, 11004998 (License Nos. XSNM-3012, XSNM-3013); CLI-98-10, 47 NRC 333 (1998)
- 21ST CENTURY TECHNOLOGIES, INC.
ENFORCEMENT ACTION; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; Docket Nos. 030-30266, 030-30266-CivP (License No. 42-23850-02E) (EA 96-170) (Confirmatory Order); CLI-98-1, 47 NRC 13 (1998)
ENFORCEMENT ACTION; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; Docket No. 030-30266-CivP (ASLBP No. 97-729-01-CivP); LBP-98-1, 47 NRC 1 (1998)
- U.S. ENRICHMENT CORPORATION
REQUEST FOR ACTION; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; Docket No. 70-7001; CLI-98-2, 47 NRC 57 (1998)
- YANKEE ATOMIC ELECTRIC COMPANY
LICENSE AMENDMENT; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER (Decision on Standing); Docket No. 50-029-LA (ASLBP No. 98-736-01-LA); LBP-98-12, 47 NRC 343 (1998)

DIGESTS
ISSUANCES OF THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

CLI-98-1 21st CENTURY TECHNOLOGIES, INC. (Fort Worth, Texas), Docket Nos. 030-30266, 030-30266-CivP (License No. 42-23850-02E) (EA 96-170) (Confirmatory Order); ENFORCEMENT ACTION; February 19, 1998; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

A The Commission grants a motion filed jointly by the NRC Staff and the Licensee for termination of a Confirmatory Order proceeding initiated by the Licensee. The Licensee had requested a hearing on the Order, which modified the license to require that the Licensee develop and implement certain written procedures, and develop, and submit for NRC approval, training and audit plans. The joint motion was filed following a settlement agreement reached by the Licensee and the NRC Staff (and approved by the Licensing Board) in a related civil penalty proceeding, which was also initiated by the Licensee.

B The Commission finds that the fundamental issue is the same in both proceedings: whether certain conditions in the license issued to 21st Century Technologies are justified on health and safety grounds. The Commission therefore concludes that good cause exists to terminate the Confirmatory Order proceeding in view of the approved settlement and termination of the civil penalty proceeding. For this reason, and because the terms of the Settlement Agreement suggest that the Staff and the Licensee will be able to reach mutually agreeable license terms, the Commission declines to undertake *sua sponte* review of the Licensing Board's approval of that agreement.

C The Commission looks with favor upon settlements. *Sequoyah Fuels Corp.* (Gore, Oklahoma Site), CLI-97-13, 46 NRC 195, 205 (1997).

CLI-98-2 U.S. ENRICHMENT CORPORATION (Paducah, Kentucky), Docket No. 70-7001; REQUEST FOR ACTION; March 19, 1998; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

A The Commission denies USEC's petition, submitted pursuant to 10 C.F.R. § 76.62(c), for review of the Director's Decision that partially denied USEC's request for an amendment to the Certificate of Compliance for the Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant. The Commission rejects all technical bases for the petition asserted by USEC and allows the Director's Decision to become final.

CLI-98-3 LOUISIANA ENERGY SERVICES, L.P. (Claiborne Enrichment Center), Docket No. 70-3070-ML; MATERIALS LICENSE; April 3, 1998; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER (Addressing NEPA Contentions)

A The Commission defers to and affirms the Board's finding in LBP-96-25, 44 NRC 331 (1996), that the proposed facility is unlikely to have a significant effect upon market prices for enrichment services, but also directed the Board not to give excessive weight to the price-effects finding, given the uncertainties of the future uranium enrichment market. The Commission further directed that the Board, in performing its ultimate cost-benefit balancing under NEPA, consider not only the facility's effects on market prices, but also the other benefits of the facility that are cited in the FEIS. The Commission affirms the Board's holding that the FEIS "no-action" section should be revised. Lastly, the Commission reverses the Board's holding that the FEIS not include any discussion of socioeconomic or "secondary" benefits, and instead holds that the NEPA cost-benefit analysis appropriately may consider and balance both negative and positive socioeconomic effects.

B The Commission also reverses in part and affirms in part the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board's Final Initial Decision, LBP-97-8, 45 NRC 367 (1997), ruling on environmental justice contentions. The Commission reverses the Board's requirement for a further investigation into racial discrimination in siting, and affirms the Board's requirement for further analysis of the disparate impacts on two impoverished African-American communities.

C The principal goals of an EIS are twofold: to compel agencies to take a "hard look" at the environmental consequences of a proposed project, and to permit the public a role in the agency's decision-making process. See *Robertson v. Methow Valley Citizens Council*, 490 U.S. 332, 349-50 (1989); *Hughes*

DIGESTS
ISSUANCES OF THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

- River Watershed Conservancy v. Glickman*, 81 F.3d 437, 443 (4th Cir. 1996). The EIS is intended to foster both informed decision-making and informed public participation, and thus ensure that the agency does not act upon incomplete information. *Marsh v. Oregon Natural Resources Council*, 490 U.S. 360, 371 (1989).
- D Although the statute itself does not mandate a cost-benefit analysis, NEPA is generally regarded as calling for some sort of a "weighing of the environmental costs against the economic, technological, or other public benefits of a proposal. See, e.g., *Idaho By and Through Idaho Public Utilities Commission v. ICC*, 35 F.3d 585, 595 (D.C. Cir. 1994); *Calvert Cliffs' Coordinating Committee, Inc. v. AEC*, 449 F.2d 1109 (D.C. Cir. 1971). The EIS need not, however, always contain a formal or mathematical cost-benefit analysis. See, e.g., *Sierra Club v. Lynn*, 502 F.2d 43, 61 (5th Cir. 1974), cert. denied, 422 U.S. 1049 (1975). See also Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) Regulations, 40 C.F.R. § 1502.23.
- E NRC regulations direct the Staff to consider and weigh the environmental, technological, and other costs and benefits of a proposed action and its alternatives, and, to the "fullest extent practicable, quantify the various factors considered." 10 C.F.R. § 51.71(d). If important factors cannot be quantified, they may be discussed qualitatively. *Id.*
- F Misleading information on the economic benefits of a project could skew an agency's overall assessment of a project's costs and benefits, and potentially result in approval of a project that otherwise would not have been approved because of its adverse environmental effects. See, e.g., *Hughes River Watershed Conservancy v. Glickman*, 81 F.3d at 446.
- G In assessing how economic benefits are portrayed, a key consideration of several courts has been whether the economic assumptions of the FEIS were so distorted as to impair fair consideration of the project's adverse environmental effects. *Id.* at 466 (citing *South Louisiana Environmental Council, Inc. v. Sand*, 629 F.2d 1005, 1011 (5th Cir. 1980)).
- H In NRC licensing adjudications, it is the licensing board that compiles the final environmental "record of decision," balances a proposed facility's benefits against its costs, and ultimately decides whether to license the facility. The adjudicatory record and board decision, and any Commission appellate decision, become, in effect, part of the FEIS. See, e.g., *Philadelphia Electric Co. (Limerick Generating Station, Units 1 and 2)*, ALAB-819, 22 NRC 681, 705-07 (1985).
- I To assist the NEPA cost-benefit analysis, the NRC ordinarily examines the need a facility will meet and the benefits it will create. See *Louisiana Energy Services, L.P. (Claiborne Enrichment Center)*, LBP-96-25, 44 NRC 331, 346-47 n.5 (1996) (and cases cited therein).
- J Although the Commission has the authority to reject or modify a licensing board's factual findings (see *Public Service Co. of New Hampshire (Seabrook Station, Units 1 and 2)*, ALAB-422, 6 NRC 33, 42 (1977); *Duke Power Co. (Catawba Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2)*, ALAB-355, 4 NRC 397, 403-05 (1976)), it will not do so lightly (see *Catawba*, 4 NRC at 403).
- K Under NEPA, the FEIS must include a statement on the alternatives to the proposed action. See 42 U.S.C. § 4332(2)(C)(iii). Generally, this includes a discussion of the agency alternative of "no action" (see 40 C.F.R. § 1502.14(d)), which is most easily viewed as maintaining the status quo. *Association of Public Agency Customers v. Bonneville Power Administration*, 126 F.3d 1158, 1188 (9th Cir. 1997).
- L The extent of the "no-action" discussion is governed by a "rule of reason." See *Citizens Against Burlington, Inc. v. Busey*, 938 F.2d 190, 195 (D.C. Cir.), cert. denied, 502 U.S. 994 (1991). The discussion need not be exhaustive or inordinately detailed. *Farmland Preservation Association v. Goldschmidt*, 611 F.2d 233, 239 (8th Cir. 1979). Such discussions typically are relatively short. See, e.g., *id.*; *Headwaters, Inc. v. Bureau of Land Management*, 914 F.2d 1174, 1181 (9th Cir. 1990).
- M The "no-action" analysis should contain a concise, descriptive summary comparing the advantages and disadvantages of the no-action alternative to the proposed action. See CEQ "Memorandum to Agencies: Answers to 40 Most Asked Questions on NEPA Regulations," 46 Fed. Reg. 18,026 (Mar. 1, 1981); see also 40 C.F.R. § 1502.14 (CEQ guidance). The section should state the principal reasons why the no-action option was eliminated from consideration.
- N Socioeconomic benefits such as new jobs and tax revenues are frequently termed "secondary" benefits because they ordinarily are not the primary reason cited to justify a project. NEPA does not bar an examination of secondary benefits.
- O A NEPA cost-benefit analysis for either reactor or nonreactor facilities, appropriately may consider and balance socioeconomic effects, both negative and positive.

DIGESTS
ISSUANCES OF THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

- P Executive Order 12898, 3 C.F.R. 859 (1995), on environmental justice, by its own terms, established no new rights or remedies. See E.O. 12898, § 6-609. Its purpose is to merely "underscore certain provision[s] of existing law that can help ensure that all communities and persons across this Nation live in a safe and healthful environment." See Memorandum for the Heads of All Departments and Agencies, 30 Weekly Comp. Pres. Doc. 279 (Feb. 14, 1994).
- Q An inquiry into racial discrimination in siting would go well beyond what NEPA has traditionally been interpreted to require. No agency or judicial decision has invoked NEPA to consider claims of racial discrimination. The Council for Environmental Quality's draft guidance focuses exclusively on identifying and adequately assessing impacts of the proposed action on minority populations, low-income populations, and Indian Tribes. It makes no mention of a NEPA-based inquiry into racial discrimination.
- R An agency inquiry into a license applicant's supposed discriminatory motives or acts would be far removed from NEPA's core interest: "the physical environment — the world around us, so to speak." *Metropolitan Edison Co. v. People Against Nuclear Energy*, 460 U.S. 766, 772 (1983).
- S Were NEPA construed broadly to require a full examination of every conceivable aspect of federally licensed projects, "available resources may be spread so thin that agencies are unable adequately to pursue protection of the physical environment and natural resources." *Id.* at 776. See also *Public Utilities Commission v. FERC*, 900 F.2d 269, 282 (D.C. Cir. 1990). NEPA gives agencies broad discretion to keep their inquiries within appropriate and manageable boundaries. See *South Louisiana Environmental Council, Inc. v. Sand*, 629 F.2d at 1011.
- T The site screening process is used by a license applicant to identify sites that may meet the stated goals of the proposed action. It is not uncommon for only one of many possible sites to be deemed reasonable. See, e.g., *Tongass Conservation Society v. Cheney*, 924 F.2d 1137, 1141-42 (D.C. Cir. 1991).
- U CEQ's implementing guidance provides that an EIS must "[r]igorously explore . . . all reasonable alternatives." 40 C.F.R. § 1502.14(a) (emphasis added). For those alternatives that have been eliminated from detailed study, the EIS is required merely to "briefly discuss" why they were ruled out. *Id.* Where (as here) "a federal agency is not the sponsor of a project, the federal government's consideration of alternatives may accord substantial weight to the preferences of the applicant and/or sponsor in the siting and design of the project." *City of Grapevine v. DOT*, 17 F.3d 1502, 1506 (D.C. Cir. 1994), cert. denied, 513 U.S. 1043 (1994) (internal quotation marks omitted).
- V Agency adjudications require advance notice of claims and a reasonable opportunity to rebut them. Our own longstanding practice requires adjudicatory boards to adhere to the terms of admitted contentions. See, e.g., *Brock v. Roadway Express, Inc.*, 481 U.S. 252, 264-65 (1987) (plurality opinion of Marshall, J.); *Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corp. v. Natural Resources Defense Council*, 435 U.S. 519, 553-54 (1978).
- W Adverse impacts that fall heavily on minority and impoverished citizens call for particularly close scrutiny.
- X "Disparate impact" analysis is our principal tool for advancing environmental justice under NEPA. The NRC's goal is to identify and adequately weigh, or mitigate, effects on low-income and minority communities that become apparent only by considering factors peculiar to those communities.
- CLI-98-4 HYDRO RESOURCES, INC. (2929 Coors Road, Suite 101, Albuquerque, NM 87120), Docket No. 40-8968-ML; MATERIALS LICENSE; April 16, 1998; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER
- A The Commission temporarily stays the effectiveness of the Presiding Officer's Memorandum and Order, LBP-98-5, 47 NRC 119 (1998), thereby staying the effective date of the materials license that the NRC Staff issued to Hydro Resources, Inc.
- B The Commission may issue a temporary stay to preserve the status quo without waiting for the filing of an answer to a motion for stay. 10 C.F.R. § 2.788(f). The issuance of a temporary stay is appropriate where petitioners raise serious questions that, if petitioners are correct, could affect the balance of the stay factors set forth in 10 C.F.R. § 2.788(e).
- CLI-98-5 LOUISIANA ENERGY SERVICES, L.P. (Claiborne Enrichment Center), Docket No. 70-3070-ML; MATERIALS LICENSE; April 30, 1998; ORDER
- A The Commission grants the motion filed by the applicant, Louisiana Energy Services, to permit it to withdraw its license application and terminate the proceeding. This renders moot all remaining issues in this case. The Commission therefore dismisses the pending petitions for Commission review of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Orders, LBP-97-3, LBP-97-22, and the Board's March 3, 1995 unpublished

DIGESTS
ISSUANCES OF THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

order ruling on LES's decommissioning funding estimate. The Commission also vacates these three Board orders.

- B While unreviewed Board decisions do not create binding precedent, where as here the unreviewed rulings "involve complex questions and vigorously disputed interpretations of agency provisions," the Commission chooses as a policy matter to vacate them and thereby eliminate any future confusion and dispute over their meaning or effect. *Cf. Kerr-McGee Chemical Corp.* (West Chicago Rare Earths Facility), CLI-96-2, 43 NRC 13, 15 (1996).
- C The *res judicata* or other preclusive effect of a previously decided issue is appropriately decided at the time the issue is raised anew.
- CLI-98-6 INTERNATIONAL URANIUM (USA) CORPORATION (White Mesa Uranium Mill), Docket No. 40-8681-MLA (Alternate Feed Material); MATERIALS LICENSE AMENDMENT; April 30, 1998; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER
- A The Commission denies three Petitioners' appeal of two orders by the Licensing Board which found that Petitioners lacked standing to participate in the proceeding.
- B Proximity alone does not suffice for standing in materials licensing cases. *See, e.g.*, Final Rule, "Informal Hearing Procedures for Materials Licensing Cases," 54 Fed. Reg. 8269, 8272 (Feb. 28, 1989); *see generally Georgia Institute of Technology* (Georgia Tech Research Reactor), CLI-95-12, 42 NRC 111, 115-17 (1995).
- C For Petitioners to qualify for standing, their asserted injuries from the action that would be approved by the license amendment must be distinct and palpable, particular and concrete, as opposed to being conjectural or hypothetical. *See, e.g., Steel Co. v. Citizens for a Better Environment*, 118 S. Ct. 1003, 1016 (1998); *Warth v. Seldin*, 422 U.S. 490, 501, 508, 509 (1975); *Sequoyah Fuels Corp.* (Gore, Oklahoma Site), CLI-94-12, 40 NRC 64, 72 (1994).
- D If Petitioners fail to respond to a Presiding Officer's reasonable and clearly articulated requests for more specific information regarding Petitioners' claims of standing, the Presiding Officer is fully justified in rejecting the petitions for intervention.
- E The Commission generally defers to the Presiding Officer's determinations regarding standing, absent an error of law or an abuse of discretion. *See Georgia Tech, supra*, 42 NRC at 116.
- CLI-98-7 PRIVATE FUEL STORAGE, L.L.C. (Independent Spent Fuel Storage Facility), Docket Nos. 72-22-ISFSI, 72-22-ISFSI-PFS; INDEPENDENT SPENT FUEL STORAGE INSTALLATION; June 5, 1998; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER
- A The Commission grants the petition filed by the applicant, Private Fuel Storage, L.L.C., for interlocutory review and reversal of the Chief Judge's ruling to create a separate board to consider all issues concerning its Physical Security Plan. While the Commission agrees with the Chief Judge that he has sufficient authority to establish multiple boards to adjudicate a single license application, and also agrees that assigning discrete issues to multiple boards may sometimes prove a useful tool for resolving proceedings expeditiously, it concludes that a second board was not called for here, given the procedural posture of the case. Once the initial Board rules on the admissibility of all pending contentions, including the security contentions, the Chief Judge may reconsider whether a second board would be desirable.
- B The Commission does not readily review interlocutory licensing board rulings, but will do so if a particular ruling (1) "[t]hreatens the party adversely affected by it with immediate and serious irreparable impact" or (2) "[a]ffects the basic structure of the proceeding in a pervasive or unusual manner." 10 C.F.R. § 2.786(g)(1) and (2); *see Oncology Services Corp.*, CLI-93-13, 37 NRC 419 (1993).
- C "[T]he Chief Administrative Judge of the Licensing Board Panel is empowered both (1) to establish two or more licensing boards to hear and decide discrete portions of a licensing proceeding; and (2) to determine which portions will be considered by one board as distinguished from another." *Public Service Co. of New Hampshire* (Seabrook Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-916, 29 NRC 434, 438 (1989) (footnote omitted).
- D The Commission expects the Chief Judge to exercise his authority to establish multiple boards only when: (1) the proceeding involves discrete and separable issues; (2) the issues can be more expeditiously handled by multiple boards than by a single board; and (3) the multiple boards can conduct the proceeding in a manner that will not burden the parties unduly.

DIGESTS
ISSUANCES OF THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

- CLI-98-8 HYDRO RESOURCES, INC. (2929 Coors Road, Suite 101, Albuquerque, NM 87120), Docket No. 40-8968-ML; MATERIALS LICENSE; June 5, 1998; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER
- A The Commission denies a petition for review of a Presiding Officer's order denying a stay request that Petitioners filed with the Presiding Officer, dismisses as moot a stay request that Petitioners filed directly with the Commission, and lifts a temporary stay that the Commission had issued in CLI-98-4, 47 NRC 111 (1998).
- B The Commission is willing to entertain petitions for review of interlocutory rulings in Subpart L cases in the rare situations where such rulings (1) threaten a party with serious, immediate, and irreparable harm or (2) affect the basic structure of the proceeding in a pervasive or unusual manner.
- C The Commission has the authority to consider a matter even if the party seeking interlocutory review has not satisfied the criteria for such review.
- D The mere issuance of important rulings does not, without more, merit interlocutory review. See *Sequoyah Fuels Corp.* (Gore, Oklahoma Site), CLI-94-11, 40 NRC 55, 63 (1994). Even legal error does not necessarily justify interlocutory review. Instead, Petitioners need to demonstrate that they are threatened with "immediate and serious irreparable impact which, as a practical matter, could not be alleviated through a petition for review of the presiding officer's final decision." 10 C.F.R. § 2.786(g)(1).
- E Section 2.1263 of the Commission's Informal Hearing Regulations provides that any request for a stay of Staff licensing action pending completion of an adjudication under Subpart L must be filed at the time a request for a hearing or petition to intervene is filed or within 10 days of the Staff's action, whichever is later. The Commission does not, however, construe section 2.1263 to preclude participants from later renewing their stay request, which was timely filed under this section, if they are subsequently threatened with serious, immediate, and irreparable harm.
- F For purposes of interlocutory review, irreparable harm does not qualify as "immediate" merely because it is likely to occur before completion of the hearing. Such a reading of the word "immediate" would stretch the definition of that word quite beyond recognition.
- G The Commission (and, earlier, the Appeal Board) have granted interlocutory review in situations where the question or order must be reviewed "now or not at all."
- H An alleged failure by the NRC Staff to comply with section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act does not "imply" the "irreparable" injury necessary for interlocutory review. To obtain such review, Petitioners are required to show the threat of irreparable harm, not merely to "imply" it.
- I Absent a clear congressional statement, adjudicatory tribunals should not infer that Congress intended to alter equity practices such as the standards for reviewing stay requests. The National Historic Preservation Act contains no such clear congressional statement.
- J A plaintiff seeking injunctive relief must prove irreparable harm; a mere violation of NEPA or other environmental statutes is insufficient to merit an injunction.
- K The National Historic Preservation Act contains no prohibition against taking a "phased review" of a property. Section 470(f) of that statute provides, in relevant part, only that a federal agency shall, "prior to the issuance of any license . . . take into account the effect of the undertaking on any district, site, building, structure, or object that is included in or eligible for inclusion in the National Register." Nor does federal case law suggest any such prohibition. The regulations implementing section 470(f) are ambiguous on the matter.
- L In such a fact-specific area of disagreement as the necessity for a stay, and at such an early stage of the proceeding, the appellate forum's deference to the trier of fact is quite high.
- M Just as procedural rulings involving discovery and admissibility of evidence or the scheduling of hearings rarely meet the standard for interlocutory review, likewise the Presiding Officer's denial of Petitioners' motion for leave to file a reply brief does not rise to the level meriting the Commission's interlocutory review. On such interlocutory matters, the Commission generally defers to the Presiding Officer.
- CLI-98-9 HYDRO RESOURCES, INC. (2929 Coors Road, Suite 101, Albuquerque, NM 87120), Docket No. 40-8968-ML; MATERIALS LICENSE; June 5, 1998; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER
- A The Commission affirms the Presiding Officer's decision not to recuse himself from the proceeding.
- B This agency has an established practice of refusing to use procedural technicalities to avoid addressing disqualification motions.

DIGESTS
ISSUANCES OF THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

- C Section 2.704(c) of the Commission's Subpart G regulations is meant to ensure both the integrity and the appearance of integrity of the Commission's formal hearing process. See *Long Island Lighting Co.* (Shoreham Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1), ALAB-907, 28 NRC 620, 623 (1988) ("parties in an adjudicatory proceeding have a right to an impartial adjudicator, both in reality and in appearance to a reasonable observer"), quoting *Metropolitan Edison Co.* (Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit 1), CLI-85-5, 21 NRC 566, 568-69 (1985). Because this rationale applies with equal force to Subpart L informal proceedings, section 2.704(c) should be applied to those proceedings as well.
- D Where the Presiding Officer himself revealed all the facts on which Petitioners based their motion to disqualify him, and where the scope of Petitioners' challenge calls into question neither his probity nor objectivity, the Commission does not believe that the failure to file an affidavit as required by 10 C.F.R. § 2.704 is fatal to the motion. This conclusion is also consistent with the Commission's practice of refusing to use procedural technicalities as a means to avoid reaching the merits of a disqualification motion.
- E Where a Presiding Officer's job discussions with a law firm representing a party to this proceeding ended more than 6 months before he was designated to sit in this proceeding, and where the firm toward which he is supposedly biased rejected his job application, the Commission sees no reason to conclude that the Presiding Officer's impartiality might reasonably be questioned under 28 U.S.C. § 455(a).
- F The Commission generally applies a very high threshold for disqualification when considering recusal motions. *Joseph J. Macktal*, CLI-89-14, 30 NRC 85, 92 n.5 (1989).
- G Where the Presiding Officer was not "seeking employment" with the law firm at or after the time he was designated as Presiding Officer in this proceeding, he did not violate 5 C.F.R. § 2635.604 of the Standards of Ethical Conduct promulgated by the Office of Government Ethics, which section applies only to executive branch employees seeking employment.
- H Section 2635.606(b) of 5 C.F.R. of the Standards of Ethical Conduct provides that, even where an offer of employment is rejected or not made, an agency "may determine that an employee" who has sought but is no longer seeking employment "shall nevertheless be subject to a period of disqualification upon the conclusion of employment negotiations." However, this regulation merely gives "the agency designee" (here, Chief Judge Cotter) the option of disqualifying an employee of his office from working on a matter, even though the employee had not run afoul of any specific provision of the Office of Government Ethics' regulations.
- I The Commission could exercise its inherent supervisory authority to disqualify the Presiding Officer. However, in the absence of any information that would present a concern as to the integrity of the process, the Commission declines to take such action.
- CLI-98-10 TRANSNUCLEAR, INC. (Export of 93.3% Enriched Uranium), Docket Nos. 11004997, 11004998 (License Nos. XSNM-3012, XSNM-3013); EXPORT LICENSE; June 5, 1998; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER
- A The Commission denies the Nuclear Control Institute's request for intervention and a hearing on two applications of Transnuclear, Inc., for licenses to export highly enriched uranium (HEU) to Canada. The Commission determines that the Petitioner is not entitled to intervene as a matter of right under the Atomic Energy Act, and that a hearing as a matter of discretion would not be in the public interest or assist the Commission in making the determinations required by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, for issuance of the export licenses.
- B Institutional interest in providing information to the public and the generalized interest of their memberships in minimizing danger from proliferation are insufficient for standing under section 189a.
- C The third criterion under section 134a(3) requires that the United States government have in place an active program to develop a low-enriched uranium (LEU) fuel or target for use in the particular reactor to which the HEU exports are being made.
- D The requirement under section 134a(3) of an active program for the development of an LEU fuel or target that can be used in the particular reactor to which the HEU exports are being made may be met where the Commission determines that the principals are acting in good faith toward concluding a formal agreement to complete the development of such a program.
- E Judgments of the Executive Branch regarding the common defense and security of the United States involve matters of foreign policy and national security, and the Commission can properly rely upon those judgments.

DIGESTS
ISSUANCES OF THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARDS

- LBP-98-1 21ST CENTURY TECHNOLOGIES, INC. (Fort Worth, Texas), Docket No. 030-30266-CivP (ASLBP No. 97-729-01-CivP); ENFORCEMENT ACTION; January 12, 1998; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER
- A In this civil penalty enforcement proceeding, the Licensing Board accepts the parties' proffered settlement agreement.
- LBP-98-2 CONAM INSPECTION, INC. (Itasca, Illinois), Docket No. 30-31373-CivP (ASLBP No. 98-735-01-CivP) (EA 97-207) (License No. 12-16559-01) (Order Imposing Civil Monetary Penalty); CIVIL PENALTY; January 21, 1998; FIRST PREHEARING CONFERENCE ORDER (Telephone Conference, 1/14/98)
- A The Atomic Safety and Licensing Board in a civil penalty proceeding issues an initial prehearing conference order setting forth rulings made during a telephone prehearing conference on January 14, 1998.
- B Prepared testimony is generally used in licensing proceedings, but there is no requirement to do so in enforcement proceedings.
- LBP-98-3 HYDRO RESOURCES, INC. (2929 Coors Road, Suite 101, Albuquerque, NM 87120), Docket No. 40-8968-ML (ASLBP No. 95-706-01-ML); MATERIALS LICENSE; January 23, 1998; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER (Granting Temporary Stay of Staff Licensing Action and Ruling on Motions)
- A Claims of irreparable injury to natural, historic, and religious resources from premining ground clearing activities present the type of potentially harmful activities the temporary stay provision (10 C.F.R. § 2.788(f)) was meant to prevent.
- B Potentially harmful action may be stayed until such time as a ruling can be made on the merits of a motion to stay the effectiveness of a Staff licensing action, usually until such time as the other parties have been given an opportunity to provide their answers.
- LBP-98-4 HYDRO RESOURCES, INC. (2929 Coors Road, Suite 101, Albuquerque, NM 87120), Docket No. 40-8968-ML (ASLBP No. 95-706-01-ML); February 9, 1998; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER (Denying Petition to Intervene and Setting Schedules)
- A By terms of section 2.713(a), the Commission's lack of tolerance for [undignified] conduct by attorneys applies equally to parties. Petitioners to become parties to NRC proceedings . . . are subject to the same requirements in their pleadings before [the ASLBP].
- LBP-98-5 HYDRO RESOURCES, INC. (2929 Coors Road, Suite 101, Albuquerque, NM 87120), Docket No. 40-8968-ML (ASLBP No. 95-706-01-ML); MATERIALS LICENSE; April 2, 1998; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER (Denying Motion for Stay and Request for Prior Hearing, Lifting of Temporary Stay, Denying Motions To Strike and for Leave To Reply)
- LBP-98-6 POWER INSPECTION, INC., Docket No. 30-20644-CivP (ASLBP No. 98-737-02-CivP) (Re: Order Imposing Civil Monetary Penalty); ENFORCEMENT ACTION; April 20, 1998; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER (Dismissing Case)
- LBP-98-7 PRIVATE FUEL STORAGE, L.L.C. (Independent Spent Fuel Storage Installation), Docket No. 72-22-ISFSI (ASLBP No. 97-732-02-ISFSI); INDEPENDENT SPENT FUEL STORAGE INSTALLATION; April 22, 1998; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER (Rulings on Standing, Contentions, Rule Waiver Petition, and Procedural/Administrative Matters)
- A In this proceeding concerning the application of Private Fuel Storage, L.L.C., under 10 C.F.R. Part 72 to construct and operate an independent spent fuel storage installation (ISFSI), the Licensing Board rules on (1) the issues of standing and admissibility of contentions relative to pending hearing requests/intervention petitions either supporting or opposing the application; (2) a 10 C.F.R. § 2.758 rule waiver petition; and (3) various administrative and procedural matters, including the use of "lead" parties and informal discovery.

DIGESTS
ISSUANCES OF THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARDS

- B** Longstanding agency practice requires that an individual, group, business entity, or governmental entity that wants to intervene "as of right" as a full party in an adjudicatory proceeding concerning a proposed licensing action must establish that it (1) has filed a timely intervention petition or meets the standards that permit consideration of an untimely petition; (2) has standing to intervene; and (3) has proffered one or more contentions that are litigable in the proceeding. See 10 C.F.R. §§ 2.714(a)(1)-(2), (b)(2). Further, the Commission has recognized that, notwithstanding a potential party's failure to meet the elements necessary to establish its standing to intervene as of right, it is possible, as a matter of discretion, to afford that participant party status. See *Portland General Electric Co.* (Pebble Springs Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2), CLI-76-27, 4 NRC 610, 614-17 (1976).
- C** Each intervention petition must be timely filed as prescribed in the notice of opportunity for hearing issued by the agency. For a petition that is not filed on time to be accepted for consideration, the participant seeking to intervene must demonstrate that a balancing of the five factors set forth in 10 C.F.R. § 2.714(a)(1)(i)-(v) support accepting the petition. Those factors include: (1) good cause, if any, for failure to file on time; (2) the availability of other means whereby the petitioner's interest will be protected; (3) the extent to which the petitioner's participation may reasonably be expected to assist in developing a sound record; (4) the extent to which the petitioner's interest will be represented by existing parties; and (5) the extent to which the petitioner's participation will broaden the issues or delay the proceeding.
- D** Relative to the question of standing as of right for those seeking party status, the agency has applied contemporaneous judicial standing concepts that require a participant to establish (1) it has suffered or will suffer a distinct and palpable injury that constitutes injury-in-fact within the zones of interests arguably protected by the governing statutes (e.g., the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (AEA), the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA)); (2) the injury is fairly traceable to the challenged action; and (3) the injury is likely to be redressed by a favorable decision. See *Yankee Atomic Electric Co.* (Yankee Nuclear Power Station), CLI-96-1, 43 NRC 1, 6 (1996). Further, when an entity seeks to intervene on behalf of its members, that entity must show it has an individual member who can fulfill all the necessary elements and who has authorized the entity to represent his or her interests.
- E** In assessing a petition to determine whether the requisite standing elements are met, which the presiding officer must do even though there are no objections to a petitioner's standing, the Commission has indicated that a presiding officer is to "construe the petition in favor of the petitioner." *Georgia Institute of Technology* (Georgia Tech Research Reactor, Atlanta, Georgia), CLI-95-12, 42 NRC 111, 115 (1995).
- F** A petitioner can be granted party status, as a matter of discretion, based upon the presiding officer's consideration of the following factors: (a) weighing in favor of allowing intervention are (1) the extent to which the petitioner's participation may reasonably be expected to assist in developing a sound record, (2) the nature and extent of the petitioner's property, financial, or other interest in the proceeding, and (3) the possible effect of any order which may be entered in the proceeding on the petitioner's interest; and (b) weighing against allowing intervention are (4) the availability of other means whereby petitioner's interest will be protected, (5) the extent to which the petitioner's interest will be represented by existing parties, and (6) the extent to which petitioner's participation will inappropriately broaden or delay the proceeding. *Pebble Springs*, CLI-76-27, 4 NRC at 616.
- G** When the facility to be licensed is to be located on a reservation of a Native American tribe that is wholly within the borders of a state, that state's asserted health, safety, and environmental interests relative to its citizens living, working, and traveling near the proposed facility and in connection with its property adjoining the reservation and the proposed transportation routes to the facility are sufficient to establish its standing.
- H** Assertion of standing based on general interests of one Native American tribe or its members in vast "aboriginal lands" that encompass tribe's existing reservation and reservation of second tribe on which facility to be licensed is to be built is inconsistent with the congressionally recognized status of the two tribes as distinct entities with separate reservations some 75 miles apart. Standing for the first tribe must, therefore, be established based on contacts of individual tribal members with the reservation of second tribe where the facility is to be located.
- I** Assertion that individual engages in activities in "the vicinity" of the location of the facility to be licensed is too general to provide him with standing as of right individually or in a representational capacity. See *Atlas Corp.* (Moab, Utah Facility), LBP-97-9, 45 NRC 414, 426-27 (description of activities as "near,"

DIGESTS
ISSUANCES OF THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARDS

- in "close proximity," or "in the vicinity" of facility in question insufficient to establish standing), *aff'd*, CLI-97-8, 46 NRC 21 (1997).
- J** Standing under 10 C.F.R. § 2.714 is not predicated on whether a petitioner wishes to take a position for or against a pending licensing application. Rather, it turns on the petitioner's ability to show that it has one or more cognizable interests that will be adversely impacted if the proceeding has one outcome rather than another. See *Nuclear Engineering Co.* (Sheffield, Illinois, Low-Level Radioactive Waste Disposal Site), ALAB-473, 7 NRC 737, 743 (1978).
- K** Nothing in the general terms of 10 C.F.R. § 2.714 governing intervention petitions exempts a discretionary intervention request from its late-filing provisions.
- L** Under factor one of the five-factor late intervention balancing test in 10 C.F.R. § 2.714(a)(1), an attempt to justify late filing as a reasonable failure to anticipate that a state's university community would not be willing to discuss the scientific merits of a proposed instate facility does not account for the precept that the failure of some other group to "carry the ball" does not constitute good cause for late filing. See *Texas Utilities Electric Co.* (Comanche Peak Steam Electric Station, Units 1 and 2), CLI-88-12, 28 NRC 605, 609 (1988), *reconsideration denied on other grounds*, CLI-89-6, 29 NRC 348 (1989), *aff'd*, *Citizens for Fair Utility Regulation v. NRC*, 898 F.2d 51 (5th Cir.), *cert. denied*, 498 U.S. 896 (1990).
- M** When lacking good cause for late filing under factor one of the five-factor late intervention balancing test set forth in 10 C.F.R. § 2.714(a)(1), a petitioner must make a particularly strong showing on the other four factors. See, e.g., *Duke Power Co.* (Perkins Nuclear Station, Units 1, 2, and 3), ALAB-431, 6 NRC 460, 462 (1977) (citing cases).
- N** Ability to file 10 C.F.R. § 2.715(a) limited appearance statements or otherwise provide a group's expertise to other participants generally is not pertinent under factor two of five-factor late intervention balancing test set forth in 10 C.F.R. § 2.714(a)(1) because it gives insufficient regard to the value of adjudicatory participation rights. See *Duke Power Co.* (Amendment to Materials License SNM-1773 — Transportation of Spent Fuel from Oconee Nuclear Station for Storage at McGuire Nuclear Station), ALAB-528, 9 NRC 146, 150 & n.7 (1979).
- O** Under factor four of the five-factor late intervention balancing test set forth in 10 C.F.R. § 2.714(a)(1), NRC Staff interests generally are assumed not to be coextensive with those of a private petitioner. See *Washington Public Power Supply System* (WPPSS Nuclear Project No. 3), ALAB-747, 18 NRC 1167, 1174-75 & n.22 (1983).
- P** In the five-factor balancing test for late intervention petitions under 10 C.F.R. § 2.714(a)(1), factor two — other means to protect petitioner's interests — and factor four — adequacy of existing representation — are accorded less significance in the balance. See *Texas Utilities Electric Co.* (Comanche Peak Steam Electric Station, Unit 2), CLI-93-4, 37 NRC 156, 165 (1993).
- Q** Interest in presenting "sound science" to presiding officer is laudable, but provides no basis for standing either as an interest cognizable for standing purposes or as one that will be the subject of actual or imminent injury upon the grant or denial of a license. See *Sheffield*, ALAB-473, 7 NRC at 743 (legal and nuclear organizations seeking to support low-level waste site renewal application lack standing because no showing that granting or denying application would injure any cognizable interest of either organization or its members); *Allied-General Nuclear Services* (Barnwell Fuel Receiving and Storage Station), ALAB-328, 3 NRC 420, 422 (1976) (when no showing of injury to cognizable interests of its individual members by licensing action, asserted ability of civil liberties organization and its members to provide information and data on civil rights issues inadequate to provide basis for standing).
- R** Of the six *Pebble Springs* factors for assessing a discretionary intervention request, factors one, four, five, and six are basically coextensive with the last four factors of the late-filing standard of 10 C.F.R. § 2.714(a)(1), with *Pebble Springs* factor one — assistance in developing a sound record — having significant sway. See *Pebble Springs*, CLI-76-27, 4 NRC at 616-17.
- S** For a proffered legal or factual contention to be admissible, it must be pled with specificity. In addition, the contention's sponsor must provide (1) a brief explanation of the bases for the contention; (2) a concise statement of the alleged facts or expert opinion that will be relied on to prove the contention, together with the source references that will be relied on to establish those facts or opinion; and (3) sufficient information to show there is a genuine dispute with the applicant on a material issue of law or fact, which must include (a) references to the specific portions of the application (including the accompanying environmental and safety reports) that are disputed and the supporting reasons for the dispute, or (b) the

DIGESTS
ISSUANCES OF THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARDS

identification of any purported failure of the application to contain information on a relevant matter as required by law and reasons supporting the deficiency allegation. See 10 C.F.R. § 2.714(b)(2)(i)-(iii). A contention that fails to meet any one of these standards must be dismissed, as must a contention that, even if proven, would be of no consequence because it would not entitle a petitioner to any relief. See *id.* § 2.714(d)(2).

T An adjudication is not the proper forum for challenging applicable statutory requirements or the basic structure of the agency's regulatory process. *Philadelphia Electric Co.* (Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station, Units 2 and 3), ALAB-216, 8 AEC 13, 20, *aff'd in part on other grounds*, CLI-74-32, 8 AEC 217 (1974). Similarly, a contention that attacks a Commission rule, or which seeks to litigate a matter that is, or clearly is about to become, the subject of a rulemaking, is inadmissible. See 10 C.F.R. § 2.758; *Potomac Electric Power Co.* (Douglas Point Nuclear Generating Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-218, 8 AEC 79, 85, 89 (1974). This includes contentions that advocate stricter requirements than agency rules impose or that otherwise seek to litigate a generic determination established by a Commission rulemaking. See *Pacific Gas and Electric Co.* (Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2), LBP-93-1, 37 NRC 5, 29-30 (1993); *Public Service Co. of New Hampshire* (Seabrook Station, Units 1 and 2), LBP-82-106, 16 NRC 1649, 1656 (1982); see also *Yankee Atomic Electric Co.* (Yankee Nuclear Power Station), CLI-96-7, 43 NRC 235, 251 (1996); *Arizona Public Service Co.* (Palo Verde Nuclear Generating Station, Units 1, 2, and 3), LBP-91-19, 33 NRC 397, 410, *aff'd in part and rev'd in part on other grounds*, CLI-91-12, 34 NRC 149 (1991). By the same token, a contention that simply states the petitioner's views about what regulatory policy should be does not present a litigable issue. See *Peach Bottom*, ALAB-216, 8 AEC at 20-21 & n.33.

U The scope of an adjudicatory proceeding is specified by the notice of hearing/opportunity for hearing and contentions that deal with matters outside that defined scope must be rejected. See, e.g., *Public Service Co. of Indiana* (Marble Hill Nuclear Generating Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-316, 3 NRC 167, 170-71 (1976); *Portland General Electric Co.* (Trojan Nuclear Plant), ALAB-534, 9 NRC 287, 289 n.6 (1979).

V Any issues of law or fact raised in a contention must be material to the grant or denial of the license application in question, i.e., they must make a difference in the outcome of the licensing proceeding so as to entitle the petitioner to cognizable relief. See 10 C.F.R. § 2.714(d)(2)(ii); 54 Fed. Reg. 33,168, 33,172 (1989). This requirement of materiality embodies the notion that an alleged error or deficiency regarding a proposed licensing action must have some significance relative to the agency's general responsibility and authority to protect the public health and safety and the environment. See *Seabrook*, LBP-82-106, 16 NRC at 1656 (safety contention "must either allege with particularity that an applicant is not complying with a specified [safety] regulation, or allege with particularity the existence and detail of a substantial safety issue on which the regulations are silent" (footnote omitted)); see also *Duke Power Co.* (Catawba Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2), LBP-82-116, 16 NRC 1937, 1946 (1982).

W The bald assertion that a matter ought to be considered or that a factual dispute exists so as to merit further consideration of a matter is not sufficient. See *Sacramento Municipal Utility District* (Rancho Seco Nuclear Generating Station), LBP-93-23, 38 NRC 200, 246 (1993), *review declined*, CLI-94-2, 39 NRC 91 (1994); see also *Connecticut Bankers Ass'n v. Board of Governors*, 627 F.2d 245, 251 (D.C. Cir. 1980). Nor does mere speculation provide an adequate basis for a contention. See *Yankee Nuclear*, CLI-96-7, 43 NRC at 267. Instead, a petitioner must provide documents or other factual information or expert opinion that set forth the necessary technical analysis to show why the proffered bases support its contention. See *Georgia Institute of Technology* (Georgia Tech Research Reactor, Atlanta, Georgia), LBP-95-6, 41 NRC 281, 305, *vacated in part and remanded on other grounds*, CLI-95-10, 42 NRC 1, *aff'd in part*, CLI-95-12, 42 NRC 111 (1995).

X With respect to documentary or other factual information or expert opinion alleged to provide the basis for a contention, the Board is not to accept uncritically the assertion that a document or other factual information or an expert opinion supplies the basis for a contention. In the case of a document, the Board should review the information provided to ensure that it does indeed supply a basis for the contention. See *Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corp.* (Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station), ALAB-919, 30 NRC 29, 48 (1989), *vacated in part on other grounds and remanded*, CLI-90-4, 31 NRC 333 (1990); see also *Public Service Co. of New Hampshire* (Seabrook Station, Units 1 and 2), CLI-89-3, 29 NRC 234, 241 (1989) ("where a contention is based on a factual underpinning in a document that has been essentially repudiated by the source of that document, the contention may be dismissed unless the intervenor offers another

DIGESTS
ISSUANCES OF THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARDS

independent source"); *Yankee Nuclear*, LBP-96-2, 43 NRC at 90 ("[a] document put forth by an intervenor as the basis for a contention is subject to scrutiny both for what it does and does not show"). By the same token, an expert opinion that merely states a conclusion (e.g. the application is "deficient," "inadequate," or "wrong") without providing a reasoned basis or explanation for that conclusion is inadequate because it deprives the Board of the ability to make the necessary, reflective assessment of the opinion as it is alleged to provide a basis for the contention.

- Y In framing contentions regarding a proposed licensing action, the focus of a petitioner's concern should be the license application. See 10 C.F.R. § 2.714(b)(2)(iii). In this regard, a contention that fails directly to controvert the license application at issue or that mistakenly asserts the application does not address a relevant issue is subject to dismissal. See *Rancho Seco*, LBP-93-23, 38 NRC at 247-48; *Georgia Power Co.* (Vogtle Electric Generating Plant, Units 1 and 2), LBP-91-21, 33 NRC 419, 424 (1991), *appeal dismissed*, CLI-92-3, 35 NRC 63 (1992).
- Z Although licensing boards generally are to litigate "contentions" rather than "bases," it has been recognized that "[t]he reach of a contention necessarily hinges upon its terms coupled with its stated bases." See *Public Service Co. of New Hampshire* (Seabrook Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-899, 28 NRC 93, 97 (1988).
- AA Incorporation by reference of one or more of the contentions of other petitioners is permitted in agency proceedings, albeit subject to the five late-filing factors set forth in 10 C.F.R. § 2.714(a)(1)(i)-(v) if adoption by reference is sought after the time for filing contentions has expired.
- BB As set forth in 10 C.F.R. § 2.714(a)(1)(i)-(v), the factors that must be balanced in determining whether to admit a late-filed contention are (1) good cause, if any, for failure to file on time; (2) the availability of other means whereby the petitioner's interest will be protected; (3) the extent to which the petitioner's participation may reasonably be expected to assist in developing a sound record; (4) the extent to which the petitioner's interest will be represented by existing parties; (5) the extent to which the petitioner's participation will broaden the issues or delay the proceeding. See, e.g., *Duke Power Co.* (Catawba Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2), CLI-83-19, 17 NRC 1041, 1046-47 (1983).
- CC Relative to the first factor set forth in 10 C.F.R. § 2.714(a)(1)(i)-(v) that must be balanced in determining whether to admit a late-filed contention, unavailability of proprietary documents does not provide good cause for delay in filing a contention when review of nonproprietary materials timely available indicates proprietary information was not necessary to the development of the late-filed contention. See *Catawba*, CLI-83-19, 17 NRC at 1043, 1045 (if contention's factual predicate otherwise available, unavailability of document does not constitute good cause for late filing); see also *Yankee Atomic Electric Co.* (Yankee Nuclear Power Station), LBP-96-15, 44 NRC 8, 26 (1996); *Philadelphia Electric Co.* (Limerick Generating Station, Units 1 and 2), LBP-83-39, 18 NRC 67, 69 (1983).
- DD Relative to the first factor set forth in 10 C.F.R. § 2.714(a)(1)(i)-(v) that must be balanced in determining whether to admit a late-filed contention, lacking good cause for delay in filing a contention, a petitioner must make a compelling showing on the other four factors. See *Commonwealth Edison Co.* (Braidwood Nuclear Power Station, Units 1 and 2), CLI-86-8, 23 NRC 241, 244 (1986). Factors two — no other means to protect the petitioner's interests in the contentions — and four — extent to which other parties can represent those interests — are, however, to be accorded less weight than factors three and five. See *id.* at 245.
- EE Relative to the five factors set forth in 10 C.F.R. § 2.714(a)(1)(i)-(v) that must be balanced in determining whether to admit a late-filed contention, in connection with factor three — sound record development — the Commission has directed that the proponent of a late-filed contention should, with as much particularity as possible, "identify its prospective witnesses, and summarize their proposed testimony." *Id.* at 246 (quoting *Mississippi Power and Light Co.* (Grand Gulf Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-704, 16 NRC 1725, 1730 (1982)).
- FF The standard for seeking a waiver of a rule or regulation in an adjudication is set forth in 10 C.F.R. § 2.758(b), which provides: "The sole ground for petition for waiver or exception shall be that special circumstances with respect to the subject matter of the particular proceeding are such that the application of the rule or regulation (or provision thereof) would not serve the purposes for which the rule or regulation was adopted." Procedurally, section 2.758(b) requires that the petition must be accompanied by an affidavit (1) identifying the specific aspect or aspects of the subject matter of the proceeding as to which the application

DIGESTS
ISSUANCES OF THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARDS

of the rule would not serve the purposes for which it was adopted, and (2) setting forth with particularity the "special circumstances" alleged to justify the waiver or exception requested.

GG Paragraphs (c) and (d) of section 2.758 state that a party's failure to make a prima facie showing on the section 2.758(b) rule waiver standard precludes further consideration of the matter, while a presiding officer that finds a prima facie showing has been made must certify the petition to the Commission for its consideration.

HH In connection with a 10 C.F.R. § 2.758 rule waiver petition, a petitioner seeking to establish a prima facie case that "special circumstances" exist such that the rule would not serve the purposes for which it was adopted must make three showings. First, relative to establishing the requisite "special circumstances" exist to support the waiver, the petitioner must allege facts not in common with a large class of facilities that were not considered, either explicitly or by necessary implication, in the rulemaking proceeding for the rule sought to be waived. See *Public Service Co. of New Hampshire* (Seabrook Station, Units 1 and 2), CLI-89-20, 30 NRC 231, 235 (1989). Put another way, the circumstances alleged must be unique to the particular facility at issue. See *Pacific Gas and Electric Co.* (Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-653, 16 NRC 55, 72-74 (1981). Speculation about future events is, however, an inadequate basis to establish the necessary "special circumstances." See *Public Service Co. of New Hampshire* (Seabrook Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-895, 28 NRC 7, 24-26, *rev'd in part on other grounds*, CLI-88-10, 28 NRC 573 (1988).

II Also with respect to the need to demonstrate "special circumstances" in requesting a rule waiver pursuant to 10 C.F.R. § 2.758, the petitioner must show application of the rule will not serve the purposes for which it was adopted. See *Seabrook*, CLI-89-20, 30 NRC at 235. Explicit statements in the statement of considerations are a primary source for determining the purposes for which the rule or regulation was adopted. See, e.g., *Seabrook*, CLI-88-10, 28 NRC at 598-600; *Seabrook*, ALAB-895, 28 NRC at 12. Further, in ascertaining a rule's purposes and whether those purposes would be impaired, it is permissible to consider future events the agency logically would have anticipated in promulgating its rules. See *Houston Lighting and Power Co.* (South Texas Project, Units 1 and 2), LBP-83-37, 18 NRC 52, 59 (1983). On the other hand, in seeking to establish that the rationale for the rule has been undercut, conjectural statements that merely highlight the uncertainty surrounding future events are not, in and of themselves, sufficient. See *Public Service Co. of New Hampshire* (Seabrook Station, Units 1 and 2), LBP-89-10, 29 NRC 297, 301, *rev'd*, ALAB-920, 30 NRC 121, *rev'd*, CLI-89-20, 30 NRC 231 (1989). Moreover, it has been established that a valid purpose for which the rule or regulation was adopted, within the meaning of 10 C.F.R. § 2.758, includes eliminating Staff case-by-case review of a generic issue in individual applications and removing such an issue from adjudication in any operating license proceeding. See *Seabrook*, ALAB-895, 28 NRC at 14, 16-17; see also *Carolina Power and Light Co.* (Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant), ALAB-837, 23 NRC 525, 547 (1986).

JJ The third showing that must be made by a 10 C.F.R. § 2.758 rule waiver petition is that the circumstances involved are "unusual and compelling" such that it is evident from the petition and other allowed papers that a waiver is necessary to address the merits of a "significant safety problem" relative to the rule at issue. *Seabrook*, CLI-89-20, 30 NRC at 235. Justifying a waiver, therefore, requires that a petitioner establish the issue raised is a significant safety problem, even if there clearly are special circumstances that undercut the rationale for the rule. See *Public Service Co. of New Hampshire* (Seabrook Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-920, 30 NRC 121, 129 (1989). Safety issues that are "conceivable" or "theoretical" do not fulfill this requirement, however. See *Seabrook*, CLI-89-20, 30 NRC at 243-44. Further, any claim of significance must be viewed in the context of any other protective measures that are in place to prevent safety problems. See *id.* at 244.

KK In accordance with 10 C.F.R. § 2.714(f)-(g), a presiding officer is authorized to control the general compass of the hearing by consolidating issues and limiting party participation to avoid the presentation of irrelevant, duplicative, or repetitive evidence. When some of a petitioner's admitted contentions challenging an application have been adopted by other intervenors, other contentions proposed by different parties challenging the application have been consolidated because of their related subject matter, and one of the parties has filed a single contention expressing general support for the application, it is appropriate to designate "lead" parties for the litigation of the various admitted contentions.

LL The party assigned the role of lead party has primary responsibility for litigating a contention. Absent some other presiding officer directive, the party with the lead role in support of a contention is to

DIGESTS
ISSUANCES OF THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARDS

conduct all discovery on the contention; file or respond to any dispositive or other motions regarding the contention; submit any required prehearing briefs on the issue; prepare prefiled direct testimony, conduct any redirect examination, and provide any surrebuttal testimony regarding the contention; and prepare posthearing proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law on the contention. The party that has the lead role in opposing a contention has similar duties, with its hearing responsibilities including conducting witness cross-examination and recross-examination and preparing rebuttal testimony as appropriate. For any given contention, the lead party is responsible for consulting with the other "involved" parties (i.e., any party that adopted its contention, filed a contention that has been consolidated, or has opposed the same contention) regarding litigation activities, but the ultimate litigating responsibility for the contention rests with the lead party.

- MM During an informal discovery process that includes the exchange of relevant documents and interviews with individuals with relevant information, parties are expected to be *specific* in their information requests and provide access to requested information and knowledgeable individuals to the *maximum* degree possible. Failure to participate in the informal discovery process consistent with the presiding officer's directives may result in appropriate Board sanctions.
- LBP-98-8 PRIVATE FUEL STORAGE, L.L.C. (Independent Spent Fuel Storage Installation), Docket Nos. 72-22-ISFSI, 72-22-ISFSI-PSP (ASLBP Nos. 97-732-02-ISFSI, 97-732-02-ISFSI-PSP); INDEPENDENT SPENT FUEL STORAGE INSTALLATION; April 23, 1998; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER (Denying Motion for Reconsideration)
- LBP-98-9 HYDRO RESOURCES, INC. (2929 Coors Road, Suite 101, Albuquerque, NM 87120), Docket No. 40-8968-ML (ASLBP No. 95-706-01-ML.) (Re: Leach Mining License); MATERIALS LICENSE; May 13, 1998; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER (Ruling on Petitions and Areas of Concern; Granting Request for Hearing; Scheduling)
- A Three petitioners in this 10 C.F.R. Part 2, Subpart L proceeding were admitted as parties after considering whether they had suffered injury in fact, whether they had filed timely petitions, and whether they had stated at least one valid area of concern. 10 C.F.R. § 1205(h). Other petitions for a hearing were denied.
- B Petitioners may have standing if they reside close enough to a planned project so that there is a reasonable apprehension of injury from implementation of the project. When the Staff of the Commission delays issuance of the full license that is applied for, the Staff's reluctance to act without further information is an indication of the reasonableness of petitioners' apprehensions of injury.
- C Even though a license is conditioned so that certain activities cannot be taken without further Staff approval, the scope of the license is not narrowed. A petitioning organization has standing to request a hearing if any of the activities under the license may cause injury to its interests or to one of its members.
- D A petitioning organization is not entitled to standing unless its member, on whom it relies for representational standing, specifies with particularity how the activities of the project will cause the member an injury.
- E An area of concern is relevant or germane to a proceeding if it falls within the scope of the challenged license application. The standards for admitting an area of concern are more lenient than for admitting contentions in Subpart G proceedings.
- F A party may ask a judge to participate in public meetings designed to facilitate settlement of the case. If a party seeks settlement negotiations in the judge's chambers, it must ask the Commission to authorize those negotiations.
- G In a Subpart L case, a presiding officer may propose ways of narrowing issues, of setting deadlines for completion of aspects of a case, of identifying issues for settlement on legal briefs, and for eliciting procedural suggestions from the parties.
- H An organization seeking standing as the representative of one of its members must submit a written statement authorizing it to be the representative and stating other facts necessary to establish standing. Unless there are special circumstances, the Presiding Officer has discretion to consider written statements that do not meet the formal requirements for an affidavit.
- I A presiding officer may make reasonable arrangements to assure that the admission of multiple parties will not cause unnecessary redundancy in the presentation of the case. The parties may be required to make reasonable arrangements to coordinate their presentations.

DIGESTS

ISSUANCES OF THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARDS

- LBP-98-10 PRIVATE FUEL STORAGE, L.L.C. (Independent Spent Fuel Storage Installation), Docket No. 72-22-ISFSI (ASLBP No. 97-732-02-ISFSI); INDEPENDENT SPENT FUEL STORAGE INSTALLATION; May 18, 1998; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER (Ruling on Motions for Reconsideration of LBP-98-7)
- A In this proceeding concerning the application of Private Fuel Storage, L.L.C., under 10 C.F.R. Part 72 to construct and operate an independent spent fuel storage installation (ISFSI), the Licensing Board rules on motions for reconsideration and/or clarification of its decision in LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998), admitting parties and contentions.
- B In the context of the record before the presiding officer, including the arguments of the participants, if the presiding officer's reasons for rejecting an intervenor's contentions "may reasonably be discerned," *Motor Vehicle Manufacturers Ass'n of the United States v. State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Co.*, 463 U.S. 29, 43 (1983) (quoting *Bowman Transportation, Inc. v. Arkansas-Best Freight Systems, Inc.*, 419 U.S. 281, 286 (1974)), the presiding officer has provided an adequate explanation for that decision.
- C If a party seeks to rely on information as a basis for admitting or rejecting a contention that clearly falls outside the stated scope of its original arguments, this is an impermissible ground for seeking reconsideration. See *Louisiana Energy Services, L.P.* (Claiborne Enrichment Center), CLI-97-2, 45 NRC 3, 4 (1997) (reconsideration motions may not rest on a "new thesis").
- D When similar aspects of other contentions have been rejected, consistency concerns counsel that the presiding officer consider a renewed argument regarding a comparable component of an admitted contention to ensure the presiding officer has not overlooked a similar matter. See *Philadelphia Electric Co.* (Limerick Generating Station, Units 1 and 2), LBP-83-25, 17 NRC 681, 687 (1983) (reconsideration asks that the deciding body take another look at existing evidence because evidence has been misunderstood or overlooked).
- E Attaching a document in support of a contention without any explanation of its significance does not provide an adequate basis for a contention. See *Louisiana Energy Services, L.P.* (Claiborne Enrichment Center), LBP-91-41, 34 NRC 332, 338 (1991).
- LBP-98-11 HYDRO RESOURCES, INC. (2929 Coors Road, Suite 101, Albuquerque, NM 87120), Docket No. 40-8968-ML (ASLBP No. 95-706-01-ML) (Re: Leach Mining and Milling License); MATERIALS LICENSE; May 26, 1998; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER (Denial of Motion to Disqualify Presiding Officer)
- A An administrative judge rules that he should not be disqualified as a judge because of employment negotiations that had been terminated over 6 months previously with the law firm that represents Licensee in this case. He states that the motion for disqualification inappropriately relies on 5 C.F.R. § 2635.604(a), which bars a government employee from serving in a matter if it will have a "direct and predictable effect on the financial interests" of an employee that "is seeking" employment.
- LBP-98-12 YANKEE ATOMIC ELECTRIC COMPANY (Yankee Nuclear Power Station), Docket No. 50-029-LA (ASLBP No. 98-736-01-LA); LICENSE AMENDMENT; June 12, 1998; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER (Decision on Standing)
- A In this Memorandum and Order concerning the application of Yankee Atomic Electric Company for approval of its license termination plan, the Licensing Board denies petitions for hearing and intervention on grounds of lack of standing.
- B Setting forth specific aspects of subject matter of the proceeding for which intervention is sought is not related to establishing standing requirements.
- C Filings not authorized by rules of procedure or leave of the Board are not considered in decisions.
- D Not all governmental or quasi-governmental entities are entitled to participate in NRC adjudicative proceedings.
- LBP-98-13 PRIVATE FUEL STORAGE, L.L.C. (Independent Spent Fuel Storage Installation), Docket No. 72-22-ISFSI (ASLBP No. 97-732-02-ISFSI); INDEPENDENT SPENT FUEL STORAGE INSTALLATION; June 29, 1998; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER (Ruling on State of Utah Physical Security Plan Contentions)
- A In this proceeding concerning the application of Private Fuel Storage, L.L.C., under 10 C.F.R. Part 72 to construct and operate an independent spent fuel storage installation, the Licensing Board rules on the admissibility of contentions concerning the Applicant's physical security plan (PSP).
- B For a proffered legal or factual contention to be admissible, it must be pled with specificity. In addition, the contention's sponsor must provide (1) a brief explanation of the bases for the contention; (2)

DIGESTS
ISSUANCES OF THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARDS

a concise statement of the alleged facts or expert opinion that will be relied on to prove the contention, together with the source references that will be relied on to establish those facts or opinion; and (3) sufficient information to show there is a genuine dispute with the Applicant on a material issue of law or fact, which must include (a) references to the specific portions of the application (including the accompanying environmental and safety reports) that are disputed and the supporting reasons for the dispute, or (b) the identification of any purported failure of the application to contain information on a relevant matter as required by law and reasons supporting the deficiency allegation. See 10 C.F.R. § 2.714(b)(2)(i)-(iii). A contention that fails to meet any one of these standards must be dismissed, as must a contention that, even if proven, would be of no consequence because it would not entitle a petitioner to any relief. See *id.* § 2.714(d)(2).

- C An improperly based challenge to a license application includes one that is rooted in a misreading or misinterpretation of the license application. See *Georgia Institute of Technology* (Georgia Tech Research Reactor, Atlanta, Georgia), LBP-95-6, 41 NRC 281, 300, *vacated in part and remanded on other grounds*, CLI-95-10, 42 NRC 1, *aff'd in part on other grounds*, CLI-95-12, 42 NRC 111 (1995).
- D There are two distinct inquiries involved in connection with the formulation of Intervenor PSP contentions: (1) whether to provide access to the security plan so the Intervenor can use it to draw up its contentions; and (2) what is the information — documentary, expert opinion, or otherwise — necessary to support the admission of the Intervenor's proffered contentions.
- E The Board-mandated requirements in *Duke Power Co.* (Catawba Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2), LBP-82-51, 16 NRC 167, 177 (1982), that an intervenor group obtain the services of a security expert and subject itself to a protective order as conditions of obtaining access to a security plan so it could then "develop" more specific contentions are prudent precautions in light of the potential sensitivity of the information in a security plan. Without those requirements, a Board would lack assurance that the individuals reviewing a plan on behalf of a petitioner both understand the need to afford the plan confidential treatment and are serious about formulating and pursuing contentions relating to the plan, as opposed to simply seeking access as a matter of curiosity.
- F An intervening State fulfills the *Catawba* preconditions for access when it (1) subjects itself to a Board-approved protective order governing its access to and disclosure of the information in the PSP; and (2) for access purposes provides the functional equivalent of a security plan "expert" by proffering one of the NRC-approved State officials designated by the State Governor under 10 C.F.R. § 73.21(c)(1)(iii), as having a "need to know" such that he or she should have PSP access and thereby become responsible for maintaining the requisite "information protection system" that will protect against unauthorized disclosures from the plan. See *id.* § 73.21(a).
- G In assessing whether to give an intervenor access to a security plan, there is no question about the seriousness of the intervenor's interest in challenging the plan when it commits, in the event the individual supporting its contentions is found not to be an expert, to obtain such an expert for the litigation of any admitted contentions (or to withdraw those contentions).
- H Once having PSP access, any contention an intervenor formulates is then subject to the same basis and specificity requirements as other contentions. Expert opinion support is not required for a contention, at least as long as there is other supporting information sufficient to provide the contention with an admissible basis.
- I When the individual put forth by an intervenor as sponsoring a contention is found not to provide "expert" support for the contention, in assessing the contention the presiding officer must then consider whether the other supporting information provided is sufficient to establish that the contention is admissible.
- J Although a revised rule will not become effective for six months, for the purpose of determining the admissibility of an intervenor's contention, the rule's adoption by the Commission gives it a regulatory force a presiding officer cannot disregard. See *Potomac Electric Power Co.* (Douglas Point Nuclear Generating Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-218, 8 ABC 79, 85 (1974).
- LBP-98-14 HYDRO RESOURCES, INC. (2929 Coors Road, Suite 101, Albuquerque, NM 87120), Docket No. 40-8968-ML (ASLBP No. 95-706-01-ML) (Re: Leach Mining and Milling License); MATERIALS LICENSE; June 30, 1998; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER (ENDAUM and SRIC's Motion for Reconsideration of LBP-98-9)
- A Intervenor's Motion for Reconsideration is denied.

DIGESTS

ISSUANCES OF THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARDS

- B In a Subpart L proceeding in which there are many areas of concern, the completeness of an application can be determined in the context of the areas of concern rather than as a separate area of concern. Incompleteness or contradictions in the application may be part of intervenor's case for its other areas of concern.
- C A Presiding Officer determines areas of concern. During the proceeding, proof may be submitted to supplement the application. Hence, the Presiding Officer's determination does not depend solely on whether an application is complete or orderly.
- D Material issues will be considered in a Subpart L proceeding, even if there must be some delay because some of the information concerning those issues is not yet available. The method of managing a case and scheduling the determination of issues is within the discretion of the Presiding Officer, who may choose to use a prehearing conference to obtain information relevant to this responsibility.

DIGESTS
ISSUANCES OF DIRECTORS' DECISIONS

DD-98-1 NORTHEAST UTILITIES (Millstone Nuclear Power Station, Units 1, 2, and 3; and Haddam Neck Plant), Docket Nos. 50-245, 50-336, 50-423, 50-213 (License Nos. DPR-21, DPR-65, NPF-49, DPR-61); February 11, 1998; DIRECTOR'S DECISION UNDER 10 C.F.R. § 2.206

A By a petition dated March 3, 1997, submitted by Albert A. Cizek (Petitioner), Petitioner requested that the licenses of the three Millstone nuclear reactors and the Haddam Neck nuclear reactor held by Northeast Utilities (NU or Licensee) be modified by placing certain conditions on the operating licenses of each of these facilities. The conditions would call for automatic and specific enforcement sanctions based upon the occurrence of certain violations or events. Petitioner alleged that the license conditions were warranted based on the Licensee's poor past performance including knowing, willful, and reckless past violations of NRC requirements.

B The Director of the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation issued a Director's Decision on February 11, 1998, concluding that the petition contained no information of which the NRC was not already aware and denying Petitioner's request for specific enforcement-related license conditions. The Director concluded that a mechanistic enforcement approach is neither necessary nor appropriate to ensure regulatory compliance at the Millstone and Haddam Neck facilities. Extensive efforts have been and are being taken by the Licensee to ensure that future operation of the Millstone units and the decommissioning of the Haddam Neck facility are accomplished safely. The NRC Staff has in place an extensive oversight program to ensure that the Licensee meets its objectives.

DD-98-2 NORTHERN STATES POWER COMPANY (Prairie Island Nuclear Generating Plant; Prairie Island Independent Spent Fuel Storage Installation), Docket Nos. 50-282, 50-306, 72-10; REQUEST FOR ACTION; February 11, 1998; DIRECTOR'S DECISION UNDER 10 C.F.R. § 2.206

A The Director of the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation denies a petition filed by the Prairie Island Indian Community pursuant to 10 C.F.R. § 2.206. The petition asked that the NRC: (1) find that the Licensee violate NRC regulations by using an independent spent fuel storage installation before establishing conditions for safely unloading TN-40 dry storage containers, (2) suspend the license until all significant issues concerning the unloading process have been resolved, (3) provide the Petitioners with an opportunity to participate fully in reviewing the unloading procedures for the casks, and (4) update the relevant technical specifications to incorporate mandatory unloading procedure requirements for the TN-40 dry storage containers.

DD-98-3 NORTH ATLANTIC ENERGY SERVICE CORPORATION (Seabrook Station, Unit 1), Docket No. 50-443 (License No. NPF-86); REQUEST FOR ACTION; March 17, 1998; DIRECTOR'S DECISION UNDER 10 C.F.R. § 2.206

A The Director of the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation denied a petition filed by The Seacoast Anti-Pollution League. The petition requested that the NRC: (1) suspend the operating license for Seabrook Station until such time as a thorough root-cause analysis of the reasons underlying the development of leaks in piping of the "B" train of the residual heat removal (RHR) system is conducted; (2) review weld documentation and inspection documentation in the leakage area; (3) review the qualification of the piping involved; (4) review the plant's quality assurance procedures for welds and piping; (5) address past allegations of improper welding and installation of substandard piping at Seabrook Station in its review and relate the alleged piping and weld deficiencies to other plant systems; and (6) delay the restart of Seabrook Station following repairs to the RHR piping system, pending completion of all requested actions. The Director concluded that no evidence was found of improper welding practices or substandard piping that contributed to pipe leakage or that would result in generic implications to other plant systems and that would require suspension of Seabrook's operating license.

DIGESTS
ISSUANCES OF DIRECTORS' DECISIONS

DD-98-4 NORTHEAST UTILITIES (Millstone Nuclear Power Station, Units 1, 2, and 3), Docket Nos. 50-245, 50-336, 50-423 (License Nos. DPR-21, DPR-65, NPF-49); REQUEST FOR ACTION; June 1, 1998; DIRECTOR'S DECISION UNDER 10 C.F.R. § 2.206

A By a petition dated February 2, 1998, submitted by the Citizens Awareness Network (CAN) and the Nuclear Information and Resource Service (NIRS) (Petitioners), Petitioners requested that the NRC take immediate action to revoke Northeast Utilities' (NU's or Licensee's) license to operate the Millstone nuclear power plants Units 1-3 due to both ongoing NU management intimidation and harassment of the NU workforce, as well as persistent NU defiance of NRC regulations and directives to create a questioning attitude that would allow NU employees to challenge NU management on safety issues without fear of harassment or reprisal. Petitioners also requested that the NRC refer the Nuclear Oversight Focus 98 List (list), the existence of which Petitioners believed buttressed their above claims, and reported NU management attempt to destroy the list to the Department of Justice (DOJ) due to a potential coverup.

B In a Director's Decision dated June 1, 1998, the NRC denied Petitioners' requests as described above. With regard to the request for license revocation, the Decision stated that, based on the NRC Staff's examination of NU's responses to NRC requests for information as well as independent NRC investigative efforts, the NRC Staff concluded that the wording at issue in the list was due to poor word choice rather than an effort by NU management to inhibit or suppress NU employees' ability to speak out on safety concerns. The Staff also concluded that the recall and destruction of the list by NU was an attempt to avoid continued dissemination of a document widely viewed to have been misinterpreted. The Staff noted the extensive efforts NU has made in the area of employee concerns, including the NRC-ordered use of an independent third-party organization to oversee NU efforts in this area. Petitioners' request for license revocation was therefore denied. Finally, the Decision explained that NU's recall of the list was not inappropriate given the facts, and that NU had no obligation to provide the list to the NRC. Accordingly, Petitioners' request to refer the list's recall to DOJ was also denied.

DD-98-5 SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY, *et al.* (San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station, Units 2 and 3), Docket Nos. 50-361, 50-362; REQUEST FOR ACTION; June 5, 1998; DIRECTOR'S DECISION UNDER 10 C.F.R. § 2.206

A The Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, denies a petition filed by Patricia Borchmann requesting that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) take immediate action to prevent the San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station (SONGS) Units 2 and 3 from restarting. In support of the requested action the Petitioner asserted a variety of safety issues concerning the SONGS units, including the adequacy of the emergency evacuation plans for SONGS, the size of the SONGS pressurizers, the condition of the SONGS Unit 1 membrane under the spent fuel pool (SFP) and SFP leak detection monitoring, loss-of-coolant accident dose calculations, the potential for criticality accidents due to the use of high-density storage racks in the SFP, the NRC's failure to comprehensively address issues that have been raised and the withholding of certain data, the production of tritium, and the cumulative effects of low-level radiation.

DD-98-6 SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY, *et al.* (San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station, Units 2 and 3), Docket Nos. 50-361, 50-362; REQUEST FOR ACTION; June 11, 1998; DIRECTOR'S DECISION UNDER 10 C.F.R. § 2.206

A The Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, denies a petition filed by Stephen Dwyer requesting that an investigation be conducted to determine if San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station (SONGS) Unit 2 has experienced degradation in the steam generator supports similar to that found in Unit 3, that further seismic analysis be performed for the SONGS steam generators, and that a retrofitting upgrade of the steam generator supports be accomplished at this time. As basis for the requests, the Petitioner stated that the ability of the SONGS steam generators to withstand a major seismic event is seriously compromised by the degradation observed in the SONGS Unit 3 steam generator internal tube supports during its 1997 refueling outage.

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX
CASES

- Advanced Medical Systems, Inc.* (One Factory Row, Geneva, OH 44041), ALAB-929, 31 NRC 271, 279 (1990)
discretionary interlocutory review of Subpart L rulings, Commission authority to grant; CLI-98-8, 47 NRC 320 n.3 (1998)
- Advanced Medical Systems, Inc.* (One Factory Row, Geneva, OH 44041), CLI-94-6, 39 NRC 285, 312 (1994)
justification for Commission imposition of license conditions; CLI-98-1, 47 NRC 14-15 (1998)
- Alabama Power Co.* (Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2), CLI-81-27, 14 NRC 795, 797 (1981)
burden on stay petitioner; CLI-98-8, 47 NRC 324 (1998)
- Allied-General Nuclear Services* (Barnwell Fuel Receiving and Storage Station), ALAB-328, 3 NRC 420, 422 (1976)
academic interest in a proceeding as basis for standing to intervene; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 270 (1998)
standing to intervene by organizations supporting license application; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 176 (1998)
- Allied-General Nuclear Services* (Barnwell Fuel Receiving and Storage Station), LBP-82-26, 15 NRC 742, 743 (1982)
academic interest in a proceeding as basis for standing to intervene; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 270 (1998)
- Amoco Production Co. v. Village of Gambell*, 480 U.S. 531 (1987)
statutory violation as a showing of irreparable harm for purpose of stay; CLI-98-8, 47 NRC 322-23 (1998)
- Amos Treat & Col. v. SEC*, 306 F.2d 260, 267 (D.C. Cir. 1962)
disqualification of judge for employment-related reasons; LBP-98-11, 47 NRC 304 (1998)
- Anson v. Eastburn*, 582 F. Supp. 18, 21 (S.D. Ind. 1983)
extent of discussion of alternatives in FEIS; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 99 n.16 (1998)
- Arizona Public Service Co.* (Palo Verde Nuclear Generating Station, Units 1, 2, and 3), LBP-91-19, 33 NRC 397, 410, *aff'd in part and rev'd in part on other grounds*, CLI-91-12, 34 NRC 149 (1991)
litigability of challenges to agency rules and regulations; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 179 (1998)
- Association of Public Agency Customers v. Bonneville Power Administration*, 126 F.3d 1158, 1188 (9th Cir. 1997)
definition of no-action alternative; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 97 (1998)
- Atlas Corp.* (Moab, Utah Facility), CLI-97-8, 46 NRC 21, 22 (1997)
penalty for failure to respond to presiding officer's requests for information; CLI-98-6, 47 NRC 118 (1998)
- Atlas Corp.* (Moab, Utah Facility), LBP-97-9, 45 NRC 414, 426-27, *aff'd*, CLI-97-8, 46 NRC 21 (1997)
standing to intervene based on description of activities as "near," in "close proximity," or "in the vicinity" of facility; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 171 (1998)
- Babcock and Wilcox* (Apollo, Pennsylvania Fuel Fabrication Facility), LBP-93-4, 37 NRC 72, 78 n.6, 94 n.64 (1993)
economic injury as basis for standing to intervene; LBP-98-12, 47 NRC 354 (1998)
- Babcock and Wilcox* (Apollo, Pennsylvania Fuel Fabrication Facility), LBP-93-4, 37 NRC 72, 80-81 (1993)
applicability of standing requirements in informal proceedings; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 270 (1998)
- Babcock and Wilcox* (Apollo, Pennsylvania Fuel Fabrication Facility), LBP-93-4, 37 NRC 72, 81 (1993)
test for standing to intervene in informal proceedings; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 269 (1998)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX
CASES

- Babcock and Wilcox* (Apolon, Pennsylvania Fuel Fabrication Facility), LBP-93-4, 37 NRC 72, 83-84 & n.28 (1993)
geographic proximity considerations for intervention in materials license proceedings; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 271-72 (1998)
- Babcock and Wilcox Co.* (Pennsylvania Nuclear Services Operations, Parks Township, Pennsylvania), LBP-94-4, 39 NRC 47, 49 (1994)
applicability of standing requirements in informal proceedings; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 270 (1998)
- Babcock and Wilcox Co.* (Pennsylvania Nuclear Services Operations, Parks Township, Pennsylvania), LBP-94-4, 39 NRC 47, 50 (1994)
injury-in-fact test for organizational standing to intervene; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 271 (1998)
- Babcock and Wilcox Co.* (Pennsylvania Nuclear Services Operations, Parks Township, Pennsylvania), LBP-94-4, 39 NRC 47, 51-52 (1994)
geographic proximity considerations for intervention in materials license proceedings; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 272 (1998)
- Babcock and Wilcox Co.* (Pennsylvania Nuclear Services Operations, Parks Township, Pennsylvania), LBP-94-4, 39 NRC 47, 52 (1994)
specificity of areas of concern at intervention stage; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 273 (1998)
- Bean v. Southwestern Waste Management Corp.*, 482 F. Supp. 673 (S.D. Tex. 1979), *aff'd mem.*, 782 F.2d 1038 (5th Cir. 1986)
forum for challenging land-use decisions alleged to be racially discriminatory; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 103 n.21 (1998)
- Bennett v. Spear*, 520 U.S. 154, 167, 117 S. Ct. 1154, 1163 (1997)
irreducible constitutional minimum requirements for standing to intervene; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 269 (1998)
- Bennett v. Spear*, 520 U.S. 154, 167, 117 S. Ct. 1154, 1167 (1997)
prudential standing requirements; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 269 (1998)
- Boston Edison Co.* (Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station), LBP-85-24, 22 NRC 97, 99 (1985), *aff'd on other grounds*, ALAB-816, 22 NRC 461 (1985)
geographic proximity considerations for intervention in materials license proceedings; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 271-72 (1998)
- Bowman Transportation, Inc. v. Arkansas-Best Freight Systems, Inc.*, 419 U.S. 281, 286 (1974)
licensing board responsibility to explain reasons for rejection of contentions; LBP-98-10, 47 NRC 290-91 (1998)
- Brock v. Roadway Express, Inc.*, 481 U.S. 252, 264-65 (1987) (plurality opinion of Marshall, J.)
scope of litigable issues; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 105 (1998)
- California v. Block*, 690 F.2d 753, 761 (9th Cir. 1982)
purpose of information disclosure function of EIS; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 88 (1998)
- Calvert Cliffs' Coordinating Committee, Inc. v. AEC*, 449 F.2d 1109 (D.C. Cir. 1971)
cost-benefit balancing required by National Environmental Policy Act; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 88 (1998)
- Carolina Power and Light Co.* (Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant), ALAB-837, 23 NRC 525, 547 (1986)
elimination of Staff case-by-case review of generic issue in individual applications and removing issues from adjudication as a valid purpose for adoption of a rule; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 239 (1998)
- Cherokee Nation v. Georgia*, 30 U.S. 1 (1831)
applicability of trust relationship doctrine to preclicensing hearing rights on materials license; LBP-98-5, 47 NRC 135 (1998)
- Chester Residents Concerned for Quality Living v. Seif*, 132 F.3d 925 (3d Cir. 1997)
forum for challenging land-use decisions alleged to be racially discriminatory; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 103 n.21 (1998)
- Citizens Against Burlington, Inc. v. Busey*, 938 F.2d 190, 195 (D.C. Cir.), *cert. denied*, 502 U.S. 994 (1991)
rule of reason applied to discussion of no-action alternative in FEIS; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 97 (1998)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX
CASES

- Citizens Against Burlington, Inc. v. Busey*, 938 F.2d 190, 197-98 (D.C. Cir.), *cert. denied*, 502 U.S. 994 (1991)
 consideration of secondary benefits in NEPA cost-benefit balancing; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 99 (1998)
- City of Carmel-Jy-the-Sea v. Department of Transportation*, 123 F.3d 1142, 1150-51 (9th Cir. 1997)
 purpose of information disclosure function of EIS; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 88 (1998)
- City of Grapevine v. Department of Transportation*, 17 F.3d 1502, 1506 (D.C. Cir. 1994), *cert. denied*, 513 U.S. 1043 (1994)
 weight given to applicant's preferences in consideration of alternatives; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 104 (1998)
- City of Grapevine v. Department of Transportation*, 17 F.3d 1502, 1507 (D.C. Cir. 1994), *cert. denied*, 513 U.S. 1043 (1994)
 NEPA-based inquiry into racial discrimination, need for; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 102 (1998)
- City of Grapevine v. Department of Transportation*, 17 F.3d 1502, 1508-09 (D.C. Cir.), *cert. denied*, 513 U.S. 1043 (1994)
 completion of National Historic Preservation Act review prior to agency approval of a project, need for; CLI-98-8, 47 NRC 324 n.16 (1998)
- City of Los Angeles v. National Highway Traffic Safety Administration*, 912 F.2d 478, 495 (D.C. Cir. 1990), *aff'd*, CLI-94-12, 40 NRC 64 (1994)
 distinction between standing determinations and assessment of petitioner's case on the merits; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 272 (1998)
- City of West Chicago, Illinois v. NRC*, 701 F.2d 632 (7th Cir. 1983)
 prelicensing hearing rights on materials license application; LBP-98-5, 47 NRC 135 (1998)
- Cleveland Electric Illuminating Co. (Perry Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 1)*, CLI-93-21, 38 NRC 87, 93-94 (1993)
 injury alleged to occur because of a change in agency procedure as basis for area of concern; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 281 n.45 (1998)
- Cleveland Electric Illuminating Co. (Perry Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 1)*, CLI-93-21, 38 NRC 87, 95 n.10 (1993)
 distinction between standing determinations and assessment of petitioner's case on the merits; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 272 (1998)
- Colorado River Tribes v. Marsh*, 605 F. Supp. 1425, 1439-40 & n.11 (C.D. Calif. 1985)
 implication of harm as basis for stay request; CLI-98-8, 47 NRC 322 (1998)
- Combustion Engineering, Inc. (Hematite Fuel Fabrication Facility)*, LBP-89-23, 30 NRC 140, 145 (1989)
 authorization for representational standing; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 271 (1998)
- Commonwealth Edison Co. (Braidwood Nuclear Power Station, Units 1 and 2)*, CLI-86-8, 23 NRC 241, 244 (1986)
 showing on other four factors where good cause for late filing is not demonstrated; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 208, 211 (1998)
- Connecticut Bankers Association v. Board of Governors*, 627 F.2d 245, 251 (D.C. Cir. 1980)
 factual support as contention basis, need for; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 180 (1998)
- Conservation Law Foundation v. Busey*, 79 F.3d 1250, 1272 (1st Cir. 1996)
 violation of NEPA as cause for injunctive relief; CLI-98-8, 47 NRC 323 n.13 (1998)
- Continental Airlines Corp.*, 901 F.2d 1259, 1262 (5th Cir. 1990), *cert. denied*, 113 S. Ct. 87 (1992)
 disqualification of judge for employer-related reasons; LBP-98-11, 47 NRC 304 (1998)
- Curators of the University of Missouri*, CLI-95-17, 42 NRC 229, 232-33 n.1 (1995)
 conduct of petitioners; LBP-98-4, 47 NRC 19 (1998)
- Curators of the University of Missouri*, LBP-90-18, 31 NRC 559, 565 (1990)
 purpose of organization as defining scope of injury to member of organization; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 271 n.15 (1998)
- Dailey v. City of Lawton*, 425 F.2d 1037 (10th Cir. 1970)
 forum for challenging land-use decisions alleged to be racially discriminatory; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 103 n.21 (1998)
- Dellums v. NRC*, 863 F.2d 968, 971 (D.C. Cir. 1988)
 test for standing to intervene in informal proceedings; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 269 (1998)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX
CASES

- Detroit Edison Co.* (Enrico Fermi Atomic Power Plant, Unit 2), LBP-78-11, 7 NRC 381, 388, *aff'd*, ALAB-470, 7 NRC 473 (1978)
economic interests as basis for standing to intervene; LBP-98-12, 47 NRC 358 (1998)
- Detroit Edison Co.* (Enrico Fermi Atomic Power Plant, Unit 2), LBP-78-37, 8 NRC 575, 583 (1978)
authorization for representational standing to intervene; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 271 (1998)
- Duke Power Co.* (Amendment to Materials License SNM-1773 — Transportation of Spent Fuel from Oconee Nuclear Station for Storage at McGuire Nuclear Station), ALAB-528, 9 NRC 146, 150 & n.7 (1979)
limited appearance statement as other means to protect late intervention petitioner's interests; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 173 (1998)
- Duke Power Co.* (Catawba Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-355, 4 NRC 397, 403-05 (1976)
Commission authority to reject or modify a licensing board's factual findings; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 93 (1998)
- Duke Power Co.* (Catawba Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-687, 16 NRC 460, 467 (1982), *rev'd on other grounds*, CLI-83-19, 17 NRC 1041 (1983)
conditional admission of security plan contentions; LBP-98-13, 47 NRC 366 n.4 (1998)
- Duke Power Co.* (Catawba Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2), CLI-83-19, 17 NRC 1041, 1043, 1045 (1983)
lack of good cause for late filing where contention's factual predicate is otherwise available; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 208 (1998)
- Duke Power Co.* (Catawba Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2), CLI-83-19, 17 NRC 1041, 1046-47 (1983)
criteria for admitting late-filed contentions; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 183 (1998)
- Duke Power Co.* (Catawba Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2), LBP-81-1, 13 NRC 27, 33 (1981)
considerations in determining a petitioner's ability to contribute to a sound record; LBP-98-12, 47 NRC 357 (1998)
- Duke Power Co.* (Catawba Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2), LBP-82-51, 16 NRC 167, 177 (1982)
conditions under which an intervenor may pursue security plan contentions; LBP-98-13, 47 NRC 366 (1998)
- Duke Power Co.* (Catawba Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2), LBP-82-116, 16 NRC 1937, 1946 (1982)
materiality of safety contentions; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 180 (1998)
- Duke Power Co.* (Perkins Nuclear Station, Units 1, 2, and 3), ALAB-431, 6 NRC 460, 462 (1977)
showing necessary on other factors where good cause is lacking for late filing; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 173 (1998)
- East-Bibb Twiggs Neighborhood Association v. Macon Bibb Planning & Zoning Commission*, 896 F.2d 1264 (11th Cir. 1989)
forum for challenging land-use decisions alleged to be racially discriminatory; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 103 n.21 (1998)
- Energy Fuels Nuclear, Inc.* LBP-97-10, 45 NRC 429, 430-32 (1997)
showing necessary to demonstrate standing, guidance from presiding officer on; CLI-98-6, 47 NRC 117 (1998)
- Enos v. Marsh*, 769 F.2d 1363, 1373 (9th Cir. 1985)
scope of FEIS analysis of licensing impacts on property value; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 109 n.27 (1998)
- Envirocare of Utah, Inc.*, LBP-92-8, 35 NRC 167, 172 (1992)
judicial concepts of standing applied in NRC proceedings; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 269 (1998)
- Envirocare of Utah, Inc.*, LBP-92-8, 35 NRC 167, 173 (1992)
test for standing to intervene in informal proceedings; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 269 (1998)
- Farmland Preservation Association v. Goidschmidt*, 611 F.2d 233, 239 (8th Cir. 1979)
extent of discussion of no-action alternative in FEIS; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 97 (1998)
- Florida Power and Light Co.* (St. Lucie Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2), CLI-89-21, 30 NRC 325, 329 (1989)
authorization for representational standing; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 270 (1998)
- Florida Power and Light Co.* (St. Lucie Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2), CLI-89-21, 30 NRC 325, 329-30 (1989)
geographic proximity as basis for standing to intervene in license amendment proceedings; LBP-98-12, 47 NRC 355 (1998)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX

CAEES

- Florida Power and Light Co.* (St. Lucie Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2), CLI-89-21, 30 NRC 325, 329-30 (1980)
injury in fact for standing to intervene in cases without obvious offsite implications; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 273 (1998)
injury-in-fact test for organizational standing to intervene; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 271 (1998)
- Florida Power and Light Co.* (Turkey Point Nuclear Generating Plant, Units 3 and 4), ALAB-952, 33 NRC 521, 528-30 (1991)
injury in fact to organizational interests; LBP-98-12, 47 NRC 347 (1998)
- Flynn v. United States By and Through Eggers*, 786 F.2d 586, 591 (3d Cir. 1986)
absent clear Congressional statement, adjudicatory boards cannot infer that standards for reviewing stay requests have changed; CLI-98-8, 47 NRC 323 n.13 (1998)
- Forest Conservation Council v. United States Forest Service*, 66 F.3d 1489, 1496 (9th Cir. 1995)
violation of NEPA as cause for injunctive relief; CLI-98-8, 47 NRC 323 n.13 (1998)
- Fund for Animals v. Lujan*, 962 F.2d 1391, 1400 (9th Cir. 1992)
violation of NEPA as cause for injunctive relief; CLI-98-8, 47 NRC 323 n.13 (1998)
- Gannett Satellite Information Network, Inc. v. Berger*, 894 F.2d 61, 67 (3d Cir. 1990)
government responsibility for actions taken by a private licensee; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 106 n.23 (1998)
- General Public Utilities Nuclear Corp.* (Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit 1), ALAB-881, 26 NRC 465, 473 (1987)
Commission standard for overturning a hearing judge's findings; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 93 (1998)
- Georgia Institute of Technology* (Georgia Tech Research Reactor, Atlanta, Georgia), CLI-95-12, 42 NRC 111, 115 (1995)
construction of petition in favor of petitioner in determining standing to intervene; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 168 (1998)
organizational standing to intervene on the basis of individual member's interests; LBP-98-12, 47 NRC 346-47 (1998)
- Georgia Institute of Technology* (Georgia Tech Research Reactor, Atlanta, Georgia), CLI-95-12, 42 NRC 111, 115-17 (1995)
proximity as basis for standing in materials license amendment proceeding; CLI-98-6, 47 NRC 117 n.1 (1998)
- Georgia Institute of Technology* (Georgia Tech Research Reactor, Atlanta, Georgia), CLI-95-12, 42 NRC 111, 116 (1995)
weight given to licensing board rulings on standing to intervene; CLI-98-8, 47 NRC 325 n.19 (1998)
weight given to presiding officer's determinations regarding standing; CLI-98-6, 47 NRC 118 (1998)
- Georgia Institute of Technology* (Georgia Tech Research Reactor, Atlanta, Georgia), LBP-95-6, 41 NRC 281, 300, vacated in part and remanded on other grounds, CLI-95-10, 42 NRC 1, *aff'd in part on other grounds*, CLI-95-12, 42 NRC 111 (1995)
improperly based challenge to license application; LBP-98-13, 47 NRC 365 n.3 (1998)
- Georgia Institute of Technology* (Georgia Tech Research Reactor, Atlanta, Georgia), LBP-95-6, 41 NRC 281, 305, vacated in part and remanded on other grounds, CLI-95-10, 42 NRC 1, *aff'd in part*, CLI-95-12, 42 NRC 111 (1995)
factual support as contention basis, need for; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 180-81 (1998)
- Georgia Power Co.* (Vogtle Electric Generating Plant, Units 1 and 2), CLI-93-16, 38 NRC 25, 32 (1993)
injury-in-fact and zone-of-interests requirements for standing to intervene; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 269 (1998)
standard for grant of organizational standing to intervene; LBP-98-12, 47 NRC 347 (1998)
test for standing to intervene in informal proceedings; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 269 (1998)
- Georgia Power Co.* (Vogtle Electric Generating Plant, Units 1 and 2), CLI-94-5, 39 NRC 190, 193 (1994)
"now or never" situation for interlocutory review; CLI-98-8, 47 NRC 321 n.7 (1998)
- Georgia Power Co.* (Vogtle Electric Generating Plant, Units 1 and 2), CLI-94-15, 40 NRC 319, 321 (1994)
legal error as justification for interlocutory review of Subpart L rulings; CLI-98-8, 47 NRC 320 n.4 (1998)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX
CASES

- Georgia Power Co.* (Vogtle Electric Generating Plant, Units 1 and 2), CLI-95-15, 42 NRC 181, 184 (1995)
"now or never" situation for interlocutory review; CLI-98-8, 47 NRC 321 n.7 (1998)
- Georgia Power Co.* (Vogtle Electric Generating Plant, Units 1 and 2), LBP-90-29, 32 NRC 89, 92 (1990)
authorization for representational standing to intervene; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 271 (1998)
- Georgia Power Co.* (Vogtle Electric Generating Plant, Units 1 and 2), LBP-91-21, 33 NRC 419, 424 (1991), *appeal dismissed*, CLI-92-3, 35 NRC 63 (1992)
dismissal of contentions for failure to directly controvert the license application; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 181 (1998)
- Griggs v. Duke Power Co.*, 401 U.S. 424 (1971)
basis for racial discrimination; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 105 n.22 (1998)
- Gulf States Utilities Co.* (River Bend Station, Unit 1), CLI-94-10, 40 NRC 43, 47-48 (1994)
weight given to licensing board rulings on standing to intervene; CLI-98-8, 47 NRC 325 n.19 (1998)
- Hall v. Small Business Administration*, 695 F.2d 175, 178, 180 (5th Cir. 1983)
disqualification of a judge because of a staff member's conflict of interest; LBP-98-11, 47 NRC 304 (1998)
- Headwaters, Inc. v. Bureau of Land Management*, 914 F.2d 1174, 1181 (9th Cir. 1990)
extent of discussion of no-action alternative in FEIS; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 97 (1998)
- Houston Lighting and Power Co.* (Allens Creek Nuclear Generating Station, Unit 1), ALAB-535, 9 NRC 377, 389-400 (1979)
authority of presiding officer to accept veracity of petitioners' assertions of residence and injury; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 275 (1998)
- Houston Lighting and Power Co.* (Allens Creek Nuclear Generating Station, Unit 1), ALAB-535, 9 NRC 377, 390-96 (1979)
injury in fact to individual member as basis for representational standing; LBP-98-12, 47 NRC 355 (1998)
- Houston Lighting and Power Co.* (Allens Creek Nuclear Generating Station, Unit 1), ALAB-535, 9 NRC 377, 393-94, 396 (1979)
injury-in-fact test for organizational standing to intervene; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 271 (1998)
- Houston Lighting and Power Co.* (Allens Creek Nuclear Generating Station, Unit 1), ALAB-630, 13 NRC 84 (1981)
interlocutory review of admissibility rulings; CLI-98-8, 47 NRC 324 n.18 (1998)
- Houston Lighting and Power Co.* (South Texas Project, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-549, 9 NRC 644, 646-47 (1979), *aff'g*, LBP-79-10, 9 NRC 439, 447-48 (1979)
injury-in-fact test for organizational standing to intervene; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 271 (1998)
- Houston Lighting and Power Co.* (South Texas Project, Units 1 and 2), CLI-82-9, 15 NRC 1363, 1365-67 (1982)
disqualification of licensing boards, grounds for; LBP-98-11, 47 NRC 303 (1998)
- Houston Lighting and Power Co.* (South Texas Project, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-639, 13 NRC 469, 473 (1981)
"now or never" situation for interlocutory review; CLI-98-8, 47 NRC 321 n.7 (1998)
- Houston Lighting and Power Co.* (South Texas Project, Units 1 and 2), CLI-82-9, 15 NRC 1363, 1365-67 (1982)
federal disqualification standards applied to NRC judges; CLI-98-9, 47 NRC 331 (1998)
- Houston Lighting and Power Co.* (South Texas Project, Units 1 and 2), LBP-79-10, 9 NRC 439, 447-48, *aff'd*, ALAB-549, 9 NRC 644 (1979)
"actual," "direct," or "genuine" interest in outcome of proceeding required for intervention; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 270 (1998)
- Houston Lighting and Power Co.* (South Texas Project, Units 1 and 2), LBP-83-37, 18 NRC 52, 59 (1983)
consideration of future events in ascertaining a rule's purpose; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 239 (1998)
- Hughes River Watershed Conservancy v. Glicknan*, 81 F.3d 437, 443 (4th Cir. 1996)
principal goals of environmental impact statement; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 87 (1998)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX
CASES

- Hughes River Watershed Conservancy v. Glickman*, 81 F.3d 437, 446 (4th Cir. 1996)
effect of misleading economic information on NEPA cost-benefit balancing; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 89 (1998)
- Idaho By and Through Idaho Public Utilities Commission v. ICC*, 35 F.3d 585, 595 (D.C. Cir. 1994)
cost-benefit balancing required by National Environmental Policy Act; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 88 (1998)
- Joseph J. Macktal*, CLI-89-14, 30 NRC 85, 91 (1989)
affidavit support for motions for disqualification; CLI-98-9, 47 NRC 331 n.4 (1998)
- Joseph J. Macktal*, CLI-89-14, 30 NRC 85, 92 n.5 (1989)
threshold for disqualification; CLI-98-9, 47 NRC 331 (1998)
- Kansas Gas and Electric Co.* (Wolf Creek Generating Station, Unit 1), ALAB-327, 3 NRC 408, 413 (1976)
"now or never" situation for interlocutory review; CLI-98-8, 47 NRC 321 n.7 (1998)
- Kerr-McGee Chemical Corp.* (West Chicago Rare Earths Facility), ALAB-928, 31 NRC 263, 269 (1990)
weight given to success on the merits in determining stay motions; LBP-98-5, 47 NRC 120 (1998)
- Kerr-McGee Chemical Corp.* (West Chicago Rare Earths Facility), CLI-82-2, 15 NRC 232 (1982)
prelicensing hearing rights on materials license application; LBP-98-5, 47 NRC 134 (1998)
- Kerr-McGee Chemical Corp.* (West Chicago Rare Earths Facility), CLI-96-2, 43 NRC 13, 15 (1996)
vacatur of unreviewed licensing board rulings; CLI-98-5, 47 NRC 114 (1998)
- Liljeberg v. Health Services Acquisition Corp.*, 486 U.S. 847, 859-61 (1988)
appearance of bias or prejudice as basis for disqualification of a judge; LBP-98-11, 47 NRC 303 (1998)
- Liteky v. United States*, 510 U.S. 540, 548, 553 n.2 (1994)
appearance of bias or prejudice as basis for disqualification of a judge; LBP-98-11, 47 NRC 303-04 (1998)
- Long Island Lighting Co.* (Shoreham Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1), ALAB-818, 22 NRC 651, 662-64 (1985)
state authority to set radiological standards; LBP-98-12, 47 NRC 352 (1998)
- Long Island Lighting Co.* (Shoreham Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1), ALAB-901, 28 NRC 302, 306-08, petition for review denied, CLI-88-11, 28 NRC 603 (1988)
authority of chief administrative judge to establish two or more licensing boards to hear discrete portions of a proceeding; LBP-98-8, 47 NRC 260 (1998)
- Long Island Lighting Co.* (Shoreham Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1), ALAB-901, 28 NRC 302, 307, petition for review denied, CLI-88-11, 28 NRC 603 (1988)
standard for review of chief administrative judge's decision to establish two or more licensing boards to hear discrete portions of a proceeding; LBP-98-8, 47 NRC 260 (1998)
- Long Island Lighting Co.* (Shoreham Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1), ALAB-902, 28 NRC 423, 430 & n.11, petition for review denied as moot, CLI-88-11, 28 NRC 603 (1988)
authority of chief administrative judge to establish two or more licensing boards to hear discrete portions of a proceeding; LBP-98-8, 47 NRC 259-60 (1998)
- Long Island Lighting Co.* (Shoreham Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1), ALAB-907, 28 NRC 620, 623 (1988)
right of parties to impartial adjudicator; CLI-98-9, 47 NRC 330 n.3 (1998)
- Long Island Lighting Co.* (Shoreham Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1), CLI-87-12, 26 NRC 383, 395 (1987)
adjustments to size of emergency planning zone; DD-98-5, 47 NRC 394 n.1 (1998)
- Long Island Lighting Co.* (Shoreham Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1), CLI-91-3, 33 NRC 76, 80 (1991)
standard for grant of interlocutory review of Subpart L rulings; CLI-98-8, 47 NRC 320 n.3 (1998)
- Long Island Lighting Co.* (Shoreham Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1), LBP-85-12, 21 NRC 644, 896, *aff'd*, ALAB-818, 22 NRC 651, *rev'd on other grounds*, CLI-86-13, 24 NRC 22 (1985)
request for parties' views on efficacy of seeking judgment in some other judicial forum relative to questions such as state authority on tribal lands; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 246 n.31 (1998)
- Louisiana Energy Services, L.P.* (Claiborne Enrichment Center), CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 77, 101-06 (1998)
litigability of discrimination in site selection process; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 203 (1998)
- Louisiana Energy Services, L.P.* (Claiborne Enrichment Center), CLI-97-2, 45 NRC 3, 4 (1997)
content of discussion on no-action alternative in FEIS; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 99 (1998)
raising new issues in reconsideration motions; LBP-98-10, 47 NRC 292, 293, 298 (1998)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX
CASES

- Louisiana Energy Services, L.P.* (Claiborne Enrichment Center), CLI-97-2, 45 NRC 3, 5 (1997)
responsibility to litigate material issues in licensing proceedings; LBP-98-14, 47 NRC 378 (1998)
- Louisiana Energy Services, L.P.* (Claiborne Enrichment Center), CLI-97-15, 46 NRC 294, 302 (1997)
applicability of Part 50 financial qualifications requirements to Part 72 licensees; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 187 (1998)
- Louisiana Energy Services, L.P.* (Claiborne Enrichment Center), CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 77, 101-02, 109 (1998)
EIS analysis of social and environmental impacts on minority and disadvantaged communities;
LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 272 (1998)
- Louisiana Energy Services, L.P.* (Claiborne Enrichment Center), LBP-96-25, 44 NRC 331, 346-47 n.5 (1996)
need for facility, assessment under National Environmental Policy Act; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 89 (1998)
- Louisiana Energy Services, L.P.* (Claiborne Enrichment Center), LBP-97-8, 45 NRC 367, 374-76 (1997)
prelicensing hearing rights of Native American tribe on materials license; LBP-98-5, 47 NRC 136 (1998)
- Louisiana Energy Services, L.P.* (Claiborne Enrichment Center), CLI-97-15, 46 NRC 294, 306-08 (1997)
adequacy of applicant's financial qualifications to construct and operate facility; LBP-98-10, 47 NRC 295 (1998)
- Louisiana Energy Services, L.P.* (Claiborne Enrichment Center), CLI-97-2, 45 NRC 3, 4 (1997)
raising new issues in reconsideration motions; LBP-98-10, 47 NRC 292, 293, 298 (1998)
- Louisiana Energy Services, L.P.* (Claiborne Enrichment Center), CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 77, 97-99 (1998)
discussion of no-action alternative, adequacy of; LBP-98-10, 47 NRC 294 (1998)
- Louisiana Energy Services, L.P.* (Claiborne Enrichment Center), CLI-97-15, 46 NRC 294, 306-08 (1997)
adequacy of applicant's financial qualifications to construct and operate facility; LBP-98-10, 47 NRC 295 (1998)
- Louisiana Energy Services, L.P.* (Claiborne Enrichment Center), CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 77, 97-99 (1998)
discussion of no-action alternative, adequacy of; LBP-98-10, 47 NRC 294 (1998)
- Louisiana Energy Services, L.P.* (Claiborne Enrichment Center), LBP-91-41, 34 NRC 332, 338 (1991)
standard for document support of a contention; LBP-98-10, 47 NRC 298-99 (1998)
- Louisiana Power and Light Co.* (Waterford Steam Electric Station, Unit 3), ALAB-732, 17 NRC 1076, 1107 (1983)
showing necessary between alleged errors and safety impacts; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 180 (1998)
- Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife*, 504 U.S. 555 (1991)
irreducible constitutional minimum requirements for standing to intervene; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 269 (1998)
- Marsh v. Oregon Natural Resources Council*, 490 U.S. 360, 371 (1989)
purpose of information disclosure function of EIS; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 88 (1998)
- Massachusetts v. Watt*, 716 F.2d 946, 952 (1st Cir. 1983)
violation of NEPA as cause for injunctive relief; CLI-98-8, 47 NRC 323 n.13 (1998)
- Metropolitan Edison Co. v. People Against Nuclear Energy*, 460 U.S. 766, 772 (1983)
consideration of social and economic factors in NEPA cost-benefit balancing; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 88 (1998)
- Metropolitan Edison Co. v. People Against Nuclear Energy*, 460 U.S. 766, 772, 776 (1983)
scope of NEPA analysis; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 102-03 (1998)
- Metropolitan Edison Co. v. People Against Nuclear Energy*, 460 U.S. 766, 772-79 (1983)
litigability of psychological stress; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 226, 228, 233, 234 (1998)
- Metropolitan Edison Co.* (Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit 1), CLI-83-25, 18 NRC 327, 332 (1983)
judicial concepts of standing applied in NRC proceedings; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 269, 270 (1998)
- Metropolitan Edison Co.* (Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit 1), CLI-85-2, 21 NRC 282, 316 (1985)
injury-in-fact and zone-of-interests tests of standing to intervene; LBP-98-12, 47 NRC 346 (1998)
- Metropolitan Edison Co.* (Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit 1), CLI-85-5, 21 NRC 566, 568-69 (1985)
right of parties to impartial adjudicator; CLI-98-9, 47 NRC 330 n.3 (1998)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX
CASES

- Mississippi Power and Light Co.* (Grand Gulf Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-704, 16 NRC 1725, 1730 (1982)
particularity required of late-filed contentions; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 208 (1998)
- Moose Lodge No. 107 v. Irvis*, 407 U.S. 163 (1972)
government responsibility for actions taken by a private licensee; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 106 n.23 (1998)
- Motor Vehicle Manufacturers Association of the United States v. State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Co.*, 463 U.S. 29, 43 (1983)
licensing board responsibility to explain reasons for rejection of contentions; LBP-98-10, 47 NRC 290-91 (1998)
- National Wildlife Federation v. Burford*, 835 F.2d 305, 318, 323-24 (D.C. Cir. 1987)
proof rather than assumption of threat of irreparable injury as basis for injunctive relief; CLI-98-8, 47 NRC 323 n.13 (1998)
- Natural Resources Defense Council v. Texaco Refining & Marketing, Inc.*, 906 F.2d 934, 939 n.6 (3d Cir. 1990)
absent clear Congressional statement, adjudicatory boards cannot infer that standards for reviewing stay requests have changed; CLI-98-8, 47 NRC 323 n.13 (1998)
- Natural Resources Defense Council v. Texaco Refining & Marketing, Inc.*, 906 F.2d 934, 940 (3d Cir. 1990)
statutory violation as cause for injunctive relief; CLI-98-8, 47 NRC 323 n.14 (1998)
- Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc. v. Hodel*, 865 F.2d 288, 294 (D.C. Cir. 1988)
information disclosure function of environmental impact statement; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 88 (1998)
- Navajo Tribe of Indians v. United States*, 624 F.2d 981, 987 (1980)
applicability of trust relationship doctrine to preclicensing hearing rights on materials license; LBP-98-5, 47 NRC 136 (1998)
- Northeast Nuclear Energy Co.* (Millstone Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1), LBP-96-1, 43 NRC 19, 23 (1996)
affidavit requirement for representational standing to intervene; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 275 (1998)
- Northern Cheyenne Tribe v. Hodel*, 851 F.2d 1152, 1157-58 (9th Cir. 1988)
proof rather than assumption of threat of irreparable injury as basis for injunctive relief; CLI-98-8, 47 NRC 323 n.13 (1998)
- Northern Indiana Public Service Co.* (Bailly Generating Station, Nuclear-1), ALAB-204, 7 AEC 835, 838 (1974)
conduct of petitioners; LBP-98-4, 47 NRC 19 (1998)
- Northern Indiana Public Service Co.* (Bailly Generating Station, Nuclear-1), LBP-74-80, 8 AEC 770, 772 n.1, *aff'd*, ALAB-239, 8 AEC 658 (1974)
affidavit support for motions for disqualification; CLI-98-9, 47 NRC 331 n.4 (1998)
- Northern States Power Co.* (Pathfinder Atomic Plant), LBP-89-30, 30 NRC 311, 312-13 (1989)
applicability of standing requirements in informal proceedings; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 270 (1998)
- Northern States Power Co.* (Pathfinder Atomic Plant), LBP-90-3, 31 NRC 40, 44-45 (1990)
geographic proximity considerations for intervention in materials license proceedings; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 271-72 (1998)
- Northern States Power Co.* (Tyrone Energy Park, Unit 1), CLI-80-36, 12 NRC 523, 527 (1980)
request of governmental agency to participate in amendment application process as cause for a hearing; LBP-98-12, 47 NRC 356 (1998)
- Nuclear Engineering Co.* (Sheffield, Illinois, Low-Level Radioactive Waste Disposal Site), ALAB-473, 7 NRC 737, 741 & n.3 (1978)
weight given to academic and professional interests in determining late intervention petitioner's standing; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 178 n.7 (1998)
- Nuclear Engineering Co.* (Sheffield, Illinois, Low-Level Radioactive Waste Disposal Site), ALAB-473, 7 NRC 737, 743 (1978)
injury in fact for standing to intervene in cases without obvious offsite implications; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 273 (1998)
materiality of contentions; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 239 (1998)
showing necessary for intervention in support of a license application; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 172 (1998)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX

CASES

- weight given to academic and professional interests in determining late intervention petitioner's standing; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 176 (1998)
- Nuclear Engineering Co.* (Sheffield, Illinois, Low-Level Radioactive Waste Disposal Site), ALAB-473, 7 NRC 737, 743-44 (1978)
- discretionary intervention, weighing of factors for grant of; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 250 (1998)
- Nuclear Engineering Co.* (Sheffield, Illinois, Low-Level Radioactive Waste Disposal Site), ALAB-473, 7 NRC 737, 745 (1978)
- burden on intervention petitioner to demonstrate ability to contribute to a sound record; LBP-98-12, 47 NRC 357 (1998)
- Nuclear Engineering Co.* (Sheffield, Illinois, Low-Level Radioactive Waste Disposal Site), ALAB-494, 8 NRC 299, 300 n.1 (1978)
- discretionary intervention by professional societies; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 178 n.7 (1998)
- Nuclear Engineering Co.* (Sheffield, Illinois, Low-Level Radioactive Waste Disposal Site), ALAB-494, 8 NRC 299, 301 n.3 (1978)
- affidavit support for motions for disqualification; CLI-98-9, 47 NRC 331 n.4 (1998)
- Ohio Edison Co.* (Petty Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 1), LBP-91-38, 34 NRC 229, 252 (1991), *aff'd in part on other grounds*, CLI-92-11, 36 NRC 47 (1992)
- abstract hypothetical injury as basis for standing to intervene; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 270 (1998)
- Oncology Services Corp.*, CLI-93-13, 37 NRC 419 (1993)
- standard for interlocutory review; CLI-98-7, 47 NRC 310 (1998)
- Oncology Services Corp.*, CLI-93-13, 37 NRC 419, 420-21 (1993)
- standard for grant of interlocutory review of Subpart L rulings; CLI-98-8, 47 NRC 320 n.3 (1998)
- Pacific Gas and Electric Co. v. State Energy Resources Conservation & Development Commission*, 461 U.S. 190, 207-12 (1983)
- jurisdiction with regard to radiological health and safety; LBP-98-12, 47 NRC 352 (1998)
- Pacific Gas and Electric Co.* (Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-653, 16 NRC 55, 72-74 (1981)
- special circumstances for grant of rule waiver; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 239 (1998)
- Pacific Gas and Electric Co.* (Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2), LBP-93-1, 37 NRC 5, 29-30 (1993)
- litigability of challenges to agency rules and regulations; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 179 (1998)
- People of Village of Gumbell v. Hodel*, 774 F.2d 1414, 1423 (9th Cir. 1985)
- statutory violation as a showing of irreparable harm for purpose of stay; CLI-98-8, 47 NRC 323 n.12 (1998)
- Pepsico Inc. v. McMillen*, 764 F.2d 458, 460-61 (7th Cir. 1985)
- disqualification of judge for employment-related reasons; LBP-98-11, 47 NRC 304 (1998)
- Personnel Administrator of Massachusetts v. Feeney*, 442 U.S. 256, 279 (1979)
- showing necessary to prove racial discrimination; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 105 n.22 (1998)
- Philadelphia Electric Co.* (Limerick Generating Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-789, 20 NRC 1443, 1447 (1984)
- economic interests as basis for standing to intervene in informal proceedings; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 270 (1998)
- Philadelphia Electric Co.* (Limerick Generating Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-819, 22 NRC 681, 705-07 (1985)
- record of decision as part of final environmental impact statement; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 89 (1998)
- Philadelphia Electric Co.* (Limerick Generating Station, Units 1 and 2), LBP-83-25, 17 NRC 681, 687 (1983)
- reconsideration motion asserting that evidence has been misunderstood or overlooked; LBP-98-10, 47 NRC 296 (1998)
- Philadelphia Electric Co.* (Limerick Generating Station, Units 1 and 2), LBP-83-39, 18 NRC 67, 69 (1983)
- lack of good cause for late filing where contention's factual predicate is otherwise available; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 208 (1998)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX
CASES

- Philadelphia Electric Co.* (Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station, Units 2 and 3), ALAB-216, 8 AEC 13, 20, *aff'd in part on other grounds*, CLI-74-32, 8 AEC 217 (1974)
challenges to statutory requirements or basic structure of agency's regulatory process; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 179 (1998)
- Philadelphia Electric Co.* (Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station, Units 2 and 3), ALAB-216, 8 AEC 13, 20-21 & n.33, *aff'd in part on other grounds*, CLI-74-32, 8 AEC 217 (1974)
litigability of petitioner's views on regulatory policy; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 179 (1998)
- Port of Astoria v. Hodel*, 595 F.2d 461, 474 (9th Cir. 1979)
prudential standing requirements; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 269 (1998)
- Portland General Electric Co.* (Pebble Springs Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2), CLI-76-27, 4 NRC 610, 616 (1976)
factors considered in grant of discretionary intervention; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 167 (1998); LBP-98-12, 47 NRC 357 (1998)
- Portland General Electric Co.* (Pebble Springs Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2), CLI-76-27, 4 NRC 610, 616-17 (1976)
discretionary intervention, Commission authority to grant; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 167, 250 (1998)
weight given to late intervention petitioner's ability to contribute to a sound record; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 177 (1998)
- Portland General Electric Co.* (Trojan Nuclear Plant), ALAB-534, 9 NRC 287, 289 n.6 (1979)
scope of an adjudicatory proceeding; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 179 (1998)
- Potomac Electric Power Co.* (Douglas Point Nuclear Generating Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-218, 8 AEC 79, 85 (1974)
admissibility of contention challenging revised rule that has not yet become effective; LBP-98-13, 47 NRC 368 n.7 (1998)
- Potomac Electric Power Co.* (Douglas Point Nuclear Generating Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-218, 8 AEC 79, 85, 89 (1974)
litigability of challenges to agency rules and regulations; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 179 (1998)
- Providence Road Community Association v. EPA*, 683 F.2d 80, 83 (4th Cir. 1982)
agency discretion in scope of NEPA analysis; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 103 (1998)
- Public Service Co. of Indiana* (Marble Hill Nuclear Generating Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-316, 3 NRC 167 (1976)
no significant hazards consideration issues outside of board jurisdiction; LBP-98-12, 47 NRC 345 (1998)
- Public Service Co. of Indiana* (Marble Hill Nuclear Generating Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-316, 3 NRC 167, 170-71 (1976)
scope of adjudicatory proceeding; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 179 (1998)
- Public Service Co. of New Hampshire* (Seabrook Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-422, 6 NRC 33, 42 (1977)
Commission authority to reject or modify a licensing board's factual findings; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 93 (1998)
- Public Service Co. of New Hampshire* (Seabrook Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-471, 7 NRC 477, 509 n.58 (1978)
consideration of secondary benefits in NEPA cost-benefit balancing; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 1009 (1998)
- Public Service Co. of New Hampshire* (Seabrook Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-734, 18 NRC 11, 15 (1983)
legal error as justification for interlocutory review of Subpart L rulings; CLI-98-8, 47 NRC 320 n.4 (1998)
- Public Service Co. of New Hampshire* (Seabrook Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-895, 28 NRC 7, 12 (1988)
source for determining purpose for which rule or regulation was adopted; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 239 (1998)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX

CASES

- Public Service Co. of New Hampshire* (Seabrook Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-895, 28 NRC 7, 16-17 (1988)
elimination of Staff case-by-case review of generic issue in individual applications and removing issues from adjudication as a valid purpose for adoption of a rule; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 239 (1998)
- Public Service Co. of New Hampshire* (Seabrook Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-895, 28 NRC 7, 24-26, *rev'd in part on other grounds*, CLI-88-10, 28 NRC 573 (1988)
speculation about future events as basis for rule waiver request; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 239 (1998)
- Public Service Co. of New Hampshire* (Seabrook Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-899, 28 NRC 93, 97 (1988)
scope of a contention; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 181 (1998)
- Public Service Co. of New Hampshire* (Seabrook Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-899, 28 NRC 93, 97 & n.11 (1988), *petition for review denied sub nom. Commonwealth of Massachusetts v. NRC*, 924 F.2d 311, 332-33 (D.C. Cir.), *cert. denied*, 502 U.S. 899 (1991)
Commission practice to adhere to terms of admitted contentions; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 105 (1998)
- Public Service Co. of New Hampshire* (Seabrook Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-916, 29 NRC 434, 437-38 (1989)
jurisdiction of first board where two or more licensing boards have been established to hear discrete portions of a proceeding; LBP-98-8, 47 NRC 259 (1998)
- Public Service Co. of New Hampshire* (Seabrook Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-916, 29 NRC 434, 438 (1989)
authority of Chief Administrative Judge to create two or more boards to hear separate issues in a proceeding; CLI-98-7, 47 NRC 311 (1998); LBP-98-8, 47 NRC 259 (1998)
- Public Service Co. of New Hampshire* (Seabrook Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-920, 30 NRC 121, 129 (1989)
significant safety issue as justification for a rule waiver; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 239 (1998)
- Public Service Co. of New Hampshire* (Seabrook Station, Unit 2), CLI-84-6, 19 NRC 975, 978 (1984)
economic interests as basis for standing to intervene in informal proceedings; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 270 (1998)
- Public Service Co. of New Hampshire* (Seabrook Station, Units 1 and 2), CLI-88-10, 28 NRC 573, 598-600 (1988)
source for determining purpose for which rule or regulation was adopted; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 239 (1998)
- Public Service Co. of New Hampshire* (Seabrook Station, Units 1 and 2), CLI-89-3, 29 NRC 234, 241 (1989)
board responsibility to review document proffered as factual support for contention; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 181 (1998)
- Public Service Co. of New Hampshire* (Seabrook Station, Units 1 and 2), CLI-89-20, 30 NRC 231, 235 (1989)
special circumstances for grant of rule waiver; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 238, 239 (1998)
unusual and compelling reasons for waiver of a rule; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 239 (1998)
- Public Service Co. of New Hampshire* (Seabrook Station, Units 1 and 2), CLI-89-20, 30 NRC 231, 243-44 (1989)
safety issues that do not fulfill the requirement for a rule waiver; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 239 (1998)
- Public Service Co. of New Hampshire* (Seabrook Station, Units 1 and 2), CLI-90-3, 31 NRC 219, 258 (1990), *aff'd on other grounds sub nom. Massachusetts v. NRC*, 924 F.2d 311 (D.C. Cir.), *cert. denied*, 112 S. Ct. 275 (1991)
weight given to irreparable injury in applying stay criteria; LBP-98-5, 47 NRC 120 (1998)
- Public Service Co. of New Hampshire* (Seabrook Station, Unit 1), CLI-91-14, 34 NRC 261, 266 (1991)
injury-in-fact and zone-of-interests requirements for standing to intervene; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 270 (1998)
- Public Service Co. of New Hampshire* (Seabrook Station, Units 1 and 2), LBP-82-106, 16 NRC 1649, 1656 (1982)
litigability of challenges to agency rules and regulations; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 179 (1998)
materiality of safety contentions; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 180 (1998)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX

CASES

- Public Service Co. of New Hampshire* (Seabrook Station, Units 1 and 2), LBP-89-10, 29 NRC 297, 301, rev'd, ALAB-920, 30 NRC 121, rev'd, CLI-89-20, 30 NRC 231 (1989)
 consideration of future events in ascertaining a rule's purpose; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 239 (1998)
- Public Service Electric and Gas Co.* (Hope Creek Generating Station, Unit 1), ALAB-759, 19 NRC 13, 20 (1984)
 disqualification of licensing boards, grounds for; LBP-98-11, 47 NRC 303 (1998)
- Public Utilities Commission v. FERC*, 900 F.2d 269, 282 (D.C. Cir. 1990)
 agency discretion in scope of NEPA analysis; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 103 (1998)
 scope of impacts considered under NEPA; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 88-89 (1998)
- Puget Sound Power and Light Co.* (Skagit/Hanford Nuclear Power Project, Units 1 and 2), LBP-82-74, 16 NRC 981, 983 (1982)
 academic interest in a proceeding as basis for standing to intervene; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 270 (1998)
- R.I.S.E. v. Kay*, 977 F.2d 573 (4th Cir. 1992), aff'g 768 F. Supp. 1144 (E.D. Va. 1991)
 forum for challenging land-use decisions alleged to be racially discriminatory; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 103 n.21 (1998)
- Robertson v. Methow Valley Citizens Council*, 490 U.S. 332, 348 (1989)
 principal goals of National Environmental Policy Act; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 87 (1998)
- Robertson v. Methow Valley Citizens Council*, 490 U.S. 332, 349 (1989)
 information disclosure function of environmental impact statement; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 88 (1998)
- Robertson v. Methow Valley Citizens Council*, 490 U.S. 332, 349-50 (1989)
 principal goals of environmental impact statement; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 87 (1998)
- Robertson v. Methow Valley Citizens Council*, 490 U.S. 332, 350 (1989)
 standard for selection of environmental option in cost-benefit balancing; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 88 (1998)
- Rockwell International Corp.* (Rocketydne Division), ALAB-925, 30 NRC 709, 712-13 n.1 (1989)
 rulings that affect the basic structure of a proceeding; CLI-98-7, 47 NRC 310 (1998)
- Roosevelt Campobello International Park Commission v. EPA*, 684 F.2d 1041, 1047 (1st Cir. 1982)
 standard for site-by-site NEPA review; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 104 (1998)
- Sacramento Municipal Utility District* (Rancho Seco Nuclear Generating Station), CLI-93-3, 37 NRC 135, 152 n.46 (1993)
 service of future documents on intervenors after termination of proceeding; CLI-98-5, 47 NRC 115 n.1 (1998)
- Sacramento Municipal Utility District* (Rancho Seco Nuclear Generating Station), LBP-93-23, 38 NRC 200, 246 (1993), review declined, CLI-94-2, 39 NRC 91 (1994)
 factual support as contention basis, need for; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 180 (1998)
- Sacramento Municipal Utility District* (Rancho Seco Nuclear Generating Station), LBP-93-23, 38 NRC 200, 247-48 (1993), review declined, CLI-94-2, 39 NRC 91 (1994)
 dismissal of contentions for failure to directly controvert the license application; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 181 (1998)
- Sacramento Municipal Utility District* (Rancho Seco Nuclear Generating Station), CLI-92-2, 35 NRC 47, 56 (1992), review denied sub nom. *Environmental & Resources Conservation Organization v. NRC*, 996 F.2d 1224 (9th Cir. 1993)
 economic interests as basis for standing to intervene in informal proceedings; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 270 (1998)
 judicial concepts of standing applied in NRC proceedings; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 269 (1998)
- Seminole Nation v. United States*, 316 U.S. 286, 296 (1942)
 applicability of trust relationship doctrine to precensuring hearing rights on materials license; LBP-98-5, 47 NRC 136 (1998)
- Sequoyah Fuels Corp.*, LBP-91-5, 33 NRC 163, 164-65 (1991)
 applicability of standing requirements in informal proceedings; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 270 (1998)
- Sequoyah Fuels Corp.*, LBP-96-12, 43 NRC 290, 296 (1996)
 authority of presiding officer to approve, deny, or condition licenses; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 269 n.14 (1998)
- Sequoyah Fuels Corp.* (Gore, Oklahoma Site), CLI-94-9, 40 NRC 1, 6-8 (1994)
 weights given to criteria for grant of a stay; LBP-98-5, 47 NRC 120 (1998)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX

CASES

- Sequoyah Fuels Corp. (Gore, Oklahoma Site)*, CLI-94-11, 40 NRC 55, 59, 63 (1994)
standard for grant of interlocutory review of Subpart L rulings; CLI-98-8, 47 NRC 320 & n.3 (1998)
- Sequoyah Fuels Corp. (Gore, Oklahoma Site)*, CLI-94-12, 40 NRC 64, 72 (1994)
showing necessary to demonstrate injury in fact from materials license amendment; CLI-98-6, 47 NRC 118 (1998)
- Sequoyah Fuels Corp. (Gore, Oklahoma Site)*, CLI-97-13, 46 NRC 195, 205 (1997)
Commission policy on settlement of contested proceedings; CLI-98-1, 47 NRC 16 (1998)
- Sequoyah Fuels Corp. (Gore, Oklahoma Site)*, CLI-97-13, 46 NRC 195, 205-06 (1997)
public-interest standard for approval of settlement agreements; LBP-98-1, 47 NRC 2 (1998)
- Sequoyah Fuels Corp. (Gore, Oklahoma Site Decontamination and Decommissioning Funding)*, LBP-94-5, 39 NRC 54 (1994)
distinction between standing determinations and assessment of petitioner's case on the merits; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 272 (1998)
- Sequoyah Fuels Corp. (Gore, Oklahoma Site Decontamination and Decommissioning Funding)*, LBP-94-5, 39 NRC 54, 66-67 (1994)
applicability of standing requirements in informal proceedings; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 270 (1998)
- Sequoyah Fuels Corp. (Gore, Oklahoma Site Decontamination and Decommissioning Funding)*, LBP-94-5, 39 NRC 54, 67-91 (1994)
geographic proximity considerations for intervention in materials license proceedings; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 272 (1998)
- Sierra Club v. Lynn*, 502 F.2d 43, 61 (5th Cir. 1974), *cert. denied*, 422 U.S. 1049 (1975)
nature of cost-benefit balancing required by National Environmental Policy Act; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 88 (1998)
- Sierra Club v. Marsh*, 872 F.2d 497, 504 (1st Cir. 1989)
violation of NEPA as cause for injunctive relief; CLI-98-8, 47 NRC 323 n.13 (1998)
- Sierra Club v. Morton*, 405 U.S. 727, 734-35 (1972)
standing to intervene on basis of general cultural, historical, and economic interests of the area; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 273 (1998)
- South Louisiana Environmental Council, Inc. v. Sand*, 629 F.2d 1005, 1011 (5th Cir. 1980)
agency discretion in scope of NEPA analysis; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 103 (1998)
assessment of how economic benefits are portrayed in NEPA cost-benefit balancing; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 89 (1998)
consideration of social and economic factors in NEPA cost-benefit balancing; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 89 (1998)
- St. Mary's Honor Center v. Hicks*, 509 U.S. 502 (1993)
showing necessary to prove racial discrimination; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 105 n.22 (1998)
- Steel Co. v. Citizens for a Better Environment*, 118 S. Ct. 1003, 1016 (1998)
showing necessary to demonstrate injury in fact from materials license amendment; CLI-98-6, 47 NRC 117 (1998)
- Tennessee Valley Authority (Watts Bar Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2)*, ALAB-413, 5 NRC 1418 (1977)
weight given to petitioner's ability to contribute to a sound record in standing determination; LBP-98-12, 47 NRC 357 (1998)
- Tennessee Valley Authority (Watts Bar Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2)*, ALAB-413, 5 NRC 1418, 1421 (1977)
authorization for representational standing; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 270-71 (1998)
- Texas Utilities Electric Co. (Comanche Peak Steam Electric Station, Units 1 and 2)*, ALAB-870, 26 NRC 71, 74 (1987)
interlocutory review of discovery rulings; CLI-98-8, 47 NRC 324 n.18 (1998)
- Texas Utilities Electric Co. (Comanche Peak Steam Electric Station, Units 1 and 2)*, CLI-88-12, 28 NRC 605, 609 (1988), *reconsideration denied on other grounds*, CLI-89-6, 29 NRC 348 (1989), *aff'd*, *Citizens for Fair Utility Regulation v. NRC*, 898 F.2d 51 (5th Cir.), *cert. denied*, 498 U.S. 896 (1990)
good cause for late filing, failure of another group to "carry the ball" as; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 173 (1998)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX

CASES

- Texas Utilities Electric Co. (Comanche Peak Steam Electric Station, Unit 2)*, CLI-93-4, 37 NRC 156, 165 (1993)
weight given to academic and professional interests in determining late intervention petitioner's standing; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 174 (1998)
- Tongass Conservation Society v. Cheney*, 924 F.2d 1137, 1140 (D.C. Cir. 1991)
information disclosure function of environmental impact statement; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 88 (1998)
- Tongass Conservation Society v. Cheney*, 924 F.2d 1137, 1141-42 (D.C. Cir. 1991)
extent of discussion of alternatives in FEIS; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 98, 104 (1998)
- Tongass Conservation Society v. Cheney*, 924 F.2d 1137, 1143-44 (D.C. Cir. 1991)
scope of FEIS analysis of licensing impacts on property values; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 109 n.27 (1998)
- Town of Huntington v. Marsh*, 859 F.2d 1134, 1143 (2d Cir. 1988)
proof rather than assumption of threat of irreparable injury as basis for injunctive relief; CLI-98-8, 47 NRC 323 n.13 (1998)
- Town of Huntington v. Marsh*, 884 F.2d 648, 651-54 (2d Cir. 1989), cert. denied, 494 U.S. 1004 (1990)
violation of NEPA as cause for injunctive relief; CLI-98-8, 47 NRC 323 n.13 (1998)
- Tulsa Gamma Ray, Inc.*, LBP-91-25, 33 NRC 535 (1991)
prepared testimony in enforcement proceedings, need for; LBP-98-2, 47 NRC 5 (1998)
- Umetco Minerals Corp.*, LBP-92-20, 36 NRC 112, 115 (1992)
applicability of standing requirements in informal proceedings; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 270 (1998)
- Umetco Minerals Corp.*, LBP-94-18, 39 NRC 369 (1994)
NRC policy on standing of Native Americans; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 272 (1998)
- Umetco Minerals Corp.*, LBP-94-18, 39 NRC 369, 370 (1994)
injury-in-fact requirement for standing to intervene in informal proceeding; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 265 n.3 (1998)
- Union of Concerned Scientists v. United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission*, 735 F.2d 1437, 1447 (D.C. Cir. 1984), cert. denied, 469 U.S. 1132 (1985)
responsibility to litigate material issues; LBP-98-14, 47 NRC 378 (1998)
- United States Department of Energy (Clinch River Breeder Reactor Plant)*, ALAB-688, 16 NRC 471, 474 (1982)
interlocutory review of scheduling rulings; CLI-98-8, 47 NRC 324 n.18 (1998)
- United States v. Lambert*, 695 F.2d 536, 540 (11th Cir. 1983)
proof rather than assumption of threat of irreparable injury as basis for injunctive relief; CLI-98-8, 47 NRC 323 n.13 (1998)
- United States v. Mason*, 412 U.S. 391, 398 (1973)
applicability of trust relationship doctrine to preclicensing hearing rights on materials license; LBP-98-5, 47 NRC 136 (1998)
- United States v. Mitchell*, 463 U.S. 206, 225-26 (1983)
applicability of trust relationship doctrine to preclicensing hearing rights on materials license; LBP-98-5, 47 NRC 136 (1998)
- Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corp. v. Natural Resources Defense Council*, 435 U.S. 519, 553-54 (1978)
scope of litigable issues; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 105 (1998)
- Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corp. (Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station)*, ALAB-179, 7 AEC 159, 172 (1974)
effect of misleading economic information on NEPA cost-benefit balancing; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 94 (1998)
- Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corp. (Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station)*, ALAB-179, 7 AEC 159, 177 (1974)
consideration of secondary benefits in NEPA cost-benefit balancing; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 100 (1998)
- Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corp. (Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station)*, ALAB-919, 30 NRC 29, 48 (1989), vacated in part on other grounds and remanded, CLI-90-4, 31 NRC 333 (1990)
board responsibility to review document proffered as factual support for contention; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 181 (1998)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX

CASES

- Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corp.* (Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station), LBP-87-7, 25 NRC 116, 118 (1987)
"interest" and "interested" defined as synonymous with standing; LBP-98-12, 47 NRC 356 (1998)
- Village of Arlington Heights v. Metropolitan Housing Development*, 429 U.S. 252 (1977)
showing necessary to prove racial discrimination; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 105 n.22 (1998)
- Warth v. Seidin*, 422 U.S. 490, 501, 508, 509 (1975) showing necessary to demonstrate injury in fact from materials license amendment; CLI-98-6, 47 NRC 117-18 (1998)
- Washington Public Power Supply System* (WPPSS Nuclear Project No. 3), ALAB-747, 18 NRC 1167, 1174-75 & n.22 (1983)
extent to which late intervention petitioner's interests will be represented by other parties, weight given to; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 174 (1998)
- Washington v. Davis*, 426 U.S. 229 (1976)
showing necessary to prove racial discrimination; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 105 n.22 (1998)
- Weinberger v. Romeo-Berkeley*, 456 U.S. 305 (1982)
statutory violation as a showing of irreparable harm for purpose of stay; CLI-98-8, 47 NRC 322 (1998)
- Westinghouse Electric Corp.* (Nuclear Fuel Export License for Czech Republic — Temelin Nuclear Power Plants), CLI-94-7, 39 NRC 322, 331 (1994)
redressability element of standing to intervene; LBP-98-12, 47 NRC 347 (1998)
- Worcester v. Georgia*, 31 U.S. 515 (1832)
applicability of trust relationship doctrine to precicensing hearing rights on materials license; LBP-98-5, 47 NRC 135 (1998)
- Yankee Atomic Electric Co.* (Yankee Nuclear Power Station), CLI-96-1, 43 NRC 1, 6 (1996)
criteria for invoking representational standing; LBP-98-12, 47 NRC 354 (1998)
judicial concepts of standing applied in NRC proceedings; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 168 (1998)
- Yankee Atomic Electric Co.* (Yankee Nuclear Power Station), CLI-96-1, 43 NRC 1, 9 (1996)
showing necessary between alleged errors and safety impacts; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 180 (1998)
- Yankee Atomic Electric Co.* (Yankee Nuclear Power Station), CLI-96-7, 43 NRC 235, 251 (1996)
litigability of challenges to agency rules and regulations; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 179 (1998)
- Yankee Atomic Electric Co.* (Yankee Nuclear Power Station), LBP-96-2, 43 NRC 61, 75, *aff'd*, CLI-96-7, 43 NRC 235, 258 (1996)
materiality of safety contentions; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 180 (1998)
- Yankee Atomic Electric Co.* (Yankee Nuclear Power Station), LBP-96-2, 43 NRC 61, 75, *aff'd*, CLI-96-7, 43 NRC 235, 267 (1996)
factual support as contention basis, need for; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 180 (1998)
- Yankee Atomic Electric Co.* (Yankee Nuclear Power Station), LBP-96-2, 43 NRC 61, 90 *aff'd*, CLI-96-7, 43 NRC 235 (1996)
scrutiny of document proffered as basis for contention for what it does and does not show; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 181 (1998)
- Yankee Atomic Electric Co.* (Yankee Nuclear Power Station), LBP-96-15, 44 NRC 8, 26 (1996)
lack of good cause for late filing where contention's factual predicate is otherwise available; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 208 (1998)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX
REGULATIONS

- 5 C.F.R. 2635.604
applicability to licensing board judges; CLI-98-9, 47 NRC 331-32 (1998)
disqualification of licensing board judge because of employment negotiations; LBP-98-11, 47 NRC 303 (1998)
- 5 C.F.R. 2635.604(a)
disqualification of judge for employment-related reasons; LBP-98-11, 47 NRC 304 (1998)
- 5 C.F.R. 2635.604(c)
agency discretion to disqualify licensing board judge; CLI-98-9, 47 NRC 332 (1998)
- 5 C.F.R. 2635.606
disqualification of licensing board judge because of employment negotiations; LBP-98-11, 47 NRC 303 (1998)
- 5 C.F.R. 2635.606(b)
disqualification of judge where offer of employment is rejected; CLI-98-9, 47 NRC 332 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 2.203
Commission policy on settlement of contested proceedings; CLI-98-1, 47 NRC 16 (1998); LBP-98-1, 47 NRC 1 (1998)
conformance of filings with service requirements; LBP-98-4, 47 NRC 20 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 2.206
enforcement-related license conditions, request for; DD-98-1, 47 NRC 24-36 (1998)
harassment and intimidation of licensee employees by management, request for action on; DD-98-4, 47 NRC 382-89 (1998)
integrity of steam generator supports, request for action on; DD-98-6, 47 NRC 396-408 (1998)
piping leaks in Residual Heat Removal system, request for action on; DD-98-3, 47 NRC 71-75 (1998)
safety of dry cask unloading process; DD-98-2, 47 NRC 38-56 (1998)
systematic problems at SONGS, assessment of; DD-98-5, 47 NRC 390-95 (1998)
treatment of late intervention request as petition under; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 279, 287 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. Part 2, Subpart G
formal hearing for uranium enrichment facility licensing; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 84 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 2.704
authority of Chief Administrative Judge to create two or more boards to hear separate issues in a proceeding; CLI-98-7, 47 NRC 311 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 2.704(c)
referral of disqualification motion to the Commission; CLI-98-9, 47 NRC 330 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 2.710
deadline for completion of discovery; LBP-98-2, 47 NRC 5 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 2.712
conformance of filings with service requirements; LBP-98-4, 47 NRC 20 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 2.713
notice of appearance, request for applicant's counsel to file; LBP-98-2, 47 NRC 6 (1998)
penalty for contemptuous conduct; LBP-98-4, 47 NRC 18 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 2.714
applicability of late-filing standards to request for discretionary intervention; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 173 n.5 (1998)
aspects of intervention as foundation for standing; LBP-98-12, 47 NRC 346 (1998)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX
REGULATIONS

- interest defined as synonymous with standing; LBP-98-12, 47 NRC 356 (1998)
- late-filed intervention petition supporting license application; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 163 (1998)
- standing to intervene in support of license application; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 172 (1998)
- timeliness of filings seeking discretionary intervention; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 279 n.40 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 2.714(a)
 - intervention by Native American tribe; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 157 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 2.714(a)(1)
 - amendment of contention without addressing late-filing criteria; LBP-98-13, 47 NRC 371 n.10 (1998)
 - applicability of late-filing standards to state intervenor; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 164 (1998)
 - dismissal of contention for failure to meet late-filing criteria; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 208 (1998)
 - weight given to late intervention petitioner's ability to contribute to a sound record; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 177 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 2.714(a)(1)(i)-(v)
 - criteria for admitting late-filed contentions; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 183 (1998)
 - five factors to be addressed in late intervention petition; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 167, 172 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 2.714(a)(1)-(2)
 - intervention as of right, standard for; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 167 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 2.714(a)(3)
 - treatment of unauthorized pleadings; LBP-98-12, 47 NRC 346 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 2.714(b)(2)
 - admission standards for areas of concern after hearing file has been made available; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 280 (1998)
 - intervention as of right, standard for LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 167 (1998)
 - scheduling of service of intervenors' contentions that are based on the hearing record; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 286 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 2.714(b)(2)(i)-(iii)
 - pleading requirements for contentions; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 178 (1998); LBP-98-13, 47 NRC 365 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 2.714(b)(2)(iii)
 - focus in framing contentions regarding a licensing action; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 181 (1998)
 - timely filing of environmental contentions; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 89 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 2.714(d)(2)
 - admissibility of contentions that would not entitle intervention petitioner to relief; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 178 (1998); LBP-98-13, 47 NRC 365 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 2.714(d)(2)(ii)
 - materiality of issues raised in a contention; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 179 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 2.714(f)
 - licensing board authority to define or consolidate contentions; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 182 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 2.714(f)-(g)
 - authority of presiding officer to assign lead parties and consolidate contentions; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 242 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 2.714a(a)
 - appealability of intervention rulings; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 249 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 2.715
 - "interested" defined as synonymous with standing; LBP-98-12, 47 NRC 356 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 2.715(a)
 - limited appearance statement as other means to protect late intervention petitioner's interests; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 173 (1998)
 - limited appearance statements in support of license application; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 163 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 2.715(c)
 - scope of participating governmental entities; LBP-98-12, 47 NRC 355 (1998)
 - standing to intervene of governmental agency; LBP-98-12, 47 NRC 355 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 2.717
 - jurisdiction of multiple boards in a single proceeding; CLI-98-7, 47 NRC 311 (1998)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX
REGULATIONS

- 10 C.F.R. 2.721
authority of Chief Administrative Judge to create two or more boards to hear separate issues in a proceeding; CLI-98-7, 47 NRC 311 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 2.730
conformance of filings with service requirements; LBP-98-4, 47 NRC 20 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 2.730(c)
replies to petitions, need for Board permission for; LBP-98-12, 47 NRC 346 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 2.743(b)(3)
prepared testimony in enforcement proceedings, need for; LBP-98-2, 47 NRC 5 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 2.758
authority of adjudicatory body to consider its own jurisdiction; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 184 n.9 (1998)
elimination of Staff case-by-case review of generic issue in individual applications and removing issues from adjudication as a valid purpose for adoption of a rule; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 239 (1998)
litigability of challenges to agency rules and regulations; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 179 (1998)
petition to waive Commission rules; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 238-42 (1998)
waiver of Part 72 applicable to licensing of independent spent fuel storage installation; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 157, 247 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 2.758(b)
petition for waiver of Part 72 and section 51.23; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 163 (1998)
standards governing rule waiver petitions; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 238 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 2.786(g)
standard for grant of interlocutory review of Subpart L rulings; CLI-98-8, 47 NRC 320 n.3 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 2.786(g)(1)
showing necessary for grant of interlocutory review of Subpart L rulings; CLI-98-8, 47 NRC 320 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 2.786(g)(1) and (2)
standard for interlocutory review; CLI-98-7, 47 NRC 310 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 2.788
content of application for temporary stay; LBP-98-3, 47 NRC 9, 11 (1998)
criteria for grant of a stay; LBP-98-5, 47 NRC 120, 138 (1998)
replies to responses to stay motions; LBP-98-5, 47 NRC 137 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 2.788(b)
restrictions on length of stay motions; LBP-98-5, 47 NRC 121 n.1 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 2.788(d)
replies to responses to stay motions; LBP-98-5, 47 NRC 137, 138 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 2.788(e)
criteria for grant of a stay; LBP-98-5, 47 NRC 120 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 2.788(f)
temporary stay of Staff licensing action; LBP-98-3, 47 NRC 9 (1998)
temporary stay to preserve the status quo, Commission authority to issue; CLI-98-4, 47 NRC 112 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. Part 2, Subpart I
formal hearing for uranium enrichment facility licensing; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 84 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 2.1205
extension of deadline for submitting amended hearing requests; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 265 (1998)
failure of intervention petitions on the merits; LBP-98-4, 47 NRC 19 n.2 (1998)
hearing rights on materials license application; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 264 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 2.1205(a)
scope of litigable issues; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 273 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 2.1205(c)
hearing rights on source or byproduct materials license; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 268 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 2.1205(c)(1)
deadline for filing hearing requests on materials licenses; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 268 (1998)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX
REGULATIONS

- 10 C.F.R. 2.1205(d)
 - late intervention petitions in materials license proceeding; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 267 (1998)
 - responsibility of presiding officer in ruling on request for hearing on materials license application; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 268 (1998)
 - scope of presiding officer's determination on hearing requests filed under; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 280 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 2.1205(e)
 - amendment of hearing requests based on new information; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 267 (1998)
 - content of hearing requests filed by person other than applicant in connection with materials licensing action; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 279-80 (1998)
 - content of request for hearing filed by person other than applicant; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 268 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 2.1205(g)
 - geographic proximity considerations for intervention in materials license proceedings; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 272 n.16 (1998)
 - intervention by proponents of licensing actions; LBP-98-3, 47 NRC 11 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 2.1205(h)
 - areas of concern in informal proceedings, scope of; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 263 (1998)
 - content of hearing requests based on new information in Safety Evaluation Report; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 267 (1998)
 - responsibility of presiding officer in ruling on request for hearing on materials license application; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 268 (1998)
 - scope of presiding officer's determination on hearing requests filed under section 2.1205(d); LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 280 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 2.1205(k)
 - late intervention petitions in materials license proceeding; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 267 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 2.1205(k)(1)
 - formation of organization after filing deadline as good cause for late filing; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 279 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 2.1205(l)(1)
 - factors to be addressed by late intervention petitions in materials license proceeding; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 279 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 2.1205(l)(1)(i) and (ii)
 - criteria to be addressed by late intervention petitions in informal proceedings; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 267 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 2.1205(j)(2)
 - treatment of late intervention request as 2.206 petition; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 279 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 2.1205(m)
 - authority of presiding officer to consolidate parties; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 284 (1998)
 - stay of actions taken under; LBP-98-3, 47 NRC 9 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 2.1205(o)
 - appeal of order dismissing petitioner; LBP-98-4, 47 NRC 20 (1998)
 - appealability of intervention rulings; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 287 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 2.1209
 - issuance of order dismissing petitioner without awaiting responses from the parties; LBP-98-4, 47 NRC 19 (1998)
 - pleadings stricken from the record; LBP-98-4, 47 NRC 20 (1998)
 - replies to responses to stay motions; LBP-98-5, 47 NRC 137 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 2.1209(a)
 - litigability of separate area of concern that is already litigable with respect to admitted areas of concern; LBP-98-14, 47 NRC 377 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 2.1213
 - Staff participation as a party to an informal proceeding; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 266 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 2.1231(a)
 - availability of hearing file to intervenors; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 287 (1998)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX
REGULATIONS

- 10 C.F.R. 2.1233
 - scheduling of service of intervenors' written filings; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 286 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 2.1233(d)
 - scope of and basis for decision by presiding officer in informal proceeding; LBP-98-14, 47 NRC 378 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 2.1237
 - Staff participation as a party to an informal proceeding; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 266 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 2.1251(a)
 - effectiveness of order dismissing petitioner; LBP-98-4, 47 NRC 20 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 2.1253
 - interlocutory review of rulings in materials licensing proceedings; CLI-98-8, 47 NRC 320 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 2.1263
 - criteria for grant of a stay; LBP-98-5, 47 NRC 120, 138 (1998)
 - replies to responses to stay motions; LBP-98-5, 47 NRC 137 (1998)
 - right of petitioner to renew stay request; CLI-98-8, 47 NRC 321 n.5 (1998)
 - temporary stay of Staff licensing action; LBP-98-3, 47 NRC 9 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. Part 20
 - litigability of challenge to; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 186 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 20.1003
 - ability of soil remediation figures in license termination plan to meet ALARA standard; LBP-98-12, 47 NRC 352 (1998)
 - background radiation determination, adequacy of bases for; LBP-98-12, 47 NRC 349 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 20.1201
 - calculation of dose limits and effective dose equivalents; LBP-98-2, 47 NRC 4 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 20.1301
 - groundwater restoration standard; LBP-98-5, 47 NRC 128 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 20.1401(b)
 - compliance of license termination plan with; LBP-98-12, 47 NRC 348 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 20.1402
 - ability of soil remediation figures in license termination plan to meet ALARA standard; LBP-98-12, 47 NRC 352 (1998)
 - compliance of site release criteria in license termination plan with; LBP-98-12, 47 NRC 352 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 20.2007
 - failure to obtain permit from Native American tribe as area of concern; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 281 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 40.32
 - burden on license applicant to demonstrate adequate assurance of safety and protection of the environment; LBP-98-14, 47 NRC 378, 379 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. Part 40, Appendix A
 - vulnerability of groundwater to liquid waste disposal, litigability of; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 282 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 50.7
 - document reference to isolation of "cynics" from group culture as violation of; DD-98-4, 47 NRC 384 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 50.47(c)(2)
 - adjustments to size of emergency planning zone; DD-98-5, 47 NRC 394 n.1 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 50.54(f)
 - consolidation of confirmatory action requests; DD-98-1, 47 NRC 27-28 (1998)
 - notification of NRC prior to restart of reactors, requirement for; DD-98-1, 47 NRC 26-27 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 50.54(q)
 - traffic capacity analysis in emergency plan, need for; DD-98-5, 47 NRC 392 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 50.82
 - definition of license termination in license termination plan; LBP-98-12, 47 NRC 349 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 50.82(a)(1)(i), (ii)
 - licensee certification of cessation of activities; DD-98-1, 47 NRC 32 (1998)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX
REGULATIONS

- 10 C.F.R. 50.82(a)(9)
activities beyond the scope of; LBP-98-12, 47 NRC 353 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 50.82(a)(9)(ii)
components of license termination plan; LBP-98-12, 47 NRC 344 (1998)
information concerning spent fuel management in license termination plan, need for; LBP-98-12, 47
NRC 351 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 50.82(b)
description of decommissioning activities in site release plan, need for; LBP-98-12, 47 NRC 352 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 50.92
no significant hazards consideration determination; LBP-98-12, 47 NRC 344 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 50.100
suspension of license pending establishment of dry cask unloading procedures; DD-98-2, 47 NRC 38,
43, 44 n.2 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. Part 50, Appendix A GDC 2
seismic analysis of steam generator supports request for; DD-98-6, 47 NRC 405 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. Part 50, Appendix B, Criterion V
notice of violation for deficiencies in dry-cask storage activities; DD-98-2, 47 NRC 41 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. Part 50, Appendix C
applicability of financial qualifications requirements to Part 72 licensees; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 187 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. Part 50, Appendix E, § IV
traffic capacity analysis in emergency plan, need for; DD-98-5, 47 NRC 392 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. Part 51
applicability to uranium enrichment facility licensing; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 84 (1998)
groundwater contamination from retention pond, potential for; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 216 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 51.104(a)(2)
litigability of adequacy of discussion of environmental issues in final environmental impact statement;
CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 89 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 51.23
litigability of challenge to; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 197, 202, 229 (1998)
waiver of waste confidence decision embodied in; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 157, 163, 240, 241-42, 247
(1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 51.23(a)
challenge to continued applicability of generic determination in; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 241 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 51.23(b)
waiver of EIS analysis provision of; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 242 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 51.45
air quality analysis requirements for independent spent fuel storage installation; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 198
(1998)
environmental report requirement for uranium enrichment facility licensing; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 84 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 51.45(b)
cumulative impact considerations of ISFSI relative to other hazardous facilities; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 201
(1998)
effluent characteristics and environmental impacts of seepage from retention pond; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC
217 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 51.45(c)
consideration of alternatives to ISFSI; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 218 (1998)
cost-benefit analysis for ISFSI, adequacy of; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 204, 220 (1998)
cost-benefit analysis of risks of transportation of spent fuel; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 200 (1998)
environmental impacts of spent fuel storage, adequacy of consideration of; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 199
(1998)
selection of rail or road access to ISFSI site, adequacy of description of considerations in; LBP-98-7,
47 NRC 223 (1998)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX
REGULATIONS

- 10 C.F.R. 51.45(d)
 - assessment of permits and entitlements associated with independent spent fuel storage installation; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 197, 218 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 51.52
 - applicability of Table S-4 to independent spent fuel storage installations; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 199 (1998)
 - litigability of challenges to; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 201, 228 (1998)
 - weight for shipping cask outside the parameters of; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 200 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 51.52(a)
 - applicability of Table S-4 to independent spent fuel storage installations; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 199 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 51.52(b)
 - environmental analysis required for transportation of spent fuel to independent spent fuel storage installation; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 199 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 51.60
 - environmental report requirement for uranium enrichment facility licensing; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 84 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 51.61
 - litigability of challenges to; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 202 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 51.71
 - consideration of secondary benefits in NEPA cost-benefit balancing; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 99 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 51.71(d)
 - assessment of permits and entitlements associated with independent spent fuel storage installation; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 218 (1998)
 - nature of cost-benefit balancing required by National Environmental Policy Act; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 82 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 51.97(c)
 - basis for Staff FEIS for uranium enrichment facility licensing; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 84 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 51.102
 - content of FEIS section on need for facility; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 85 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 51.102, 51.103
 - responsibility for compiling final environmental record of decision; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 89 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. Part 70
 - distinction between financial qualifications standards of Part 72 and; LBP-98-10, 47 NRC 295 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 70.23(a)(5)
 - distinction between financial qualifications standards of Part 72 and; LBP-98-10, 47 NRC 295 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. Part 71
 - coverage of licensees and contract carriers; LBP-98-10, 47 NRC 291 (1998)
 - litigability of challenges to; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 184, 186, 190, 192 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 71.0(d), 71.4
 - license needs for intermodal transfer facility; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 184 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. Part 72
 - adoption of contentions of other intervenors by reference; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 236 (1998)
 - applicability of Part 50 financial qualifications requirements to; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 187 (1998)
 - authority to construct and operate independent spent fuel storage installation; LBP-98-13, 47 NRC 363 (1998)
 - definition of independent spent fuel storage installation; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 212 (1998)
 - design of spent fuel storage system to support unloading activities; DD-98-2, 47 NRC 40 (1998)
 - distinction between financial qualifications standards of Part 70 and; LBP-98-10, 47 NRC 295 (1998)
 - license to possess and store spent fuel at independent spent fuel storage installation; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 157 (1998)
 - waiver of; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 157, 163, 240, 247 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 72.2(b)
 - definition of independent spent fuel storage installation; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 183 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 72.3
 - definition of person in context of license applicant for independent spent fuel storage installation; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 183 (1998)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX
REGULATIONS

- 10 C.F.R. 72.6(c)(1)
license needs for intermodal transfer facility; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 184, 237 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 72.11
content of application for spent fuel storage installation regarding cask maintenance and unloading; DD-98-2, 47 NRC 38, 51-52 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 72.12
license needs for intermodal transfer facility; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 184 (1998)
material omissions from application for spent fuel storage installation regarding cask maintenance and unloading; DD-98-2, 47 NRC 38, 52 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 72.22(e)
distinction between financial qualifications standards of Part 70 and; LBP-98-1C, 47 NRC 295 (1998)
financial qualifications of applicant to construct independent spent fuel storage installation; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 229, 237 (1998)
financial qualifications of applicant to engage in Part 72 activities; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 187, 214 (1998)
safety of cask design for ISFSI; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 230 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 72.24
radiation and environmental monitoring requirements for ISFSI; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 217 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 72.24(d)
groundwater effects of independent spent fuel storage installation and transportation of spent fuel; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 192 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 72.24(d)(2)
adequacy of independent spent fuel storage installation design to prevent accidents; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 195 (1998)
adequacy of structural design of independent spent fuel storage installation to withstand probable maximum flood; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 191 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 72.30(a)
decommissioning plan for independent spent fuel storage installation, adequacy of; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 196 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 72.32
compliance of applicant with offsite notification and coordination requirements; LBP-98-10, 47 NRC 292 (1998)
training of operators of ISFSI, adequacy of; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 232 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 72.32(6)
radiation monitoring, adequacy of ISFSI provisions for; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 229 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 72.32(a)(2)
transportation accidents, need for ISFSI application to address; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 232 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 72.32(a)(7)
training of operators of ISFSI, adequacy of; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 232 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 72.32(a)(8)
emergency planning requirements for populations living outside independent spent fuel storage installation; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 227 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 72.40(a)(6)
financial qualifications of applicant to engage in Part 72 activities; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 187 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 72.60
suspension of licenses for independent spent fuel storage installations, reasons for; DD-98-2, 47 NRC 44 n.2 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 72.82(e)
reporting of preoperational test results; DD-98-2, 47 NRC 39-40 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 72.90(a)
land use patterns and ownership in vicinity of ISFSI, adequacy of description of; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 224-25 (1998)
location of rail spur, failure to describe; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 224 (1998)
road expansion authorizations, failure to describe; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 224 (1998)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX
REGULATIONS

- 10 C.F.R. 72.90(c)
land use patterns and ownership in vicinity of ISFSI, adequacy of description of; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 224-25 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 72.90(e)
economic impacts of ISFSI, need for consideration of; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 222 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 72.92
collection and evaluation of flood record, requirement for construction of independent spent fuel storage installation; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 192 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 72.98
probable maximum flood for independent spent fuel storage installation; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 191 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 72.98(b)
land use patterns and ownership in vicinity of ISFSI, adequacy of description of; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 224-25 (1998)
radiological contamination of agricultural products for human consumption, potential of ISFSI for; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 222 (1998)
septic tank impact on groundwater and ecology; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 223 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 72.98(b) & (c)
regional and cumulative environmental impacts of ISFSI, failure of applicant to discuss; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 216 237 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 72.98(c)(2)
economic impacts of ISFSI, need for consideration of; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 222 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 72.100
regional and cumulative environmental impacts of ISFSI, failure of applicant to discuss; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 216 (1998)
risks of particulate emissions from construction and cement activities as ISFSI; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 20 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 72.100(b)
ecological and species impacts of ISFSI; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 204, 205, 221 (1998)
economic impacts of ISFSI, need for consideration of; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 222 (1998)
groundwater effects of independent spent fuel storage installation and transportation of spent fuel; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 192 (1998)
selection of rail or road access to ISFSI site, adequacy of description of considerations in; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 223 (1998)
septic tank impact on groundwater and ecology; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 223 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 72.104
adequacy of analysis of radiation shielding at ISFSI; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 209 (1998)
radiation exposures from independent spent fuel storage installation, adequacy of control measures, LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 194 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 72.106(b)
compliance of independent spent fuel storage installation with dose limits; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 185 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 72.108
adequacy of WASH-1238 to satisfy; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 200 (1998)
ecological and species impacts of ISFSI; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 204 (1998)
groundwater effects of independent spent fuel storage installation and transportation of spent fuel; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 192 (1998)
litigability of challenges to; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 201 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 72.122
litigability of challenges to; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 216 (1998)
notice of violation for deficiencies in dry-cask storage activities; DD-98-2, 47 NRC 55 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 72.122(b)(2)
cask-pad stability during seismic event at ISFSI; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 206, 210 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 72.122(b)(4)
radiation and environmental monitoring requirements for ISFSI; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 217 (1998)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX
REGULATIONS

- 10 C.F.R. 72.122(f)
design feature to allow onsite inspection and maintenance of canisters and cladding, need for; LBP-98-10, 47 NRC 293 (1998)
inspection and maintenance of safety components, including cladding and canisters; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 189 (1998)
procedure for verifying the presence of helium in storage canisters, adequacy of; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 189 (1998)
seal maintenance and emergency seal replacement on dry storage casks; DD-98-2, 47 NRC 38, 40, 45 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 72.122(h)
confinement barriers and systems for maintenance and unloading of dry storage casks; DD-98-2, 47 NRC 38, 40, 45-47 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 72.122(i)
loading and storage of dry storage casks prior to development of safety procedures for unloading; DD-98-2, 47 NRC 38, 40, 48-50 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 72.126
radiation and environmental monitoring requirements for ISFSI; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 217 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 72.126(c) & (d)
effluent characteristics and environmental impacts of seepage from retention pond; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 217 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 72.126(d)
radiation exposures from independent spent fuel storage installation, adequacy of control measures; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 194 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 72.128(a)
inspection and maintenance of safety components, including cladding and canisters; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 189 (1998)
cask-pad stability during seismic event at ISFSI; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 206, 210 (1998)
procedure for verifying the presence of helium in storage canisters, adequacy of; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 189 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 72.128(a)(1)
design feature to allow onsite inspection and maintenance of canisters and cladding, need for; LBP-98-10, 47 NRC 293 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 72.130
decommissioning criteria relative to dry storage casks; DD-98-2, 47 NRC 38, 40, 50-51 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. Part 72, Subpart G
quality assurance program for independent spent fuel storage installation, adequacy of; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 188 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 72.150, 72.152
notice of violation for deficiencies in dry-cask storage activities; DD-98-2, 47 NRC 55 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 72.180
limits on stand-alone security measures to onsite transportation of spent fuel; LBP-98-13, 47 NRC 373 (1998)
spent fuel transportation considerations in security plan, litigability of; LBP-98-13, 47 NRC 371, 372 (1998)
staffing capability to respond to safeguards contingency events; LBP-98-13, 47 NRC 368 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 72.184(a)
litigability of challenge to; LBP-98-13, 47 NRC 372 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 72.210
authority to store fuel in an independent spent fuel storage facility; LBP-98-12, 47 NRC 351 (1998)
redressability element of standing to intervene; LBP-98-12, 47 NRC 350 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. Part 73
intervenor access to security plan under protective order; LBP-98-13, 47 NRC 363 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 73.21(a)
responsibility of state designee with security plan access; LBP-98-13, 47 NRC 367 (1998)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX
REGULATIONS

- 10 C.F.R. 73.21(c)(1)(iii)
state designee with security plan access; LBP-98-13, 47 NRC 367 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 73.25
physical protection of intermodal transfer junction, litigability of; LBP-98-13, 47 NRC 371 (1998)
protection against terrorism and sabotage, litigability of adequacy of security measures for; LBP-98-13,
47 NRC 372 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 73.26
physical protection of intermodal transfer junction, litigability of; LBP-98-13, 47 NRC 371 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 73.37
spent fuel transportation, physical protection of; LBP-98-13, 47 NRC 372 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 73.37(b)(4)
central communications center, litigability of challenge to adequacy of; LBP-98-13, 47 NRC 373 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 73.45
physical protection of intermodal transfer junction, litigability of; LBP-98-13, 47 NRC 371 (1998)
protection against terrorism and sabotage, litigability of adequacy of security measures for; LBP-98-13,
47 NRC 372 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 73.46, 73.50
physical protection of intermodal transfer junction, litigability of; LBP-98-13, 47 NRC 371 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 73.50(b)(4)
alarm system performance, litigability of; LBP-98-13, 47 NRC 371 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 73.50(g)(2)
description of response times of local law enforcement personnel in security plan, need for; LBP-98-13,
47 NRC 369 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 73.51(d)
admissibility of contention challenging number of security personnel; LBP-98-13, 47 NRC 368 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 73.51(d)(6)
description of response times of local law enforcement personnel in security plan, need for; LBP-98-13,
47 NRC 369, 374 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. Part 73, Appendix B, Criterion V.A
security personnel equipment and training, litigability of adequacy of; LBP-98-13, 47 NRC 369 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. Part 73, Appendix C
local law enforcement assistance in physical protection of ISFSI; LBP-98-13, 47 NRC 369 (1998)
physical protection of intermodal transfer junction, litigability of; LBP-98-13, 47 NRC 371 (1998)
protection against terrorism and sabotage, litigability of adequacy of security measures for; LBP-98-13,
47 NRC 372 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. Part 73, Appendix C, § 3.d
description of response times of local law enforcement personnel in security plan, need for; LBP-98-13,
47 NRC 369, 373-74 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. 76.62(c)
review of Director's Decision; CLI-98-2, 47 NRC 57 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. Part 100, Appendix A
request for evaluation of faults other than capable faults; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 191 n.14 (1998)
- 10 C.F.R. Part 100, Appendix A, § III(c)
definition of safe shutdown earthquake; DD-98-6, 47 NRC 405 n.2 (1998)
- 36 C.F.R. Part 800
NRC responsibilities under National Historic Preservation Act; LBP-98-5, 47 NRC 122 (1998)
- 36 C.F.R. 800.3 (1997)
review of effects of licensing action on historic site; LBP-98-5, 47 NRC 121 (1998)
- 36 C.F.R. 800.3(b)
flexibility in implementation of review of historic properties; CLI-98-8, 47 NRC 324 n.17 (1998)
- 36 C.F.R. 800.3(c)
phased compliance with National Historic Preservation Act review of a property; CLI-98-8, 47 NRC 324
n.17 (1998)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX
REGULATIONS

- 40 C.F.R. 146.4
definition of exempted aquifers; LBP-98-5, 47 NRC 127 (1998)
- 40 C.F.R. 1502.14
content of discussion on no-action alternative in FEIS; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 98 (1998)
- 40 C.F.R. 1502.14(a)
consideration of alternatives to proposed action, scope of; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 104 (1998)
- 40 C.F.R. 1502.14(d)
consideration of no-action alternative in final environmental impact statement; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 97 (1998)
- 40 C.F.R. 1502.23
nature of cost-benefit balancing required by National Environmental Policy Act; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 88 (1998)
- 40 C.F.R. 1508.8(b)
consideration of secondary benefits in NEPA cost-benefit balancing; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 99 (1998)
- 43 C.F.R. Part 7
NRC responsibilities under Archeology Resources Protection Act; LEP-98-5, 47 NRC 122 (1998)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX
STATUTES

- Atomic Energy Act, 182a
notification of NRC prior to restart of reactors, requirement for; DD-98-1, 47 NRC 26-27 (1998)
- Atomic Energy Act, 189, 42 U.S.C. § 2239 *et seq.*,
prelicensing hearing rights on materials license application; LBP-98-5, 47 NRC 134 (1998)
stay of effectiveness of license pending health and safety hearing on application; CLI-98-8, 47 NRC
317 (1998)
- Atomic Energy Act, 189a(1), 42 U.S.C. § 2239(a)
interest requirement for standing to intervene in materials license proceeding; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 268
(1998)
- Clean Air Act, 111
air quality analysis requirements for independent spent fuel storage installation; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 198
(1998)
- Clean Water Act, 404
water permits required for independent spent fuel storage installation; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 198 (1998)
- Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act of 1986, 42 U.S.C. §§ 11001-11050
compliance of applicant with offsite notification and coordination requirements; LBP-98-10, 47 NRC 292
(1998)
- Energy Policy Act of 1992, 42 U.S.C. 2296b-6
national security and defense interests in maintaining domestic source of enriched uranium; CLI-98-3, 47
NRC 95 (1998)
- Energy Policy Act of 1992, 42 U.S.C. 2297, 2297a, 2297e (1992)
promotion of domestic uranium enrichment technologies; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 95 (1998)
- Energy Policy Act of 1992, 42 U.S.C. 2297a(8)
need for domestic source of uranium enrichment services; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 95 (1998)
- Executive Order 12898, "Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and
Low-Income Populations," 3 C.F.R. § 859 (1995)
disparate impact analysis of racial discrimination in facility siting; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 100 (1998)
environmental justice issues in siting of ISFSI, need to address; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 233 (1998)
NRC policy on standing of Native Americans; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 272 (1998)
prelicensing hearing rights of Native American tribe on materials license; LBP-98-5, 47 NRC 136
(1998)
- Executive Order 12898, § 6-609
rights and remedies established by; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 102 (1998); CLI-98-5, 47 NRC 115 n.2 (1998)
- National Environmental Policy Act, 42 U.S.C. § 4321 *et seq.* (1994)
applicability to uranium enrichment facility licensing; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 84 (1998)
economic interests as basis for standing to intervene in informal proceedings; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 270
(1998)
- National Environmental Policy Act, 42 U.S.C. § 4331
principal goals of; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC (1998)
- National Environmental Policy Act, 42 U.S.C. § 4332
content of environmental impact statement; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 87 (1998)
- National Environmental Policy Act, 42 U.S.C. § 4332(2)(C)
proposals requiring preparation of environmental impact statement; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 87 (1998)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX
STATUTES

- National Environmental Policy Act, 42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C)(iii)
consideration of alternatives in final environmental impact statement; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 97 (1998)
- National Historic Preservation Act, 16 U.S.C. § 470 (1966)
absence of historical surveys as grounds for temporary stay of Staff licensing action; LBP-98-3, 47 NRC 9 (1998)
- National Historic Preservation Act, 16 U.S.C. § 470(f)
cause for injunctive relief; CLI-98-8, 47 NRC 323 n.14 (1998)
issuance of license prior to completion of review process under; LBP-98-5, 47 NRC 120, 123-25 (1998)
stay of effectiveness of license pending historic property review; CLI-98-8, 47 NRC 317, 323 n.15 (1998)
- Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982, 42 U.S.C. 5841, 10101-10270
NRC statutory authority to issue a Part 72 license to a private entity; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 183 (1998)
- Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982, 42 U.S.C. §§ 10131(a)(5), 10222(a)(5)(b)
new arguments in financial qualifications contention improperly raised in motion for reconsideration; LBP-98-10, 47 NRC 295 (1998)
- Nuclear Waste Policy Act, 135(h), 42 U.S.C. 10155(h)
Commission authority to license a private offsite fuel storage facility; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 240 (1998)
- Price-Anderson Act, 42 U.S.C. § 2210
new arguments in financial qualifications contention improperly raised in motion for reconsideration; LBP-98-10, 47 NRC 295 (1998)
- USEC Privatization Act, 42 U.S.C. 2243(f)(2)(B) (1996 & Supp. 1997)
need for domestic source of uranium enrichment services; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 95 (1998)
- 5 U.S.C. 554 and 557
responsibility to litigate material issues in licensing proceeding; LBP-98-14, 47 NRC 378 (1998)
- 28 U.S.C. § 455(a)
dissatisfaction with a judge as basis for disqualification motion; LBP-98-11, 47 NRC 304-05 (1998)
recusal of judge where impartiality might reasonably be questioned; CLI-98-9, 47 NRC 331 (1998)
- 44 U.S.C. § 1508
Federal Register as constructive notice to all U.S. residents; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 173 (1998); LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 279 (1998)
- Utah Code Ann. § 19-2-108
air quality analysis requirements for independent spent fuel storage installation; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 198 (1998)

LEGAL CITATIONS INDEX
OTHERS

- 101 Cong. Rec. S8321, S8323 (daily ed. July 20, 1989) (statement of Sen. Domenici)
national security and defense interests in maintaining domestic source of enriched uranium; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 95 (1998)
- 115 Cong. Rec. 40,416 (1970) (remarks of Sen. Jackson)
action-forcing procedures mandated by National Environmental Policy Act; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC (1998)
- H.R. Rep. No. 102-474, 102d Cong., 2d Sess., pt. 1, at 143 (1992)
U.S. policy on protection of domestic uranium enrichment industry; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 96 n.15 (1998)
- H.R. Rep. No. 102-474, 102d Cong., 2d Sess., pt. 1, at 144 (1992)
need for domestic source of uranium enrichment services; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 95 (1998)
U.S. policy on protection of domestic uranium enrichment industry; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 95 (1998)
- Memorandum for the Heads of All Departments and Agencies, 30 Weekly Comp. Pres. Doc. 279 (Feb. 14, 1994)
purpose of E.O. 12898; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 102 (1998)
- Note, Rethinking the Trust Doctrine in Federal Indian Law*, 98 Harv. L. Rev. 422 (1984)
applicability of trust relationship doctrine to precicensing hearing rights on materials license; LBP-98-5, 47 NRC 136 (1998)
- Random House Dictionary of the English Language* at 712 (Unabridged ed. 1973)
definition of "immediate"; CLI-98-8, 47 NRC 321 n.6 (1998)
- S. Rep. No. 101-60, 101st Cong., 1st Sess. 8, 20, 43 (1989)
need for domestic source of uranium enrichment services; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 95 (1998)
- S. Rep. No. 101-470, 101st Cong. 2d Sess. 2 (1990)
need for domestic source of uranium enrichment services; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 95 (1998)
- S. Rep. No. 102-72, 102d Cong., 1st Sess. 144-45 (1991)
national security and defense interests in maintaining domestic source of enriched uranium; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 95 (1998)

SUBJECT INDEX

ACCIDENTS

adequacy of independent spent fuel storage installation design to prevent; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)

ADJUDICATORY HEARINGS

scope of review; CLI-98-8, 47 NRC 314 (1998)

AFFIDAVITS

supporting motion for disqualification; CLI-98-9, 47 NRC 326 (1998)

AMENDMENT

of Certificate of Compliance for gaseous diffusion plant; CLI-98-2, 47 NRC 57 (1998)

APPELLATE REVIEW

Commission authority to reject or modify a licensing board's factual findings; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 77 (1998)

of presiding officer's determinations regarding standing; CLI-98-6, 47 NRC 116 (1998)

APPLICANTS

burden to demonstrate adequate assurance of safety and protection of the environment; LBP-98-14, 47 NRC 376 (1998)

weight given to preferences of, in siting and design of project; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 77 (1998)

AREAS OF CONCERN

standards for admission; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 261 (1998)

ATOMIC ENERGY ACT

prelicensing hearing rights on materials license; LBP-98-5, 47 NRC 119 (1998)

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

for gaseous diffusion plant, amendment of; CLI-98-2, 47 NRC 57 (1998)

CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE

authority of to establish two or more licensing boards to hear discrete portions of a proceeding; LBP-98-8, 47 NRC 259 (1998)

CIVIL PENALTIES

reduction of; LBP-98-1, 47 NRC 1 (1998)

CONDUCT OF PARTIES

frivolous, disruptive, and contemptuous, penalty for; LBP-98-4, 47 NRC 17 (1998)

CONNECTED ACTIONS

linkage between independent spent fuel storage installation and national high-level waste program; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)

CONSOLIDATION OF PARTIES

in Subpart L proceedings; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 261 (1998)

CONSTRUCTION

of intervention petition in favor of petitioner; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)

CONTEMPT

penalty for; LBP-98-4, 47 NRC 17 (1998)

CONTENTIONS

acceptance where subject to pending rulemaking; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998); LBP-98-13, 47 NRC 360 (1998)

SUBJECT INDEX

- challenges to materials license application, litigability of; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998); LBP-98-13, 47 NRC 360 (1998)
- explanation of reasons for ruling on admissibility of; LBP-98-10, 47 NRC 288 (1998)
- information required in support of; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)
- materiality of issues raised; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)
- of other petitioners, incorporation by reference; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)
- scope of litigable issues in; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 77 (1998); LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)
- specificity and basis requirements for admissibility of; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998); LBP-98-13, 47 NRC 360 (1998)
- supporting information or expert opinion; LBP-98-10, 47 NRC 288 (1998); LBP-98-13, 47 NRC 360 (1998)
- CONTENTIONS, LATE-FILED
 - five-factor test for admission of; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)
 - good cause for delay; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)
 - other means and other parties to protect intervenors' interests; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)
 - sound record development as factor in admission of; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)
- CORRECTIVE ACTION VERIFICATION PROGRAM
 - NRC order directing third-party implementation of; DD-98-1, 47 NRC 23 (1998)
- COST-BENEFIT ANALYSIS
 - for ISFSI, adequacy of; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)
 - formal or mathematical in EIS, requirement for; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 77 (1998)
 - misleading information on economic benefits of a project, effects of; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 77 (1998)
 - scope of, for uranium enrichment facility; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 77 (1998)
 - socioeconomic or secondary benefits balanced in FEIS; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 77 (1998)
- COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY
 - guidance on consideration of alternatives under NEPA; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 77 (1998)
 - guidance on identifying and assessing racial discrimination in siting; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 77 (1998)
- DECISIONS
 - explanation of reasons for; LBP-98-10, 47 NRC 288 (1998)
- DECOMMISSIONING
 - adequacy of independent spent fuel storage installation design to permit; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)
 - cost estimates; DD-98-1, 47 NRC 23 (1998)
 - post-shutdown activities report; DD-98-1, 47 NRC 23 (1998)
- DECOMMISSIONING FUNDING
 - for independent spent fuel storage installation, adequacy of; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)
- DECOMMISSIONING PLAN
 - for independent spent fuel storage installation, adequacy of; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)
- DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
 - conflict with duties and prerogatives of; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)
- DIRECTOR'S DECISION
 - review of partial denial; CLI-98-2, 47 NRC 57 (1998)
- DISCOVERY
 - deadline for completion of; LBP-98-2, 47 NRC 3 (1998)
 - informal, responsibilities of parties; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)
- DISCRIMINATION
 - in siting of ISFSI; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)
- DISQUALIFICATION
 - NRC policy on using procedural techniques to avoid motions for; CLI-98-9, 47 NRC 326 (1998)
 - of licensing board judge because of employment negotiations with licensee's law firm; LBP-98-11, 47 NRC 302 (1998)
 - of licensing board judge, threshold for; CLI-98-9, 47 NRC 326 (1998)
- DOSE
 - from land application of wastewater; LBP-98-5, 47 NRC 119 (1998)
 - See also Effective Dose Equivalents

SUBJECT INDEX

- See also Effective Dose Equivalents
- DOSE LIMITS**
calculation of; LBP-98-2, 47 NRC 3 (1998)
compliance of independent spent fuel storage installation with; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)
for restored groundwater; LBP-98-5, 47 NRC 119 (1998)
- DRY STORAGE CASKS**
TN-40, safety of unloading process; DD-98-2, 47 NRC 37 (1998)
- EARTHQUAKES**
evaluation basis; CLI-98-2, 47 NRC 57 (1998)
- ECONOMIC IMPACTS**
of ISFSI, need for consideration of; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)
- EFFECTIVE DOSE EQUIVALENTS**
calculation of; LBP-98-2, 47 NRC 3 (1998)
- EMERGENCY PLANNING ZONES**
adjustments to size of; DD-98-5, 47 NRC 390 (1998)
- EMERGENCY PLANS**
for independent spent fuel storage installation, adequacy of; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)
traffic capacity analysis in; DD-98-5, 47 NRC 390 (1998)
- ENFORCEMENT**
mechanistic approach as license condition; DD-98-1, 47 NRC 23 (1998)
- ENFORCEMENT PROCEEDINGS**
prepared testimony in; LBP-98-2, 47 NRC 3 (1998)
- ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**
as part of record of decision; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 77 (1998)
analysis of need for facility in; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 77 (1998)
principal goals of; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 77 (1998)
See also Final Environmental Impact Statement
- ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS**
of independent spent fuel storage installation, adequacy of consideration of; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)
- ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE**
disparate impacts; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 77 (1998)
prelicensing hearing rights of Native American tribe on materials license; LBP-98-5, 47 NRC 136 (1998); LBP-98-5, 47 NRC 119 (1998)
racial discrimination in siting; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 77 (1998)
rights and remedies under Executive Order 12898; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 77 (1998)
- ENVIRONMENTAL REPORT**
range of alternatives to ISFSI considered in; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)
- EXECUTIVE ORDER 12898**
rights and remedies afforded by; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 77 (1998)
- EXTENSION OF TIME**
NRC Staff request for; LBP-98-4, 47 NRC 17 (1998)
- FILINGS**
unauthorized, treatment of; LBP-98-12, 47 NRC 343 (1998)
- FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**
socioeconomic or secondary benefits balanced in; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 77 (1998)
- FINANCIAL QUALIFICATIONS**
to engage in Part 72 activities; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)
- FLOODS**
collection and evaluation of records relevant to construction of independent spent fuel storage installation; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)
probable maximum, for independent spent fuel storage installation; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)
- GASEOUS DIFFUSION PLANT**
amendment of certificate of compliance for; CLI-98-2, 47 NRC 57 (1998)

SUBJECT INDEX

GROUNDWATER

- contamination by leachate injected into aquifers, potential for; LBP-98-5, 47 NRC 119 (1998); LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 261 (1998)
- exempted aquifers; LBP-98-5, 47 NRC 119 (1998)
- restoration standard; LBP-98-5, 47 NRC 119 (1998)

HARASSMENT AND INTIMIDATION

- of licensee employees by management; DD-98-4, 47 NRC 381 (1998)

HEALTH AND SAFETY

- protection during extension of time to install modifications to seismic design; CLI-98-2, 47 NRC 57 (1998)

HEALTH EFFECTS

- of postulated seismic event; CLI-98-2, 47 NRC 57 (1998)

HEARING RIGHTS

- prelicensing, on materials license application; LBP-98-5, 47 NRC 119 (1998)

HELIUM

- in storage canisters, procedure for verifying the presence of; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)

HIGH-PRESSURE SAFETY INJECTION SYSTEM

- design issues; DD-98-1, 47 NRC 23 (1998)

HISTORIC SITES

- review requirements prior to license issuance; LBP-98-5, 47 NRC 119 (1998)

INDEPENDENT SPENT FUEL STORAGE INSTALLATION

- adequacy of assessment of permits and entitlements associated with; LBP-93-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)
- characterization as permanent repository; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)
- technical specifications, modification of; DD-98-2, 47 NRC 37 (1998)
- use before establishing safe unloading conditions for dry storage containers; DD-98-2, 47 NRC 37 (1998)

INFORMAL HEARINGS

- interlocutory review of rulings in; CLI-98-8, 47 NRC 314 (1998)

See also Subpart I. Proceedings

INJURY IN FACT

- for standing to intervene, specificity required to establish; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)
- geographic proximity and Staff delay of issuance of full license as basis for apprehensions of; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 261 (1998)

INSPECTION

- and maintenance of safety components, including cladding and canisters; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)

INTERMODAL TRANSFER FACILITY

- license needed for; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)

INTERVENORS

- access to security plans; LBP-98-13, 47 NRC 360 (1998)
- lead, authority of licensing board to designate; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)

INTERVENTION

- as of right, criteria for; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)
- by a state; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)
- by Native American tribe; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)
- by proponents of licensing actions; LBP-98-3, 47 NRC 7 (1998)
- uncontested, determination of standing; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)

INTERVENTION, DISCRETIONARY

- ability to assist in developing a sound record as standard for; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)
- applicability of late-filing standard; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)
- standard for grant of; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)

INTERVENTION, LATE

- adequacy of existing representation; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)
- five-factor test for; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)
- other means to protect petitioner's interests; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)

SUBJECT INDEX

- INTERVENTION PETITIONS
 - construction in favor of petitioner in making standing determinations; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)
- INTERVENTION PETITIONS, LATE-FILED
 - five-factor test for acceptance of; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)
 - good cause for; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)
- IRREPARABLE INJURY
 - to natural, historic, and religious resources; LBP-98-3, 47 NRC 7 (1998)
 - weight applied in determining stay motions; LBP-98-5, 47 NRC 119 (1998)
- JURISDICTION
 - where two or more boards have been established to hear discrete portions of a proceeding; LBP-98-8, 47 NRC 259 (1998)
- LICENSE CONDITIONS
 - effect on scope of license; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 261 (1998)
 - enforcement-related; DD-98-1, 47 NRC 23 (1998)
 - justification on health and safety grounds; CLI-98-1, 47 NRC 13 (1998)
- LICENSE TERMINATION PLAN
 - components of; LBP-98-12, 47 NRC 343 (1998)
- LICENSEE EMPLOYEES
 - harassment and intimidation by management; DD-98-4, 47 NRC 381 (1998)
- LICENSES
 - for intermodal transfer facilities, need for; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)
- LICENSING BOARD JUDGES
 - disqualification because of employment negotiations with licensee's law firm, denial of motion for; LBP-98-11, 47 NRC 302 (1998)
 - participation in settlements; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 261 (1998)
 - recusal of; CLI-98-9, 47 NRC 326 (1998)
- LICENSING BOARDS
 - authority of chief administrative judge to establish two or more, to hear discrete portions of a proceeding; LBP-98-8, 47 NRC 259 (1998)
 - authority to create separate boards in a proceeding; CLI-98-7, 47 NRC 307 (1998)
 - Commission authority to reject or modify factual findings of; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 77 (1998)
 - discretion in managing proceedings; CLI-98-8, 47 NRC 314 (1998); LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)
 - jurisdiction of first board where two or more boards have been established to hear discrete portions of a proceeding; LBP-98-8, 47 NRC 259 (1998)
 - responsibility to explain reasons for decisions or rulings; LBP-98-10, 47 NRC 288 (1998)
- LIMITED APPEARANCE STATEMENTS
 - applicability under five-factor test for late intervention; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)
- MAINTENANCE
 - of safety components, including cladding and canisters; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)
- MATERIALS LICENSE
 - stay of effective date; CLI-98-4, 47 NRC 111 (1998)
- MATERIALS LICENSE APPLICATION
 - litigability of challenge to; LBP-98-13, 47 NRC 360 (1998)
- MATERIALS LICENSE PROCEEDING
 - standing to intervene in; CLI-98-6, 47 NRC 116 (1998)
- MINING ACTIVITIES
 - in situ*, temporary stay of license to conduct; LBP-98-3, 47 NRC 7 (1998)
- MINORITIES
 - disparate impacts of facility siting on; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 77 (1998)
- MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION
 - raising matters for first time in; LBP-98-10, 47 NRC 288 (1998)
 - related matters raised in; LBP-98-10, 47 NRC 288 (1998)
- MOTIONS
 - replies to responses to; CLI-98-8, 47 NRC 314 (1998)

SUBJECT INDEX

NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT

- consideration of alternatives, guidance on; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 77 (1998)
- license applicant's site screening process; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 77 (1998)
- needs assessment for independent spent fuel storage installation; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)
- no-action alternative considered under; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 77 (1998)
- principal goals of environmental impact statement; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 77 (1998)
- record of decision; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 77 (1998)
- secondary benefits considered in cost-benefit balancing; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 77 (1998)

NATIONAL HIGH-LEVEL WASTE PROGRAM

- linkage between independent spent fuel storage installation and; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)

NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT

- failure of NRC Staff to comply with, as basis for stay request; CLI-98-8, 47 NRC 314 (1998)
- phased review of a property; CLI-98-8, 47 NRC 314 (1998)

NATIVE AMERICANS

- applicability of trust doctrine to preclicensing hearing rights on materials license application; LBP-98-5, 47 NRC 119 (1998)
- tribal standing to intervene; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)

NO-ACTION ALTERNATIVE

- consideration under NEPA; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 77 (1998)
- rule of reason applied in consideration of; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 77 (1998)
- scope of analysis; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 77 (1998)
- to ISFSL consideration of; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)

NOTICE

- constructive, *Federal Register* us; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)

NOTIFICATION

- of NRC prior to restart of reactors; DD-98-1, 47 NRC 23 (1998)

NRC POLICY

- on settlement of contested proceedings; CLI-98-1, 47 NRC 13 (1998); LBP-98-1, 47 NRC 1 (1998)
- on use of procedural techniques to avoid addressing disqualification motions; CLI-98-9, 47 NRC 326 (1998)

NRC PROCEEDINGS

- responsibility to litigate material issues in; LBP-98-14, 47 NRC 376 (1998)

NRC REVIEW

- of final design information prior to installation of modifications; CLI-98-2, 47 NRC 57 (1998)

NRC STAFF

- licensing actions, temporary stay of; LBP-98-3, 47 NRC 7 (1998)
- request for extension of time; LBP-98-4, 47 NRC 17 (1998)

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

- authority to issue temporary stay; CLI-98-4, 47 NRC 111 (1998)
- authority to limit environmental inquiry; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 77 (1998)
- authority to reject or modify a licensing board's factual findings; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 77 (1998)
- statutory authority to issue a license to a private entity; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)
- supervisory authority to disqualify licensing board judges; CLI-98-9, 47 NRC 326 (1998)

PENALTY

- for contemptuous conduct; LBP-98-4, 47 NRC 17 (1998)

See also Civil Penalties

PERMANENT REPOSITORY

- independent spent fuel storage installation characterized as; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)

PIPING

- leaks in Residual Heat Removal system; DD-98-3, 47 NRC 71 (1998)

PLEADINGS

- language of; LBP-98-4, 47 NRC 17 (1998)

PRESIDING OFFICER

- authority to consolidate parties; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 261 (1998)

SUBJECT INDEX

- authority to manage proceedings through scheduling of filings; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 261 (1998)
- scope of and basis for decision by; LBP-98-14, 47 NRC 376 (1998)
- weight given to determinations regarding standing; CLI-98-6, 47 NRC 116 (1998)
- PUBLIC HEARINGS**
 - in vicinity of nuclear power plant, request for; DD-98-1, 47 NRC 23 (1998)
- PUBLIC INTEREST**
 - standard for approval of settlement agreements; LBP-98-1, 47 NRC 1 (1998)
 - standard for grant of a stay; LBP-98-5, 47 NRC 119 (1998)
- QUALITY ASSURANCE PROGRAM**
 - for independent spent fuel storage installation, adequacy of; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)
- RACIAL DISCRIMINATION**
 - in siting; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 77 (1998)
 - See also Environmental Justice
- RADIATION EXPOSURES**
 - from independent spent fuel storage installation, adequacy of control measures; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)
- RADIATION MONITORING**
 - requirements for independent spent fuel storage installation; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)
- RADIATION SHIELDING**
 - at ISFSI, adequacy of analysis of; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)
- RADIOLOGICAL CONTAMINATION**
 - of agricultural products for human consumption, potential effects of ISFSI on; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)
 - of groundwater by leachate injected into geologic aquifer; LBP-98-5, 47 NRC 119 (1998)
 - of soil during prior mining activities, release during new activities; LBP-98-5, 47 NRC 119 (1998)
- RECORD OF DECISION**
 - as part of environmental impact statement; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 77 (1998)
- RECUSAL**
 - of licensing board judge because of employment negotiations with licensee's law firm; LBP-98-11, 47 NRC 302 (1998)
 - of licensing board judge for job discussions with party's law firm; CLI-98-9, 47 NRC 326 (1998)
- RES JUDICATA**
 - timing of decisions on; CLI-98-5, 47 NRC 113 (1998)
- RESIDUAL HEAT REMOVAL SYSTEM**
 - pipings leaks in; DD-98-3, 47 NRC 71 (1998)
- RESTART**
 - notification of NRC prior to; DD-98-1, 47 NRC 23 (1998)
- RETENTION POND**
 - potential for overflow and groundwater contamination from; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)
- REVERSAL OF RULING**
 - to create a separate board to consider security plan issues; CLI-98-7, 47 NRC 307 (1998)
- REVIEW**
 - of Director's Decision partially denying request for amendment of Certificate of Compliance for gaseous diffusion plant; CLI-98-2, 47 NRC 57 (1998)
 - See also Appellate Review
- REVIEW, INTERLOCUTORY**
 - discretionary, standard for grant of; CLI-98-8, 47 NRC 314 (1998)
 - standard for grant of; CLI-98-7, 47 NRC 307 (1998); CLI-98-8, 47 NRC 314 (1998)
- RULES AND REGULATIONS**
 - interpretation of 10 C.F.R. 2.713(a); LBP-98-4, 47 NRC 17 (1998)
 - interpretation of 10 C.F.R. 2.788(f) and 2.1263; LBP-98-3, 47 NRC 7 (1998)
 - litigability of challenges to; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998); LBP-98-13, 47 NRC 360 (1998)
- RULES OF PRACTICE**
 - admissibility of contentions, specificity and basis requirements for; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)

SUBJECT INDEX

areas of concern in Subpart L proceedings; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 261 (1998)

authority of licensing board to designate lead intervenors or parties; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)

authority of presiding officer to manage proceedings; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 261 (1998)

challenges to license application, litigability of; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998); LBP-98-13, 47 NRC 360 (1998)

contention acceptance where subject to pending rulemaking; LBP-98-13, 47 NRC 360 (1998)

discretionary intervention, standard for grant of; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)

effect of license conditions on scope of license; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 261 (1998)

explanation of reasons for rulings on contentions; LBP-98-10, 47 NRC 288 (1998)

filings not authorized by rules of procedure, treatment of; LBP-98-12, 47 NRC 343 (1998)

five-factor test for late intervention; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)

geographic proximity and Staff delay of issuance of full license as basis for standing to intervene; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 261 (1998)

good cause for late filing of contentions; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)

good-cause requirement for late intervention petitions; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)

incorporation by reference of one or more of the contentions of other petitioners; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)

informal discovery, responsibilities of parties; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)

interest requirement for intervention; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)

interlocutory review of licensing board ruling to create a separate board; CLI-98-7, 47 NRC 307 (1998)

interlocutory review, standard for grant of; CLI-98-8, 47 NRC 314 (1998)

intervenor access to security plans; LBP-98-13, 47 NRC 360 (1998)

intervention as of right, criteria for; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)

intervention by a state; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)

intervention by Native American tribe; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)

judicial concepts of standing applied in NRC proceedings; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)

late-filed contentions, five-factor test for admission of; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)

late-filing standards applied to discretionary intervention; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)

licensing board discretion in managing proceedings; CLI-98-8, 47 NRC 314 (1998)

litigability of bases for contentions; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)

litigability of challenges to Commission rules; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)

materiality of issues raised in contentions; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)

member authorization for representational standing to intervene; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 261 (1998)

participation of licensing board judges in settlements; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 261 (1998)

prepared testimony in enforcement proceedings; LBP-98-2, 47 NRC 3 (1998)

settlement of contested proceedings; CLI-98-1, 47 NRC 13 (1998)

raising matters for first time in motion for reconsideration; LBP-98-10, 47 NRC 288 (1998)

representational standing to intervene, specification of member injury for; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 261 (1998)

res judicata, timing of decisions on; CLI-98-5, 47 NRC 113 (1998)

scope of an adjudicatory proceeding; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)

scope of contentions; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 77 (1998)

sound record development as a factor in admission of late-filed contentions; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)

specificity and basis requirements for admission of contentions; LBP-98-13, 47 NRC 360 (1998)

specificity required to establish injury in fact for standing to intervene; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)

standard for seeking a waiver of a rule or regulation in an adjudication; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)

standing to intervene in materials license proceeding; CLI-98-6, 47 NRC 116 (1998)

standing to intervene where intervention is uncontested; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)

stay of order; CLI-98-4, 47 NRC 111 (1998)

stay pending appeal; CLI-98-8, 47 NRC 314 (1998)

support for contentions; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)

supporting information for contentions; LBP-98-10, 47 NRC 288 (1998)

timeliness of intervention petitions; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)

vacatur; CLI-98-5, 47 NRC 113 (1998)

SUBJECT INDEX

- zone of interests test for standing to intervene; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)
- RULINGS
 - explanation of reasons for; LBP-98-10, 47 NRC 288 (1998)
- SCHEDULING
 - of filings, use by presiding officer to expedite informal proceedings; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 261 (1998)
- SECURITY PLANS
 - access of intervenor to; LBP-98-13, 47 NRC 360 (1998)
- SEISMIC ANALYSIS
 - of steam generator supports at SONGS, request for; DD-98-6, 47 NRC 396 (1998)
- SEISMIC DESIGN
 - cash-pad at ISFSI; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)
 - of gaseous diffusion plant, request for amendment of Certificate of Compliance; CLI-98-2, 47 NRC 57 (1998)
- SERVICE OF DOCUMENTS
 - on intervenors after termination of proceeding; CLI-98-5, 47 NRC 113 (1998)
- SETTLEMENT AGREEMENTS
 - as basis for termination of proceeding; CLI-98-1, 47 NRC 13 (1998)
 - NRC policy on; CLI-98-1, 47 NRC 13 (1998); LBP-98-1, 47 NRC 1 (1998)
 - public-interest standard for approval of; LBP-98-1, 47 NRC 1 (1998)
- SETTLEMENTS
 - participation of licensing board judges in; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 261 (1998)
- SITE SCREENING
 - applicant's process under NEPA; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 77 (1998)
- SITE SELECTION
 - for ISFSI, discriminatory effects of; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)
- SITE SUITABILITY
 - geotechnical, of independent spent fuel storage installation; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)
- SOIL
 - contaminated, potential for radiological releases during new activities; LBP-98-5, 47 NRC 119 (1998)
- STANDARDS OF ETHICAL CONDUCT
 - applicability to licensing board judges; CLI-98-9, 47 NRC 326 (1998)
- STANDING TO INTERVENE
 - aspects of intervention as basis for; LBP-98-12, 47 NRC 343 (1998)
 - geographic proximity and Staff delay of issuance of full license as basis for; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 261 (1998)
 - in materials license proceeding, proximity as basis for; CLI-98-6, 47 NRC 116 (1998)
 - injury in fact and zone of interests tests for; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)
 - interest required to establish; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)
 - judicial concepts applied in NRC proceedings; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998); LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 261 (1998)
 - Native American tribe; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)
 - participation of governmental agency; LBP-98-12, 47 NRC 343 (1998)
 - representational, nonaffidavit authorization by member; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 261 (1998)
 - representational, specification of member injury for; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 261 (1998)
 - specificity required to establish injury in fact; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)
 - state interest in; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)
 - where intervention is uncontested; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)
- STATES
 - access to security plan; LBP-98-13, 47 NRC 360 (1998)
 - intervention by; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)
- STAY
 - criteria for grant of; LBP-98-5, 47 NRC 119 (1998)
 - of *in situ* mining activities; LBP-98-3, 47 NRC 7 (1998)
 - pending appeal, deadline for filing request for; CLI-98-8, 47 NRC 314 (1998)

SUBJECT INDEX

- public interest considerations in determining motions for; LBP-98-5, 47 NRC 119 (1998)
- replies to responses to motions for; LBP-98-5, 47 NRC 119 (1998)
- temporary, of Staff licensing action; LBP-98-3, 47 NRC 7 (1998)
- temporary, to preserve status quo; CLI-98-4, 47 NRC 111 (1998)
- STEAM GENERATOR SUPPORTS
 - integrity at SONGS; DD-98-6, 47 NRC 396 (1998)
- STORAGE CANISTERS
 - procedure for verifying the presence of helium in; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)
- SUBPART I PROCEEDINGS
 - applicability of section 2.704(c) in; CLI-98-9, 47 NRC 326 (1998)
 - areas of concern, standards for admission; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 261 (1998)
 - consolidation of parties; LBP-98-9, 47 NRC 261 (1998)
 - litigability of separate area of concern that is already litigable with respect to admitted areas of concern; LBP-98-14, 47 NRC 376 (1998)
 - scope of and basis for decision by presiding officer; LBP-98-14, 47 NRC 376 (1998)
 - See also Informal Hearings
- TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS
 - independent spent fuel storage installation, modification of; DD-98-2, 47 NRC 37 (1998)
- TERMINATION OF PROCEEDINGS
 - service of documents on intervenors after; CLI-98-5, 47 NRC 113 (1998)
 - settlement agreement as basis for; CLI-98-1, 47 NRC 13 (1998)
- TESTIMONY
 - prepared, in enforcement proceedings; LBP-98-2, 47 NRC 3 (1998)
- THERMAL DESIGN
 - of independent spent fuel storage installation, adequacy of; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)
- TRAINING
 - and certification of personnel for independent spent fuel storage installation, adequacy of; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)
- TRANSPORTATION OF SPENT FUEL
 - radiological impacts of; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)
- TRITIUM LUMINOUS GUNSIGHTS
 - manufacturing standards; LBP-98-1, 47 NRC 1 (1998)
- TRUST RELATIONSHIP DOCTRINE
 - applicability to precensuring hearing rights on materials license application; LBP-98-5, 47 NRC 119 (1998)
- URANIUM ENRICHMENT
 - market prices; CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 77 (1998)
- VACATUR
 - of unreviewed rulings; CLI-98-5, 47 NRC 113 (1998)
- VIOLATIONS
 - programmatic concerns at Millstone facility; DD-98-1, 47 NRC 23 (1998)
- WAIVER OF RULES OR REGULATIONS
 - special circumstances for; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)
 - standard for seeking; LBP-98-7, 47 NRC 142 (1998)
- WASTEWATER
 - dose from land application of; LBP-98-5, 47 NRC 119 (1998)
- WATCH LIST
 - characteristics of plants on; DD-98-1, 47 NRC 23 (1998)

FACILITY INDEX

CLAIBORNE ENRICHMENT CENTER; Docket No. 70-3070-ML
MATERIALS LICENSE; April 3, 1998; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER (Addressing NEPA
Contentions); CLI-98-3, 47 NRC 77 (1998)
MATERIALS LICENSE; April 30, 1998; ORDER; CLI-98-5, 47 NRC 113 (1998)
HADDAM NECK PLANT; Docket No. 50-213
REQUEST FOR ACTION; February 11, 1998; DIRECTOR'S DECISION UNDER 10 C.F.R. § 2.206;
DD-98-1, 47 NRC 23 (1998)
MILLSTONE NUCLEAR POWER STATION, Units 1, 2, and 3; Docket Nos. 50-245, 50-336, 50-423
REQUEST FOR ACTION; February 11, 1998; DIRECTOR'S DECISION UNDER 10 C.F.R. § 2.206;
DD-98-1, 47 NRC 23 (1998)
REQUEST FOR ACTION; June 1, 1998; DIRECTOR'S DECISION UNDER 10 C.F.R. § 2.206;
DD-98-4, 47 NRC 381 (1998)
PRAIRIE ISLAND NUCLEAR GENERATING PLANT; Docket Nos. 50-282, 50-306
REQUEST FOR ACTION; February 11, 1998; DIRECTOR'S DECISION UNDER 10 C.F.R. § 2.206;
DD-98-2, 47 NRC 37 (1998)
PRAIRIE ISLAND INDEPENDENT SPENT FUEL STORAGE INSTALLATION; Docket No. 72-10
REQUEST FOR ACTION; February 11, 1998; DIRECTOR'S DECISION UNDER 10 C.F.R. § 2.206;
DD-98-2, 47 NRC 37 (1998)
SAN ONOFRE NUCLEAR GENERATING STATION, Units 2 and 3; Docket Nos. 50-361, 50-362
REQUEST FOR ACTION; June 5, 1998; DIRECTOR'S DECISION UNDER 10 C.F.R. § 2.206;
DD-98-5, 47 NRC 390 (1998)
REQUEST FOR ACTION; June 11, 1998; DIRECTOR'S DECISION UNDER 10 C.F.R. § 2.206;
DD-98-6, 47 NRC 396 (1998)
SEABROOK STATION, Unit 1; Docket No. 50-443
REQUEST FOR ACTION; March 17, 1998; DIRECTOR'S DECISION UNDER 10 C.F.R. § 2.206;
DD-98-3, 47 NRC 71 (1998)
WHITE MESA URANIUM MILL; Docket No. 40-8681-MLA
MATERIALS LICENSE AMENDMENT; April 30, 1998; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER; CLI-98-6,
47 NRC 116 (1998)
YANKEE NUCLEAR POWER STATION; Docket No. 50-029-LA
LICENSE AMENDMENT; June 12, 1998; MEMORANDUM AND ORDER (Decision on Standing);
LBP-98-12, 47 NRC 343 (1998)

NUREG-0750
Vol. 47, Index 2

INDEXES TO NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION ISSUANCES
JANUARY - JUNE 1998

SEPTEMBER 1998

120555154486
US NRC-OCIO
DIV--INFORMATION MANAGEMENT
TPS--PDF--NUREG
2WFEN-6E7
WASHINGTON
1 1AN1A21XP
DC 20555