

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

Atomic Safety and Licensing Board

Before Administrative Judges:

ASLBP BOARD 09-892-HLW-CAB04 Thomas S. Moore, Chairman Paul S. Ryerson Richard E. Wardwell
--

In the Matter of)	
)	
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY)	Docket No. 63-001
)	
(High Level Waste Repository))	May 4, 2010

**STATE OF NEVADA'S ANSWER TO THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
REGULATORY UTILITY COMMISSIONERS' PETITION TO INTERVENE**

Honorable Catherine Cortez Masto
Nevada Attorney General
Marta Adams
Chief, Bureau of Government Affairs
100 North Carson Street
Carson City, Nevada 89701
Tel: 775-684-1237
Email: madams@ag.nv.gov

Egan, Fitzpatrick & Malsch, PLLC
Martin G. Malsch *
Charles J. Fitzpatrick *
John W. Lawrence *
12500 San Pedro Avenue, Suite 555
San Antonio, TX 78216
Tel: 210.496.5001
Fax: 210.496.5011
mmalsch@nuclearlawyer.com
cfitzpatrick@nuclearlawyer.com
jlawrence@nuclearlawyer.com

*Special Deputy Attorneys General

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. STANDING 1

A. NARUC Has Not Established Representational Standing..... 1

B. NARUC Has No Concrete Interest Because It Has No Substantive Claims 2

II. DISCRETIONARY INTERVENTION 3

III. NON-TIMELY INTERVENTION..... 5

A. Good Cause For Failure To File On Time (Factor (i))..... 5

B. Nature Of Petitioner's Right To Be Made A Party (Factor (ii)) 9

C. Nature Of Petitioner's Interest (Factor (iii))..... 9

D. Effect On Petitioner's Interests (Factor (iv)) 9

E. Availability Of Other Means To Protect Petitioner's Interests (Factor (v))..... 9

**F. Extent To Which Petitioner's Interests Will Be Represented By Existing
 Parties (Factor (vi)) 10**

**G. Extent To Which Petitioner's Participation Will Broaden The Issues Or
 Delay The Proceeding (Factor (vii))..... 10**

**H. Extent To Which Petitioner's Participation May Reasonably Be Expected
 To Assist In Developing A Sound Record (Factor (viii)) 10**

I. Summary 10

IV. CONTENTIONS..... 11

**A. NAR-MISC-03 – DOE'S DECISION TO IRREVOCABLY TERMINATE
 THE YUCCA MOUNTAIN PROJECT IS ARBITRARY AND
 CAPRICIOUS IN VIOLATION OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE
 PROCEDURE ACT 12**

**B. NAR-MISC-04 – DOE DID NOT COMPLY WITH NEPA BEFORE
 DECIDING TO IRREVOCABLY TERMINATE THE YUCCA
 MOUNTAIN PROJECT 13**

V. CONCLUSION 15

STATE OF NEVADA'S ANSWER TO THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF REGULATORY UTILITY COMMISSIONERS' PETITION TO INTERVENE

On March 15, 2010, the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners (NARUC) petitioned for leave to intervene in this proceeding. For the reasons set forth below, the State of Nevada (Nevada) opposes NARUC's petition. The Native Community Action Council (NCAC) joins in this Answer.

I. STANDING

As explained below, NARUC has not established its standing to intervene in this proceeding as a matter of right.

A. NARUC Has Not Established Representational Standing

NARUC's standing argument is premised on a claim, supported by an affidavit, that it represents the interests of all 50 State public utility commission members who would be affected by DOE's withdrawal of its license application for the Yucca Mountain repository (Petition at 5-8). NARUC recognizes, however, that established NRC case-law on representational standing requires it to identify one of its members by name and address, demonstrate that this member has an interest that may be affected by the proceeding, and show that the member authorizes NARUC to request a hearing on its behalf (Petition at 8). To satisfy these requirements, NARUC chose the Honorable David Wright, who is both the current Chairman of NARUC's Nuclear Issues-Waste Management Disposal Subcommittee and a member of the South Carolina Public Service Commission.

As discussed above, Mr. Wright's standing must be established in order for NARUC's representational standing argument to succeed. *Private Fuel Storage (Independent Spent Fuel Storage Installation)*, CLI-99-10, 49 NRC 318, 323 (1999). NARUC argues that Mr. Wright has standing to intervene because of his official duty to represent and protect the health,

safety, and economic welfare of South Carolina's citizens (Petition at 10). Unfortunately for NARUC, the State of South Carolina is also seeking to intervene in this proceeding as a matter of right in order to represent and protect those very same interests (*see* Petition of the State of South Carolina to Intervene, February 26, 2010, at 10). Under 10 C.F.R. § 2.309 (d)(2)(ii), only a "single designated representative of the State" may be admitted as a party. Nevada does not in any way question the good faith of either NARUC or Commissioner Wright, but Nevada cannot understand how Commissioner Wright could represent the interests of South Carolina and its citizens when South Carolina's Attorney General is already doing so. Clearly, some choice of representation by South Carolina was required. If Commissioner Wright cannot represent the interests of South Carolina and its citizens because the South Carolina Attorney General represents them, then he has no individual standing to intervene and, because NARUC relies exclusively on Commissioner Wright's standing as a member, its case for standing fails as well.¹

B. NARUC Has No Concrete Interest Because It Has No Substantive Claims

NARUC's members' interests here are unusually narrow. NARUC seeks to intervene in order to assert an alleged procedural right that the Yucca Mountain license application be considered fully on its merits. In such a procedural right case, a petitioner must establish that the procedural right at stake is designed to protect its concrete interests in the outcome of the agency proceedings.² For example, in *Electric Power Supply Ass'n v. FERC*,

¹ Mr. Wright cannot base his standing on 10 C.F.R. § 2.309 (d)(2) (as argued in Petition at 10, note 10) because this paragraph applies only to standing with respect to "a facility located within its [South Carolina's] borders." Yucca Mountain is not located in South Carolina.

² If this is not treated as a procedural rights case, NARUC would be required to satisfy the redressability element of standing. Because NARUC's injuries would appear to be of a type that will be redressed only if Yucca Mountain is licensed, NARUC would be required to show that if the application proceeds, there is a substantial likelihood the outcome will be favorable and the license will be issued. *See Duke Power Co. v. Carolina Environmental Study Group*, 438 U.S. 59, 78 (1978). Such a showing would be impossible to make.

391 F.3d 1255 (D.C. Cir. 2004), the Court held that an association of energy marketers had standing to challenge an agency rule permitting illegal ex parte communications in its hearings because the association's members had concrete financial interests at stake and were participating as parties in hearings where the rule applied.

Even if NARUC had established some concrete interests that would be affected if Yucca Mountain is not licensed, it has not sought to advance any of those interests by filing substantive contentions. NARUC is not seeking to intervene to support any aspect of the license application on its merits. If NARUC's procedural right is vindicated, the proceeding will continue, but NARUC will disappear from the scene and, as NARUC states elsewhere, the remaining parties cannot represent its interests (Petition at 20). NARUC's interests (if any) may still exist but, insofar as the NRC proceeding is concerned, its interests will exist only in the abstract, subject to rejection or redefinition at the discretion of the NRC and the remaining parties. In short, NARUC will no longer have the "concrete interest in the outcome of the proceeding" that the law on standing requires. Its injury is purely a procedural one, and the assertion of a pure procedural interest without more is not sufficient for standing. *See Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife*, 504 U.S. 555, 572-73 (1992).

II. DISCRETIONARY INTERVENTION

NARUC also argues that it should be granted discretionary intervention pursuant to 10 C.F.R. § 2.309 (e) (Petition at 16). Discretionary intervention is an "extraordinarily procedure" that cannot not be granted "unless there are compelling factors in favor of such intervention." 69 Fed. Reg. 2182, 2201 (January 14, 2004). NARUC's case falls far short of a compelling one.

Under the six-factor test, an ability to contribute to a sound record (10 C.F.R. § 2.309 (e)(1)(i)) is the primary consideration. *Portland General Electric (Pebble Springs Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2)*, CLI-76-27, 4 NRC 610, 617 (1976). However, NARUC cannot make a

favorable showing on this critical factor because its participation would be limited to legal issues associated with DOE's motion to withdraw its application (Petition at pp. 22, 27, 31, 35, 38). If the licensing proceeding continues, NARUC will be long gone when the time arrives for any evidence to be admitted. Yet, it is a petitioner's ability to contribute sound evidence rather than its asserted legal skills that is of significance in evaluating and balancing this particular factor. *Houston Lighting and Power Co. (Allens Creek Nuclear Generating Station, Unit 1)*, ALAB-671, 15 NRC 508, 513 n. 14 (1982); *Kansas Gas and Electric Co. (Wolf Creek Generating Station, Unit 1)*, LBP-84-17, 19 NRC 878, 888 (1984).

NARUC's showing on the other two factors weighing in favor of intervention (10 C.F.R. § 2.309 (e)(1)(ii) and (iii)) also fails. This is because both relate to a petitioner's interests and, as indicated above, NARUC has no cognizable interest in this proceeding unless the State of South Carolina agrees that Mr. Wright and NARUC, as opposed to its Attorney General, should represent its interests.

All of the factors weighing against intervention in 10 C.F.R. § 2.309 (e)(2) apply to NARUC's request, with the possible exception of factor (ii) (the extent to which petitioner's interests will be represented by existing parties). Factor (i) (other means to protect petitioner's interests) weighs against NARUC's intervention because NARUC seeks only to raise legal issues and, accordingly, its interests will be protected by participating as an amicus. *See Tennessee Valley Authority (Watts Bar Nuclear Plant, Unit 2)*, CLI-10-12, __ NRC __ (March 26, 2010) (slip op. at 11, note 50). Factor (iii) (the extent to which petitioner's intervention will inappropriately broaden the issues or delay the proceeding) weighs against NARUC because, as explained below in Nevada's discussion of NARUC's contentions, NARUC seeks to raise at least two contentions (NAR-03 and NAR-04) that appear to be outside of the scope of the proceeding

and therefore inappropriate. Finally, even factor (ii) will count against intervention if South Carolina is admitted as a party because Mr. Wright's interests (and, therefore, NARUC's interests) will be protected by South Carolina's participation through its Attorney General.

In sum, NARUC's case for discretionary intervention cannot be a compelling one because it fails on the most important factor (an ability to contribute to a sound record on technical issues) and it also fails on every other factor with the possible exception of factor (2)(ii) (the extent to which petitioner's interests will be represented by existing parties). It will fail on factor (2)(ii) as well if South Carolina is allowed to intervene.

III. NON-TIMELY INTERVENTION

NARUC concedes that its petition is untimely (Petition at 17), but it argues that its late petition should be accepted based on a balancing of factors in 10 C.F.R. § 2.309 (c) (Petition at 17-22). The Commission addressed the subject of late intervention petitions in a recent decision, *Tennessee Valley Authority (Watts Bar Nuclear Plant, Unit 2)*, CLI-10-12, __ NRC __ (March 26, 2010). In this decision the Commission summarized its practice as follows:

The first factor – good cause – is accorded the greatest weight. Absent a showing of good cause, a non-timely petition will not be excused unless the petitioner makes a compelling showing on the remaining factors. A petitioner's showing must be highly persuasive; it would be a rare case where we would excuse a non-timely petition absent good cause.

Id. (slip op. at 4). As indicated below, NARUC has not shown good cause to its failure to file on time and has made no compelling showing on the remaining factors.

A. Good Cause For Failure To File On Time (Factor (i))

The Notice of Hearing in this proceeding, 73 Fed. Reg. 63029 (October 22, 2008), required that all petitions to intervene in this proceeding be filed no later than December 22, 2008, almost one and one-half years ago. Nevertheless, NARUC argues that its standing by and doing nothing for almost one and one-half years was justified because "[t]his DOE motion to

withdraw was not just unpredictable, but highly improbable" when the deadline for timely petitions passed (Petition at 17). Also according to NARUC, DOE's application was "a high-quality license application that, on its face, provides the Board reasonable assurance that the facility can be built and operated in accordance with the legal and regulatory requirements" and "[a]s a result, there was no reason for NARUC to intervene" (Petition at 18). In other words, NARUC completely ignored the possibility that parties, such as Nevada, might offer convincing evidence that disposal of high-level radioactive waste in Yucca Mountain would be unsafe, and assumed not only that DOE would march forward but also that the NRC licensing boards and the Commission would protect NARUC's interests by granting DOE's application.

NARUC utterly fails to account for the possibility that a hearing process, presided over by expert and impartial NRC tribunals, would lead to decision that rejected DOE's application. NARUC's argument that it had good cause for late intervention is not only presumptuous, but it also flies in the face of long-standing and well-settled Commission precedent clearly holding that a petitioner may not justify intervening after the established deadline by claiming it was lulled into inaction by the participation of other parties. *Citizens for Fair Utility Regulation v. NRC*, 898 F.2d 51 (5th Cir. 1990), *affirming Texas Utilities Electric Company (Comanche Peak Steam Electric Station, Units 1 and 2)*, CLI-88-12, 28 NRC 605, 609 (1988); *Gulf States Utilities Company (River Bend Station, Units 1 and 2)*, ALAB-444, 6 NRC 760, 795-98 (1977). In the latter case, the Union of Concerned Scientists attempted to replace the State of Louisiana after the State decided to withdraw from the proceeding, arguing that the organization and its members had been "lulled into inaction" by the State's previous participation. 6 NRC at 796. The Appeal Board rejected that argument, holding that the belated petitioners assumed the risk that the previous litigant's degree of involvement would not fulfill

their expectations and that "a foreseeable consequence of the materialization of that risk was that it would no longer be possible to undertake [themselves] the vindication of [their] interests." *See also Easton Utilities Commission v. AEC*, 424 F.2d 847, 852 (D.C. Cir. 1970).

NARUC also claims that its late intervention was justified since it filed "immediately upon learning that DOE filed a motion to withdraw the license application." Petition at 19. This is a bit of a stretch because NARUC filed its Petition almost two weeks after DOE filed its motion. However, what is more important in this regard is that NARUC failed to act upon earlier, public information. A petitioner has an obligation to uncover and apply publicly available information in a timely manner. *Texas Utilities Electric Company (Comanche Peak Steam Electric Station, Unit 2)*, CLI-93-4, 37 NRC 156, 164-65 (1993); *Texas Utilities Electric Company (Comanche Peak Steam Electric Station, Units 1 and 2)*, CLI-92-12, 36 NRC 62, 69-73 (1992); *Kansas Gas & Electric Company (Wolf Creek Generating Station, Unit 1)*, LBP-84-17, 19 NRC 878, 886 (1984). Even before petitions were due on December 22, 2008, it was well known that President Obama was committed to abandoning the repository at Yucca Mountain. *See e.g.*, a September 25, 2008 New York Times article quoting then-candidate Obama as saying that "the nuclear waste disposal efforts at Yucca Mountain have been an expensive failure and should be abandoned" (Exhibit 1). NARUC itself, in a recent April 2, 2010 media release (Exhibit 2), admitted that "since taking office in January 2009, the Obama Administration made clear their intent to shutter the project." Thus, NARUC failed to uncover and apply information, publicly available before December 22, 2008, or shortly thereafter, that the Administration (which necessarily includes DOE) would seek to abandon Yucca Mountain, which necessarily implies that DOE would move to withdraw the license application. This information was more than sufficient to put NARUC on notice that it should seek to participate

in the proceeding in order to protect its interests if not within the established deadline, then at least as soon as possible thereafter.

It is not relevant that DOE's motion to withdraw was not actually filed until many months after the President's position became generally known. The Commission held in *Duke Power Co. (Catawba Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2)*, CLI-83-19, 17 NRC 1041, 1045 (1983) that "the institutional unavailability of a licensing related document does not establish good cause for filing a contention late if information was available early enough to provide the basis for the timely filing of that contention." *Catawba* was followed in *Long Island Lighting Company (Shoreham Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1)*, LBP-83-42, 18 NRC 112 (1983), *affirmed*, ALAB-743, 18 NRC 387 (1983). The analysis in *Shoreham* is instructive. In *Shoreham* an organization filed an untimely petition to intervene to support the application and the applicant's emergency plan, which had been prepared and filed following the local government's repudiation of an earlier emergency plan the applicant had prepared for the local government and the local government's subsequent announcement that it would not prepare its own substitute plan. The petitioner argued that its duty to file promptly upon receipt of new and material information arose only with the filing of the applicant's plan, the actual licensing document. The Licensing Board and Appeal Board both disagreed and denied the late petition, holding that the event triggering the petitioner's duty was the local government's earlier announcement that it would not prepare its own plan. That announcement signaled that the applicant would be filing its own plan and provided adequate information to support petitioner's intervention and contentions. As in *Shoreham*, NARUC's duty to file within a reasonable time was triggered not by the formal filing of licensing related documents (DOE's formal filing of the motion and its earlier formal

notice that such a motion would be filed), but rather by earlier public announcements that clearly signaled what would follow.

B. Nature Of Petitioner's Right To Be Made A Party (Factor (ii))

As indicated above, NARUC has not established any right to be made a party.

C. Nature Of Petitioner's Interest (Factor (iii))

NARUC does not identify any interests other than those offered to establish standing (Petition at 19). As noted above, NARUC has not established standing as a matter of right and its interests are purely procedural in any event.

D. Effect On Petitioner's Interests (Factor (iv))

NARUC argues here that a withdrawal with prejudice will mean that billions of dollars of utility charges will have been wasted (Petition at 15, 19). However, if DOE's motion to withdraw is denied, or DOE's application is re-filed after a withdrawal without prejudice, but the application is ultimately denied on its merits after years of hearing litigation, many more ratepayer dollars will have been wasted. Thus NARUC's argument assumes that the application will be granted if it is not withdrawn. This assumption has no basis, especially at this early stage of the proceeding. NARUC's further argument that withdrawal "necessarily exacerbates NARUC's member commission's ability to carry out their [sic] fiduciary responsibilities to protect the health, safety, and economic welfare of its State electric ratepayers "is hopelessly vague and unsupported (Petition at 15).

E. Availability Of Other Means To Protect Petitioner's Interests (Factor (v))

Nevada does not dispute that the precise relief NARUC seeks, a denial of DOE's motion to withdraw, may be obtained only in this proceeding (Petition at 20). However, inasmuch as NARUC seeks only to raise legal issues, it may participate effectively before NRC by filing an *amicus* brief, and this factor cuts against allowing late intervention. The

Commission considered the availability of *amicus* participation as relevant in applying factor (v) in a very recent decision, *Tennessee Valley Authority (Watts Bar Nuclear Plant, Unit 2)*, CLI-10-12, ___ NRC ___ (March 26, 2010) (slip op. at 11, note 50).

F. Extent To Which Petitioner's Interests Will Be Represented By Existing Parties (Factor (vi))

NARUC argues that there is no admitted party that will protect its interests (Petition at 10-16, 20). But, because NARUC's representational standing argument refers to the interests of South Carolina's utility commission and South Carolina's ratepayers, this argument cannot be accepted unless South Carolina's intervention petition is denied. If South Carolina's intervention petition is granted, it will represent South Carolina's commission and ratepayers.

G. Extent To Which Petitioner's Participation Will Broaden The Issues Or Delay The Proceeding (Factor (vii))

NARUC argues that granting its petition will not delay the proceeding (Petition at pg. 21). However, this factor weighs against NARUC because, as explained below in Nevada's discussion of NARUC's contentions, NARUC seeks to raise issues not discussed in DOE's motion to withdraw, including at least two contentions (NAR-03 and NAR-04) that appear to be outside of the scope of the proceeding and inappropriate. This will delay the proceeding.

H. Extent To Which Petitioner's Participation May Reasonably Be Expected To Assist In Developing A Sound Record (Factor (viii))

As noted above, NARUC's demonstration on this factor fails because it will make absolutely no contribution to any technical record.

I. Summary

As indicated above, NARUC must make a compelling showing on factors (ii) through (viii) because it does not establish any good cause for its late intervention (factor (i)). It utterly fails to do so. Of the seven factors, NARUC succeeds at the very most on only one –

factor (vi) (extent to which NARUC's interests will be represented by existing parties) and, as explained above, this factor does not count in NARUC's favor if South Carolina intervenes. The other factors either count against NARUC or are at best neutral. The Commission has held that a favorable showing on factor (vi) does not overcome the adverse effect of not demonstrating good cause for late intervention (factor (i)). *Westinghouse Electric Corporation (Nuclear Fuel Export License for Czech Republic)*, CLI-94-7, 39 NRC 322, 329 (1994). Moreover, in evaluating and balancing factors (i) and (vi), petitioner's governmental status (NARUC refers to South Carolina's Utility Commission's interests) cannot in and of itself cannot carry the day. *Public Service Company of Indiana (Marble Hill Nuclear Generating Station, Units 1 and 2)*, ALAB-339, 4 NRC 20 (1976).

IV. CONTENTIONS

NARUC submits four contentions. Nevada does not object to the admission of NAR-MISC-01 or NAR-MISC-02. However, Nevada objects to NAR-MISC-03 and NAR-MISC-04 as follows.

A. NAR-MISC-03 – DOE'S DECISION TO IRREVOCABLY TERMINATE THE YUCCA MOUNTAIN PROJECT IS ARBITRARY AND CAPRICIOUS IN VIOLATION OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT

Nevada objects to the admissibility of this contention as follows:

a. Statement of Issue (10 CFR § 2.309(f)(1)(i))

No objection.

b. Brief Statement of Basis (10 CFR § 2.309(f)(1)(ii))

No objection.

c. Scope of the Proceeding (10 CFR § 2.309(f)(1)(iii))

Whether, in considering DOE's withdrawal motion, NRC must or may consider DOE's stated reasons for seeking withdrawal is inextricably linked to NRC's consideration of the merits of that motion, and is best addressed in that context. However, in general, the NRC does not apply the APA to a federal agency applicant as if it were performing the function of a court on judicial review.

d. Materiality (10 CFR 2.309(f)(1)(iv))

See discussion in (c) above.

e. Adequate Basis (10 CFR 2.309(f)(1)(v))

No objection.

f. Genuine dispute (10 CFR § 2.309(f)(1)(vi))

See discussion in (c) above.

B. NAR-MISC-04 – DOE DID NOT COMPLY WITH NEPA BEFORE DECIDING TO IRREVOCABLY TERMINATE THE YUCCA MOUNTAIN PROJECT

Nevada objects to the admissibility of this contention as follows.

a. Statement of Issue (10 CFR § 2.309(f)(1)(i))

Nevada does not object on specificity grounds to this contention insofar as it seeks to raise the pure legal question whether, to support its motion to withdraw, DOE must prepare an environmental impact statement that is separate from the statement it prepared to support its license application, regardless of the adequacy of the discussion of the no-action alternative in that statement.

b. Brief Statement of Basis (10 CFR § 2.309(f)(1)(ii))

No objection.

c. Scope of the Proceeding (10 CFR § 2.309(f)(1)(iii))

This proceeding, like all NRC proceedings, is limited in scope to whether NRC has complied with NEPA. Whether DOE has complied with NEPA is only relevant insofar as NRC may seek to comply with NEPA by relying on an environmental statement prepared by DOE.

d. Materiality (10 CFR 2.309(f)(1)(iv))

This proceeding, like all NRC proceedings, is limited in scope to whether NRC has complied with NEPA. NEPA allegations directed at DOE do not in themselves raise material issues.

e. Adequate Basis (10 CFR 2.309(f)(1)(v))

No objection.

f. Genuine dispute (10 CFR § 2.309(f)(1)(vi))

Nevada reservations with respect to whether NAR-MISC-04 raises

material issues that are within the scope of the proceeding apply here as well.

V. **CONCLUSION**

NARUC's Petition should be denied.

Respectfully submitted,

Honorable Catherine Cortez Masto
Nevada Attorney General
Marta Adams
Chief, Bureau of Government Affairs
100 North Carson Street
Carson City, Nevada 89701
Tel: 775-684-1237
Email: madams@ag.nv.gov

(signed electronically)

Martin G. Malsch *
Charles J. Fitzpatrick *
John W. Lawrence *
Egan, Fitzpatrick & Malsch, PLLC
12500 San Pedro Avenue, Suite 555
San Antonio, TX 78216
Tel: 210.496.5001
Fax: 210.496.5011
mmalsch@nuclearlawyer.com
cfitzpatrick@nuclearlawyer.com
jlawrence@nuclearlawyer.com

*Special Deputy Attorneys General

Dated: May 4, 2010

Exhibit 1

SEPTEMBER 25, 2008, 11:13 AM

Obama's Science Quiz

By *JOHN TIERNEY*

The journal Nature managed to get answers to 18 questions about science policy from Senator Barack Obama, but not from Senator John McCain. You can read [the full text of Mr. Obama's answers here](#) along with summaries of what Mr. McCain has said in the past on these issues.

One of the biggest differences that emerges in the Nature answers, as in [previous answers to ScienceDebate08](#), concerns nuclear power. While Mr. McCain has previously called for building 45 new nuclear reactors by 2030, Mr. Obama sounds much more cautious:

It is unlikely that we can meet our aggressive climate goals if we eliminate nuclear power as an option. However, before an expansion of nuclear power is considered, key issues must be addressed, including security of nuclear fuel and waste, waste storage and proliferation. The nuclear waste disposal efforts at Yucca Mountain [in Nevada] have been an expensive failure and should be abandoned. I will work with the industry and governors to develop a way to store nuclear waste safely while we pursue long-term solutions.

What does a "long-term solution" mean? If this means waiting until there's a form of storage that will be safe for thousands of years — the hope for Yucca Mountain — then when, if ever, might we expect to see new nuclear power plants?

Exhibit 2

State Regulators Go to Court with DOE over Nuclear Waste Fees

WASHINGTON--The nation's State utility regulators are taking the U.S. Department of Energy to court over its decision last year to continue charging fees associated with moving and disposing of spent-nuclear fuel.

The National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners (NARUC) filed a petition for review today at the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit. NARUC is the national association representing the State Public Service Commissioners who regulate essential utility services, such as energy, telecommunications, and water.

At issue is DOE's October 2009 rejection of a request from NARUC to suspend payments into the Nuclear Waste Fund (NWF), a fund Congress established in 1982 to pay for the transportation and permanent disposal of commercial nuclear waste. The fees are assessed to nuclear utility companies and passed through to ratepayers by NARUC's Public Service Commission members based upon the federal government's explicit promise that the waste would be moved and safely disposed by DOE, most likely at the Yucca Mountain repository in Nevada. To date, ratepayers have paid approximately \$17 billion into the fund over the last 27 years. Further, the fund has earned an additional \$13.5 billion in interest, bringing it to about \$30 billion.

Although the Yucca project has been oft delayed, DOE in 2008 filed an application with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for a license to operate the repository. But since taking office in January 2009, the Obama Administration made clear their intent to shutter the project and convene the Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future to recommend a new disposal strategy.

With the Administration effectively zeroing out funding for the project in its budget proposals, NARUC last July asked the Energy Department to suspend payments into the NWF, determining that since the project was stalled, ratepayers shouldn't be charged for it. In response, DOE rejected the request, asserting that all fee payments to the fund are essential.

NARUC, in its petition, said DOE's rejection is an actionable determination that can be challenged in court.

"Since 1983, the nation's nuclear-utility consumers have faithfully contributed almost \$20 billion into the Nuclear Waste Fund, with the expectation that the spent-nuclear fuel would be safely moved and stored," said NARUC President David Coen of Vermont. "Unfortunately, the federal government has failed to live up to its end of the bargain. We do not take this action lightly; we are hopeful that the newly appointed Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future will chart a workable path. But until that time, there is no need to assess these fees on our consumers, particularly when we have no idea what solutions the Commission will suggest, and whether they will be implemented."

* * * * *

NARUC is a non-profit organization founded in 1889 whose members include the governmental agencies that are engaged in the regulation of utilities and carriers in the fifty States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. NARUC's member agencies regulate telecommunications, energy, and water utilities. NARUC represents the interests of State public utility commissions before the three branches of the Federal government.

####

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

Atomic Safety and Licensing Board

In the Matter of)	
)	
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY)	Docket No. 63-001-HLW
)	
(High Level Waste Repository))	

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that the foregoing State of Nevada's Answer to National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners' Petition to Intervene has been served upon the following persons by the Electronic Information Exchange:

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

CAB 01

William J. Froehlich, Chair
Administrative Judge
Email: wjf1@nrc.gov
Thomas S. Moore
Administrative Judge
Email: tsm2@nrc.gov
Richard E. Wardwell
Administrative Judge
Email: rew@nrc.gov

CAB 02

Michael M. Gibson, Chair
Administrative Judge
Email: mmg3@nrc.gov
Alan S. Rosenthal
Administrative Judge
Email: axr@nrc.gov
Nicholas G. Trikouros
Administrative Judge
Email: NGT@NRC.GOV

CAB 03

Paul S. Ryerson, Chair
Administrative Judge
Email: psr1@nrc.gov
Michael C. Farrar
Administrative Judge
Email: mcf@nrc.gov
Mark O. Barnett
Administrative Judge
Email: mob1@nrc.gov
mark.barnett@nrc.gov

CAB 04

Thomas S. Moore, Chair
Administrative Judge
Email: tsm2@nrc.gov
Paul S. Ryerson
Administrative Judge
Email: psr1@nrc.gov
Richard E. Wardwell
Administrative Judge
Email: rew@nrc.gov

Anthony C. Eitreim, Esq., Chief Counsel
Email: ace1@nrc.gov
Daniel J. Graser, LSN Administrator
Email: djg2@nrc.gov
Lauren Bregman
Email: lrb1@nrc.gov

Sara Culler
 Email: sara.culler@nrc.gov
 Joseph Deucher
 Email: jhd@nrc.gov
 Patricia Harich
 Email: patricia.harich@nrc.gov
 Zachary Kahn
 Email: zxk1@nrc.gov
 Erica LaPlante
 Email: ea1@nrc.gov
 Matthew Rotman
 Email: matthew.rotman@nrc.gov
 Andrew Welkie
 Email: axw5@nrc.gov
 Jack Whetstine
 Email: jgw@nrc.gov

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
 Office of the Secretary of the Commission
 Mail Stop - O-16 C1
 Washington, DC 20555-0001
 Hearing Docket
 Email: hearingdocket@nrc.gov
 Andrew L. Bates
 Email: alb@nrc.gov
 Adria T. Byrdsong
 Email: atb1@nrc.gov
 Emile L. Julian, Esq.
 Email: elj@nrc.gov
 Evangeline S. Ngbea
 Email: esn@nrc.gov
 Rebecca L. Giitter
 Email: rll@nrc.gov

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
 Office of Comm Appellate Adjudication
 Mail Stop - O-16C1
 Washington, DC 20555-0001
 OCAA Mail Center
 Email: ocaamail@nrc.gov

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
 Office of the General Counsel
 Mail Stop - O-15 D21
 Washington, DC 20555-0001
 Mitzi A. Young, Esq.
 Email: may@nrc.gov

Marian L. Zobler, Esq.
 Email: mlz@nrc.gov
 Andrea L. Silvia, Esq.
 Email: alc1@nrc.gov
 Daniel Lenehan, Esq.
 Email: dwl2@nrc.gov
 Adam S. Gendelman
 Email: Adam.Gendelman@nrc.gov
 Joseph S. Gilman, Paralegal
 Email: jsg1@nrc.gov
 Karin Francis, Paralegal
 Email: kfx4@nrc.gov
 Michael G. Dreher
 Email: Michael.dreher@nrc.gov
 OGCMailCenter
 Email: OGCMailCenter@nrc.gov

Hunton & Williams LLP
 Counsel for the U.S. Department of Energy
 Riverfront Plaza, East Tower
 951 East Byrd Street
 Richmond, VA 23219
 Kelly L. Faglioni, Esq.
 Email: kfaglioni@hunton.com
 Donald P. Irwin, Esq.
 Email: dirwin@hunton.com
 Michael R. Shebelskie, Esq.
 Email: mshebelskie@hunton.com
 Pat Slayton
 Email: pslayton@hunton.com

U.S. Department Of Energy
 Office of General Counsel
 1551 Hillshire Drive
 Las Vegas, NV 89134-6321
 George W. Hellstrom
 Email: george.hellstrom@ymp.gov

U.S. Department of Energy
 Office of General Counsel
 1000 Independence Avenue, S.W.
 Washington, DC 20585
 Martha S. Crosland, Esq.
 Email: martha.crosland@hq.doe.gov
 Nicholas P. DiNunzio, Esq.
 Email: nick.dinunziok@rw.doe.gov

James Bennett McRae
 Email: ben.mcrae@hq.doe.gov
 Christina C. Pak, Esq.
 Email: christina.pak@hq.doe.gov
 Scott Blake Harris
 Email: scott.harris@hq.doe.gov
 Sean A. Lev
 Email: sean.lev@hq.doe.gov

U.S. Department of Energy
 Office of Counsel
 Naval Sea Systems Command
 Nuclear Propulsion Program
 1333 Isaac Hull Avenue, SE
 Washington Navy Yard, Building 197
 Washington, DC 20376
 Frank A. Putzu, Esq.
 Email: frank.putzu@navy.mil

For the U.S. Department of Energy
 USA Repository Services LLC
 Yucca Mountain Project Licensing Group
 1160 N. Town Center Drive, Suite 240
 Las Vegas, NV 89144
 Jeffrey Kriner, Regulatory Programs
 Email: jeffrey.kriner@ymp.gov
 Stephen J. Cereghino, Licensing/Nucl Safety
 Email: stephen.cereghino@ymp.gov

For the U.S. Department of Energy
 USA Repository Services LLC
 Yucca Mountain Project Licensing Group
 6000 Executive Boulevard, Suite 608
 North Bethesda, MD 20852
 Edward Borella, Sr Staff
 Licensing/Nuclear Safety
 Email: edward.borella@ymp.gov

U.S. Department of Energy
 Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Mgmt
 Office of Repository Development
 1551 Hillshire Drive
 Las Vegas, NV 89134-6321
 Timothy C. Gunter
 Email: timothy.gunter@ymp.gov

U.S. Department of Energy
 1000 Independence Avenue, S.W.
 Washington, DC 20585
 Eric Knox, Associate Director, Systems
 Operations and External Relations, OCRWM
 Email: eric.knox@hq.doe.gov
 Dong Kim, LSN Project Manager, OCRWM
 Email: dong.kim@rw.doe.gov

Morgan, Lewis, Bockius LLP
 1111 Pennsylvania Ave., NW
 Washington, DC 20004
 Lewis Csedrik, Esq.
 Email: lcsedrik@morganlewis.com
 Jay Gutierrez, Esq.
 Email: jgutterrez@morganlewis.com
 Charles B. Moldenhauer, Associate
 Email: cmoldenhauer@morganlewis.com
 Brian P. Oldham, Esq.
 Email: boldham@morganlewis.com
 Thomas Poindexter, Esq.
 Email: tpoindexter@morganlewis.com
 Alex S. Polonsky, Esq.
 Email: apolonsky@morganlewis.com
 Thomas A. Schmutz, Esq.
 Email: tschmutz@morganlewis.com
 Donald Silverman, Esq.
 Email: dsilverman@morganlewis.com
 Annette M. White, Associate
 Email: c@morganlewis.com
 Paul J. Zaffuts, Esq.
 Email: pzaffuts@morganlewis.com
 Clifford W. Cooper, Paralegal
 Email: ccooper@morganlewis.com
 Shannon Staton, Legal Secretary
 Email: sstaton@morganlewis.com
 Raphael P. Kuyler
 Email: rkuyler@morganlewis.com

Carter Ledyard & Milburn, LLP
 Counsel for Lincoln County
 1401 Eye Street, N.W., Suite 300
 Washington, DC 20005
 Barry S. Neuman, Esq.
 Email: neuman@clm.com

Churchill, Esmeralda, Eureka, Mineral
and Lander Counties
1705 Wildcat Lane
Ogden, UT 84403
Loreen Pitchford, LSN Coordinator
for Lander County
Email: lpitchford@comcast.net

Robert List
Armstrong Teasdale LLP
1975 Village Center Circle, Suite 140
Las Vegas, NV 89134-62237
Email: rlist@armstrongteasdale.com

City of Las Vegas
400 Stewart Ave.
Las Vegas, NV 89101
Margaret Plaster, Management Analyst
Email: mplaster@LasVegasNevada.gov

Clark County Nuclear Waste Division
500 S. Grand Central Parkway
Las Vegas, NV 89155
Irene Navis
Email: iln@co.clark.nv.us
Engelbrecht von Tiesenhausen
Email: evt@co.clark.nv.us
Philip Klevatorick
Email: klevatorick@co.clark.nv.us

Nuclear Waste Project Office
1761 East College Parkway, Suite 118
Carson City, NV 89706
Bruce Breslow
Email: breslow@nuc.state.nv.us
Steve Frishman, Tech. Policy Coordinator
Email: steve.frishman@gmail.com

Eureka County and Lander County
Harmon, Curran, Speilberg & Eisenberg
1726 M. Street N.W., Suite 600
Washington, DC 20036
Diane Curran, Esq.
Email: dcurran@harmoncurran.com

Nevada Nuclear Waste Task Force
P.O. Box 26177
Las Vegas, NV 89126
Judy Treichel, Executive Director
Email: judyntwf@aol.com

Talisman International, LLC
1000 Potomac St., N.W., Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20007
Patricia Larimore
Email: plarimore@talisman-intl.com

Nuclear Energy Institute
1776 I Street, NW, Suite 400
Washington, DC 20006-3708
Michael A. Bauser, Esq.
Associate General Counsel
Email: mab@nei.org
Anne W. Cottingham, Esq.
Email: awc@nei.org
Ellen C. Ginsberg, Esq.
Email: ecg@nei.org
Rod McCullum
Email: rxm@nei.org
Steven P. Kraft
Email: spk@nei.org
Jay E. Silberg
Email: jay.silberg@pillsburylaw.com
Timothy J.V. Walsh
Email: timothy.walsh@pillsburylaw.com

White Pine County
City of Caliente
Lincoln County
P.O. Box 126
Caliente, NV 89008
Jason Pitts
Email: jayson@idtservices.com

Nuclear Information and Resource Service
6930 Carroll Avenue, Suite 340
Takoma Park, MD 20912
Michael Mariotte, Executive Director
Email: nirsnet@nirs.org

Radioactive Waste Watchdog
 Beyond Nuclear
 6930 Carroll Avenue, Suite 400
 Takoma Park, MD 20912
 Kevin Kamps
 Email: kevin@beyondnuclear.org

Abigail Johnson
 612 West Telegraph Street
 Carson City, NV 89703
 Email: abbyj@gbis.com

National Congress of American Indians
 1301 Connecticut Ave. NW - Second floor
 Washington, DC 20036
 Robert I. Holden, Director
 Nuclear Waste Program
 Email: robert_holden@ncai.org

Churchill County (NV)
 155 North Taylor Street, Suite 182
 Fallon, NV 89406
 Alan Kalt
 Email: comptroller@churchillcounty.org

Inyo County Water Department
 Yucca Mtn Nuclear Waste
 Repository Assessment Office
 163 May St.
 Bishop, CA 93514
 Matt Gaffney, Project Associate
 Email: mgaaffney@inyoyucca.org

Mr. Pat Cecil
 Inyo County Planning Director
 P.O. Box L
 Independence, CA 93526
 Email: pcecil@inyocounty.us

Robert S. Hanna
 233 E. Carrillo St., Suite B
 Santa Barbara, CA 93101
 Email: rsanna@bsglaw.net

Michael C. Berger
 233 E. Carrillo St., Suite B
 Santa Barbara, CA 93101
 Email: mberger@bsglaw.net

Environmental Protection Agency
 Ray Clark
 Email: clark.ray@epa.gov

Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board
 Joyce Dory
 Email: dory@nwtrb.gov

Intertech Services Corporation
 (for Lincoln County)
 P.O. Box 2008
 Carson City, NV 89702-2008
 Dr. Mike Baughman
 Email: bigboff@aol.com

Nye County Department of Natural
 Resources & Federal Facilities
 1210 E. Basin Road, Suite 6
 Pahrump, NV 89048
 David Swanson
 Email: dswanson@nyecounty.net

Lincoln County Nuclear Oversight Prgm
 100 Depot Ave., Suite 15; P.O. Box 1068
 Caliente, NV 89008-1068
 Lea Rasura-Alfano, Coordinator
 Email: jcciac@co.lincoln.nv.us

Nye County Regulatory/Licensing Adv.
 18160 Cottonwood Rd. #265
 Sunriver, OR 97707
 Malachy Murphy
 Email: mrmurphy@chamberscable.com

Nye County Nuclear Waste Repository Project
 Office (NWRPO)
 2101 E. Calvada Blvd., Suite 100
 Pahrump, NV 89048
 Zoie Choate, Secretary
 Email: zchoate@co.nye.nv.us
 Sherry Dudley, Admin. Technical Coordinator
 Email: sdudley@co.nye.nv.us

Mineral County Board of Commissioners
 P.O. Box 1600
 Hawthorne, NV 89415
 Linda Mathias, Administrator
 Office of Nuclear Projects
 Email: yuccainfo@mineralcountynv.org

State of Nevada
 100 N. Carson Street
 Carson City, NV 89710
 Marta Adams
 Email: madams@ag.state.nv.us

White Pine County (NV) Nuclear
 Waste Project Office
 959 Campton Street
 Ely, NV 89301
 Mike Simon, Director
 (Heidi Williams, Adm. Assist.)
 Email: wpnucwst1@mwpower.net

Fredericks & Peebles, L.L.P.
 1001 Second Street
 Sacramento, CA 95814
 916-441-2700
 FAX 916-441-2067
 Darcie L. Houck
 Email: dhouck@ndnlaw.com
 John M. Peebles
 Email: jpeebles@ndnlaw.com
 Joe Kennedy, Chairman
 Email: chairman@timbisha.org
 Barbara Durham
 Tribal Historic Preservation Officer
 Email: dvdurbarbara@netscape.com

Shane Thin Elk
 Fredericks Peebles & Morgan, LLP
 3610 North 163rd Plaza
 Omaha, Nebraska 68116
 (402) 333-4053
 Email: sthinelk@ndnlaw.com

Susan Durbin
 Deputy Attorney General
 California Department of Justice
 1300 I St.
 P.O. Box 944255
 Sacramento, CA, 94244-2550
 Email: susan.durbin@doj.ca.gov

Brian Hembacher
 Deputy Attorney General
 California Department of Justice
 300 S. Spring St
 Los Angeles, CA 90013
 Email: brian.hembacher@doj.ca.gov

Timothy E. Sullivan
 Deputy Attorney General
 California Department of Justice
 1515 Clay St., 20th Flr.
 P.O. Box 70550
 Oakland, CA 94612-0550
 Email: timothy.sullivan@doj.ca.gov

Brian Wolfman
 Public Citizen Litigation Group
 1600 20th Street, N.W.
 Washington, D.C. 20009

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

Jeffrey D. VanNiel
 530 Farrington Court
 Las Vegas, NV 89123
 Email: nbridvnr@gmail.com

Ethan I. Strell
 Carter Ledyard & Milburn LLP
 2 Wall Street
 New York, NY 10005
 Email: strell@clm.com

Jennings, Strouss & Salmon, PLC
 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Suite 500
 Washington DC 20006-4725
 Alan I. Robbins
 Email: arobbins@jssl.com
 Debra D. Roby
 Email: droby@jssl.com

Steven A. Heinzen
 Godfrey & Kahn, S.C.
 One East Main Street, Suite 500
 P.O. Box 2719
 Madison, WI 53701-2719
 Email: sheinzen@gklaw.com

Douglas M. Poland
 Godfrey & Kahn, S.C.
 One East Main Street, Suite 500
 P.O. Box 2719
 Madison, WI 53701-2719
 Email: dpoland@gklaw.com

Arthur J. Harrington
 Godfrey & Kahn, S.C.
 780 N. Water Street
 Milwaukee, WI 53202
 Email: aharring@gklaw.com

Gregory Barlow
 P.O. Box 60
 Pioche, NV 89043
 Email: lcda@lcturbonet.com

Connie Simkins
 P.O. Box 1068
 Caliente, NV 89008
 Email: jcciac@co.lincoln.nv.us

Bret O. Whipple
 1100 South Tenth Street
 Las Vegas, NV 89104
 Email: bretwhipple@nomademail.com

Richard Sears
 801 Clark Street, Suite 3
 Ely, NV 89301
 Email: rwsears@wpcda.org

Alexander, Berkey, Williams & Weathers
 2030 Addison Street, Suite 410
 Berkeley, CA 94704
 Curtis G. Berkey
 Email: cberkey@abwwlaw.com
 Scott W. Williams
 Email: swilliams@abwwlaw.com
 Rovianna A. Leigh
 Email: rleigh@abwwlaw.com

Kenneth P. Woodington
 Davidson & Lindemann, P.A.
 1611 Devonshire Drive
 P. O. Box 8568
 Columbia, SC 29202
 Email: kwoodington@dml-law.com

Robert M. McKenna
 Attorney General, State of Washington
 Office of the Attorney General
 PO Box 40117
 Olympia, WA 98504-0117
 H. Lee Overton
 Email: leeol@atg.wa.gov
 Michael L. Dunning
 Email: michaeld@atg.wa.gov
 Andrew A. Fitz
 Email: andyf@atg.wa.gov
 Jonathan C. Thompson
 Email: JonaT@atg.wa.gov

Philip R. Mahowald, General Counsel
 Prairie Island Indian Community
 Legal Department
 Email: pmahowald@piic.org
 5636 Sturgeon Lake Road
 Welch, MN 55089

Don L. Keskey
 Email: donkeskey@publiclawresourcenter.com
 Public Law Resource Center PLLC
 505 N. Capitol Avenue
 Lansing, MI 48933

Thomas R. Gottshall
Email: tgottshall@hsblawfirm.com
S. Ross Shealy
Email: rshealy@hsblawfirm.com
Haynsworth Sinkler Boyd, PA
1201 Main Street, Suite 2200
Post Office Box 11889
Columbia, SC 29211-1889

James Bradford Ramsay
Email: jramsay@naruc.org
Robin J. Lunt
Email: rlunt@naruc.org
National Association of Regulatory
Utility Commissioners
1101 Vermont Avenue, Suite 200
Washington, DC 20005

(signed electronically)
Laurie Borski, Paralegal