# Official Transcript of Proceedings



## **NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

Title:

Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Project

Calvert Cliffs Unit 3

Docket Number:

52-016-COL

**DOCKETED** 

January 17, 2012 (p.m.)

ASLBP Number:

09-874-02 COL-BD01

OFFICE OF SECRETARY RULEMAKINGS AND ADJUDICATIONS STAFF

Location:

(telephone conference)

Date:

Tuesday, January 10, 2012

Work Order No.:

NRC-1374

Pages 269-304

ORIGINAL

NEAL R. GROSS AND CO., INC. Court Reporters and Transcribers 1323 Rhode Island Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20005 (202) 234-4433

05 03

SECY 032

1	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
2	NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
3	+ + + +
4	ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD PANEL
5	+ + + +
6	PRE-HEARING CONFERENCE
7	x
8	In the Matter of: : Docket No. 52-016-COL
9	CALVERT CLIFFS 3 NUCLEAR : ASLBP No.
10	PROJECT, LLC and UNISTAR : 09-874-02 COL-BD01
11	NUCLEAR OPERATING SERVICES,:
12	LLC. :
13	(Combined License :
14	Application for Calvert :
15	Cliffs Unit 3) :
16	x
17	Tuesday, January 10, 2012
18	Teleconference
19	BEFORE:
20	RONALD M. SPRITZER, Chair
21	GARY S. ARNOLD, Administrative Judge
22	WILLIAM W. SAGER, Administrative Judge
23	
24	

1	APPEARANCES:
2	On Behalf of UniStar Nuclear, LLC.:
3	DAVID REPKA, ESQ.
4	TYSON SMITH, ESQ.
5	of: Winston & Strawn, LLP
6	1700 K Street, N.W.
7	Washington, DC 20006
8	(415)591-6874 (Smith)
9	
10	On Behalf of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission:
11	ANTHONY WILSON, ESQ.
12	ADAM GENDELMAN, ESQ.
13	SARA KIRKWOOD, ESQ.
14	of: Office of the General Counsel
15	Mail Stop - 0-15 D21
16	U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
17	Washington, D.C. 20555-0001
18	(301)415-3699 (WILSON)
19	
20	On behalf of the Nuclear Information Resource
21	Service:
22	MICHAEL MARIOTTE
23	DOMINIQUE FRENCH, ESQ.
24	of: Nuclear Information Resource Service
25	6390 Carroll Avenue #340
	NEAL D. ODOGG

1	Takoma Park, MD 20912
2	(301)270-6477
3	
4	On behalf of the State of Maryland:
5	BRENT A. BOLEA, ESQ.
6	of: State of Maryland
7	Office of the Attorney General
8	Maryland Energy Administration
9	and Power Plant Research Program
10	of the Department of Natural Resources
11	1623 Forest Drive, Suite 300
12	Annapolis, MD 21403
13	(410)260-7538
14	ALSO PRESENT:
15	MATINA SOLOMAKOS
16	KIRSTEN STODDARD
17	ANDY WELKIE
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

#### P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

2	11:02 a.m.
3	CHAIR SPRITZER: Good morning. We are
4	here today for a pre-hearing conference in the matter
5	of Calvert Cliff's 3 Nuclear project and UniStar
6	Nuclear Operating Services. This is Docket Number 52-
7	016-COL and it's also ASLBP Number 09-874-02-COL-BD01.
8	And, as I said, we're here to have a
9	prehearing conference. We'll start with myself, Judge
10	Spritzer.
11	ADMIN. JUDGE ARNOLD: Judge Arnold.
12	CHAIR SPRITZER: And Judge Sager are you
13	there?
14	ADMIN. JUDGE SAGER: Yes, I am here.
15	CHAIR SPRITZER: And we also have with us
16	in our room here in Rockville, Andy Welkie who is our
17	information technology person. He's here to answer
18	any questions and also provide a little information
19	about how the electronic exhibits process will work.
20	That is how we're going to go about making exhibits
21	available for questioning at the hearing.
22	Kirsten Stoddard our law clerk. And
23	Matina Solomakos who is our administrative support
24	person. For the parties to the case, why don't we
25	start with UniStar. Can you introduce yourselves

1	again for the record?
2	MR. SMITH: Sure, this is Tyson Smith.
3	I'm an attorney for UniStar. And with me, but on
4	another line, is David Repka.
5	CHAIR SPRITZER: All right, and the NRC
6	staff. Can you identify yourselves again?
7	MR. WILSON: This is Anthony Wilson,
8	joined by Sara Kirkwood, Adam Gendelman and project
9	staff.
10	CHAIR SPRITZER: And intervenors?
11	MR. MARIOTTE: This is Michael Mariotte
12	from Nuclear Information and Resource Service. With
13	me is Dominique French, also of Nuclear Information
14	and Resource Service. And Scott Sklar, our expert
15	witness may be coming on the line later, I'm not
16	positive.
17	CHAIR SPRITZER: Okay. And the State of
18	Maryland?
19	MR. BOLEA: Good morning. I'm Brent Bolea
20	for the State of Maryland.
21	CHAIR SPRITZER: All right. We have a
22	list that I hope everybody has seen and had a chance
23	to review, a list of topics we're going to go over.
24	Some very mundane stuff but things we want to make
25	sure everybody's aware of and clear on. Starting with

the all important matter of parking for the hearing.

The Calvert County's government has been kind enough to make this facility available, the Albright Building Facility, available to us without charge.

The one thing they asked in return is that

The one thing they asked in return is that we not occupy their parking lot, the parking lot immediately in front of the building. Instead use the parking lot at 200 Duke Street, it's a short walk from the hearing.

The one immediately adjacent to the building is the one the employees use so they'd like not to arrive to work on Thursday morning and find their parking spaces taken. We may have some difficulty enforcing that for any members of the public that might be attending the public, but we appreciate your cooperation in that.

We have a press release out that provides this kind of background information on where to park and security procedures. I don't know whether anybody has seen a copy of it, it's available on the NRC website under the press release category. Has any of the parties seen this before?

MR. SMITH: This is Tyson Smith for UniStar, yes we have seen that press release and that information and we'll circulate it to our experts and

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.2

1	other potential attendees.
2	CHAIR SPRITZER: Okay, great. And,
3	Intervenors, are you aware of this?
4	MR. MARIOTTE: No, I wasn't aware. And I
5	don't actually even know where the hearing is, but I
6	guess I'll have to find that out.
7	CHAIR SPRITZER: Well that you should
8	certainly be clear on by the 26th.
9	MR. MARIOTTE: Yes, I think so.
10	CHAIR SPRITZER: As I said there is a
11	press release, it's available on the NRC website. If
L2	you have, I think it's under Press Releases if you
13	look around on the public website.
14	MR. MARIOTTE: Will do.
15	CHAIR SPRITZER: It's identified by
16	Calvert Cliffs. Also in the order we issued on
L7	November 9th. Oh, yes, we did cover the parking issue
18	there too. Okay, look at our order that we issued on
L9	November 9th, but you should also take a look at the
20	press release there may be some information there that
21	we didn't cover.
22	The press release also includes the
23	limited appearance session that we're going to do on
24	the 25th. So anyway everybody should take a look at
25	that If you have any questions contact Kirsten

Anything related to security procedures, parking, whatever, contact Kirsten.

In terms of security right now the plan is the Calvert County government has consented to provide security. I don't know specifically what they're going to do in terms of how much screening they're going to do in terms of electronic examination before you go in. But everybody should plan to arrive, I would think, at least 30 minutes beforehand.

That'll also give you a little chance to see how the monitors will be set up and so forth and generally get familiar with the layout of the facility we're going to be using. I don't know if anybody's been there. It has kind of an L-shaped dias, which on one side of the L, which is where the judges will be sitting, I think what our plan is right now at least is to use the other side of the L for whatever witness or witnesses will be testifying.

I think there are two screens already there which we'll use for both the judges and people in the audience and the parties to be able to view whatever exhibit we might be talking about at any given point in time.

And if it's necessary we're going to bring some monitors so that if we need to put monitors at

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

the tables for the parties so if there's any difficulty, where you would have to turn around 180 degrees or something to see an exhibit, we'll put a monitor there for you so you won't have to do that. At least that's our current plan.

So let's move on to exhibits. At the start of the hearing what we're planning to do is have everybody move and we'll go party by party and ask you to move into evidence whatever exhibits you want to move into evidence. Hopefully, you know, we'd like to go through that as quickly as we can to the extent, I don't know if the motion in limine that was filed by the staff pretty much summarizes where we are in terms of any disputes about admissibility.

You're obviously not limited to what's been put in the motion in limine but to the extent you can work out among yourselves any disputes about admissibility of documents and thereby move that process along that would certainly be in our interest and I think in everybody's interest.

On the motion in limine we will get out a general, ruling that. Ι mean Ι think in on particularly with the specific objections testimony, we'll certainly look at those objections and take them into account in issuing our ruling.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	It's less likely that we're going to exclude testimony
2	right off the bat before we even heard whatever
3	evidence there is. But we'll certainly consider the
4	objections that were made, and any others that we
5	might get as we look through the evidence from the
6	hearing, because we don't have a jury we don't
7	necessarily have to exclude evidence.
8	At least this is my reading of the law.
9	We don't have to exclude evidence up front, we can
10	always take the objections into account and let you
11	know our position when we issue the ruling on the
12	merits. But we will get an order out on that in the
13	near future, and certainly before the hearing.
14	In terms of displaying exhibits at the
15	hearing I think I've already kind of summarized what
16	we're proposing to do. Is there anything else you
17	(Off microphone comment)
18	CHAIR SPRITZER: All right. Let me just
19	add, do you all have any questions about how the
20	exhibits will be made available to you or how you will
21	be able to view exhibits that we may be asking
22	witnesses about? Going once, twice.
23	MR. SMITH: This is Tyson Smith. No.
24	CHAIR SPRITZER: Okay.
25	MR. MARIOTTE: This is Mike with NIRS, I'm

1	sorry, could you run through it very quickly?
2	CHAIR SPRITZER: Run through what?
3	MR. MARIOTTE: How the exhibits will be
4	displayed?
5	CHAIR SPRITZER: Well we'll have
6	MR. MARIOTTE: Just, you know, this is our
7	first time at doing this.
8	CHAIR SPRITZER: Well I understand and
9	feel free to ask.
10	MR. MARIOTTE: So I may have a lot of
11	stupid questions this morning. I'm not sure.
12	CHAIR SPRITZER: Yes, what will happen is
13	if we're asking a witness about an exhibit, or for
14	that matter, if someone during their opening or
15	closing argument wants to have an exhibit displayed,
16	it will be on, we have two screens, I guess,
17	essentially large like a flat screen TV that are
18	already in this facility, that are positioned, they
19	conduct public meetings there. I think it's the
20	Zoning Board that normally meets there.
21	And they have these screens there for both
22	people sitting in the audience and people sitting at
23	what, for us will be the judges bench, to be able to
24	view the exhibits. If you're sitting at a table
ſ	

that's not convenient as far as viewing either of

those two screens we're going to have a monitor there for you so you'll be able to see the exhibit.

Now what we would like, well of course the Judges are going to be the ones asking questions of the witnesses, we will use the questions have been submitted to us by the parties, or at least by the parties who have submitted questions, and we'll add some fo our own. But you'll be able to see, when we're asking the witness, you'll be able to see the exhibit that we're referring to, which hopefully will be on the page that we're talking about if we're talking about a specific page.

Now, we're going to come later to the question of opening and closing arguments, but if you have exhibits you may want to refer to during your opening statement, if we're going to have opening statements we'll cover this in a minute, but it would be useful, it would be helpful, for our IT personnel if you could provide a list of what those exhibits are in advance of the hearing.

We will have them available electronically, so we can bring up an exhibit even if we don't know in advance that that's what somebody's going to be talking about. But it will go more smoothly if we have a list so when you get up, Mr.

1	Mariotte, if you're going to make an opening statement
2	and you've told us in advance that you're going to be
3	talking about a particular document and what page,
4	that's an exhibit that you're going to move into
5	evidence, and what page you're going to be referring
6	to. That would make it a lot easier to put it up on
7	the screen rather than having to take a break while
8	our IT staff tries to find the document.
9	MR. MARIOTTE: Right. Okay, and so if I
10	mention an exhibit it has to be displayed or can it
11	just be referred to as its name?
12	CHAIR SPRITZER: No, you don't have to
13	display it.
14	MR. MARIOTTE: Okay, I just wanted to
15	clarify that. Thank you.
16	CHAIR SPRITZER: It's going to be a little
17	more, I think it would probably be more effective if
18	you display it, but it's up to you. We're not going
19	to require you to do that.
20	MR. MARIOTTE: Okay.
21	CHAIR SPRITZER: Let me ask, by the way,
22	we did not get any witness questions from your side.
23	Is that because you didn't submit any? You're not
24	required to submit them, but we wanted to make sure
25	there wasn't some problem in the electronic submission

1	process where you submitted something and we didn't
2	see it.
3	MR. MARIOTTE: I guess I was unaware that
4	the deadline for that was passed.
5	CHAIR SPRITZER: Yes, it's passed some
6	time ago I'm afraid. Well
7	MR. MARIOTTE: I haven't received any from
8	anybody else either.
9	CHAIR SPRITZER: You're not supposed to
10	receive.
11	MR. MARIOTTE: Oh okay, that might have
12	kicked in a reminder for me. It's been sort of a
13	hectic time with a new baby and the holidays and stuff
14	so I have to confess I haven't been paying as close of
15	attention as I should be.
16	CHAIR SPRITZER: Yes, the deadline for
17	that has passed. We can formulate our own questions
18	so that doesn't preclude us from asking questions of
19	the applicant and staff witnesses and we certainly
20	intend to do that. We just wanted to make sure we
21	hadn't missed something that you had submitted.
22	MR. MARIOTTE: Foul up on my end, not the
23	EIE's.
24	CHAIR SPRITZER: Okay, for once. All
25	right. One document we do need, this is a technical
i	

 ${\tt Mr.}$ Mariotte, you submitted an 1 for you, affidavit of Mr. Sklar that we asked you to submit 2 basically authenticating his testimony. That didn't 3 have a number on it. We're going to number that 4 JNT000031. 5 MR. MARIOTTE: Okay, I apologize. 6 7 That will be JNT000031. CHAIR SPRITZER: So when you update your exhibit list that should be 8 9 numbered that way. I apologize. 10 MR. MARIOTTE: Okay. In any event if we're 11 CHAIR SPRITZER: going to have opening statements I would apply to 12 13 everybody it would be useful to have a list of any exhibits that you might want to refer to in opening. 14 Obviously, you're not obligated to do that if you 15 16 don't want to. We have an issue with, I want to see if 17 this is a problem here if this has affected anybody's 18 19 ability to get access to other party's exhibits. This is the issue that the Secretary's Office here at the 2.0 NRC has raised about copyrighted documents. Some of 21 the exhibits submitted in this case, as well as in 22 23 some of our other cases, are magazine articles or 24 newspaper articles that the Secretary's Office here

decided they couldn't make publicly available on ADAMS

because of what they saw as potential copyright issues.

As I understand it, if you have, you all should have exchanged exhibits among yourselves, that

should have exchanged exhibits among yourselves, that is all the parties to the case. If you downloaded those exhibits you should have all of the exhibits that the other parties have offered or will be offering. Those wouldn't have excluded any documents based on copyright. It's only what's displayed here at the NRC.

I guess the problem arises if you did not download exhibits you received from the other sides, other parties, didn't save or have since deleted the emails and were assuming you would be able to get everything on ADAMS, that's where we might run into a problem. Let me ask the intervenors, did you download or still have the emails that contained the exhibits that are being offered by the staff and UniStar?

MR. MARIOTTE: We still have the emails.

I know we downloaded some things but probably not everything. But I doubt if we would perceive a real problem. But we do have the emails.

MS. STODDARD: Mr. Mariotte, this is Kirsten Stoddard, the law clerk, if you still have those emails from the other parties the links on those

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

2	all the documents whether they're copyrighted or not
3	copyrighted.
4	MR. MARIOTTE: Okay, thank you.
5	CHAIR SPRITZER: All right. Does anybody
6	else think they might have a potential problem, that
7	they were relying on the public ADAMS for access to
8	exhibits?
9	MR. SMITH: This is Tyson Smith, the
10	applicant has downloaded all of the exhibits and we
11	have those. We don't see a problem with that from our
12	end.
13	CHAIR SPRITZER: Well the staff I can't
14	imagine would have a problem.
15	MR. WILSON: That's correct. We have no
16	problem.
17	CHAIR SPRITZER: State of Maryland, have
18	you, I don't know whether you've been going through
19	the exhibits in detail, but as far as you know do you
20	have access to everything? Is the State still on the
21	line?
22	MR. BOLEA: Yes, Your Honor, I'm still
23	here.
24	CHAIR SPRITZER: Have you been reviewing
25	the exhibits? Is this even a potential issue for you?
	NEAL D. CDOCC

will still work. You can use those links to access

1	MR. BOLEA: I don't think we have an
2	issue. I think we have access to all of the exhibits,
3	but if we run into a problem I'll contact your law
4	clerk and let her know.
5	CHAIR SPRITZER: Okay, that's fine.
6	MR. BOLEA: Thank you.
7	CHAIR SPRITZER: All right, as far as the
8	exhibit lists go, as indicated in this order, we'd
9	like to have When do we need it by? Up to date
10	exhibits?
11	MS. STODDARD: By the end of the next
12	week.
13	CHAIR SPRITZER: Yes, by the end of next
14	week we'd like to have a updated exhibit list from
15	everybody. This should include any changes in exhibit
16	numbers. If you have, for example, I believe there's
17	and Applicant Exhibit, what is it, 00017 that has four
18	sub-parts, that should be labeled 17 A through D.
19	MS. STODDARD: (Inaudible)
20	CHAIR SPRITZER: Oh yes, for the
21	intervenors, for the direct testimony of Mr. Sklar, it
22	was originally JNT00001, I think that needs to be
23	JNTR00001, to indicate that it's a revised document.
24	That would be what you'd want to have on your exhibit

list.

MR. MARIOTTE: Okay.

2.2

MS. STODDARD: Yes, Mr. Mariotte, this is Kirsten Stoddard the law clerk again. The exhibit list we just want to make sure, and this applies for the staff as well, that they're comprehensive. That is when you submitted your updated exhibit lists with your rebuttal testimony it didn't include the exhibits that you initially filed.

So we'd just like to have all the exhibits you plan on entering into evidence, or offering into evidence, on one document. And since you're going to be offering your revised Exhibit 1, you should list Joint Intervenors Revised Exhibit 1 and not Joint Intervenor's Exhibit 1.

And similarly, as we discussed previously, if you could list Joint Intervenor's Exhibit 31, which is Mr. Sklar's affidavit that you didn't number, if you could just add that to your exhibit list too that would be great.

MR. MARIOTTE: Okay, will do. Can I ask a question, which I think I know the answer to? In the most recent round of discovery we included a couple of new articles that came out since we filed our exhibits and all that. Can we include those now as exhibits or was that basically a cutoff date?

1 CHAIR SPRITZER: Well if you want to add 2 exhibits why don't you file a short motion as soon as 3 possible and we'll allow the other parties to respond. 4 I think there's enough time, we can respond as soon as 5 possible. 6 MR. MARIOTTE: They weren't crucial. So 7 I don't know if we need to put everybody through that. 8 CHAIR SPRITZER: All right. 9 MR. SMITH: I apologize, this is Tyson Smith for UniStar. We actually have recently, there's 10 11 a document, and exhibit, that's come up that we think 12 is actually relevant and sort of changes some of the 13 information that's in some of the testimony that we 14 is important to raise, and so one of think my 15 questions I was going to ask today is how should we go 16 about doing that? 17 It could be done in the form of 18 exhibit. It's a press release from a company, but alternatively we could just have our expert speak to 19 20 it at the hearing. So I didn't know how you wanted to 21 proceed or what you thought the best way might be to 22 proceed on that. 23 CHAIR SPRITZER: As to which way to go 24 about, it sounds like you would need to either update

the testimony or add the exhibit. Certainly, if

2 me as a judge, I'd rather be able to read the document 3 than just hear somebody describe it. So hopefully 4 that answers at least the first part of your question. 5 Maybe, you know, it sounds like the intervenor's have one or two things they'd like to 6 add. You have at least one. Maybe you all could come 7 to some understanding and perhaps the staff would 8 agree, perhaps not, but if we could get this handled 9 10 by agreement that would obviously make everybody's lives easier. 11 MR. SMITH: Okay, I will contact the other 12 13 parties and see if we can't reach some sort of agreement. And it sounds like the preferred approach 14 15 from your end would have us, with maybe perhaps if we 16 can reach agreement, a short joint motion or unopposed motion to add that as an exhibit. 17 18 CHAIR SPRITZER: That would be great. And some additional 19 the intervenor's, if they have 20 documents, they can discuss those with you as well and maybe we can get it worked out. If there has to be a 21 22 motion then I quess we'll have to go that route and 23 we'll get it ruled on as soon as we can. 24 MR. MARIOTTE: I'm sure we can work it I'm pretty sure I know what document Tyson is 25 out.

somebody's going to talk about something, at least for

1	talking about.
2	MR. SMITH: Okay, we'll chat after this,
3	Mr. Mariotte.
4	MR. MARIOTTE: Okay.
5	CHAIR SPRITZER: Very good. Okay, before
6	we move on to the question of opening and closing
7	statements, anything else anybody wants to ask about
8	what we've covered so far? Particularly regarding
9	exhibits, exhibit lists, technology issues?
LO	MR. WILSON: Well at this time we'd like
L1	to This is Anthony Wilson for staff, just go back
L2	to venue logistics. We were wondering of the facility
L3	had meeting rooms that would be available to us?
L4	CHAIR SPRITZER: We'll have to get back to
L5	you on that. I don't know, can you check on that?
16	MS. STODDARD: I can check on that.
L7	MR. WILSON: Okay, and in addition in the
L8	event of inclement weather should we follow the
L9	Federal Government announcements or is there something
20	for the county or who should we follow?
21	CHAIR SPRITZER: Well if Calvert County is
22	closed we could safely assume we won't be using their
23	building. If the county were open but the NRC were
24	not operating, I guess that's possible, we could have
- 1	1

a storm down in Calvert County and not up here.

would think if the Federal Government is going to be closed then we're not going to hold a hearing even if Calvert County is open. I'm looking around the table here to see if anybody has any different thoughts.

I think if that happens we're already going to be down there, of course, on the 25th. Probably what we should do is get you a cell phone contact. Probably for Kirsten, our law clerk, so you'll have somebody to contact in the event we have a weather issue. Certainly if the county is closed we're not going to have access to the facility and we're not going to be able to function so that's a pretty easy call.

If the NRC is closed because there happens to be a bad storm up here in the Washington area but maybe it's not so bad down in Calvert County we might go ahead. I don't know whether, if that raises the question of whether NRC employees can work or should be expected to work when the agency they're working for is closed for the day.

MS. KIRKWOOD: Your Honor, this is Sara Kirkwood for the staff. I think in terms of the NRC employees if we were already in Calvert County and Calvert wasn't affected by the storm I think that closing only applies to the immediate metro area,

which Calvert isn't part of. So I don't that would operate as any sort of bar to the employees working.

CHAIR SPRITZER: Okay. Yes, that makes

sense. We will, however, I think it would be a good idea for us to get you a contact number. We'll be in Solomons for the limited appearance sessions, obviously you all, we'll be at the Calvert County Marine Museum and we'll get you a phone number where you can reach if there's some issue about weather or logistics, anything of that nature.

MR. WILSON: Thank you, Your Honor.

CHAIR SPRITZER: We'll send that out by email. Okay, any other questions on logistics or exhibits or technology? All right, hearing none we will move on to the question of opening and closing statements.

Let me ask the parties first, do you want to make opening statements? The reason I ask is, of course typically an opening statement is to provide an outline of what you expect the evidence to show. But you've already submitted your evidence to us and largely the hearing is going to consist of us asking questions. But we don't want to foreclose opening statements if you think they would be useful. So why don't we start with UniStar, do you all have any view

on	that?

MR. SMITH: Well, I think in general i
agree with you as to the point of opening statements
in the typical hearing. I think here it's not
necessary to give a lengthy opening statement but I
think that, you know, a short statement would be
helpful at least for, at a minimum, the members of the
public in the audience to help understand the party's
position in advance of hearing the judges questioning
of the witnesses. So I think it would set it up a
little bit. But I think it certainly could be brief,
on the order of five minutes or ten minutes max.

CHAIR SPRITZER: Okay. Intervenors do you have any view on that?

MR. MARIOTTE: I agree with UniStar on that I think, you know, for the members of the public on particular I think it's helpful. And yes I think we'd like the opportunity for a short opening statement.

CHAIR SPRITZER: And the staff, do you all also want to make and opening statement or not?

MR. WILSON: We would agree with the intervenors and the applicant that perhaps a short statement may be necessary.

CHAIR SPRITZER: Okay. Now for the State

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

of Maryland, you're not a party, but we'd welcome any 1 2 statement you'd like to provide but you're under no 3 obligation to make one. Thank you, Your Honor. 4 MR. BOLEA: Ι don't think the State is going to provide one but I'd 5 agree with the other parties that it sounds like it 6 7 would be a reasonable idea for the reasons that they articulated. 8 9 CHAIR SPRITZER: Okay. Well what we'll do, we'll include in our order an allocation of time 10 11 for everybody. And we'll include something for the It may be less than for the other parties but 12 13 we'll include something, you're of course under no 14 obligation to actually use that if you don't want to though. 15 16 MR. BOLEA: Okay, thank you. 17 CHAIR SPRITZER: In terms of questions I 18 think the idea for the opening statements would, as indicated, to move through them fairly 19 everyone 20 quickly. So we're not going to be asking, certainly 21 not a great many questions like we have done at oral arguments that we've had in this case. 22 23 For closing statements I think you could 24 expect that we will probably have a fair number of But for the openings I think we'll pretty 25 questions.

much let you make your case and save the questions for 1 2 later on. In terms of the order of witnesses. 3 4 me go around, I mean, to me the normal sense would be to start with the party who has brought the case, 5 which is the intervenors, have them go first and then 6 7 we would hear from witnesses from the staff and 8 UniStar. 9 But it's been handled in other ways in 10 other cases. It's not unusual for, the ultimate 11 burden of proof rests with the staff to support the I suppose there's an argument that staff may 12 EIS. 13 want to go first, or should go first. So let me open that up for discussion. Let's start with the staff on 14 15 this one. Do you have any view as to what the order 16 of witnesses should be in terms of who we call first 17 and ask questions of first? MR. WILSON: No, Your Honor, we're not 18 opposed to going first or going in the middle, or 19 20 last. 21 CHAIR SPRITZER: Okay, intervenors, do you have any view on that? 22 I don't think we have any 23 MR. MARIOTTE: real preference. Whatever works best for the panel. 24 CHAIR SPRITZER: Okay. And, last but not 25

least, UniStar?

MR. SMITH: Your Honor, the order in which you outlined initially sounded fine with us, with the intervenors first and then the staff and then UniStar. But we don't have an objection to some other order either.

MR. WILSON: But, Your Honor, staff would note that since everyone is going to be relying on the EIS you may want to at least get that in first.

CHAIR SPRITZER: You mean in terms of admitting? Well here's what I envisioned on that. Before we get to any witnesses, probably after the opening statements, we'll have all the parties that want to move exhibits into evidence do that.

As I indicated earlier I would hope that there would be a minimum amount of time consumed on that, that you will have worked out, well, we will have ruled on the motion in limine, you will have any other disagreements or issues there might be to the extent you can you'll have resolved them among yourselves. Any objections that can't be resolved obviously we'll have to rule on them.

I would envision each of you would get up and say I hereby move into evidence, you know, Intervenor's Exhibits 1 through whatever the last one

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

is. Or if you happen to have a gap in there somewhere, you know, 1 through whatever except for exhibit such and such. In other words move them into evidence as a group, not one by one.

We'll give each of the other parties at that point the opportunity to object to any of those exhibits. For the staff since you've already filed a motion in limine you can simply say that you reiterate the objections made in your motion in limine, you don't need to go through them line by line or document by document again.

And we'll then proceed to admit those documents. For the staff you could certainly, you know, I would assume you would included the EIS as well as the other documents that you've offered. So by the time we start with actual witnesses we'll have all the documents issues, hopefully, resolved. And then we can ask questions based on documents that are already admitted into evidence. Does anybody see any problems with that procedure?

MR. WILSON: Well, this is Anthony Wilson for staff, our witness Laura Quinn, the only reason for her testimony is to deport the EIS, so if there won't be objections to that we'll probably then move not to have her appear.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIR SPRITZER: Yes, unless, and I can't

imagine what ground there would be to objecting to the

entering of the EIS into evidence. That's what we're

here about, about the adequacy of the EIS. So unless

something very unusual is going on I wouldn't think we

would need a sponsoring witness for the EIS.

Obviously you'll need to confirm that with the

intervenors and UniStar. But I hope that would not be

an issue we need to spend any time on and wouldn't

need a witness for that. Any other potential issues

about the procedure for moving exhibits into evidence?

Okay, what we'll do on the order of

witnesses then is we'll include that in our order.

We'll talk among ourselves and we'll include that in

our order.

In terms of rebuttal questioning of witnesses, this is I'm sure will be something new for you, Mr. Mariotte. Perhaps for the others as well, I

don't know. What we've done at other hearings and I

think what we would propose to do here, what we're

talking about is a situation where we've finished

asking our question of, let's say, the intervenor's

witness, Mr. Sklar. The staff, the applicant or maybe

also the intervenors, might have some additional

questions you want us to ask at that point.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

What we would probably do, what we will do 1 unless somebody has any violent objection, is take a 2 recess, probably ten or 15 minutes, when we've 3 finished with a witness or a block of witnesses and 4 5 allow you all to submit written, they're probably 6 going to have to be handwritten questions, to us. Any 7 additional questions you would want us to ask at that that particular witness 8 point of or group 9 witnesses. 10 Is that clear, Mr. Mariotte? You've 11 probably not run across this before. 12 MR. MARIOTTE: Actually I've run across it 13 in PSC hearings before, so that makes sense to me, 14 thank you. 15 CHAIR SPRITZER: So you should, as you're listening to the testimony, you may be want to be 16 17 thinking of any questions you'd want us to ask that we 18 haven't asked already. 19 I think, given the way that the applicant 20 and staff witness statements have been submitted, that 21 is essentially as one statement rather than three individual ones, we'll have panels of witnesses for 22 23 both the applicant and staff. As we'll have all the 24 witnesses up there, sworn, testifying at the same

time.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

We may direct questions to a specific person who we think knows the answer or we may just direct them to the panel of witnesses as a group and they can tell us who the appropriate person or persons is to answer the questions. Again, that seems to me to be the most logical way of proceeding but if anybody has any different views now would be the time to let us know. Okay, hearing nothing further we'll proceed.

(Off the record comments.)

CHAIR SPRITZER: On the question of witness introduction I think we have enough, but if we need any further explanations we'll let you know. All right, anything further on witnesses? I'll include my fellow judges in that, I've been doing all the talking here. Judge Sager, do you have anything you wanted to bring up that we haven't talked about?

ADMIN. JUDGE SAGER: No, nothing for me. All right. Well the CHAIR SPRITZER: last thing on our list is deadline for transcript corrections and proposed findings of fact, conclusions Unless somebody objects I think we'll take that up at the conclusion of hearing. See what everybody's schedules are like at that point. Normally we'd allow, once the transcript comes out, we

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

allow something on the order of two weeks to three 1 2 weeks for the parties, hopefully, to submit a joint 3 list of transcript questions. 4 Mr. Mariotte, just for your further 5 edification, this does not mean changing the substance 6 the witness testimony. This means 7 where typographical errors, maybe an error 8 reporter attributed a statement to one witness and 9 everyone agrees it was actually a different witness 10 who was speaking at the time. But it's not a means to 11 change the testimony, the substantive testimony, of 12 anybody. Only to make essentially clerical, 13 typographical type corrections. 14 That makes sense to me, MR. MARIOTTE: 15 thank you. CHAIR SPRITZER: Normally we'd do that two 16 17 to three weeks after the transcript becomes available. 18 We'd allow another two to three weeks after the 19 submitted transcript corrections are to submit 20 proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law. 21 I think we can work that out at the end of 22 hearing, unless anybody thinks we need to decide that 23 now. All right.

including my fellow judges, can think of that we need

anything

further

Is

there

24

25

anybody,

to talk about today? 1 2 MR. MARIOTTE: No. MR. SMITH: No, Your Honor. 3 4 MARIOTTE: Ι have one questions 5 related to the limited appearance hearing. Is that hearing strictly on this contention or is it on all 6 7 cotentions in general? ADMIN. JUDGE SAGER: We would like it to 8 9 be strictly on this contention, but we're not going to 10 limit people if they go out on a tangent. CHAIR SPRITZER: Yes, what's submitted at 11 12 the limited appearance session is not evidence that we would consider in our ruling on contentions, it's 13 14 limited to information, typically people talk about 15 things that have, at best, a remote connection to 16 anything. 17 The one possible contribution it can make to the hearing, if people actually do talk about 18 19 things related to the issue that we're going to be 20 hearing, is to suggest questions, areas of inquiry, for the Board. But it's not substantive evidence that 21 we would then consider in actually making our ruling. 22 23 But it can suggest ideas to us and gives people a 24 chance to voice their opinions even though we can't

base our ruling on them.

1	MR. MARIOTTE: And is it normal protocol
2	for all the parties to appear at this?
3	CHAIR SPRITZER: No. There's no
4	requirement that you, or any party, be present there
5	at all. And in fact it's really not intended for
6	parties to make statements.
7	MR. MARIOTTE: Right, no I understand that
8	part.
9	CHAIR SPRITZER: It's for the public. But
10	no there's no requirement that you be there and we
11	won't think any the less of you if you decide not to
12	be there. And that applies to everyone, so entirely
13	up to you.
14	MR. MARIOTTE: With the new baby I'm just
15	not traveling that well.
16	CHAIR SPRITZER: Very well. You'll have
17	enough traveling, I suspect, as it is. Let me ask,
18	Mr. Mariotte, are you going to be the representative
19	for all of the intervenor's at the hearing? Is that
20	your current plan or is anybody else going to be
21	MR. MARIOTTE: Yes, I will be. Some of
22	the others may attend, I don't know, but I'll be the
23	representative.
24	CHAIR SPRITZER: You'll be the one doing
25	the talking in other words, to the

MR. MARIOTTE: 1 Correct. 2 CHAIR SPRITZER: Making opening and 3 closing statement. 4 MR. MARIOTTE: Correct. 5 CHAIR SPRITZER: Okay, very good. All right, unless anybody has anything further we will 6 7 adjourn and we'll get an order out shortly. also get you the information, the contact number, 8 9 where you can contact our law clerk on the 25th and, 10 if necessary, the 26th. And anything else we've 11 mentioned at the hearing. 12 And if there are procedural issues, 13 logistical issues, whatever that come up between now 14 and the date of the hearing feel free to contact 15 Kirsten. Do they have your phone number? She'll give 16 you her phone number in case you don't have it. 17 MS. STODDARD: Yes, my phone is 301-415-18 You email 5534. can also me, it's 19 kirsten.stoddard@nrc.gov. I think it's on all the 20 services lists too. 21 CHAIR SPRITZER: All right, unless anybody has anything further I think we will adjourn the 22 23 prehearing conference at this point. Thank you all. 24 (Whereupon, the conference in the above-

mentioned matter was adjourned at 11:44 a.m.)

#### CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the attached proceedings before the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission

Proceeding:

Calvert Cliffs Unit 3

Pre-Hearing Conference

Docket Number: 52-016-COL

ASLBP Number: 09-874-02-COL-BD01

Location:

Teleconference

were held as herein appears, and that this is the original transcript thereof for the file of the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission taken and thereafter reduced to typewriting under my direction and that said transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings.

Official Reporter

Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc.

much ans of