

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

COMMISSIONERS

DOCKETED 06/05/08

SERVED 06/05/08

Dale E. Klein, Chairman
Gregory B. Jaczko
Peter B. Lyons
Kristine L. Svinicki

In the Matter of)

U.S. Department of Energy)

(High Level Waste Repository:)
Pre-Application Matters))

Docket Nos. PAPO-00, PAPO-001

CLI-08-11

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

Before us today is a motion by the State of Nevada to disqualify the law firm Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP (Morgan Lewis) from representing the Department of Energy (DOE) “in all NRC Yucca Mountain proceedings.”¹ Nevada argues that Morgan Lewis has conflicts of interest that are “not susceptible to waiver or mitigation” and could affect “the integrity of the NRC’s impending Yucca Mountain licensing proceedings.”²

¹ Motion of the State of Nevada to Disqualify the Law Firm of Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP Because of Conflicts of Interest (April 3, 2008)(Nevada Motion) at 7. A number of Morgan Lewis attorneys have filed notices of appearance before the Advisory Pre-License Application Presiding Officer Board (Advisory PAPO Board)(Docket No. PAPO-001).

² Nevada Motion at 6, 7 n.9.

Both the NRC Staff and DOE oppose the motion to disqualify.³ For the reasons below, we deny the motion.

I. BACKGROUND

Nevada asks us to disqualify Morgan Lewis from NRC's Yucca Mountain proceeding (if it takes place) because the law firm also represents several nuclear utility companies that are suing DOE for violation of what is commonly known as the "Standard Contract," a contract committing DOE to take title to and dispose of commercial spent nuclear fuel.⁴ Nevada claims that Morgan Lewis's "actions on behalf of DOE" for the Yucca Mountain licensing "could harm the interests of its Standard Contract clients and vice versa."⁵

More specifically, Nevada argues that DOE has statutory public safety obligations under the Nuclear Waste Policy Act, which oblige DOE to suspend work on Yucca Mountain, decline to submit a license application or, if necessary, withdraw an application for construction authorization, if at any time DOE determines that Yucca Mountain would be unsuitable as a repository.⁶ As Nevada's argument goes, DOE's statutory obligations could require it to "giv[e] up on Yucca Mountain," but this "would be contrary to the overarching interests of [Morgan Lewis's] Standard Contract clients, who

³ See U.S. Department of Energy's Answer in Opposition to the State of Nevada's Motion to Disqualify the Law Firm of Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP (April 14, 2008)(DOE Answer); NRC Staff Response to State of Nevada Motion to Disqualify Law Firm (April 14, 2008).

⁴ See 10 C.F.R. Part 961 (codifying the terms of the Standard Contract for Disposal of Spent Nuclear Fuel and/or High-Level Radioactive Waste).

⁵ Nevada Motion at 4.

⁶ *Id.* at 4 (citing § 113(c)(3) of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act, 42 U.S.C. § 10133).

would be understandably upset for having paid millions of dollars to DOE for a repository at Yucca Mountain but not getting one.”⁷ In short, Nevada claims that Morgan Lewis’s “duty to its client DOE” may conflict with its “duty of loyalty to its Standard Contract clients.”⁸ Nevada further claims that because of “DOE’s overriding statutory duty to protect the environment and public health,” the “apparent conflict of interest [is] not susceptible to waiver or mitigation.”⁹

In support of its motion, Nevada points to a recent DOE Inspector General (IG) “Special Report” that examined alleged conflicts of interest involving DOE’s choice of Morgan Lewis to assist in Yucca Mountain licensing matters. The report concluded that DOE’s procurement for legal services “appeared to follow the conflicts of interest requirements set forth in the Federal Acquisition Regulations [FAR], Department of Energy Acquisition Regulations [DEAR], and District of Columbia Bar Rules of Professional Conduct.”¹⁰ Specifically, the report noted that DOE required and approved a Morgan Lewis plan to avoid or mitigate any legal ethics or organizational conflict of interest; granted a waiver of the conflict of interest, pursuant to applicable regulations; and “also consented to the Morgan Lewis legal representation of the agency under the District of Columbia Rules of Professional Conduct.”¹¹

⁷ *Id.* at 4.

⁸ *Id.* at 5.

⁹ *Id.* at 6.

¹⁰ *Special Report, Review of Alleged Conflicts of Interest Involving a Legal Services Contractor for the Yucca Mountain Project License Application*, U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Inspector General, Office of Audit Services, DOE/IG-0792 (April 2008)(IG Report), cover memorandum by Gregory H. Friedman (April 2, 2008) at 2.

¹¹ *Id.*, IG Report at 6-7; *see also* Cover Memorandum at 2.

But the report also concluded that “the public interest would have been better served had [DOE] done more to document the key decision points relating to this procurement,” including documenting the reasons why DOE shifted from its policy position in 1999 that law firms representing utilities in spent fuel litigation be excluded from consideration for Yucca Mountain work.¹² As described in the IG report, DOE’s view during a similar procurement for legal services in 1999 was that “[a] law firm whose loyalties lie with the utility companies might urge a less thorough process that could conclude earlier, when the Department’s best interests lie with a careful approach that may indeed take longer and be a more expensive process.”¹³

In response, DOE claims that Nevada’s motion to disqualify Morgan Lewis is “tactical.”¹⁴ DOE states that it has complied with all federal procurement regulations and applicable rules of professional responsibility. DOE further stresses that federal regulations explicitly permit a waiver of conflicts of interest when it is in the overall interest of the United States to award a contract, and that “at every step of the procurement process, DOE adhered to FAR and DEAR regulations regarding organizational conflicts of interests.”¹⁵ DOE acknowledges that “there is some overlap of subject matter (disposition of spent nuclear fuel)” between the NRC licensing proceeding and the Standard Contract litigation, but claims that the two matters involve different forums and largely distinct legal and factual issues, and therefore applicable

¹² *Id.*, Cover Memorandum at 4.

¹³ *Id.*, IG Report at 2-3.

¹⁴ DOE Answer at 7.

¹⁵ *Id.* at 10,12.

rules of professional conduct for attorneys permit waiver of the Morgan Lewis conflicts of interest.¹⁶

Moreover, DOE emphasizes that the agency had no obligation to follow the same procurement policy followed in 1999, and that its views on conflicts and on its specialized needs for legal services have “evolved over time.”¹⁷ DOE states that its current “need for specialized legal services and the resulting limited pool of available firms with such expertise justified the acceptance and mitigation of a specific conflict of interest that the agency had defined as [] unacceptable at the time of the 1999 procurement.”¹⁸ DOE also states that it was not required by law to document and “justify the difference in procurement approaches” between 1999 and 2007.¹⁹

DOE additionally argues that: (1) Nevada lacks standing to seek disqualification of DOE’s chosen counsel; (2) the NRC is the wrong forum to raise challenges to DOE’s procurement decision and choice of counsel; and (3) Nevada simply has not met “its burden [to] establish[] that disqualification of DOE’s counsel, which is a discretionary remedy, is appropriate under the circumstances.”²⁰ DOE also suggests that the Nevada motion is untimely.²¹

¹⁶ *Id.* at 16-18.

¹⁷ *Id.* at 14.

¹⁸ *Id.* at 13.

¹⁹ *Id.* at 14.

²⁰ *Id.* at 1-2; *see also id.* at 5-7, 8-9, 20-21.

²¹ *Id.* at 3 n.4.

II. DISCUSSION

As we have outlined above in some detail, Nevada's motion to disqualify Morgan Lewis for conflict of interests involves many issues, including whether DOE properly executed conflict of interest waivers under agency and other federal procurement regulations, the overall propriety of DOE's procurement process in 2007, the adequacy of the Morgan Lewis conflicts mitigation plan, and whether the arrangements at issue implicate any legal ethics concern under District of Columbia Bar Rules of Professional Conduct. For the most part, these are matters outside the scope of the NRC's safety and environmental responsibilities.²²

Only one aspect of Nevada's motion goes to the NRC's statutory responsibility to protect public health and safety. That is the suggestion that Morgan Lewis's conflict of interest might adversely affect the "integrity" of the Yucca Mountain licensing proceedings.²³ We take seriously any allegation, such as Nevada's, that an unresolved conflict of interest or other ethical breach threatens the integrity of an NRC licensing proceeding, potentially leading to a biased result and potentially compromising public health and safety. We recognize that our regulations do not address conflicts of interest as such, but the absence of a specific rule "does not – and could not –interfere with our inherent supervisory authority over the conduct of adjudicatory proceedings before this

²² To the extent that Nevada may have a cognizable interest to challenge DOE's procurement process, there are other forums with the jurisdiction and expertise to review procurement protests. See, e.g., 31 U.S.C. § 3552 (jurisdiction of Government Accountability Office); 28 U.S.C. § 1491(a)(1)(jurisdiction of Court of Federal Claims). Further, the District of Columbia Bar's Board on Professional Responsibility is empowered to consider complaints on attorney discipline matters. See District of Columbia Bar Rules XI, § 4.

²³ Nevada Motion at 7 n.9.

Commission.”²⁴ If demanded by compelling circumstances, therefore, we would act to assure that a claimed conflict of interest not jeopardize the exercise of our health-and-safety responsibilities.

Here, though, no such showing has been made. In awarding the contract to Morgan Lewis, DOE was fully aware of the conflict of interest and imposed mitigating measures ensuring separation between Morgan Lewis’s “Standard Contract” and “Yucca Mountain” litigating groups. DOE’s Inspector General found that these measures had been “implemented.”²⁵ Notwithstanding these measures, Nevada remains dissatisfied. Nevada postulates, for example, that Morgan Lewis may discover information indicating that the Yucca Mountain site is unsuitable to be a repository, but that its “duty of loyalty” to its Standard Contract clients may interfere with proper disclosures of significant information.²⁶ Nevada further presents a hypothetical scenario, questioning what Morgan Lewis might do if it discovered “DOE e-mails . . . suggesting serious quality assurance defects in scientific work supporting the Yucca Mountain license application, and DOE asked Morgan Lewis for advice whether the NRC should be notified and whether consideration of the affected parts of the license application should be suspended until the scientific work could be redone?”²⁷ Nevada argues that Morgan

²⁴ *United States Energy Research and Development Administration* (Clinch River Breeder Reactor Plant), CLI-76-13, 4 NRC 67, 75 (1976). See also *Baltimore Gas and Elec. Co.* (Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 & 2), CLI-98-15, 48 NRC 45, 53 (1998) (Commission has “plenary supervisory authority . . . to interpret and customize its process for individual cases”).

²⁵ See IG Report, Cover Memorandum at 2.

²⁶ Nevada Motion at 4.

²⁷ *Id.* at 4-5.

Lewis's "duty to its client DOE would surely require it to say 'yes' to both questions, but its duty of loyalty to its Standard Contract clients may suggest otherwise."²⁸

In other words, Nevada suggests that Morgan Lewis might advise DOE to conceal significant safety information from the NRC. But concealing such information would violate NRC regulations and might amount to criminal misbehavior.²⁹ Based merely on speculation in Nevada's motion, we will not proceed on an assumption that there is any significant possibility that Morgan Lewis or DOE would engage in serious misconduct by withholding significant health and safety information from the NRC. A "presumption of regularity attaches to the actions of Government agencies."³⁰ Absent "clear evidence to the contrary," we presume that public officers will "properly discharge[] their official duties."³¹ Nevada's motion provides no showing of actual or likely bad faith by DOE or Morgan Lewis, nor otherwise presents any concrete basis for us to assume that they would take actions verging on criminality.

We may not lightly interfere in arrangements made between parties and their lawyers. In investigations, for example, the D.C. Circuit has held that the NRC may not disqualify attorneys representing multiple witnesses, unless it has "concrete evidence"

²⁸ *Id.* at 5.

²⁹ See, e.g., 10 C.F.R. § 63.11 (deliberately submitting to NRC "inaccurate" or "incomplete" information on Yucca Mountain is misconduct suitable for enforcement action); 10 C.F.R. § 63.73 (requiring DOE to report Yucca Mountain "deficiencies" to NRC); 10 C.F.R. § 63.172 (making "willful" violations of sections 63.11 and 63.73, among others, subject to criminal penalties under section 223 of the Atomic Energy Act, 42 U.S.C. § 2273). See also 18 U.S.C. § 2001 (making "material false statements" to the government subject to criminal penalties).

³⁰ *United States v. Postal Serv.*, 534 U.S. 1, 10 (2001).

³¹ See, e.g., *Public Serv. Co. of New Hampshire*, LBP-89-04, 29 NRC 62, 73 (1989).

that the attorney will “obstruct and impede” the investigation.³² While this standard does not require proof of wrongdoing, it requires more than “mere concern or speculation.”³³ Nevada’s motion in this case presents nothing more than this.

If a Yucca Mountain license application is tendered, it will be the NRC’s responsibility to review the application to assure that all safety and environmental requirements are met. DOE will be responsible for the accuracy and completeness of that application throughout the licensing process.³⁴ As we indicated above, we could (among other remedies) disqualify DOE’s (or any other party’s) counsel from participating in an NRC proceeding upon a concrete showing that a conflict of interest or other ethics concern would obstruct our obtaining a full range of necessary safety or environmental information, or would otherwise threaten the integrity of our regulatory process. Nevada’s motion, however, makes no such showing.³⁵

³² See *Professional Reactor Operator Soc. v. NRC*, 939 F.2d 1047, 1051-52 (D.C. Cir. 1991). NRC’s regulations on investigations reflect the D.C. Circuit’s ruling. See 10 C.F.R. § 19.18.

³³ See Final Rule, Exclusion of Attorneys From Interviews Under Subpoena, 57 Fed. Reg. 61,785, 61,782-83 (Dec. 29, 1992).

³⁴ See 10 C.F.R. § 63.10.

³⁵ Because we find insufficient basis for Nevada’s loss of “integrity” claim, we need not reach DOE’s arguments that Nevada does not have standing to seek the NRC to disqualify DOE’s choice of counsel, and that Nevada’s motion is untimely. See DOE’s Answer at 3 n.4, 5-7.

III. CONCLUSION

Nevada's motion to disqualify the law firm Morgan Lewis from representing DOE in all NRC Yucca Mountain proceedings is *denied*.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

For the Commission

/RA/
Annette L. Vietti-Cook
Secretary of the Commission

Dated at Rockville, Maryland,
this 5th day of June, 2008.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

In the Matter of)
)
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY) Docket No. PAPO-00
)
(High-Level Waste Repository:)
Pre-Application Matters))
)

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that copies of the foregoing COMMISSION MEMORANDUM AND ORDER (CLI-08-11), dated June 5, 2008, have been served upon the following persons by Electronic Information Exchange.

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

Thomas S. Moore, Chair
Administrative Judge
E-mail: tsm2@nrc.gov

Alex S. Karlin,
Administrative Judge
E-mail: ask2@nrc.gov

Alan S. Rosenthal
Administrative Judge
E-mail: axr@nrc.gov
rsnthl@comcast.net

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Office of the Secretary of the Commission
Mail Stop O-16C1
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Hearing Docket
E-mail: hearingdocket@nrc.gov

ASLBP (cont'd.)

Anthony C. Eitreim, Esq.
Chief Counsel
E-mail: ace1@nrc.gov

James M. Cutchin: jmc3@nrc.gov
Joseph Deucher: jhd@nrc.gov
Margaret Parish: map4@nrc.gov
Marcia Carpentier: mx7@nrc.gov
Bradley S. Baxter: bx7@nrc.gov
Lauren Bregman: lrb1@nrc.gov
Zachary Kahn: zxk1@nrc.gov
Erica LaPlante: eal1@nrc.gov
Johanna Thibault: jrt3@nrc.gov
Emily Krause: eik1@nrc.gov

Daniel J. Graser
LSN Administrator
E-mail: djg2@nrc.gov
ASLB HLW Adjudication
E-mail: ASLBP_HLW_Adjudication@nrc.gov

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Office of Public Affairs
Mail Stop O-16D3
Washington, DC 20555-0001

David McIntyre:
E-mail: dtm@nrc.gov

DOCKET NO. PAPO-00
COMMISSION MEMORANDUM AND ORDER, CLI-08-11

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

Janice E. Moore, Esq.
E-mail: jem@nrc.gov
Mitzi A. Young, Esq.
E-mail: may@nrc.gov
Marian L. Zobler, Esq.
E-mail: mlz@nrc.gov
Andrea L. Silvia, Esq.
E-mail: alc1@nrc.gov
Margaret J. Bupp, Esq.
E-mail: mjb5@nrc.gov
Daniel W. Lenehan, Esq.
E-mail: dwl2@nrc.gov
Jessica Bielecki, Esq.
E-mail: jab2@nrc.gov
OGC Mail Center
E-mail: OGCMailCenter@nrc.gov

U.S. Department of Energy
1551 Hillshire Drive
Las Vegas, NV 89134-6321

Timothy C. Gunter
E-mail: timothy_gunter@ymp.gov
Susan L. Rives
E-mail: susan_rives@ymp.gov

U.S. Department of Energy
Office of General Counsel
1000 Independence Avenue S.W.
Washington, DC 20585

Martha S. Crosland, Esq.
E-mail: Martha.crosland@hq.doe.gov
Nicholas P. DiNunzio, Esq.
E-mail: nick.dinunzio@rw.doe.gov
Angela M. Kordyak, Esq.
E-mail: angela.kordyak@hq.doe.gov
Mary B. Neumayr, Esq.
E-mail: mary.neumayr@hq.doe.gov

U.S. Department of Energy
Office of General Counsel
1551 Hillshire Drive
Las Vegas, NV 89134-6321

George W. Hellstrom, Esq.
E-mail: george.hellstrom@ymp.gov

DOCKET NO. PAPO-00
COMMISSION MEMORANDUM AND ORDER, CLI-08-11

Counsel for the U.S. Department of Energy
Morgan, Lewis, Bockius LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20004

Lewis Csedrik, Esq.
E-mail: icsedrik@morganlewis.com
Jay Gutierrez, Esq.
E-mail: jguterrez@morganlewis.com
Thomas Poindexter, Esq.
E-mail: tpoindexter@morganlewis.com
Alex S. Polonsky, Esq.
E-mail: apolonsky@morganlewis.com
Thomas A. Schmutz, Esq.
E-mail: tschmutz@morganlewis.com
Donald Silverman, Esq.
E-mail: dsilverman@morganlewis.com
Paul J. Zaffuts, Esq.
E-mail: pzaffuts@morganlewis.com
Thomas E. Reinert, Jr., Esq.
E-mail: treinert@morganlewis.com
Corrine A. Niosi, Esq.
E-mail: cniosi@morganlewis.com
Liesel J. Danjczek, Esq.
E-mail: ldanjczek@morganlewis.com
Anna L. Vinson, Esq.
E-mail: avinson@morganlewis.com
Annette M. White, Esq.
E-mail: annette.white@morganlewis.com

Counsel for the State of Nevada
Egan, Fitzpatrick & Malsch, PLLC
2001 K Street
Washington, DC 20006

Martin G. Malsch, Esq.
E-mail: mmalsch@nuclearlawyer.com
Susan Montesi
E-mail: smontesi@nuclearlawyer.com

Counsel for the U.S. Department of Energy
Hunton & Williams, LLP
Riverfront Plaza, East Tower
951 East Byrd Street
Richmond, VA 23219

W. Jeffrey Edwards, Esq.
E-mail: jewards@hunton.com
Kelly L. Faglioni, Esq.
E-mail: kfaglioni@hunton.com
Melissa Grier
E-mail: mgrier@hunton.com
Donald P. Irwin, Esq.
E-mail: dirwin@hunton.com
Stephanie Meharg:
E-mail: smeharg@hunton.com
Edward P. Noonan, Esq.
E-mail: enoonan@hunton.com
Audrey B. Rusteau
E-mail: arusteau@hunton.com
Michael R. Shebelskie, Esq.
E-mail: mshebelskie@hunton.com
Pat Slayton
E-mail: pslayton@hunton.com
Belinda A. Wright
E-mail: bwright@hunton.com

Counsel for Lincoln County
Carter Ledyard & Milburn, LLP
1401 Eye Street, N.W., Suite 300
Washington, DC 20005

Barry S. Neuman, Esq.
E-mail: neuman@clm.com

DOCKET NO. PAPO-00
COMMISSION MEMORANDUM AND ORDER, CLI-08-11

Egan, Fitzpatrick & Malsch, PLLC
12500 San Pedro Avenue, Suite 555
San Antonio, TX 78216

Charles J. Fitzpatrick, Esq
E-mail: cfitzpatrick@nuclearlawyer.com
Laurie Borski, Paralegal
E-mail: lborski@nuclearlawyer.com

Counsel for the State of Nevada
Ross Dixon & Bell
2001 K. Street N.W., Suite 400
Washington, DC 20006

Merril Hirsh, Esq.
E-mail: mhirsh@rdbl.com

Counsel for Eureka County, Nevada
Harmon, Curran, Speilberg & Eisenberg, LLP
1726 M. Street N.W., Suite 600
Washington, DC 20036

Diane Curran, Esq.
E-mail: dcurran@harmoncurran.com

City of Las Vegas
400 Stewart Avenue
Las Vegas, NV 89101

Margaret Plaster, Management Analyst
E-mail: mplaster@LasVegasNevada.gov
Liane Lee, Legislative Affairs Officer
E-mail: lilee@LasVegasNevada.GOV

Clark County (NV) Nuclear Waste Division
500 S. Grand Central Parkway
Las Vegas, NV 98155

Engelbrecht von Tiesenhausen
E-mail: evt@co.clark.nv.us
Phil Klevorick
E-mail: klevorick@co.clark.nv.us

Clark County, Nevada
500 South Grand Central Parkway
Las Vegas, NV 89106

Elizabeth A. Vibert, Deputy District Attorney
E-mail: VibertE@co.clark.nv.us

Churchill County, Eureka County, Lander County,
Mineral County, Esmeralda County
1975 Village Center Circle, Suite 140
Las Vegas, NV 89134-6237

Robert F. List, Esq.
E-mail: rlist@armstrongteasdale.com

Nuclear Energy Institute
1776 I Street, NW Suite 400
Washington, DC 20006-3708

Michael A. Bauser, Esq.
E-mail: mab@nei.org
Anne W. Cottingham, Esq.
E-mail: awc@nei.org
Ellen C. Ginsberg, Esq.
E-mail: ecg@nei.org

DOCKET NO. PAPO-00
COMMISSION MEMORANDUM AND ORDER, CLI-08-11

White Pine County
City of Caliente
Lincoln County
P.O. Box 126
Caliente, NV 89008

Jason Pitts
E-mail: jayson@idtservices.com

NWOP Consulting, Inc.
1705 Wildcat Lane
Ogden, UT 84403

Loreen Pitchford, LSN Coordinator
For Churchill, County, Eureka County, and
Lander County,
E-mail: lpitchford@comcast.net

Nye County (NV) Regulatory/Licensing Adv.
18160 Cottonwood Rd. #265
Sunriver, OR 97707

Malachy Murphy, Esq.
E-mail: mrmurphy@chamberscable.com
Jeffrey D. VanNiel
E-mail: nbrjdv@gmail.com
Zoie Choate, Secretary
E-mail: zchoate@co.nye.nv.us
Sherry Dudley, Administrative Technical
Coordinator
E-mail: sdudley@co.nye.nv.us

Inyo County (CA) Yucca Mountain Nuclear Waste
Repository Assessment Office
163 May St.
Bishop, CA 93514

Chris Howard, GIS/LAN Administrator
E-mail: choward@inywater.org

Nuclear Waste Project Office
1761 East College Parkway, Suite 118
Carson City, NV 89706

Robert Loux
E-mail: bloux@nuc.state.nv.us
Steve Frishman, Tech. Policy Coordinatory
E-mail: Steve.frishman@gmail.com

Timbisha Shoshone Tribe
Frederick and Peebles, LLP
1001 Second St.
Sacramento, CA 95814

Darcie L. Houck, Esq.
E-mail: dhouch@ndlaw.com
John M. Peebles, Esq.
E-mail: jpeebles@ndlaw.com
Joe Kennedy, Esq.
E-mail: chairperson@timbisha.org

DOCKET NO. PAPO-00
COMMISSION MEMORANDUM AND ORDER, CLI-08-11

Talisman International, LLC
1000 Potomac St., NW
Suite 300 Washington, DC 20007

Patricia Larimore, Senior Paralegal
E-mail: plarimore@talisman-intl.com

Yucca Mountain Project Licensing Group
DOE/BSC
Regulatory Programs
1180 North Town Center Dr.
Las Vegas, NV 89144

Jeffrey Kriner
E-mail: jeffrey.kriner@ymp.gov

California Department of Justice
Office of the Attorney General
1515 Clay Street, 20th Floor
P.O. Box 70550
Oakland, CA 94612-0550

California Department of Justice
Office of the Attorney General
1300 I Street
P.O. Box 944255
Sacramento, CA 94244-2550

Timothy E. Sullivan, Deputy Attorney General
Email: Timothy.Sullivan@doj.ca.gov
Michele Mercado, Analyst
Email: Michele.Mercado@doj.ca.gov

Susan Durbin, Deputy Attorney General
E-mail susan.durbin@doj.ca.gov

California Department of Justice
300 S. Spring Street, Suite 1700
Los Angeles, CA 90013

California Energy Commission
1516 9th Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Brian Hembacher, Deputy Attorney General
Email: brian.hembacher@doj.ca.gov

Kevin, W. Bell, Senior Staff Counsel
E-mail: kwbell@energy.state.ca.us

[Original Signed by L. Lewis] _____
Office of the Secretary of the Commission

Dated at Rockville, Maryland
this 5th day of June 2008