SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF	THE UNITED STATE:
	. –
VIRGINIA URANIUM, INC., ET AL.,)
Petitioners,)
v.) No. 16-1275
JOHN WARREN, ET AL.,)
Respondents.)

Pages: 1 through 68

Place: Washington, D.C.

Date: November 5, 2018

HERITAGE REPORTING CORPORATION

Official Reporters
1220 L Street, N.W., Suite 206
Washington, D.C. 20005-4018
(202) 628-4888
contracts@hrccourtreporters.com

1	IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
2	
3	VIRGINIA URANIUM, INC., ET AL.,)
4	Petitioners,)
5	v.) No. 16-1275
6	JOHN WARREN, ET AL.,)
7	Respondents.)
8	
9	
10	Washington, D.C.
11	Monday, November 5, 2018
12	
13	The above-entitled matter came on for
14	oral argument before the Supreme Court of the
15	United States at 11:07 a.m.
16	APPEARANCES:
17	
18	CHARLES J. COOPER, ESQ., Washington, D.C.; on behalf
19	of the Petitioners.
20	GEN. NOEL J. FRANCISCO, Solicitor General,
21	Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.;
22	For the United States, as amicus curiae,
23	supporting the Petitioners.
24	TOBY J. HEYTENS, Solicitor General of Virginia,
25	Richmond, Virginia; on behalf of the Respondents

1	CONTENTS	
2	ORAL ARGUMENT OF:	PAGE:
3	CHARLES J. COOPER, ESQ.	
4	On behalf of the Petitioners	3
5	ORAL ARGUMENT OF:	
6	GEN. NOEL J. FRANCISCO, ESQ.	
7	For the United States, as amicus	
8	curiae, supporting the Petitioners	17
9	ORAL ARGUMENT OF:	
10	TOBY J. HEYTENS, ESQ.	
11	On behalf of the Respondents	30
12	REBUTTAL ARGUMENT OF:	
13	CHARLES J. COOPER, ESQ.	
14	On behalf of the Petitioners	63
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1	PROCEEDINGS
2	(11:07 a.m.)
3	CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: We'll hear
4	argument next in Case 16-1275, Virginia Uranium
5	versus Warren.
6	Mr. Cooper.
7	ORAL ARGUMENT OF CHARLES J. COOPER
8	ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONERS
9	MR. COOPER: Mr. Chief Justice, and
10	may it please the Court:
11	In the PG&E case, this Court held
12	that, although the State of California had the
13	undisputed regulatory power to in place a
14	moratorium on the construction of new nuclear
15	plants, it was preempted under the Atomic
16	Energy Act from using that undisputed de jure
17	authority as a means for indirectly and de
18	facto regulating the nuclear safety of nuclear
19	plants. The
20	JUSTICE GINSBURG: Mr. Cooper, there's
21	something odd with using PG&E an for your
22	side, because the bottom line in that case was
23	no preemption.
24	MR. COOPER: That's true, Your Honor.
25	JUSTICE GINSRIEG: So to say well

- 1 they had -- they said all this stuff along the
- 2 way, but the bottom line judgment in -- and
- 3 that was true in English as well -- no
- 4 preemption?
- 5 MR. COOPER: Your Honor, and -- and
- 6 the reason that the Court in PG&A came -- PG&E
- 7 came to that conclusion was it accepted the
- 8 court of appeals' interpretation of state law
- 9 that the purpose -- the purpose of that
- 10 regulatory -- that -- that -- the court's or
- 11 the -- California's exercise of regulatory
- authority was not for the purpose of protecting
- 13 against radiation hazards, which is the --
- 14 which is the line drawn in the statute between
- 15 what is federal and what is state.
- So PG&E, Your -- Your Honor, as I say,
- in -- clearly held that the state could not
- indirectly -- use its acknowledged authority to
- indirectly and de facto regulate a activity
- 20 that was in the exclusive authority of the NRC.
- 21 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: What -- what if
- 22 it's --
- MR. COOPER: And in this case --
- 24 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: What if it's dual
- 25 purpose?

1	MR. COOPER: Well, Your Honor
2	JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: Which a lot of
3	things are going to be in this context.
4	MR. COOPER: That's true, Your Honor,
5	and
6	JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: So how how does
7	that work?
8	MR. COOPER: Justice Kavanaugh, in a
9	case where it's a dual purpose, this Court in
10	PG&E said, is it grounded in the impermissible
11	purpose? Is it grounded in the courts of
12	appeals have had no problem examining
13	situations where and that's going to be true
14	in most
15	JUSTICE GORSUCH: Well, but, Mr.
16	Cooper
17	MR. COOPER: legislation.
18	JUSTICE GORSUCH: Mr. Cooper, then
19	then we don't we get into trouble under
20	Shady Grove of guessing what the motivations of
21	a state legislature are and all the
22	methodological, epistemological, and federalism
23	questions that that raises? What do we do
24	about that?

MR. COOPER: Your Honor, this Court in

- 1 a variety of contexts is called upon to examine
- 2 the legislative purpose of a particular
- 3 enactment --
- 4 JUSTICE GORSUCH: I know we do it in
- 5 the Fourteenth -- Fourteenth Amendment context,
- 6 for example, but I'm --
- 7 MR. COOPER: Yes.
- JUSTICE GORSUCH: -- I'm hard pressed
- 9 to come up with many other examples where we --
- 10 where we look at a state legislative purpose
- 11 and -- and -- and decide its permissibility
- 12 based on our assessment of -- of legislative
- 13 motive.
- 14 MR. COOPER: Well, Your Honor, and we
- 15 have not been able to find another statute
- where Congress has prescribed a purpose-based
- 17 preemption standard.
- 18 But Congress has nonetheless, in terms
- 19 that are quite clear and in terms that this
- 20 Court in PG&E accepted and implemented, made
- 21 purpose the line between what is state -- what
- is state and what is federal with respect to
- the regulation of nuclear power development.
- JUSTICE GORSUCH: So we're just stuck
- 25 with purpose whether we like it or not. I -- I

- 1 -- I got it.
- 2 MR. COOPER: That's -- that's the
- 3 bottom line, yes, Your Honor.
- 4 JUSTICE GORSUCH: But is PG&E perhaps
- 5 distinguishable on this basis: That at least
- 6 there California was directly regulating the
- 7 construction of nuclear power plants,
- 8 prohibiting them, and that is an area under,
- 9 what is it, 2021(c) that's expressly preempted.
- 10 Here, you have efforts to regulate
- 11 mining, an upstream activity, that are not
- 12 expressly dealt with in the statute. So what
- do we do about that?
- 14 MR. COOPER: Your Honor, I don't think
- that distinguishes PG&E at all because, in
- 16 PG&E, the state was using its acknowledged
- 17 power to decide whether nuclear power plants
- 18 would be constructed.
- 19 JUSTICE GORSUCH: Well, but that --
- 20 that --
- MR. COOPER: That's a (c) activity.
- JUSTICE GORSUCH: -- that -- that --
- I'm sorry to interrupt, but I just want to
- 24 narrow the question so that we -- we might be
- 25 more productive, for -- for me, helpfully for

- 1 me.
- 2 There, California was regulating
- 3 construction. And that's -- that's dealt with
- 4 by (c), but (k), I grant you, 2021(k), does
- 5 seem to have a carveout based on purpose.
- 6 MR. COOPER: Yes.
- JUSTICE GORSUCH: You got me there,
- 8 okay?
- 9 (Laughter.)
- 10 MR. COOPER: Yes.
- 11 JUSTICE GORSUCH: But I think Justice
- 12 White was saying, well, within the construction
- world, all right, we have this carveout under
- 14 (k) that we have to deal with, and California
- 15 might regulate construction for purposes other
- than safety considerations, for economic or
- 17 other considerations.
- 18 What do we do about it when -- when a
- 19 state comes along and says, I'm not even going
- to regulate construction, I'm not even going to
- 21 get into that game, I'm not in the (c) game at
- 22 all? Why would we look at (k)? Why would we
- look at anything? Why wouldn't we just say
- 24 this is just not an area that Congress
- 25 regulated? Congress just couldn't come to

1	agreement on how to regulate mining?
2	MR. COOPER: Well, to to come back
3	to PG&E, what the what California regulated
4	was not construction. It it preempted
5	construction. It pretermitted construction.
6	And what the Atomic Energy Act gives
7	the NRC regulatory control of is how a plant is
8	constructed. So, before you get to the how,
9	California answered the whether.
LO	And it and this Court acknowledged
11	that that was within its authority. But what
12	it couldn't do was use that de jure authority
L3	over whether to effectively and indirectly
L 4	regulate the nuclear safety of the operation of
15	the plant.
L6	The State of Virginia is doing exactly
L7	the same thing here. It's using its
18	JUSTICE GINSBURG: Suppose suppose
19	Virginia had said we think that the extraction
20	is a dangerous activity, so we are justifying
21	this ban on mining to protect the workers from
22	the hazards associated with mining, not with
23	milling or tailing, just mining.
24	Then I take it you would lose, right?

MR. COOPER: I would lose, Your Honor,

```
1 yes. I would lose if that was the State of
```

- 2 Virginia's genuine purpose.
- What the Congress has -- asks the
- 4 courts to do is to determine the purpose of a
- 5 -- of a state regulation, state regulations
- 6 ranging in the -- in this body of law from a
- 7 state very creatively denying municipal
- 8 services, such as fire and police, sewer,
- 9 garbage, to restricting access on its public
- 10 roads in order to -- to -- to use those
- 11 sovereign powers in order to prevent the -- the
- 12 -- coming into existence the regulatory power
- of the NRC in the first place.
- 14 And that is what PG&E says, quite
- 15 reasonably, states cannot do. If they could do
- 16 that, it would make a mockery -- as this Court
- 17 said in the National Meat Association case,
- 18 would make a mockery of the purpose-based
- 19 preemption standard that Congress has
- 20 prescribed.
- 21 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: I might just
- 22 be repeating Justice Gorsuch's question, but
- 23 you've conceded, if they talk about mining
- 24 hazards, that that's -- you lose. And I
- 25 appreciate the candor.

1	But what if the legislation is written
2	to protect against mining hazards and of the, I
3	don't know, 60 members of the legislature, 20
4	of them say this is a great way to keep nuclear
5	energy out of the state and we should do that?
6	What is the purpose of that
7	legislation? Still to protect against mining
8	hazards, or do you look behind it and it says,
9	well, a third of them thought it was a good way
10	to keep nuclear power out? How how do you
11	analyze that question?
12	MR. COOPER: Your Honor, the the
13	courts can't accept simply as written what the
14	state may say in terms of what the purpose is.
15	That's that's exactly what happened in the
16	Entergy case from the Second Circuit.
17	The the legislature in Vermont was
18	acutely aware of PG&E and acutely aware of
19	trying to avoid preemption. And so, on the
20	face of the statute, it articulated non-safety
21	rationales for what was, the court of appeals
22	determined, it its its concealed purpose,
23	which was radiation hazards of nuclear power
24	generation.
25	So the the courts really have to

- 1 look behind to see if, in fact, the -- the
- 2 legislature is motivated and its purpose is a
- 3 prohibited radiation hazard.
- 4 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Is this going to
- 5 require deposing every single legislative
- 6 member?
- 7 MR. COOPER: No, Your Honor.
- 8 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Because what do
- 9 you look at? In a lot of these things, people
- 10 just vote. They don't say why. Or they do
- 11 what one of my colleagues suggested, they give
- 12 mixed motives.
- 13 This is an odd way to read a
- 14 preemption statute.
- 15 MR. COOPER: Your Honor, I know of no
- 16 case, that I'm aware of anyway, when this Court
- and the federal courts go about the what is
- ordinary business of trying to determine
- 19 legislative purpose, where legislators have
- 20 been deposed. That is not what we have in
- 21 mind.
- 22 What the courts look to in these cases
- 23 are the standard, ordinary indicia of -- of --
- of objective purpose. What does the text say?
- 25 By the way, the text in this case says a lot

- 1 about that.
- 2 But what is the legislative history?
- 3 What are the historical contexts of -- of the
- 4 legislation itself? What was the legislature
- 5 addressing? What --
- 6 JUSTICE KAGAN: But you would concede,
- 7 Mr. Cooper, that two states with exactly the
- 8 same statutes, it could come out different ways
- 9 because the legislative history was different
- 10 in the two states?
- 11 MR. COOPER: It -- it -- it could,
- 12 Your Honor, if -- if the purpose animating the
- 13 legislature through the best good-faith
- 14 examination of the court's looking at that
- issue came to the conclusion that, yes, this
- 16 genuine and non-prohibited purpose was the
- 17 but-for purpose, if you will, of the
- 18 legislation.
- 19 Yes, that -- that is --
- 20 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: Is that --
- 21 JUSTICE KAGAN: It seems to present
- real opportunities for gamesmanship as well,
- 23 sort of bad incentives for a state. Just cover
- 24 over your purpose?
- MR. COOPER: Your Honor, and we've

- 1 seen that -- we've seen that in -- in cases
- 2 that have been decided in -- in this line. As
- 3 I was saying, the -- the Entergy case itself,
- 4 the legislature was very careful to attempt to
- 5 obscure what was, and the courts determined
- 6 quite properly, what was genuinely animating
- 7 the legislative body in that case.
- 8 And it's not unusual in this
- 9 particular area. And when -- when Congress
- 10 determined to create a system of dual
- 11 regulation and drew the line between the
- 12 purpose of the state to regulate radiation
- hazards, it was reserving for the federal
- 14 government that particular area with good
- 15 reason.
- 16 It was allowing the states to regulate
- in the area of electric generation as they had
- 18 always done and to -- if -- if the states
- 19 would have regulated this particular plant as
- though it was a fossil fuel plant, then there
- 21 would be no doubt that its purposes were not
- 22 nuclear safety.
- JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: But how are we
- 24 going to tell that in most cases? Justice
- 25 Kagan's question about two state laws are going

- 1 to be treated differently based on our inquiry
- 2 or the federal court's inquiry into the
- 3 subjective motive seems very odd.
- 4 The thing that concerns me about this
- 5 is, how is this going to work?
- 6 MR. COOPER: Your Honor --
- 7 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: And -- and one way
- 8 would be, as Justice Sotomayor said, subjective
- 9 motivations depositions. You rightly say, I
- 10 think, that that's not what you're looking for.
- 11 So what's -- what is it? You ask
- whether the state can articulate a legitimate
- 13 non-safety rationale, that's -- that's a
- 14 possible answer.
- MR. COOPER: That's -- that's --
- JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: But that's too
- 17 low, I think you're going to say.
- MR. COOPER: You're right, I am going
- 19 to say that, Your Honor.
- 20 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: But then what do
- 21 -- what -- what is the answer, for something
- 22 workable that makes sense here? That's what --
- that's what's bothering me.
- MR. COOPER: Your Honor, I think if --
- if you're -- if you're groping, if you were,

- 1 for a framework for courts to analyze this, it
- 2 seems to me the Court in Arlington Heights
- 3 produced a perfectly apt way for courts to
- 4 approach this.
- If the -- the person, the plaintiff
- 6 challenging the preemption of the statute can
- 7 demonstrate that the prohibited purpose was a
- 8 motivating factor, then the state has to come
- 9 in and show that it would have been enacted
- 10 even in the absence of the motivating factor.
- 11 And, again, the -- the Congress
- 12 drew the line here because it wanted to ensure
- 13 -- and this was -- purpose is actually in this
- 14 a narrowing preemption because, typically, if
- 15 -- if the state enacts a measure, regardless of
- 16 what its purpose is, that is an indirect
- 17 regulation of that which is exclusively
- 18 federal. As in the National Meat Association
- 19 case, the court doesn't look into what the
- 20 purpose was. It simply preempts it, quite
- 21 properly.
- 22 This actually takes -- takes the
- 23 standard preemption doctrine and its state --
- it's friendlier to the state's interests
- 25 because it allows states, as (k) explicitly

- 1 says, to regulate the materials at issue --
- 2 source, byproduct, and special nuclear
- 3 materials -- for purposes other than protection
- 4 against radiation hazards.
- But, when it comes to something that
- 6 dramatically important, protection against
- 7 radiation hazards of these nuclear materials,
- 8 the Congress wanted that to be exclusively
- 9 federal, and so it drew the line on -- on
- 10 purpose.
- If I may reserve the balance of my
- 12 time, Mr. Chief Justice.
- 13 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you,
- 14 counsel.
- 15 General Francisco.
- 16 ORAL ARGUMENT OF GENERAL NOEL J. FRANCISCO
- 17 FOR THE UNITED STATES, AS AMICUS CURIAE,
- 18 SUPPORTING THE PETITIONERS
- 19 GENERAL FRANCISCO: Mr. Chief Justice,
- 20 and may it please the Court:
- 21 Under the Atomic Energy Act, Virginia
- 22 can ban uranium mining because it thinks that
- 23 mining isn't safe. But what it can't --
- 24 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Because it thinks
- 25 mining is what?

1	GENERAL	FRANCISCO:	Because	mining
---	---------	------------	---------	--------

- 2 isn't safe. But what it can't do is ban
- 3 uranium mining because uranium processing isn't
- 4 safe.
- 5 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Can you, the
- 6 federal government, order the state to permit
- 7 and regulate mining?
- 8 GENERAL FRANCISCO: No, Your Honor, I
- 9 don't think so.
- 10 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: So, if you can't
- do that, then how can you force them or judge
- any reason they give for saying I don't want to
- 13 do it?
- 14 GENERAL FRANCISCO: Well, Your Honor,
- this is simply a straightforward preemption
- 16 analysis. And all that's required here --
- 17 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: But you just told
- 18 me you can't order them to mine.
- 19 GENERAL FRANCISCO: Right. And if
- 20 Virginia --
- 21 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Or to apply safety
- 22 reasons. So, if you can't order them to do it,
- wouldn't we be, in effect, doing that if we
- 24 said your purpose for not wanting to do this is
- 25 preempted, now you must?

1	GENERAL FRANCISCO: Not in the
2	slightest, Your Honor, because, if Virginia's
3	mining ban were preempted, Virginia wouldn't
4	have to do anything. It could apply its
5	existing mining laws, it could adopt a new
6	mining law if it wanted, or it could leave the
7	entire area completely unregulated.
8	But the one thing that Pacific Gas
9	tells us that it can't do, is it can't use the
LO	authority that it does have to reach into and
11	indirectly regulate something reserved
12	exclusively
13	JUSTICE KAGAN: May
L4	GENERAL FRANCISCO: to the federal
L5	government.
L6	JUSTICE KAGAN: may may I go
L7	back to Justice Gorsuch's question
18	GENERAL FRANCISCO: Yes, Your Honor.
L9	JUSTICE KAGAN: about PG&E and
20	whether it's the same as or different from this
21	case? And it seems this might be just a
22	different way of saying what he said, but it
23	it does seem to me that when you're talking
24	about construction of a nuclear plant, there's
25	obvious dual authority between the federal

- 1 government and the states.
- 2 2018 gives a lot of authority to the
- 3 states, and then 2021(c) clearly makes this a
- 4 part of what the Commission looks at.
- 5 And, you know, Mr. Cooper said there's
- 6 the whether question and the how question.
- 7 But, honestly, if you think about the thing,
- 8 there -- if there's dual authority in one area,
- 9 and it seems to me that that's not true here,
- 10 where the Act specifically says that the
- 11 Commission's authority starts when the --
- 12 GENERAL FRANCISCO: Sure.
- 13 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: -- materials are
- 14 extracted from the earth and has nothing to do
- 15 --
- 16 GENERAL FRANCISCO: Right.
- 17 JUSTICE KAGAN: -- with what happens
- 18 prior to that. So isn't the separation
- involved in these two activities very different
- 20 from the separation involved in the PG&E
- 21 context?
- 22 GENERAL FRANCISCO: So my -- my answer
- 23 to your question is no. And if I could explain
- 24 by reference also to the facts of some other
- 25 cases.

- 1 Take Skull Valley, for example.
- 2 There, the state, everyone agreed, had complete
- 3 authority over the use of the roadways. But
- 4 what the state couldn't do was effectively shut
- 5 down a spent nuclear fuel facility by
- 6 preventing any fuel from reaching the facility
- 7 in the first place by way of the roads.
- 9 understand that's a nice Tenth Circuit case, so
- 10 well done.
- 11 (Laughter.)
- 12 JUSTICE GORSUCH: But it doesn't bind
- 13 this Court. So what do we do about -- I'm
- 14 stuck where Justice Kagan is, and so it's not
- going to help me to cite a Tenth Circuit case,
- 16 I'm sorry, colleagues.
- 17 (Laughter.)
- 18 JUSTICE GORSUCH: But I -- I want to
- 19 know from first principles why PG&E isn't
- 20 simply explained as a construction case.
- 21 GENERAL FRANCISCO: Sure.
- 22 JUSTICE GORSUCH: And construction, I
- don't see whether and how in the statute in
- 24 (c). I see construction, period.
- 25 GENERAL FRANCISCO: Right.

1	JUSTICE GORSUCH: And California was
2	regulating construction in some fashion.
3	GENERAL FRANCISCO: Right. And I
4	JUSTICE GORSUCH: Here here, it's
5	mining. And maybe Congress should have
6	preempted in mining, instead of just starting
7	with milling, but it didn't.
8	GENERAL FRANCISCO: Yeah.
9	JUSTICE GORSUCH: So why isn't that
10	the end of the case?
11	GENERAL FRANCISCO: Because I think
12	the answer to your question is that neither
13	PG&E nor anything that we're arguing here is
14	really a nuclear-specific rule.
15	Take the National Meat Association
16	case, for example, a decision of this Court.
17	The federal government had exclusive regulatory
18	authority over slaughterhouse operations. And
19	what the Court made clear was that the state
20	couldn't use its authority over the sales of
21	meat to reach into and indirectly regulate
22	slaughterhouse operations.
23	Here, the purpose inquiry actually
24	narrows the scope of preemption because not
25	only does the state have to use the authority

1 that it does have to reach into and indirectly

- 2 touch upon something that the federal
- 3 government regulates, it has to do so for a
- 4 very specific and impermissible purpose.
- 5 And I think that if you adopted a
- 6 contrary rule, unlike the one adopted by the
- 7 Fourth Circuit, it really is a road map for
- 8 completely undermining a multibillion-dollar
- 9 industry.
- 10 And that, Your Honor, is the reason I
- 11 was citing Skull Valley, not because I believe
- that the holding obviously is binding on this
- 13 Court, because its facts show that a state
- 14 could simply shut down all nuclear activity by
- designating the roadway leading up to a nuclear
- 16 plant as unsuitable for commercial trucking,
- 17 even if the only commercial trucks that ever go
- 18 up that roadway are to make deliveries to the
- 19 facility.
- 20 JUSTICE KAGAN: But a problem --
- 21 JUSTICE ALITO: Well, purpose is
- 22 usually a subjective concept, but -- and that's
- 23 what Congress -- that's the term Congress chose
- 24 to use in 2021(k), but is there a way of
- 25 understanding that as applying an objective

- 1 standard that doesn't boil down to rational
- 2 basis review? So the inquiry wouldn't be what
- 3 was in the minds of these particular
- 4 legislators, but would a reasonable
- 5 legislator -- is -- do -- enact this particular
- 6 prohibition if its objective was not
- 7 disagreement with the federal regulations?
- 8 GENERAL FRANCISCO: Yes, Your Honor, I
- 9 think there is. And -- and, Justice Kavanaugh,
- 10 I think this also goes to the concern that you
- 11 were raising as well.
- 12 I think that the way you would analyze
- 13 this is by looking at the text, the legislative
- 14 history, the historical context in which it was
- 15 enacted, and the plausibility of any
- 16 permissible non-safety rationale that the state
- 17 puts forward.
- 18 If the state puts forward a plausible
- 19 non-safety rationale and that rationale is not
- otherwise foreclosed by the text, legislative
- 21 history, and historical context, then I think
- 22 the state wins.
- The problem in this case is that the
- 24 Fourth Circuit effectively assumed that the
- 25 purpose of this law was to prohibit uranium

- 1 processing because uranium processing was
- 2 unsafe. But it held that that was simply
- 3 irrelevant to the disposition of the case.
- 4 JUSTICE GORSUCH: But, General, even
- 5 under your standard, we have a problem of mixed
- 6 motives, because every piece of legislation has
- 7 a variety of motives behind it. We have a lot
- 8 of congressmen with a lot of different
- 9 purposes.
- I -- I'm not sure I understand how
- 11 you're going to solve the problem. In -- in
- 12 Virginia, we have in this record evidence that
- 13 they're concerned both about --
- 14 GENERAL FRANCISCO: Right.
- 15 JUSTICE GORSUCH: -- environmental and
- 16 economic impacts from mining itself, as well as
- 17 with other things.
- 18 So what do we do with those cases
- 19 where -- where, at the end of the day, it's
- 20 indeterminate?
- 21 GENERAL FRANCISCO: So two responses,
- 22 Your Honor. The first, which I'll get off of
- 23 quickly because I -- I don't think you're going
- 24 to find it fully responsive, is that you don't
- 25 have to address that here because the Fourth

1 Circuit refused to apply any purpose inquiry at

- 2 all.
- But, secondly, I think that the answer
- 4 lies in where the burden of proof is. The
- 5 burden of proof is on those challenging state
- 6 law. And if they cannot establish that the
- 7 principal or predominant purpose of this law
- 8 was impermissible, then they lose.
- 9 And so, here, the Fourth Circuit
- 10 refused to undertake any inquiry at all because
- it effectively assumed that the purpose was in
- 12 Petitioners' favor but concluded that that was
- 13 irrelevant.
- 14 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: Any plausible
- 15 non-safety rationale, that's your test?
- 16 GENERAL FRANCISCO: I think, if it's
- 17 not foreclosed by the text, legislative
- 18 history, and historical context and they can
- 19 establish a plausible rationale at the time
- that this was adopted, then, yes, I think that
- 21 we win.
- 22 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: So that answers
- Justice Gorsuch's question because, if there's
- 24 at least one plausible non-safety rationale,
- 25 that's good enough or --

1	GENERAL FRANCISCO: I think that
2	plausible non-safety rationale has to be
3	sufficient to sustain the law.
4	JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: What does that
5	GENERAL FRANCISCO: So, for
6	JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: what does that
7	mean?
8	GENERAL FRANCISCO: So, for example,
9	suppose that Virginia put forward a rationale
LO	of we don't like big, huge, ugly holes dug into
11	the Virginia countryside, which is a very
12	plausible rationale. But suppose that in a
13	particular area of Virginia they actually have
L4	tons of big, ugly holes dug in the Virginia
15	countryside by way of coal mines.
L6	CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: I thought they
L7	just said we don't want we've got too many
L8	
L9	JUSTICE GORSUCH: They've got too many
20	
21	CHIEF JUSTICE GORSUCH: but don't
22	want any more.
23	JUSTICE GORSUCH: Yeah.
24	GENERAL FRANCISCO: Well, Your Honor
2.5	and I think that that's exactly the type of

1 analysis that the statute itself requires when

- 2 it required that type of purpose inquiry,
- 3 because I do think otherwise -- otherwise, you
- 4 really are giving state and local governments a
- 5 road map for undermining a multibillion-dollar
- 6 industry. Just one other example.
- JUSTICE KAGAN: Well, General, you --
- 8 you -- you've been talking about the
- 9 undermining of this industry, but I guess a
- 10 couple of things is, one is that as long as
- 11 there is this other purpose or as long as the
- 12 state can say that there's this other purpose,
- it will just as successfully be able to
- 14 undermine the industry.
- 15 And then on the -- on -- on the
- 16 -- as well, this statute does give the federal
- 17 government the ability to make sure that states
- 18 can't really undermine it if the federal
- 19 government wants a nuclear industry badly
- 20 enough, because, in addition to the fact that
- 21 somebody can import this material from another
- 22 state or from another country, the federal
- 23 government itself can mine for this material on
- 24 its own lands, or it can condemn lands and --
- and do it with newly acquired lands.

Τ	GENERAL FRANCISCO: Sure.
2	JUSTICE KAGAN: So there's a limit to
3	how far any state is able to undermine the
4	federal goal here if the federal goal is real
5	enough.
6	GENERAL FRANCISCO: I I agree, Your
7	Honor, but two responses to the first part of
8	your question, and then I'd like to address the
9	second part of your question as well.
10	On the first part of your question, we
11	assume that the states engage in good faith,
12	and we assume that the states aren't going to
13	misstate their reasons for doing something.
14	But I will tell you that it is a lot
15	more difficult for a state to, for example,
16	rezone all land that nuclear activity is taking
17	place on as residential, even if it's totally
18	unsuitable for residential dwelling, if they
19	know they're going to have to come forward and
20	justify that.
21	And may I finish the second point,
22	Your Honor?
23	CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Briefly.
24	GENERAL FRANCISCO: Yes. In my in

-- in response to the second part of your

- 1 question, Justice Kagan, yes, the federal
- 2 government can in certain circumstances condemn
- 3 land. But take not something like this case,
- 4 but take something like an ongoing nuclear
- 5 facility where the state is using, under the
- 6 Fourth Circuit's rule, its authority to rezone
- 7 that land as residential to completely obstruct
- 8 it and shut it down.
- 9 It is a lot more difficult for the
- 10 federal government to come in and condemn an
- 11 entire operating nuclear power plant.
- 12 Thank you, Your Honor.
- 13 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you,
- 14 counsel.
- Mr. Heytens.
- 16 ORAL ARGUMENT OF TOBY J. HEYTENS
- 17 ON BEHALF OF THE RESPONDENTS
- 18 MR. HEYTENS: Mr. Chief Justice, and
- 19 may it please the Court:
- This is an obstacle preemption case
- 21 masquerading as a field preemption case. There
- is no field preemption here because of the
- 23 undisputed fact that the Nuclear Regulatory
- 24 Commission does not and cannot regulate any
- aspect of uranium mining, including the safety

- 1 aspects of uranium mining.
- 2 And there is no obstacle preemption
- 3 here because the Atomic Energy Act and the
- 4 Nuclear Regulatory Commission have repeatedly
- 5 reaffirmed that states have the ability to
- 6 regulate mining up to and including by banning
- 7 it altogether.
- 8 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: They -- they --
- 9 they can regulate milling, correct?
- 10 MR. HEYTENS: Excuse me, I want to
- 11 make -- the federal government regulates
- 12 milling --
- 13 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: Right.
- 14 MR. HEYTENS: -- Justice Kavanaugh,
- 15 yes.
- 16 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: Yeah. So the
- 17 mining and milling occur together, correct? In
- 18 other words, they occur -- you don't have
- 19 mining without milling; you don't have milling
- 20 without mining.
- 21 MR. HEYTENS: Justice Kavanaugh, there
- 22 -- there's a way -- the in situ leaching
- 23 process, they literally occur at the same time.
- 24 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: If you have
- 25 conventional mining.

1	MR. HEYTENS: I'm sorry, yes, you have
2	to mill before you can mine. That's correct.
3	JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: Right.
4	MR. HEYTENS: But but I think in
5	many ways what this case boils down to is two
6	questions about Pacific Gas, either one of
7	which is sufficient to resolve this case in our
8	favor.
9	The first question is why the Court
10	conducted a purpose analysis in Pacific Gas,
11	and the second question is what is the nature
12	of the purpose analysis that Pacific Gas did?
13	So let me take the first question: why did the
14	Court do it?
15	The reason the Court did it is
16	because, as several members of this Court have
17	already flagged, Pacific Gas was dealing with
18	an area of overlapping shared authority between
19	the federal and state government. And I know
20	the yellow brief dwells on this, so I want to
21	quote some of the language in the Court's
22	opinion that addresses this.
23	The Court said at page 194 of its
24	opinion that that case arose at an issue
25	involving the intersection of federal and state

- 1 authority. The Court said at pages 211 and 212
- 2 of its opinion that it was involving the dual
- 3 regulation of nuclear-powered energy
- 4 generation, and the --
- 5 JUSTICE ALITO: Before you get too
- 6 deeply into that decision, which you have
- 7 addressed very extensively and well in your
- 8 brief, could I just ask you this?
- 9 Suppose the Virginia General Assembly
- 10 enacted a law that reads as follows: The
- 11 General Assembly disagrees with the federal
- 12 government that uranium tailings can be safely
- 13 stored in Virginia and, for that reason and
- only that reason, we are banning the practice
- of uranium mining.
- Would that be preempted?
- 17 MR. HEYTENS: Justice Alito, we do not
- 18 think even that mythical statute would be
- 19 preempted. And let me -- I'll start by
- 20 explaining why we don't think that, and then
- 21 I'll explain why I don't think the answer to
- 22 that matters in this case.
- JUSTICE ALITO: Yeah, how would that
- 24 be -- I mean, doesn't that make nonsense of
- 25 2120 -- 2021(k)?

- 1 MR. HEYTENS: Justice Alito, I don't
- 2 think it does and here's why: I think the
- 3 predicate for 2021(k) is the existence of an
- 4 NRC-regulated activity.
- 5 2021(k) has to be read in pari materia
- 6 with 2021(b). 2021(b) also refers to purpose,
- 7 and it says that in a situation where the state
- 8 negotiates for the discontinuance of commission
- 9 authority, the state again gets the right to
- 10 regulate those activities for purposes of
- 11 health and safety.
- 12 And then 2021(k) comes along and says:
- Just because you haven't gotten a 2021(b)
- 14 agreement doesn't mean you can't regulate for
- other purposes.
- 16 JUSTICE BREYER: So why -- why can't
- 17 the -- you know, the imagination allows you to
- think of all kinds of things where they stop
- 19 the tailing. No one who works in a tailing
- 20 plant can eat. All right? You know, that's
- 21 not going to be a real law.
- But they can't eat, they can't have
- 23 electricity in the plant, they can't build it
- in the first place because it's residential.
- You name it, they have authority in all kinds

- of places and all they have to do to stop the
- 2 tailings is they use this other authority
- 3 solely in order to stop the tailings, and you
- 4 say that's just fine.
- 5 MR. HEYTENS: Well -- well, Justice
- 6 Breyer, I think there are two different reasons
- 7 why that's distinct from this situation. First
- 8 --
- 9 JUSTICE BREYER: I know the eating is
- 10 distinct, but what I'm driving at is the
- 11 general matter of -- of I were in a state
- legislature, and you could think of a thousand
- ways, my guess, is we stop tailings in our
- 14 state how. And then you look to an area you
- 15 can regulate and you regulate that area, but
- 16 you do it in a way that nobody can build a
- 17 plant. Okay?
- 18 MR. HEYTENS: Yes.
- 19 JUSTICE BREYER: Now I don't think
- that's a far-fetched question.
- 21 MR. HEYTENS: I -- I think the --
- 22 JUSTICE BREYER: And that's what they
- 23 say happened here.
- MR. HEYTENS: Yes, and I think the
- answer to your question, Justice Breyer, goes

- 1 back to a point that Justice Gorsuch made
- 2 earlier. In that situation, if we're talking
- 3 about a plant, we are talking about dual
- 4 overlapping federal and state authority under
- 5 2021.
- 6 JUSTICE BREYER: But that's not my
- 7 question. It's the tailings they can't
- 8 regulate. You get my question?
- 9 MR. HEYTENS: Yes, Justice Breyer.
- 10 JUSTICE BREYER: A good lawyer, like
- 11 you, and he finds a different area, and it just
- 12 turns out that the regulation in this different
- area will stop them from ever having tailings.
- 14 And that's why they did it. Okay? So -- so
- 15 that's my problem.
- 16 MR. HEYTENS: Just -- let me try this
- 17 again, Justice Breyer.
- 18 When we're talking about a tailings
- 19 facility, we're in an area of overlapping
- 20 authority because NRC regulates tailings
- 21 management. And at that point, you are covered
- 22 by 2021(k). And the Court has to conduct the
- 23 sort of purpose analysis that's mandated by
- 24 2021(k).
- 25 Our submission is that this case is

- 1 fundamentally different because we are
- 2 regulating mining --
- JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: But, when you're
- 4 regulating mining, you're always regulating
- 5 milling because you have the two together, but
- 6 you can't regulate milling, as you acknowledge,
- 7 but the two are interlinked in a way that I'm
- 8 not sure you can disaggregate in the way you're
- 9 doing.
- 10 MR. HEYTENS: Justice Kavanaugh, I
- 11 understand that conceptually we -- we could
- 12 have a metaphysical debate about whether you
- can separate mining and milling and whether --
- 14 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: It's -- in the
- 15 real world, it's not separated.
- 16 MR. HEYTENS: Well, Justice Kavanaugh,
- in the statute, it's separated. And in NRC's
- 18 judgment, they're separated.
- 19 I think the best evidence of that is
- 20 discussed in our brief. It's the Hydro
- 21 Resource -- Resources decision of NRC. So this
- is a case in which NRC is regulating an
- 23 activity that they have the authority to
- 24 regulate. It's a milling process. Right?
- 25 And NRC has argued that, as part of

- 1 their regulation of milling, they should take
- 2 into account background radiation that exists
- 3 because of previously un-NRC regulated mining.
- And NRC says we can't do that. We're
- 5 not allowed to take into account the
- 6 consequences of previous mining activities
- 7 because we, NRC, have no authority to regulate
- 8 mining. Even though we have authority to
- 9 regulate milling, we, NRC, can't regulate
- 10 mining. And even taking into account radiation
- 11 that exists because of that previous mining
- would constitute impermissible NRC regulation
- of mining.
- 14 And so I think regardless of whether
- as a metaphysical level we could say milling
- 16 and mining are so inextricably intertwined that
- the regulation of one is necessarily the
- 18 regulation of the other, I think both Congress
- 19 and the text of the statute, right, I mean, so
- that's the other point, this statute from the
- 21 beginning has given NRC the ability to regulate
- 22 milling.
- 23 And in the entire history of this Act,
- NRC has never once advanced the argument, as
- far as we're aware, that says because we can

1 regulate milling, a fortiori we can regulate

- 2 mining because mining is inextricably
- 3 intertwined with milling.
- 4 In fact, NRC has aggressively
- 5 disclaimed that argument in a decision where a
- 6 great deal actually turned on that argument.
- 7 But the second question to raise,
- 8 Justice Breyer -- to go back to Justice Breyer.
- 9 So I think the first reason that Justice
- 10 Breyer's example isn't covered by this
- 11 situation is that we concede, once we're
- 12 dealing with an NRC-regulated activity, a
- tailings facility, 2021(k) requires some sort
- 14 of purpose analysis. That's why the court did
- 15 a purpose analysis in Pacific Gas.
- 16 JUSTICE KAGAN: And that's also why
- 17 Skull Valley is right?
- 18 MR. HEYTENS: Yes, Justice Kagan,
- 19 because the vast majority of the activities in
- 20 Skull Valley were NRC-regulated activities.
- 21 And we have no guarrel with that decision
- whatsoever.
- But the other reason is even if -- so,
- 24 to go back to Justice Alito's hypothetical,
- 25 excuse me -- even if it appeared on the face of

- 1 the statute, the first reason we think that
- that law is not preempted, and if that law's
- 3 not preempted, this law is obviously not
- 4 preempted, but even if the Court were inclined
- 5 to reserve judgment or to carve out an
- 6 exception for a law where that sort of purpose
- 7 is stated on the text or the face of the
- 8 statute, there would be no justification for
- 9 unleashing the, all things considered,
- 10 subjective motivations of the state legislature
- 11 that we see in the blue brief and the yellow
- 12 brief.
- 13 And, here, I think what --
- 14 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: If we --
- 15 JUSTICE BREYER: Now the motives in my
- opinion is a bad word because you don't know
- 17 people's motives. You don't normally look into
- 18 that. Motives can be backward-looking. He did
- 19 it out of revenge. They can be referring
- 20 solely to a past fact. He hit my sister,
- 21 that's why.
- 22 But we're concerned with the subset of
- 23 that where we're looking to the future. And I
- think you're right to say that's purpose. When
- 25 we talk about -- and every judge, as far as I

1 know, including Justice Scalia, whom we used to

- 2 talk about this, sometimes will look to a
- 3 statute's purpose. Go back to Lord Cooke. Go
- 4 back as far as you want.
- Name any judge in American history,
- and who's been heard of, of course, we have a
- 7 dozen ways of looking at purpose. So what's
- 8 wrong with looking at purpose here? I grant
- 9 you a state legislature, unlike Congress, is
- 10 less likely to hold on the record hearings
- 11 about a statute, but then that would be a
- reason for saying, when we try to determine
- purpose, we do not look necessarily to
- 14 legislative history as written in committee
- 15 reports because there aren't any.
- 16 Now there Justice Scalia and I could
- 17 have a lot of arguments about whether you do,
- whether you don't, but that's beside the point.
- 19 When you say don't look at purpose, there I get
- off the boat because I think that's our job as
- 21 a court in -- in a relevant case to determine
- 22 what the purpose of the statute is. Sometimes
- 23 it's easy. Sometimes it's tough.
- So what's wrong with what I just said?
- 25 MR. HEYTENS: I think I have two

- 1 answers, Justice Breyer.
- The first one is that when we're
- 3 dealing with a state legislature, which is
- 4 fundamentally, as you say, unlike Congress, and
- 5 it's unlike Congress in a different way. A
- 6 state legislature does not have to show its
- 7 authority to do something.
- 8 Under our federal system, the
- 9 challenger has to show why a state legislature
- 10 may not do something. So the first thing I'd
- 11 say is we'd have to know why would the purpose
- of this law matter. And to go back to, I
- think, something that was brought up by Justice
- 14 Gorsuch, our fundamental view is, because
- 15 Congress does not regulate mining in any way,
- in any shape, or any form, it does not matter
- the purpose for which Virginia has chosen to
- 18 forbid mining.
- 19 But even if the Court wanted to carve
- out an exception for the case that we've talked
- 21 about earlier, I think -- I think, Justice
- Breyer, you're absolutely right. I think the
- 23 purpose of the statute is an Orthodox question
- of statutory interpretation and should be
- determined the way the Court normally does.

1	The	face	of	this	statute	regulates
---	-----	------	----	------	---------	-----------

- 2 mining. The face of this statute cites
- 3 environmental and natural resources
- 4 consequences that flow from mining.
- 5 JUSTICE ALITO: And what does that
- 6 mean? Yeah.
- 7 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Now what do you
- 8 mean by that? You had it in your brief. Let's
- 9 see. You said there was a plausible purpose
- 10 other than to prevent nuclear development.
- 11 And you say the possibility that
- 12 certain impacts of uranium development activity
- may reduce or potentially limit certain uses of
- 14 Virginia environmental resources, and -- and I
- 15 -- I don't know what that means.
- 16 MR. HEYTENS: Fair enough, Justice
- 17 Ginsburg. I mean, I think -- we think it's
- 18 fairly apparent what those would mean in the
- 19 context of this situation.
- This would be a massive earth-moving
- 21 mine operation. There's a statistic that's in
- the federal government's cert stage amicus
- 23 brief where they say that, to get one to five
- 24 pounds of uranium, you have to displace one ton
- of dirt to get one to five pounds of uranium.

1	This would be a massive disruption of
2	Virginia's seated view. We're talking about a
3	fundamentally profoundly rural area of Virginia
4	that's building its economy based on
5	agriculture and tourism. And I think it's
6	fairly obvious how that would have a
7	significant impact on Virginia's environment
8	and natural resources, which is why this
9	CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, how much
10	is I'm trying to envision you know, one
11	ton sounds like a lot, but a ton of dirt, how
12	how much is that? That's not it's
13	probably not that much. I mean, are you
14	talking a truckload or what?
15	MR. HEYTENS: Perhaps, Mr. Chief
16	Justice, but our friends on the other side
17	it's also not one pound of uranium. Our
18	friends on the other side say this deposit is
19	100 I believe it's 119 it's either tons
20	it's an enormous quantity.
21	They're not they don't want to mine
22	one to five pounds of uranium. They want to
23	mine what they themselves describe as the
24	largest deposits of uranium in the continental

25 United -- in the United States.

1	JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: If we
2	JUSTICE ALITO: Well, Virginia allows
3	coal mining and has a fair amount of coal
4	mining in the western part of the state. So
5	could a court compare coal mining with uranium
6	mining and see if there's something that if one
7	is more disruptive to the scenery than the
8	other or one is more dangerous to miners than
9	the other, something like that?
10	So you could ask whether it's
11	plausible that this was done for some reason
12	other than just the fact that Virginia
13	disagrees with the NRC that the tailings can be
14	dealt with in a safe way.
15	MR. HEYTENS: And, Justice Alito, I
16	think there is an apparent and obvious
17	explanation that is all that the Court
18	doesn't need to do anything beyond it's
19	something the Chief Justice flagged.
20	There is Virginia could easily
21	decide that there is a world of difference. I
22	mean, the analogy I've thought of here is the
23	removal of Ten Commandments monuments, right,
24	where Virginia could easily decide that there
25	is a world of difference between telling people

```
1 and companies and communities that have built
```

- 2 their economic livelihood around coal mining
- 3 that we are not going to shut those down and
- 4 disrupt the entire way of life in an area.
- 5 There's a world of difference between
- 6 saying that, and we do not intend to start a
- 7 massive mining operation in a part of the state
- 8 that has never had such a mining operation.
- 9 JUSTICE ALITO: Well, that may be.
- 10 You could have a moratorium on mining, period.
- 11 You could have a mora -- no more mining of
- 12 anything in Virginia. You could have that.
- MR. HEYTENS: We -- we certainly --
- 14 JUSTICE ALITO: That's not what the
- 15 legislature did here.
- 16 MR. HEYTENS: It's not what they did,
- 17 and it's also what the court in Pacific Gas
- 18 said, it's not what California was required to
- do, because there was an argument that was made
- 20 in Pacific Gas that, if California really meant
- 21 their proffered rationale, there are other
- 22 steps that California could have and perhaps
- 23 would have taken if they wanted to pursue that
- 24 goal at all costs.
- 25 JUSTICE GORSUCH: Once you start --

- 1 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: If we don't accept
- 2 --
- JUSTICE GORSUCH: I'm sorry, please.
- 4 No, go ahead.
- JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: If we don't accept
- 6 your broader position, what do you think of the
- 7 Solicitor General's suggestion that we look it
- 8 up whether the state has a plausible non-safety
- 9 rationale?
- 10 MR. HEYTENS: We -- we think that
- 11 that's the language the Court -- once you
- decide to do purpose, that's the second point I
- 13 was making earlier. If you decide to do
- 14 purpose, we think that's the way you should do
- 15 purpose. It's the way the Court did purpose in
- 16 Pacific Gas.
- 17 And we think that, under that, we
- 18 clearly win because we are materially
- indistinguishable from California and Pacific
- 20 Gas. Another --
- JUSTICE GINSBURG: But you -- you --
- 22 you, at the pleadings stage, you made a
- 23 concession that the purpose of the ban was to
- 24 address radiological safety concerns.
- Why did you make that concession?

- 1 MR. HEYTENS: Well, Justice Ginsburg,
- 2 I want to -- I'm glad to have the opportunity
- 3 to address that.
- We didn't concede anything. What we
- 5 did is we moved to dismiss, and we
- 6 acknowledged -- all of the quotes they cite
- 7 from our lower court briefing, what we say is
- 8 we acknowledge that, as a party who moves to
- 9 dismiss, we are required to assume the truth of
- 10 all well-pleaded factual allegations in the
- 11 complaint.
- So to the extent they --
- JUSTICE KAGAN: But, why did you even
- 14 do that? Why is this a factual allegation?
- 15 MR. HEYTENS: Well, to the extent that
- 16 what was in someone's mind when they did
- 17 something, I think that is a factual
- 18 allegation, but our submission is that's not
- 19 relevant and that's not how you determine --
- JUSTICE BREYER: But it's not about
- 21 what's in their mind.
- MR. HEYTENS: But --
- JUSTICE BREYER: There -- there is a
- 24 -- there is a well-known, sometimes laughed at,
- sometimes I do think it's great, a reasonable

- 1 legislator. The reasonable legislator is
- 2 called a legislative -- a judicial invention.
- 3 And the reason they invent it is so that they
- 4 can work out obscure provisions of the statutes
- 5 and what their real purpose is and what they
- 6 mean.
- 7 MR. HEYTENS: Right.
- 8 JUSTICE BREYER: Now that too has been
- 9 used for hundreds of -- I don't know if
- 10 hundreds, but many, many, many years.
- 11 MR. HEYTENS: Absolutely.
- 12 JUSTICE BREYER: So we don't have to
- look in their minds, do we?
- 14 MR. HEYTENS: Well -- well, Justice
- Breyer, that is exactly what the Petitioners
- 16 are asking you to do. The statements that are
- 17 --
- JUSTICE BREYER: It may be, but
- 19 regardless, my question is, why do you have to
- look in their minds? What you do is the same
- 21 thing you do with a federal statute, what you
- 22 do with statutes every day: You get provisions
- and you say reading the words, reading the
- 24 applications, dah-dah, dah-dah, you
- 25 know, fill in the blanks, what would a

- 1 reasonable legislator have wanted this
- purpose -- what purpose would it have served?
- I think I've done that, perhaps
- 4 wrongly -- I don't think so -- hundreds of
- 5 times.
- 6 MR. HEYTENS: Yes, Justice Breyer, we
- 7 agree with --
- 8 JUSTICE BREYER: Okay? So all they
- 9 want is a chance to show that, but, here, you
- 10 say you don't even get a chance to show it.
- 11 MR. HEYTENS: Justice Breyer, we agree
- 12 with everything you just said about purpose.
- And it brings me back to my answer to Justice
- 14 Kagan and Justice Ginsburg. Excuse me.
- The statements in the brief that they
- 16 are citing before this Court are statements
- where we say the Court should not consider
- 18 these hundreds of pages of statements where
- 19 people offer their subjective perspective on
- 20 why they did what they did.
- 21 We say all of those materials are
- 22 beside the point. So -- so what happened here
- 23 is --
- JUSTICE GORSUCH: But, counsel, what
- 25 I'm hearing is rationale basis review. Is

- there any rationale basis on which a legislator
- 2 could vote for that? Okay, fine, if that's
- 3 what you're asking. But to layer purpose on
- 4 top of it introduces all of the complications
- 5 that Justice Kagan has alluded to, which is, if
- 6 we're going to start inquiring into purpose,
- 7 one state may not be able to do the same thing
- 8 another state may be able to do simply because
- 9 of our assessment of what was in somebody's
- 10 mind.
- 11 And if we start looking at this
- 12 statute, I don't even know where to begin,
- 13 because it talks about the environmental and
- 14 local resource impacts of mining and milling
- and tailings and everything else.
- 16 Now could a rational legislator have
- done this only for concern about mining?
- 18 Maybe. If I'm going to start going down the
- 19 road of what's in somebody's head and
- 20 subjective intentions of even an imaginary,
- 21 hypothetical reasonable legislator, I don't
- 22 know.
- MR. HEYTENS: Well, Justice Gorsuch,
- 24 we absolutely agree with you, which is why our
- 25 primary submission is that, because this is not

- 1 an area that's regulated by the federal
- 2 government at all, you don't do any sort of
- 3 purpose analysis.
- 4 That -- our primary submission is that
- 5 exactly what you just said, Justice Gorsuch,
- 6 that there's no warrant to do that, there's no
- 7 need to do that, and the Court shouldn't do it.
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Well, except where
- 9 do we draw the line or how do we draw it
- 10 between the Skull decision and the Second
- 11 Circuit Vermont decision? There, activities
- 12 that the state were -- were alleged to be doing
- were intended and did, in fact, affect
- regulated conduct by the federal government.
- 15 But one could say here, if you
- 16 prohibit mining, you're affecting milling or
- 17 disposal.
- 18 MR. HEYTENS: Right.
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: So how -- where
- 20 and how do we draw the line between that
- 21 regulation that we're permitted to look to
- 22 purpose for and that which we're not?
- MR. HEYTENS: Right. The line, we
- think, is straightforward. It's based on the
- 25 text of the statute. It's NRC-regulated

- 1 activity, because, in both the Skull Valley
- decision and in the Entergy decision, the state
- 3 law was directly acting upon and regulating
- 4 something that is itself regulated by NRC.
- 5 The spent nuclear fuels facility in
- 6 Skull Valley was regulated by NRC. The Vermont
- 7 Yankee nuclear power plant was certainly
- 8 regulated by NRC. And the Court would do --
- 9 now I want to bring up the roads provision
- 10 because Mr. Cooper mentioned them.
- 11 They say there's this one provision of
- 12 the law at issue in Skull Valley that turns a
- 13 county road into a state road.
- 14 Well, I'D say two things about that
- 15 provision. First, if that's literally all that
- 16 Utah did, all Utah did was to convert a road
- 17 from a county road to a state road, and that's
- 18 the only thing they did, there would be no
- 19 basis whatsoever for finding that law standing
- alone was preempted by the Atomic Energy Act.
- 21 And to the extent that it operated --
- 22 I think there was also discussion of the
- 23 National Meats case, which I think is
- 24 affirmatively helpful for us because, at the
- 25 end of the opinion in National Meat, the Court

- 1 got to the sales provision of the California
- 2 law and the Court said: You know, this doesn't
- 3 directly act upon the conduct that's regulated
- 4 by federal law. And so I guess you could make
- 5 an argument, the Humane Society made the
- 6 argument, that's not preempted.
- 7 And here's what the Court actually
- 8 said in National Meat. That argument ignores
- 9 the way that the sales provision operates
- 10 within state law as a whole.
- 11 California didn't enact the sales
- 12 provision as a free-standing provision. They
- 13 enacted the sales provision as part of an
- 14 interrelated series of laws that in the court's
- 15 language regulated the same thing as the
- 16 federal government, just in a different way.
- 17 And we think that's directly on point,
- because when this Court CVSG'd in Skull Valley,
- 19 the Solicitor General's CVSG brief adopted that
- 20 precise rationale when it came to the roads
- 21 provision. It said the roads provision has to
- 22 be analyzed as part of how Utah's entire scheme
- is regulating the spent nuclear fuels facility.
- 24 You have to look at the scheme as a
- whole and you have to look at how the entirety

```
of the series of interrelated laws work.
```

- 2 JUSTICE KAGAN: Suppose --
- JUSTICE ALITO: 2021, Section (c),
- 4 2021(c)(4) says that the Commission shall
- 5 retain the authority to regulate the disposal
- of byproduct. And then (k) says nothing. And
- 7 that is -- it's that regulatory authority, I
- 8 take it, which is the statutory basis of the
- 9 preemption argument.
- 10 And (k) says nothing in this section
- 11 shall be construed to affect the authority of
- 12 the state or local agencies so forth. So how
- 13 do you --
- MR. HEYTENS: Sure.
- 15 JUSTICE ALITO: Why is it tied -- why
- do you -- why do you say (k) is tied solely
- 17 to --
- MR. HEYTENS: Sure.
- 19 JUSTICE ALITO: -- licensing?
- 20 MR. HEYTENS: Well, Justice Alito,
- 21 first, in this case, we're not talking about
- 22 byproduct. We're talking about source
- 23 material. And -- and the reason that that is
- 24 critically important -- I don't think I'm just
- 25 quibbling over terminology -- is because, when

- we're talking about source material, both 2090
- 2 --
- JUSTICE ALITO: Well, it goes on to
- 4 say the disposal of such other byproducts
- 5 source or special nuclear material.
- 6 MR. HEYTENS: Correct. But it -- but
- 7 you have to read that in conjunction with 20 --
- 8 2092 and 20 -- 2095, both of which specifically
- 9 say that NRC jurisdiction over source material
- 10 does not even begin or commence until after
- 11 that source material is removed from the
- 12 ground.
- Congress was very clear. They have a
- 14 belt-and-suspenders approach. They don't just
- 15 say that NRC can't regulate the transfer of
- 16 source material. That's 2092.
- 17 They go even further in 2095, and this
- is an extraordinary provision. It prohibits
- 19 NRC from even requesting reports about source
- 20 material until after it's out of the ground.
- 21 NRC has literally no authority over source
- 22 material until it leaves the ground.
- JUSTICE ALITO: But do you dispute the
- 24 fact that the NRC has -- occupies the field of
- 25 regulation of source material?

1	MR.	HEYTENS:	After	it	leaves	the
---	-----	----------	-------	----	--------	-----

- 2 ground.
- JUSTICE ALITO: After it leaves the
- 4 ground.
- 5 MR. HEYTENS: Well, but -- but that's
- 6 the critical distinction in this case because
- 7 our whole point that -- the predicate of our
- 8 argument --
- 9 JUSTICE ALITO: Yeah, but if the -- if
- 10 -- if a state law indirectly, surreptitiously
- 11 regulates the same thing, it would fall within
- 12 the prohibited field.
- 13 MR. HEYTENS: Justice Alito, I quess
- 14 I'd have to know -- I'd have to have a little
- more information about what we mean by
- 16 "indirectly or surreptitiously regulates the
- 17 same thing, "because it's certainly -- if -- if
- we're talking about Petitioners' strong version
- of that argument, that is completely
- inconsistent with this Court's rejection of a
- 21 field preemption argument in Pacific Gas,
- 22 because think about the argument that
- 23 California -- excuse me, not California -- that
- 24 Pacific Gas and the federal government made for
- 25 preemption in that case.

1 Of	course,	allowing	the	nation	S
------	---------	----------	-----	--------	---

- 2 largest state to prevent nuclear power
- 3 construction -- nuclear power plant
- 4 construction, of course, that is going to have
- 5 a profound impact on the civilian nuclear power
- 6 industry in the United States. And the Court
- 7 acknowledged that, and the Court said: No, we
- 8 understand, California could do that, but we've
- 9 concluded that Congress has nonetheless given
- 10 California the right to regulate for economic
- 11 safety reasons. And it is for Congress, not
- 12 for this Court -- this is what the Court
- 13 specifically said in Pacific Gas -- if Congress
- 14 concludes that California is misusing the
- 15 authority that has been left to them, it is for
- 16 Congress to tell the state that.
- 17 And -- but I'll just go back to the
- 18 point that --
- 19 JUSTICE KAGAN: But, of course, Mr.
- 20 Heytens, not for reasons having to do with
- 21 radiological safety.
- MR. HEYTENS: Yes.
- JUSTICE KAGAN: And I suppose one way
- 24 to understand this -- the preemptive field here
- is that it surely extends to various kinds of

- 1 activities, and this is not one of those
- 2 activities, the mining.
- But, in addition, it extends to
- 4 judgments about radiological safety, even
- 5 outside those activities, on the theory that
- 6 the NRC is the proper body to make judgments
- 7 about radiological safety and we don't want 50
- 8 states to be making their own.
- 9 So I suppose that's a -- a way to
- 10 explain the opposite position.
- 11 MR. HEYTENS: I agree with that,
- 12 Justice Kagan, but I think the very last thing
- you said shows why that argument can't possibly
- 14 be right.
- 15 NRC lacks the authority to regulate
- 16 even the radiological safety aspects of mining.
- 17 So the logical -- if you define the field that
- 18 way, the logical implication of that argument
- is that there is literally no one who has the
- 20 authority to regulate radiological safety
- 21 aspects of uranium mining, because the NRC
- 22 can't do it, because the NRC has repeatedly
- 23 reaffirmed that they have no power to do
- 24 anything.
- 25 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: Aren't the

1 radiological safety issues posed by the milling

- 2 far more than the mining? I thought that was
- 3 why you're concerned about the milling. To
- 4 Justice Alito's point, it's a way to prohibit
- 5 the milling, you can't do that; let's prohibit
- 6 the mining, that way we prohibit the milling,
- 7 which has the radiological safety concerns. I
- 8 think that's the --
- 9 MR. HEYTENS: Sure.
- 10 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: -- that's the
- 11 point.
- MR. HEYTENS: Justice Kavanaugh, I
- 13 think -- I think that's right, and I think part
- of the reason that Congress has given NRC
- jurisdiction over the milling is because of
- 16 those various concerns. But I --
- 17 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: Just one technical
- 18 point --
- MR HEYTENS: I'm sorry.
- 20 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: -- on phrasing.
- 21 The Solicitor General said plausible non-safety
- 22 rationale. I assume you would amend that to
- 23 say plausible non-radiological safety
- 24 rationale?
- MR. HEYTENS: Yes, I would, Justice

1 Kavanaugh, and I think that's consistent with

- what they've said in their briefing. I think,
- 3 at the cert stage, they said we could regulate
- 4 mining, even the safety aspects of mining, as
- 5 long as we're doing it based on the mining.
- 6 And -- and to take your point, Justice
- 7 Kavanaugh, I think there's three possibilities.
- 8 There's the radiological safety aspects of
- 9 uranium sitting in the ground.
- 10 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: Right.
- 11 MR. HEYTENS: There's the radiological
- 12 safety aspects of the mining process. And
- there's the radiological safety aspects of the
- 14 milling. I -- I agree with you completely the
- 15 reason you give NRC jurisdiction over the third
- is the conclusion that that poses special
- 17 concerns.
- 18 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: It's all of the
- 19 concerns, isn't it, on radiological safety?
- 20 Almost all?
- 21 MR. HEYTENS: I -- I want to amend it
- 22 to almost all, Justice Kavanaugh. I know
- there's discussion in some of the briefing in
- 24 this case that suggests that there are
- 25 radiological concerns associated with the

- 1 mining process itself. Congress said that
- 2 sitting in the -- excuse me -- a committee
- 3 report from 1946 says that, sitting in the
- 4 ground, uranium does not create radiological
- 5 safety concerns. But there's the separate
- 6 question of whether the process of digging it
- 7 out of the ground raises any radiological
- 8 safety concerns.
- 9 And I think there's at least some
- 10 evidence in some of the briefing that there may
- 11 be at least some radiological safety concerns
- 12 associated with doing that. Without saying
- they're the same as milling.
- 14 And there -- regardless of whether
- there are radiological safety concerns, there
- are clearly a wide variety of health and safety
- 17 concerns associated with extracting massive
- 18 amounts of material out of the ground.
- And so we think that, at the end of
- 20 the day, the purpose -- this Court has
- 21 reaffirmed repeatedly that the purpose of a
- 22 statute includes not only what it sets out to
- 23 change but also what it resolves to leave
- 24 alone.
- 25 And we think the single clearest and

- 1 completely dispositive decision by Congress in
- 2 this case was the decision it made in 1946 that
- 3 it reaffirmed in 1954 and has left undisturbed
- 4 until the present day, that the federal
- 5 government does not regulate uranium mining.
- 6 For that reason, Virginia's inherent
- 7 sovereign ability to control something as
- 8 fundamental as what material gets pulled out of
- 9 the ground remains fully intact, its ban should
- 10 not be preempted, and this Court should affirm.
- 11 Thank you.
- 12 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you,
- 13 counsel.
- 14 Four minutes, Mr. Cooper.
- 15 REBUTTAL ARGUMENT OF CHARLES J. COOPER
- 16 ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONERS
- 17 MR. COOPER: Thank you, Mr. Chief
- 18 Justice.
- 19 And, Justice Kavanaugh, I want to come
- 20 straight to your point that you cannot mill
- 21 mining unless you have -- mill uranium unless
- 22 you have mined it in the first place.
- There were two ways for Virginia to
- 24 prohibit milling and tailings management, both
- of which they were concerned about. They

weren't concerned about radiological aspects of

- 2 -- of mining qua mining any more than the NRC
- 3 is. It's the milling and the tailings that
- 4 represent the threat of nuclear safety.
- 5 And there were two ways they could do
- 6 it. They could do it directly. We prohibit
- 7 milling in this state. But that would have run
- 8 straight into a stop sign, Your Honor, of
- 9 preemption. There's no way it could do --
- 10 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Suppose -- suppose
- 11 -- suppose they say our rationale does have to
- do with the mining, not the milling; we think
- there are radiological hazards from -- from the
- 14 unearthing the -- the uranium. Suppose they
- 15 said that.
- MR. COOPER: Your Honor, they could
- 17 say that, but a court would have to look behind
- it, would have to look behind at using all the
- 19 techniques that my friend, the Solicitor
- 20 General, has mentioned, including plausibility.
- 21 But, to come back, Justice Kavanaugh,
- 22 I want to make clear that the Court understand,
- 23 as Justice Gorsuch has referenced, that the
- 24 statute that banned mining had sister
- 25 provisions. In the very same breath, Virginia

```
1 enacted a -- a uranium administrative group,
```

- 2 tasking it with the -- with the responsibility
- 3 to study uranium mining in -- in Virginia and
- 4 milling and tailings. On page 185 -- I would
- 5 refer the Court to 185 through 187.
- 6 With respect to milling activity, the
- 7 capacity -- these are things that they're
- 8 supposed to study -- the capacity of the mill,
- 9 the process to be used in milling and ore
- 10 extraction, the reagents in processing
- 11 material, the method for conveying tailings and
- 12 wastewater from milling.
- The next paragraph, with respect to
- 14 tailings management, the quantity and
- 15 characteristics of the tailings, the method of
- 16 disposal, treatment systems for the removal of
- 17 solids, radionuclides, on and on for the next
- 18 several pages -- pages.
- 19 The -- the -- the courts below and my
- 20 friends for the Commonwealth have focused
- 21 myopically on the one sentence that is the ban.
- 22 What was really happening here and the purpose
- of this was to prohibit milling and tailings
- 24 management, the only thing that really
- 25 represents serious radiological hazards.

1	Second point, dual regulation. My
2	friend quotes from PG&E, Justice Gorsuch, and I
3	want to I want to finish his quote. He
4	didn't get to finish it. "Congress has
5	preserved the dual regulation of
6	nuclear-powered electricity generation." This
7	is from 212, 211, 212. Colon: "The Federal
8	Government maintains complete control of the
9	safety and "nuclear" aspects of energy
10	generation the States exercise that
11	their traditional authority." Justice Gorsuch
12	traditional authority, which they've always
13	exercised over the generation, transmission,
14	and sale of electricity, over the over the
15	need for additional generation, generating
16	capacity, the type of generating facilities to
17	be licensed, are they going to be coal or
18	nuclear.
19	Your Your Honor, in California
20	in in PG&E, California had the antecedent
21	authority, its and its alone, to decide whether
22	there would be a plant of any kind, including a
23	nuclear plant. And if there was no nuclear
24	plant, there could be no NRC authority or
25	regulation over how that thing was constructed

- 1 or how it was operated.
- 2 My final point here, plausible
- 3 non-safety rationale. This is the one place
- 4 where I guess I do disagree with my friend, the
- 5 Solicitor General. That sounds too much to me
- 6 like rational basis review, like any
- 7 conceivable thing that -- that the state could
- 8 bring forward or a judge could even conceive of
- 9 will do the trick.
- 10 That's not what Congress had in mind
- 11 when it said: Courts, look at the purpose. Is
- 12 the purpose for the protection against
- 13 radiological hazards? That's what Congress
- 14 wants you to decide.
- 15 And not just is it any plausible
- 16 purpose, is it -- is -- is it -- is that the
- 17 purpose? And you have to do your best. It's
- 18 not easy. But that's -- that's the question
- 19 that -- that Congress has said is before the
- 20 courts.
- 21 And if the courts conclude in their
- 22 best efforts that that's the purpose, well,
- 23 then it's preempted.
- Thank you, Your Honor.
- 25 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you,

1	cour	nsel.	The	case i	s sı	ubmitte	ed.		
2			(When	reupon,	at	12:07	p.m.,	the	case
3	was	submi	tted	.)					
4									
5									
6									
7									
8									
9									
10									
11									
12									
13									
14									
15									
16									
17									
18									
19									
20									
21									
22									
23									
24									
25									

	Ui
1	38: 23 53: 20 54: 3
	acting [1] 53 :3
100 [1] 44 :19	activities [9] 20:19 34:10
119 [1] 44: 19	38: 6 39: 19,20 52: 11 59: 1,2
185 [2] 65: 4,5	5
187 [1] 65: 5	activity [11] 7:11,21 9:20
194 [1] 32: 23	23 :14 29 :16 34 :4 37 :23 39 :
1946 [2] 62 :3 63 :2	12 43 :12 53 :1 65 :6
1954 [1] 63: 3	actually [6] 16:13,22 22:
2	23 27 :13 39 :6 54 :7
20 [3] 11 :3 56 :7,8	acutely [2] 11:18,18
2018 [1] 20: 2	addition [2] 28:20 59:3
2016 [1] 20. 2 2021 [2] 36: 5 55: 3	additional [1] 66:15
2021(b [3] 34: 6,6,13	address [4] 25:25 29:8 47:
2021(c [2] 7:9 20:3	24 48: 3
2021(c)(4 [1] 55:4	addressed [1] 33:7
2021(k [9] 8:4 23:24 33:25	addresses [1] 32 :22
34: 3,5,12 36: 22,24 39: 13	addressing [1] 13:5
2090 [1] 56: 1	administrative [1] 65:1
	adopt [1] 19:5
2092 [2] 56: 8,16	adopted [4] 23:5,6 26:20
2095 [2] 56: 8,17 211 [2] 33: 1 66: 7	54 :19
	advanced [1] 38: 24
212 [3] 33 :1 66 :7,7 2120 [1] 33 :25	affect [2] 52:13 55:11
	affecting [1] 52:16
5	affirm [1] 63 :10
50 [1] 59 :7	affirmatively [1] 53:24
6	agencies [1] 55:12
	aggressively [1] 39:4
60 [1] 11: 3	agree [6] 29:6 50:7,11 51:
A	24 59 :11 61 :14
ability [4] 28:17 31:5 38:21	agreed [1] 21:2
63:7	agreement [2] 9:1 34:14
able [5] 6:15 28:13 29:3 51:	agriculture [1] 44:5
7,8	ahead [1] 47:4
absence [1] 16 :10	alito [19] 23:21 33:5,17,23
absolutely [3] 42:22 49:	34: 1 43: 5 45: 2,15 46: 9,14
11 51 :24	55: 3,15,19,20 56: 3,23 57: 3
accept [3] 11:13 47:1,5	9,13
accepted [1] 6:20	alito's [2] 39:24 60:4
access [1] 10:9	allegation [2] 48:14,18
account [3] 38:2,5,10	allegations [1] 48:10
acknowledge [2] 37:6 48:	alleged [1] 52 :12
8	allowed [1] 38:5
acknowledged [4] 7:16	allowing [2] 14:16 58:1

alluded [1] 51:5

almost [2] 61:20.22 alone [3] **53:**20 **62:**24 **66: 9**:19,20 **52**:11 **59**:1,2, already [1] 32:17 altogether [1] 31:7 amend [2] 60:22 61:21 amendment [1] 6:5 **29**:16 **34**:4 **37**:23 **39**: american [1] 41:5 amicus [2] 17:17 43:22 amount [1] 45:3 amounts [1] 62:18 analogy [1] 45:22 analysis [8] 18:16 28:1 32: **SS** [4] **25**:25 **29**:8 **47**: 10,12 **36:**23 **39:**14,15 **52:**3 analyze [3] 11:11 16:1 24: analyzed [1] **54**:22 animating [2] 13:12 14:6 another [5] 6:15 28:21,22 **47**:20 **51**:8 answer [8] 15:14,21 20:22 **22**:12 **26**:3 **33**:21 **35**:25 **50**: 13 answered [1] 9:9 answers [2] 26:22 42:1 antecedent [1] 66:20 anyway [1] **12**:16 apparent [2] 43:18 45:16 appeals [1] 11:21 appeared [1] **39:**25 [6] **29:**6 **50:**7,11 **51:** applications [1] 49:24 apply [3] 18:21 19:4 26:1 applying [1] 23:25 appreciate [1] 10:25 approach [2] 16:4 56:14 [9] **23:**21 **33:**5,17,23 apt [1] 16:3 area [17] 7:8 8:24 14:9,14, 17 **19**:7 **20**:8 **27**:13 **32**:18 5,19,20 **56:**3,23 **57:**3, **35:**14,15 **36:**11,13,19 **44:**3 46:4 52:1 aren't [3] 29:12 41:15 59: argued [1] 37:25 arguing [1] **22**:13 argument [17] 17:16 30: allows [3] 16:25 34:17 45: 16 **38:**24 **39:**5,6 **46:**19 **54:**5, 6,8 **55**:9 **57**:8,19,21,22 **59**: 13.18 **63:**15

arguments [1] 41:17 arlington [1] 16:2 arose [1] 32:24 around [1] 46:2 articulate [1] **15**:12 articulated [1] 11:20 asks [1] 10:3 aspect [1] 30:25 aspects [9] 31:1 59:16,21 **61:**4,8,12,13 **64:**1 **66:**9 assembly [2] 33:9,11 assessment [2] 6:12 51:9 associated [4] 9:22 61:25 **62:**12.17 association [3] 10:17 16: 18 **22:**15 assume [4] 29:11,12 48:9 60:22 assumed [2] 24:24 26:11 atomic [4] 9:6 17:21 31:3 **53**:20 attempt [1] 14:4 authority [34] 9:11,12 19: 10,25 **20:**2,8,11 **21:**3 **22:**18, 20,25 30:6 32:18 33:1 34:9, 25 **35:**2 **36:**4,20 **37:**23 **38:**7, 8 **42**:7 **55**:5,7,11 **56**:21 **58**: 15 **59:**15,20 **66:**11,12,21,24 avoid [1] 11:19 aware [4] 11:18,18 12:16 **38:**25 В

back [11] 9:2 19:17 36:1 39: 8,24 **41**:3,4 **42**:12 **50**:13 **58**: 17 **64**:21 background [1] 38:2 backward-looking [1] **40**:18 bad [2] 13:23 40:16 **badly** [1] **28**:19 balance [1] 17:11 ban [7] 9:21 17:22 18:2 19: 3 **47:**23 **63:**9 **65:**21 banned [1] **64**:24 banning [2] 31:6 33:14 based [6] 6:12 8:5 15:1 44: 4 **52**:24 **61**:5 basis [7] 7:5 24:2 50:25 51:

acknowledged [4] 7:16

act [7] 9:6 17:21 20:10 31:3

9:10 **48:**6 **58:**7

acquired [1] 28:25

1 **53**:19 **55**:8 **67**:6 begin [2] 51:12 56:10 beginning [1] **38**:21 behalf [2] 30:17 63:16 behind [5] 11:8 12:1 25:7 **64:**17.18 believe [2] 23:11 44:19 **below** [1] **65**:19 belt-and-suspenders [1] 56:14 beside [2] 41:18 50:22 best [4] 13:13 37:19 67:17, between [8] 6:21 14:11 19: 25 32:18 45:25 46:5 52:10, 20 beyond [1] 45:18 big [2] 27:10,14 **bind** [1] **21**:12 binding [1] 23:12 **blanks** [1] **49**:25 blue [1] 40:11 boat [1] 41:20 body [3] 10:6 14:7 59:6 boil [1] 24:1 **boils** [1] **32**:5 both [6] 25:13 38:18 53:1 **56:**1.8 **63:**24 **bothering** [1] **15**:23 **bottom** [1] **7**:3 breath [1] 64:25 breyer [24] 34:16 35:6,9,19, 22,25 **36:**6,9,10,17 **39:**8,8 **40:**15 **42:**1,22 **48:**20,23 **49:** 8,12,15,18 **50:**6,8,11 breyer's [1] 39:10 brief [9] 32:20 33:8 37:20 **40:**11.12 **43:**8.23 **50:**15 **54:** briefing [4] 48:7 61:2,23 **62:**10 briefly [1] 29:23 bring [2] 53:9 67:8 **brings** [1] **50**:13 broader [1] 47:6 brought [1] 42:13 build [2] 34:23 35:16 **building** [1] **44**:4

built [1] 46:1 burden [2] 26:4,5 business [1] 12:18 but-for [1] 13:17 byproduct [3] 17:2 55:6, 22 byproducts [1] 56:4

california [19] 7:6 8:2.14 **9:**3,9 **22:**1 **46:**18,20,22 **47:** 19 **54**:1,11 **57**:23,23 **58**:8, 10.14 66:19.20 called [2] 6:1 49:2 came [2] 13:15 54:20 candor [1] 10:25 cannot [4] 10:15 26:6 30: 24 63:20 capacity [3] 65:7,8 66:16 careful [1] 14:4 carve [2] 40:5 42:19 carveout [2] 8:5.13 case [32] 10:17 11:16 12: 16,25 **14:**3,7 **16:**19 **19:**21 **21:**9,15,20 **22:**10,16 **24:**23 **25**:3 **30**:3,20,21 **32**:5,7,24 **33:**22 **36:**25 **37:**22 **41:**21 **42:**20 **53:**23 **55:**21 **57:**6,25 **61**:24 **63**:2 cases [5] 12:22 14:1,24 20: 25 **25**:18 cert [2] 43:22 61:3 certain [3] 30:2 43:12,13 certainly [3] 46:13 53:7 57: 17 challenger [1] 42:9 challenging [2] 16:6 26:5 **chance** [2] **50**:9,10 change [1] 62:23 characteristics [1] 65:15 **charles** [1] **63**:15 chief [15] 10:21 17:12,13, 19 **27:**16,21 **29:**23 **30:**13,18 **44:**9,15 **45:**19 **63:**12,17 **67:** chose [1] 23:23

chosen [1] 42:17

circuit [8] 11:16 21:9,15

23:7 **24**:24 **26**:1,9 **52**:11

circuit's [1] 30:6 circumstances [1] 30:2 cite [2] 21:15 48:6 cites [1] 43:2 citing [2] 23:11 50:16 civilian [1] 58:5 clear [4] 6:19 22:19 56:13 64:22 **clearest** [1] **62**:25 clearly [3] 20:3 47:18 62: coal [6] 27:15 45:3,3,5 46:2 colleagues [2] 12:11 21: 16 colon [1] 66:7 come [9] 6:9 8:25 9:2 13:8 **16**:8 **29**:19 **30**:10 **63**:19 **64**: comes [3] 8:19 17:5 34:12 coming [1] 10:12 commandments [1] 45: 23 **commence** [1] **56**:10 commercial [2] 23:16.17 commission [5] 20:4 30: 24 **31**:4 **34**:8 **55**:4 commission's [1] 20:11 committee [2] 41:14 62:2 commonwealth [1] 65: communities [1] 46:1 companies [1] 46:1 compare [1] **45**:5 complaint [1] 48:11 complete [2] 21:2 66:8 completely [6] 19:7 23:8 **30**:7 **57**:19 **61**:14 **63**:1 complications [1] 51:4 **concealed** [1] **11:**22 concede [3] 13:6 39:11 48: conceded [1] 10:23 conceivable [1] 67:7 conceive [1] 67:8 concept [1] 23:22 conceptually [1] 37:11 concern [2] 24:10 51:17

concerned [5] 25:13 40: 22 60:3 63:25 64:1 concerns [12] 15:4 47:24 **60:**7,16 **61:**17,19,25 **62:**5,8, 11,15,17 concession [2] 47:23.25 conclude [1] 67:21 concluded [2] 26:12 58:9 concludes [1] **58**:14 conclusion [2] 13:15 61: 16 condemn [3] 28:24 30:2. conduct [3] 36:22 52:14 **54**:3 **conducted** [1] **32**:10 congress [29] 6:16,18 8: 24,25 **10**:3,19 **14**:9 **16**:11 **17:**8 **22:**5 **23:**23,23 **38:**18 **41:**9 **42:**4.5.15 **56:**13 **58:**9. 11,13,16 60:14 62:1 63:1 **66:4 67:**10,13,19 congressmen [1] 25:8 conjunction [1] 56:7 consequences [2] 38:6 **43**:4 consider [1] 50:17 considerations [2] 8:16. 17 considered [1] 40:9 consistent [1] 61:1 constitute [1] 38:12 constructed [3] 7:18 9:8 66:25 construction [15] 7:7 8:3, 12,15,20 **9:**4,5,5 **19:**24 **21:** 20,22,24 **22:**2 **58:**3,4 construed [1] 55:11 context [6] 6:5 20:21 24: 14.21 **26:**18 **43:**19 contexts [2] 6:1 13:3 continental [1] 44:24 contrary [1] 23:6 control [3] 9:7 63:7 66:8 conventional [1] 31:25 convert [1] 53:16 conveying [1] 65:11 cooke [1] 41:3

cooper [25] 6:7,14 7:2,14, 21 **8**:6,10 **9**:2,25 **11**:12 **12**: 7,15 **13:**7,11,25 **15:**6,15,18, 24 **20:**5 **53:**10 **63:**14,15,17 **64**:16 correct [4] 31:9.17 32:2 56: costs [1] 46:24 couldn't [4] 8:25 9:12 21:4 **22**:20 counsel [4] 17:14 30:14 **50**:24 **63**:13 country [1] 28:22 countryside [2] 27:11,15 **county** [2] **53:**13,17 couple [1] 28:10 course [4] 41:6 58:1,4,19 court [48] 6:20 9:10 10:16 **11:**21 **12:**16 **16:**2,19 **17:**20 **21**:13 **22**:16.19 **23**:13 **30**: 19 **32**:9,14,15,16,23 **33**:1 **36**:22 **39**:14 **40**:4 **41**:21 **42**: 19,25 **45**:5,17 **46**:17 **47**:11, 15 **48**:7 **50**:16,17 **52**:7 **53**:8, 25 **54:**2,7,18 **58:**6,7,12,12 **62:**20 **63:**10 **64:**17,22 **65:**5 courts [12] 10:4 11:13,25 **12:**17,22 **14:**5 **16:**1,3 **65:**19 **67:**11,20,21 court's [5] 13:14 15:2 32: 21 **54**:14 **57**:20 cover [1] 13:23 covered [2] 36:21 39:10 create [2] 14:10 62:4 creatively [1] 10:7 critical [1] 57:6 critically [1] **55**:24 curiae [1] 17:17 cvsq [1] **54**:19 cvsg'd [1] 54:18

dah-dah [3] 49:24,24,24 dangerous [2] 9:20 45:8 day [4] 25:19 49:22 62:20 63:4 de [1] 9:12 deal [2] 8:14 39:6 dealing [3] 32:17 39:12 42:

dealt [3] 7:12 8:3 45:14 debate [1] 37:12 decide [8] 6:11 7:17 45:21. 24 47:12.13 66:21 67:14 decided [1] 14:2 decision [11] 22:16 33:6 **37:**21 **39:**5,21 **52:**10,11 **53:** 2,2 63:1,2 deeply [1] 33:6 define [1] 59:17 deliveries [1] 23:18 demonstrate [1] 16:7 denying [1] 10:7 deposed [1] 12:20 deposing [1] 12:5 deposit [1] 44:18 depositions [1] 15:9 deposits [1] 44:24 describe [1] 44:23 designating [1] 23:15 determine [5] 10:4 12:18 **41:**12.21 **48:**19 determined [4] 11:22 14: 5.10 **42:**25 **development** [3] **6:**23 **43:** 10.12 difference [3] 45:21,25 46: different [12] 13:8.9 19:20. 22 20:19 25:8 35:6 36:11, 12 **37:**1 **42:**5 **54:**16 differently [1] 15:1 difficult [2] 29:15 30:9 digging [1] 62:6 directly [5] 7:6 53:3 54:3, 17 **64**:6 dirt [2] 43:25 44:11 disaggregate [1] 37:8 disagree [1] 67:4 disagreement [1] 24:7 disagrees [2] 33:11 45:13 disclaimed [1] 39:5 discontinuance [1] 34:8 discussed [1] 37:20 discussion [2] 53:22 61:

dismiss [2] 48:5,9

displace [1] **43**:24 disposal [4] 52:17 55:5 56: 4 **65**:16 disposition [1] 25:3 dispositive [1] 63:1 dispute [1] 56:23 disrupt [1] 46:4 disruption [1] 44:1 disruptive [1] 45:7 distinct [2] 35:7.10 distinction [1] 57:6 distinguishable [1] 7:5 distinguishes [1] 7:15 doctrine [1] 16:23 doing [7] 9:16 18:23 29:13 **37:**9 **52:**12 **61:**5 **62:**12 done [5] 14:18 21:10 45:11 **50:**3 **51:**17 doubt [1] 14:21 down [7] 21:5 23:14 24:1 **30:**8 **32:**5 **46:**3 **51:**18 dozen [1] 41:7 dramatically [1] 17:6 draw [3] 52:9,9,20 drew [3] 14:11 16:12 17:9 driving [1] 35:10 dual [7] 14:10 19:25 20:8 **33:**2 **36:**3 **66:**1.5 dug [2] 27:10,14 dwelling [1] 29:18 dwells [1] 32:20

earlier [3] 36:2 42:21 47: 13 earth [1] 20:14 earth-moving [1] **43**:20 easily [2] 45:20,24 easy [2] 41:23 67:18 eat [2] 34:20,22 eating [1] 35:9 economic [4] 8:16 25:16 **46**:2 **58**:10 economy [1] 44:4 **effect** [1] **18**:23 effectively [4] 9:13 21:4 **24:**24 **26:**11 efforts [2] 7:10 67:22 either [2] 32:6 44:19

electric [1] **14**:17 electricity [3] 34:23 66:6. enact [2] 24:5 54:11 enacted [5] 16:9 24:15 33: 10 54:13 65:1 enactment [1] 6:3 enacts [1] 16:15 end [4] 22:10 25:19 53:25 **62:**19 energy [7] 9:6 11:5 17:21 **31:**3 **33:**3 **53:**20 **66:**9 engage [1] 29:11 enormous [1] 44:20 enough [4] 26:25 28:20 29: 5 **43**:16 ensure [1] 16:12 entergy [3] 11:16 14:3 53: entire [5] 19:7 30:11 38:23 **46**:4 **54**:22 entirety [1] 54:25 environment [1] 44:7 environmental [4] 25:15 **43:**3.14 **51:**13 envision [1] 44:10 establish [2] 26:6,19 even [24] 8:19,20 16:10 23: 17 **25:**4 **29:**17 **33:**18 **38:**8, 10 **39:**23.25 **40:**4 **42:**19 **48:** 13 **50**:10 **51**:12,20 **56**:10,17, 19 **59:**4,16 **61:**4 **67:**8 everyone [1] 21:2 everything [2] 50:12 51: evidence [3] 25:12 37:19 **62:**10 exactly [6] 9:16 11:15 13:7 **27**:25 **49**:15 **52**:5 examination [1] 13:14 examine [1] 6:1 example [7] 6:6 21:1 22: 16 27:8 28:6 29:15 39:10 **examples** [1] **6**:9 except [1] 52:8 exception [2] 40:6 42:20 **exclusive** [1] **22**:17 exclusively [3] 16:17 17:

8 **19**:12 excuse [5] 31:10 39:25 50: 14 **57**:23 **62**:2 **exercise** [1] **66**:10 **exercised** [1] **66**:13 existence [2] 10:12 34:3 existing [1] 19:5 exists [2] 38:2,11 explain [3] 20:23 33:21 59: **explained** [1] **21:**20 **explaining** [1] **33**:20 explanation [1] 45:17 explicitly [1] 16:25 **expressly** [2] **7:**9,12 extends [2] 58:25 59:3 extensively [1] 33:7 extent [3] 48:12.15 53:21 **extracted** [1] **20**:14 extracting [1] 62:17 extraction [2] 9:19 65:10 extraordinary [1] 56:18

F

face [5] 11:20 39:25 40:7 43:1.2 facilities [1] 66:16 facility [8] 21:5,6 23:19 30: 5 **36:**19 **39:**13 **53:**5 **54:**23 fact [8] 12:1 28:20 30:23 39:4 40:20 45:12 52:13 56: factor [2] 16:8,10 facts [2] 20:24 23:13 factual [3] 48:10.14.17 fair [2] 43:16 45:3 fairly [2] 43:18 44:6 faith [1] 29:11 fall [1] 57:11 far [5] 29:3 38:25 40:25 41: 4 60:2 far-fetched [1] 35:20 fashion [1] 22:2 favor [2] 26:12 32:8 federal [34] 6:22 12:17 14: 13 **15**:2 **16**:18 **17**:9 **18**:6 **19**: 14,25 **22**:17 **23**:2 **24**:7 **28**: 16,18,22 **29:**4,4 **30:**1,10 **31:** 11 **32**:19,25 **33**:11 **36**:4 **42**:

8 43:22 49:21 52:1,14 54:4, 16 **57**:24 **63**:4 **66**:7 field [7] **30**:21.22 **56**:24 **57**: 12.21 58:24 59:17 fill [1] **49:**25 final [1] 67:2 find [2] 6:15 25:24 finding [1] 53:19 finds [1] 36:11 fine [2] 35:4 51:2 finish [3] 29:21 66:3,4 fire [1] 10:8 first [17] 10:13 21:7,19 25: 22 **29:**7,10 **32:**9,13 **34:**24 **35**:7 **39**:9 **40**:1 **42**:2,10 **53**: 15 **55**:21 **63**:22 five [3] **43**:23,25 **44**:22 flagged [2] 32:17 45:19 flow [1] 43:4 focused [1] 65:20 follows [1] 33:10 forbid [1] 42:18 force [1] 18:11 foreclosed [2] 24:20 26: form [1] 42:16 forth [1] 55:12 fortiori [1] 39:1 forward [5] 24:17,18 27:9 **29**:19 **67**:8 fossil [1] 14:20 four [1] 63:14 fourteenth [2] 6:5.5 fourth [5] 23:7 24:24 25:25 **26**:9 **30**:6 framework [1] 16:1 francisco [29] 17:15,16,19 **18**:1,8,14,19 **19**:1,14,18 **20**: 12,16,22 **21:**21,25 **22:**3,8, 11 **24**:8 **25**:14,21 **26**:16 **27**: 1,5,8,24 **29:**1,6,24 free-standing [1] 54:12 friend [3] 64:19 66:2 67:4 friendlier [1] 16:24 friends [3] 44:16.18 65:20 fuel [3] 14:20 21:5.6 fuels [2] 53:5 54:23 fully [2] 25:24 63:9

fundamental [2] 42:14 63: fundamentally [3] 37:1 **42**:4 **44**:3 further [1] 56:17 future [1] 40:23

game [2] 8:21,21 gamesmanship [1] 13: 22 garbage [1] 10:9 qas [13] 19:8 32:6,10,12,17 **39:**15 **46:**17,20 **47:**16,20 **57:**21.24 **58:**13 general [38] 17:15,16,19 **18:**1,8,14,19 **19:**1,14,18 **20:** 12,16,22 21:8,21,25 22:3,8, 11 **24**:8 **25**:4,14,21 **26**:16 **27:**1,5,8,24 **28:**7 **29:**1,6,24 **33:**9,11 **35:**11 **60:**21 **64:**20 **67:**5 general's [2] 47:7 54:19 generating [2] 66:15,16 generation [7] 11:24 14: 17 33:4 66:6,10,13,15 genuine [2] 10:2 13:16 genuinely [1] 14:6 qets [2] 34:9 63:8 ginsburg [8] 9:18 17:24 **43:**7,17 **47:**21 **48:**1 **50:**14 64:10 qive [4] 12:11 18:12 28:16 **61:**15 given [3] 38:21 58:9 60:14 gives [2] 9:6 20:2 giving [1] 28:4 glad [1] 48:2 goal [3] 29:4,4 46:24 **good-faith** [1] **13**:13 gorsuch [30] 6:4,8,24 7:4, 19,22 **8:**7,11 **21:**8,12,18,22 **22:**1,4,9 **25:**4,15 **27:**19,21, 23 **36**:1 **42**:14 **46**:25 **47**:3 **50:**24 **51:**23 **52:**5 **64:**23 **66:** 2,11 gorsuch's [3] 10:22 19:17 **26:**23 got [5] 7:1 8:7 27:17,19 54: qotten [1] 34:13 government [20] **14**:14 **18**:6 **19**:15 **20**:1 **22**:17 **23**:3 **28:**17,19,23 **30:**2,10 **31:**11 **32:**19 **33:**12 **52:**2,14 **54:**16 **57:**24 **63:**5 **66:**8 governments [1] 28:4 **government's** [1] **43**:22 grant [2] 8:4 41:8 great [3] 11:4 39:6 48:25 groping [1] 15:25 ground [10] 56:12,20,22 **57:**2,4 **61:**9 **62:**4,7,18 **63:**9 group [1] 65:1 quess [5] 28:9 35:13 54:4 **57:**13 **67:**4

Н happened [3] 11:15 35:23 **50**:22 happening [1] **65**:22 happens [1] 20:17 hard [1] 6:8 hazard [1] 12:3 hazards [11] 9:22 10:24 **11:**2.8.23 **14:**13 **17:**4.7 **64:** 13 65:25 67:13 head [1] **51**:19 health [2] 34:11 62:16 heard [1] 41:6 hearing [1] **50**:25 hearings [1] 41:10 heights [1] 16:2 held [1] 25:2 help [1] 21:15 helpful [1] 53:24 **helpfully** [1] **7:**25 heytens [53] **30:**15,16,18 **31**:10,14,21 **32**:1,4 **33**:17 **34:**1 **35:**5,18,21,24 **36:**9,16 **37:**10,16 **39:**18 **41:**25 **43:** 16 **44:**15 **45:**15 **46:**13,16 **47:**10 **48:**1,15,22 **49:**7,11, 14 **50**:6,11 **51**:23 **52**:18,23 **55**:14,18,20 **56**:6 **57**:1,5,13 **58:**20,22 **59:**11 **60:**9,12,19, 25 **61:**11,21 historical [4] 13:3 24:14.

21 26:18 history [8] 13:2,9 24:14,21 **26:**18 **38:**23 **41:**5.14 hit [1] 40:20 hold [1] **41**:10 holding [1] 23:12 holes [2] **27**:10,14 honestly [1] 20:7 honor [27] 6:14 7:3,14 9: 25 **11:**12 **12:**7,15 **13:**12,25 **15**:6,19,24 **18**:8,14 **19**:2,18 **23**:10 **24**:8 **25**:22 **27**:24 **29**: 7,22 **30:**12 **64:**8,16 **66:**19 67:24 huge [1] 27:10 humane [1] **54:**5 hundreds [4] 49:9,10 50:4, hydro [1] 37:20 hypothetical [2] 39:24 51:

ignores [1] 54:8 imaginary [1] **51**:20 imagination [1] 34:17 impact [2] 44:7 58:5 impacts [3] **25**:16 **43**:12 **51**:14 impermissible [3] 23:4 26:8 38:12 implemented [1] 6:20 implication [1] 59:18 import [1] 28:21 important [2] 17:6 55:24 incentives [1] **13**:23 inclined [1] 40:4 includes [1] 62:22 including [5] 30:25 31:6 **41**:1 **64**:20 **66**:22 inconsistent [1] 57:20 indeterminate [1] 25:20 indicia [1] **12**:23 indirect [1] 16:16 indirectly [6] 9:13 19:11 22:21 23:1 57:10,16 indistinguishable [1] 47: justification [1] 40:8 industry [6] 23:9 28:6,9,14, justifying [1] 9:20

19 **58:**6 inextricably [2] 38:16 39: information [1] **57**:15 inherent [1] **63**:6 inquiring [1] **51**:6 inquiry [7] 15:1,2 22:23 24: 2 26:1.10 28:2 instead [1] **22**:6 intact [1] 63:9 intend [1] 46:6 intended [1] **52**:13 **intentions** [1] **51**:20 interests [1] 16:24 interlinked [1] 37:7 interpretation [1] 42:24 interrelated [2] **54**:14 **55**: **interrupt** [1] **7**:23 intersection [1] 32:25 intertwined [2] 38:16 39: introduces [1] 51:4 invent [1] 49:3

invention [1] 49:2 involved [2] 20:19.20 involving [2] 32:25 33:2 irrelevant [2] **25**:3 **26**:13 isn't [8] 17:23 18:2,3 20:18 **21**:19 **22**:9 **39**:10 **61**:19 issue [4] 13:15 17:1 32:24 **53**:12 issues [1] 60:1 itself [7] 13:4 14:3 25:16

iob [1] 41:20 judge [4] 18:11 40:25 41:5 **67:**8 judgment [2] 37:18 40:5 judgments [2] **59**:4,6 iudicial [1] 49:2 jure [1] 9:12 jurisdiction [3] 56:9 60: 15 **61:**15

28:1,23 **53**:4 **62**:1

justify [1] 29:20

K

kagan [20] 13:6,21 19:13, 16,19 **20:**17 **21:**14 **23:**20 28:7 29:2 30:1 39:16,18 48: 13 **50:**14 **51:**5 **55:**2 **58:**19, 23 **59:**12 kagan's [1] 14:25 kavanaugh [37] 13:20 14: 23 **15**:7,16,20 **24**:9 **26**:14, 22 27:4,6 31:8,13,14,16,21, 24 **32**:3 **37**:3,10,14,16 **40**: 14 **45**:1 **47**:1,5 **59**:25 **60**:10, 12,17,20 **61:**1,7,10,18,22 **63**:19 **64**:21 **keep** [2] **11:**4,10 kind [1] 66:22 kinds [3] 34:18,25 58:25

lacks [1] 59:15 land [3] 29:16 30:3,7 lands [3] 28:24,24,25 language [3] 32:21 47:11 **54:**15 largest [2] 44:24 58:2 last [1] 59:12 laughed [1] 48:24 laughter [3] 8:9 21:11,17 law [19] 10:6 19:6 24:25 26: 6,7 **27:**3 **33:**10 **34:**21 **40:**2, 3,6 42:12 53:3,12,19 54:2,4, 10 57:10 laws [4] 14:25 19:5 54:14 **55**:1 law's [1] 40:2 lawyer [1] 36:10 layer [1] 51:3 leaching [1] 31:22 leading [1] 23:15 least [4] 7:5 26:24 62:9,11 leave [2] 19:6 62:23 leaves [3] 56:22 57:1,3 **left** [2] **58:**15 **63:**3 legislation [5] 11:1,7 13:4, 18 **25**:6 legislative [13] 6:2,10,12

12:5,19 **13:**2,9 **14:**7 **24:**13,

20 **26**:17 **41**:14 **49**:2

legislator [7] 24:5 49:1,1 **50:**1 **51:**1,16,21 legislators [2] 12:19 24:4 legislature [13] 11:3,17 **12**:2 **13**:4,13 **14**:4 **35**:12 **40**: 10 41:9 42:3,6,9 46:15 **legitimate** [1] **15**:12 less [1] 41:10 level [1] 38:15 licensed [1] 66:17 licensing [1] **55**:19 lies [1] 26:4 life [1] 46:4 likely [1] 41:10 limit [2] 29:2 43:13 line [9] 6:21 7:3 14:2.11 16: 12 **17:**9 **52:**9,20,23 literally [4] **31**:23 **53**:15 **56**: 21 **59:**19 little [1] 57:14 livelihood [1] 46:2 local [3] 28:4 51:14 55:12 logical [2] **59:**17,18 long [3] 28:10,11 61:5 look [22] 6:10 8:22,23 11:8 **12**:1,9,22 **16**:19 **35**:14 **40**: 17 **41:**2,13,19 **47:**7 **49:**13, 20 **52:**21 **54:**24,25 **64:**17,18 **67:**11 looking [7] 13:14 15:10 24: 13 **40:**23 **41:**7,8 **51:**11 looks [1] 20:4 lord [1] 41:3 lose [5] 9:24,25 10:1,24 26: lot [9] 12:9,25 20:2 25:7,8 **29**:14 **30**:9 **41**:17 **44**:11 low [1] 15:17 lower [1] 48:7

М

made [8] 6:20 22:19 36:1 **46**:19 **47**:22 **54**:5 **57**:24 **63**: maintains [1] 66:8 majority [1] 39:19 management [4] 36:21 63:24 65:14,24 mandated [1] 36:23

many [7] **6**:9 **27**:17,19 **32**:5 49:10,10,10 map [2] 23:7 28:5 masquerading [1] 30:21 massive [4] 43:20 44:1 46: 7 62:17 materia [1] 34:5 material [14] 28:21.23 55: 23 **56:**1,5,9,11,16,20,22,25 **62**:18 **63**:8 **65**:11 materially [1] 47:18 materials [5] 17:1,3,7 20: matter [3] 35:11 42:12,16 matters [1] 33:22 mean [12] 27:7 33:24 34: 14 38:19 43:6,8,17,18 44: 13 **45**:22 **49**:6 **57**:15 means [1] 43:15 meant [1] 46:20 measure [1] 16:15 meat [6] 10:17 16:18 22:15, 21 **53**:25 **54**:8 meats [1] **53**:23 member [1] 12:6 members [2] 11:3 32:16 mentioned [2] 53:10 64: 20 metaphysical [2] 37:12 **38:**15 method [2] 65:11,15 might [4] 7:24 8:15 10:21 **19:**21 mill [4] 32:2 63:20,21 65:8 milling [35] 9:23 22:7 31:9, 12,17,19,19 **37:**5,6,13,24 **38:**1,9,15,22 **39:**1,3 **51:**14 **52:**16 **60:**1,3,5,6,15 **61:**14 **62:**13 **63:**24 **64:**3,7,12 **65:**4, 6.9.12.23 mind [5] 12:21 48:16,21 51: 10 67:10 minds [3] **24:**3 **49:**13,20 mine [6] 18:18 28:23 32:2 **43:**21 **44:**21.23 mined [1] 63:22 miners [1] 45:8 mines [1] 27:15

mining [73] 7:11 9:1,21,22, 23 **10:**23 **11:**2,7 **17:**22,23, 25 **18:**1,3,7 **19:**3,5,6 **22:**5,6 **25:**16 **30:**25 **31:**1,6,17,19, 20,25 **33:**15 **37:**2,4,13 **38:**3, 6,8,10,11,13,16 **39:**2,2 **42:** 15,18 **43:**2,4 **45:**3,4,5,6 **46:** 2,7,8,10,11 **51:**14,17 **52:**16 **59:**2,16,21 **60:**2,6 **61:**4,4,5, 12 **62:**1 **63:**5,21 **64:**2,2,12, 24 **65:**3 minutes [1] 63:14 misstate [1] **29**:13 misusing [1] **58**:14 mixed [2] 12:12 25:5 mockery [2] 10:16,18 monuments [1] **45**:23 mora [1] 46:11 moratorium [1] **46**:10 most [1] 14:24 motivated [1] **12**:2 **motivating** [2] **16**:8,10 motivations [2] 15:9 40: motive [2] 6:13 15:3 motives [6] 12:12 25:6,7 40:15,17,18 moved [1] 48:5 moves [1] 48:8 much [4] 44:9.12.13 67:5 multibillion-dollar [2] **23:8 28:**5 municipal [1] 10:7 must [1] 18:25 myopically [1] 65:21

Ν

mythical [1] 33:18

name [2] 34:25 41:5 narrow [1] 7:24 narrowing [1] 16:14 narrows [1] 22:24 national [6] 10:17 16:18 22:15 53:23,25 54:8 nation's [1] 58:1 natural [2] 43:3 44:8 nature [1] 32:11 necessarily [2] 38:17 41:

need [3] 45:18 52:7 66:15 negotiates [1] 34:8 neither [1] 22:12 never [2] 38:24 46:8 new [1] 19:5 newly [1] 28:25 **next** [2] **65**:13,17 nice [1] 21:9 nobody [1] **35**:16 noel [1] 17:16 nonetheless [2] 6:18 58: non-prohibited [1] 13:16 non-radiological [1] 60: non-safety [10] 11:20 15: 13 **24:**16,19 **26:**15,24 **27:**2 **47**:8 **60**:21 **67**:3 nonsense [1] 33:24 nor [1] 22:13 normally [2] 40:17 42:25 nothing [3] 20:14 55:6,10 nrc [30] 9:7 10:13 36:20 37: 21,22,25 **38:**4,7,9,12,21,24 **39:**4 **45:**13 **53:**4,6,8 **56:**9, 15,19,21,24 **59:**6,15,21,22 **60**:14 **61**:15 **64**:2 **66**:24 nrc-regulated [4] 34:4 39: 12,20 **52:**25 nrc's [1] 37:17 nuclear [33] 6:23 7:7,17 9: 14 **11**:4,10,23 **14**:22 **17**:2,7 **19:**24 **21:**5 **23:**14,15 **28:**19 **29**:16 **30**:4,11,23 **31**:4 **43**: 10 **53:**5,7 **54:**23 **56:**5 **58:**2, 3,5 **64:**4 **66:**9,18,23,23 nuclear-powered [2] 33: 3 66:6 nuclear-specific [1] 22: 14

0

objective [3] 12:24 23:25 24:6 obscure [2] 14:5 49:4 obstacle [2] 30:20 31:2 obstruct [1] 30:7 obvious [3] 19:25 44:6 45:

obviously [2] 23:12 40:3 occupies [1] 56:24 occur [3] **31:**17,18,23 odd [2] 12:13 15:3 offer [1] 50:19 okay [5] 8:8 35:17 36:14 **50**:8 **51**:2 once [4] 38:24 39:11 46:25 **47**:11 one [29] 12:11 15:7 19:8 20: 8 **23**:6 **26**:24 **28**:6,10 **32**:6 **34:**19 **38:**17 **42:**2 **43:**23,24, 25 **44**:10,17,22 **45**:6,8 **51**:7 **52:**15 **53:**11 **58:**23 **59:**1,19 **60:**17 **65:**21 **67:**3 ongoing [1] 30:4 only [7] 22:25 23:17 33:14 **51**:17 **53**:18 **62**:22 **65**:24 operated [2] 53:21 67:1 **operates** [1] **54**:9 operating [1] 30:11 operation [4] 9:14 43:21 **46:**7.8 operations [2] **22**:18,22 opinion [5] 32:22,24 33:2 **40**:16 **53**:25 opportunities [1] 13:22 opportunity [1] 48:2 opposite [1] 59:10 oral [2] 17:16 30:16 order [6] 10:10,11 18:6,18, 22 **35**:3 ordinary [2] 12:18,23 ore [1] 65:9 orthodox [1] 42:23 other [23] 6:9 8:15,17 17:3 **20**:24 **25**:17 **28**:6,11,12 **31**: 18 **34:**15 **35:**2 **38:**18,20 **39:** 23 43:10 44:16,18 45:8,9, 12 46:21 56:4 otherwise [3] 24:20 28:3, out [13] 11:5,10 13:8 36:12 **40**:5,19 **42**:20 **49**:4 **56**:20 **62:**7.18.22 **63:**8 outside [1] 59:5 over [14] 9:13 13:24 21:3 **22**:18,20 **55**:25 **56**:9,21 **60**:

own [2] 28:24 59:8 pacific [13] 19:8 32:6,10, 12,17 **39:**15 **46:**17,20 **47:**16, 19 **57**:21,24 **58**:13 page [2] 32:23 65:4 pages [4] 33:1 50:18 65:18, paragraph [1] **65**:13 pari [1] **34**:5 part [11] 20:4 29:7,9,10,25 **37:**25 **45:**4 **46:**7 **54:**13,22 **60:**13 particular [7] 6:2 14:9,14. 19 **24:**3,5 **27:**13 party [1] 48:8 past [1] 40:20 people [3] 12:9 45:25 50: people's [1] 40:17 perfectly [1] 16:3 perhaps [4] 7:4 44:15 46: period [2] 21:24 46:10 permissibility [1] 6:11 permissible [1] 24:16 permit [1] 18:6 permitted [1] **52**:21 person [1] 16:5 **perspective** [1] **50**:19 petitioners [3] 17:18 49: 15 **63:**16 petitioners' [2] 26:12 57: 18 pg&e [13] 6:20 7:4,15,16 9: 3 **10**:14 **11**:18 **19**:19 **20**:20 **21:**19 **22:**13 **66:**2,20 phrasing [1] **60**:20 piece [1] **25**:6 place [6] 10:13 21:7 29:17 **34**:24 **63**:22 **67**:3 places [1] 35:1 **plaintiff** [1] **16:**5 plant [16] 9:7,15 14:19,20 **19:**24 **23:**16 **30:**11 **34:**20,

15 **61:**15 **66:**13,14,14,25

overlapping [3] 32:18 36:

23 35:17 36:3 53:7 58:3 66: 22.23.24 plants [2] **7**:7,17 plausibility [2] 24:15 64: plausible [13] 24:18 26:14. 19,24 **27:**2,12 **43:**9 **45:**11 **47:**8 **60:**21,23 **67:**2,15 pleadings [1] **47**:22 please [3] 17:20 30:19 47: point [17] 29:21 36:1,21 38: 20 41:18 47:12 50:22 54: 17 **57:**7 **58:**18 **60:**4,11,18 **61**:6 **63**:20 **66**:1 **67**:2 police [1] 10:8 posed [1] 60:1 poses [1] 61:16 position [2] 47:6 59:10 possibilities [1] 61:7 possibility [1] 43:11 possible [1] **15**:14 possibly [1] 59:13 potentially [1] **43**:13 pound [1] 44:17 pounds [3] 43:24,25 44:22 power [13] 6:23 7:7,17,17 **10**:12 **11**:10,23 **30**:11 **53**:7 **58:**2,3,5 **59:**23 powers [1] 10:11 practice [1] 33:14 precise [1] **54**:20 predicate [2] 34:3 57:7 predominant [1] 26:7 preempted [14] 7:9 9:4 **18:**25 **19:**3 **22:**6 **33:**16,19 **40:**2,3,4 **53:**20 **54:**6 **63:**10 **67**:23 preemption [17] 6:17 10: 19 **11:**19 **12:**14 **16:**6,14,23 **18:**15 **22:**24 **30:**20,21,22 **31:**2 **55:**9 **57:**21,25 **64:**9 preemptive [1] 58:24 **preempts** [1] **16:**20 prescribed [2] 6:16 10:20 present [2] 13:21 63:4 preserved [1] 66:5 pressed [1] 6:8

pretermitted [1] 9:5 prevent [3] 10:11 43:10 58: preventing [1] 21:6 previous [2] 38:6,11 previously [1] 38:3 primary [2] 51:25 52:4 principal [1] **26**:7 **principles** [1] **21**:19 prior [1] 20:18 probably [1] **44**:13 problem [5] 23:20 24:23 **25:**5,11 **36:**15 process [6] 31:23 37:24 **61:**12 **62:**1,6 **65:**9 processing [4] 18:3 25:1, 1 **65:**10 produced [1] 16:3 productive [1] 7:25 proffered [1] 46:21 **profound** [1] **58:**5 profoundly [1] 44:3 prohibit [8] 24:25 52:16 **60:**4,5,6 **63:**24 **64:**6 **65:**23 prohibited [3] 12:3 16:7 **57**:12 prohibiting [1] 7:8 prohibition [1] 24:6 prohibits [1] 56:18 proof [2] 26:4.5 proper [1] **59**:6 properly [2] 14:6 16:21 protect [3] 9:21 11:2,7 protection [3] 17:3,6 67: provision [11] **53**:9,11,15 **54:**1,9,12,12,13,21,21 **56:** provisions [3] 49:4,22 64: public [1] 10:9 pulled [1] 63:8 purpose [73] 6:2,10,21,25 8:5 10:2,4 11:6,14,22 12:2, 19,24 13:12,16,17,24 14:12 **16:**7,13,16,20 **17:**10 **18:**24 22:23 23:4,21 24:25 26:1,7, 11 **28**:2,11,12 **32**:10,12 **34**:

6 **36:**23 **39:**14,15 **40:**6,24 **41:**3,7,8,13,19,22 **42:**11,17, 23 **43**:9 **47**:12,14,15,15,23 **49:**5 **50:**2,2,12 **51:**3,6 **52:**3, 22 62:20,21 65:22 67:11,12, 16.17.22 purpose-based [2] 6:16 **10**:18 purposes [6] 8:15 14:21 **17:**3 **25:**9 **34:**10.15 pursue [1] 46:23 put [1] 27:9 **puts** [2] **24:**17,18 \mathbf{O}

qua [1] 64:2 quantity [2] 44:20 65:14 quarrel [1] 39:21 question [26] 7:24 10:22 **11:**11 **14:**25 **19:**17 **20:**6,6, 23 22:12 26:23 29:8,9,10 **30:**1 **32:**9,11,13 **35:**20,25 **36:**7,8 **39:**7 **42:**23 **49:**19 **62:** 6 **67:**18 **auestions** [1] **32**:6 quibbling [1] **55**:25 quickly [1] 25:23 quite [4] 6:19 10:14 14:6 **16:**20 quote [2] 32:21 66:3 quotes [2] 48:6 66:2

R

radiation [7] 11:23 12:3 **14:**12 **17:**4,7 **38:**2,10 radiological [21] 47:24 **58:**21 **59:**4,7,16,20 **60:**1,7 **61:**8,11,13,19,25 **62:**4,7,11, 15 **64**:1,13 **65**:25 **67**:13 radionuclides [1] 65:17 raise [1] 39:7 raises [1] 62:7 raising [1] 24:11 ranging [1] 10:6 rational [3] 24:1 51:16 67: rationale [19] **15**:13 **24**:16, 19,19 **26:**15,19,24 **27:**2,9, 12 **46:**21 **47:**9 **50:**25 **51:**1

54:20 **60:**22,24 **64:**11 **67:**3 rationales [1] 11:21 reach [3] 19:10 22:21 23:1 reaching [1] 21:6 read [3] 12:13 34:5 56:7 reading [2] 49:23,23 reads [1] 33:10 reaffirmed [4] 31:5 59:23 **62**:21 **63**:3 reagents [1] 65:10 real [5] 13:22 29:4 34:21 **37:**15 **49:**5 really [8] 11:25 22:14 23:7 **28:**4,18 **46:**20 **65:**22,24 reason [16] 14:15 18:12 **23:**10 **32:**15 **33:**13.14 **39:**9. 23 **40**:1 **41**:12 **45**:11 **49**:3 **55:**23 **60:**14 **61:**15 **63:**6 reasonable [5] 24:4 48:25 **49**:1 **50**:1 **51**:21 reasonably [1] **10**:15 reasons [5] 18:22 29:13 **35:**6 **58:**11.20 rebuttal [1] 63:15 record [2] 25:12 41:10 reduce [1] 43:13 refer [1] 65:5 reference [1] 20:24 referenced [1] 64:23 referring [1] 40:19 refers [1] 34:6 refused [2] 26:1,10 regardless [4] 16:15 38: 14 **49**:19 **62**:14 regulate [35] 7:10 8:15,20 **9:**1,14 **14:**12,16 **17:**1 **18:**7 **19:**11 **22:**21 **30:**24 **31:**6,9 **34**:10,14 **35**:15,15 **36**:8 **37**: 6,24 **38:**7,9,9,21 **39:**1,1 **42:** 15 **55:**5 **56:**15 **58:**10 **59:**15, 20 **61:**3 **63:**5 regulated [11] 8:25 9:3 14: 19 **38:**3 **52:**1,14 **53:**4,6,8 **54:**3.15 regulates [6] 23:3 31:11 **36:**20 **43:**1 **57:**11,16 regulating [9] 7:6 8:2 22: 2 37:2,4,4,22 53:3 54:23

regulation [15] 6:23 10:5 **14**:11 **16**:17 **33**:3 **36**:12 **38**: 1.12.17.18 **52:**21 **56:**25 **66:** 1.5.25 regulations [2] 10:5 24:7 regulatory [6] 9:7 10:12 **22**:17 **30**:23 **31**:4 **55**:7 rejection [1] 57:20 relevant [2] 41:21 48:19 remains [1] 63:9 removal [2] 45:23 65:16 removed [1] 56:11 repeatedly [3] 31:4 59:22 **62**:21 repeating [1] 10:22 report [1] 62:3 reports [2] 41:15 56:19 represent [1] 64:4 represents [1] **65**:25 requesting [1] **56**:19 require [1] **12**:5 required [4] 18:16 28:2 46: 18 **48**:9 requires [2] 28:1 39:13 reserve [2] 17:11 40:5 reserved [1] 19:11 reserving [1] 14:13 residential [4] 29:17,18 **30:**7 **34:**24 resolve [1] 32:7 resolves [1] 62:23 resource [2] 37:21 51:14 resources [4] 37:21 43:3. 14 **44:**8 respect [3] 6:22 65:6,13 respondents [1] 30:17 response [1] 29:25 responses [2] 25:21 29:7 responsibility [1] 65:2 responsive [1] **25**:24 restricting [1] 10:9 retain [1] 55:5 revenge [1] 40:19 review [3] 24:2 50:25 67:6 rezone [2] 29:16 30:6 rightly [1] 15:9 road [8] 23:7 28:5 51:19 53: 13, 13, 16, 17, 17

roads [5] 10:10 21:7 53:9 54:20,21 roadway [2] 23:15,18 roadways [1] 21:3 roberts [8] 10:21 17:13 27: 16 29:23 30:13 44:9 63:12 67:25 rule [3] 22:14 23:6 30:6 run [1] 64:7 rural [1] 44:3

S

safe [4] 17:23 18:2,4 45:14 **safely** [1] **33**:12 safety [28] 8:16 9:14 14:22 **18:**21 **30:**25 **34:**11 **47:**24 **58**:11,21 **59**:4,7,16,20 **60**:1, 7,23 **61:**4,8,12,13,19 **62:**5,8, 11,15,16 **64:**4 **66:**9 sale [1] 66:14 sales [5] **22:**20 **54:**1,9,11, same [11] 9:17 13:8 19:20 **31:**23 **49:**20 **51:**7 **54:**15 **57:** 11.17 **62:**13 **64:**25 saying [7] 8:12 14:3 18:12 **19:**22 **41:**12 **46:**6 **62:**12 says [14] 8:19 10:14 11:8 **12:**25 **17:**1 **20:**10 **34:**7,12 **38:**4,25 **55:**4,6,10 **62:**3 scalia [2] 41:1,16 scenery [1] 45:7 scheme [2] 54:22,24 scope [1] 22:24 seated [1] 44:2 second [9] 11:16 29:9,21, 25 **32**:11 **39**:7 **47**:12 **52**:10 **66:**1 secondly [1] 26:3 section [2] 55:3,10 see [6] 12:1 21:23,24 40:11 **43:9 45:6** seem [2] 8:5 19:23 seems [5] 13:21 15:3 16:2 **19:**21 **20:**9 seen [2] 14:1,1 sense [1] 15:22 **sentence** [1] **65:**21 **separate** [2] **37:**13 **62:**5

separated [3] **37:**15,17,18 **separation** [2] **20**:18,20 series [2] 54:14 55:1 serious [1] **65**:25 served [1] 50:2 services [1] 10:8 sets [1] 62:22 several [2] 32:16 65:18 sewer [1] 10:8 shall [2] 55:4.11 **shape** [1] **42**:16 shared [1] 32:18 **shouldn't** [1] **52**:7 show [6] 16:9 23:13 42:6,9 **50:**9.10 **shows** [1] **59**:13 shut [4] 21:4 23:14 30:8 46: side [2] 44:16,18 sian [1] 64:8 significant [1] 44:7 **simply** [7] **11:**13 **16:**20 **18:** 15 **21**:20 **23**:14 **25**:2 **51**:8 **single** [2] **12:**5 **62:**25 sister [2] 40:20 64:24 sitting [3] 61:9 62:2,3 situ [1] 31:22 situation [5] 34:7 35:7 36: 2 **39**:11 **43**:19 skull [9] 21:1 23:11 39:17. 20 **52**:10 **53**:1,6,12 **54**:18 slaughterhouse [2] 22: 18.22 slightest [1] 19:2 society [1] 54:5 **solely** [3] **35**:3 **40**:20 **55**:16 **solicitor** [5] **47**:7 **54**:19 **60**: 21 **64**:19 **67**:5 solids [1] 65:17 solve [1] 25:11 **somebody** [1] **28:**21 somebody's [2] 51:9,19 someone's [1] 48:16 **sometimes** [5] **41**:2,22,23 **48:**24.25 sorry [5] 7:23 21:16 32:1 **47:**3 **60:**19 sort [5] 13:23 36:23 39:13

40:6 **52**:2 **sotomayor** [10] **12**:4,8 **15**: 8 **18:**5,10,17,21 **20:**13 **52:**8, sounds [2] 44:11 67:5 source [10] 17:2 55:22 56: 1,5,9,11,16,19,21,25 sovereign [2] 10:11 63:7 **special** [3] **17:**2 **56:**5 **61:**16 specific [1] 23:4 **specifically** [3] **20**:10 **56**: 8 58:13 **spent** [3] **21:**5 **53:**5 **54:**23 stage [3] 43:22 47:22 61:3 **standard** [6] **6**:17 **10**:19 **12:**23 **16:**23 **24:**1 **25:**5 **standing** [1] **53**:19 start [6] 33:19 46:6.25 51:6. | subset [1] 40:22 11,18 **starting** [1] **22**:6 starts [1] 20:11 state [63] 6:10,21,22 7:16 8: suggestion [1] 47:7 19 **9:**16 **10:**1,5,5,7 **11:**5,14 **13:**23 **14:**12,25 **15:**12 **16:**8. 15,23 **18:**6 **21:**2,4 **22:**19,25 **23**:13 **24**:16,18,22 **26**:5 **28**: 4,12,22 **29:**3,15 **30:**5 **32:**19, 25 **34**:7,9 **35**:11,14 **36**:4 **40**: supposed [1] **65**:8 10 **41**:9 **42**:3,6,9 **45**:4 **46**:7 **47:**8 **51:**7,8 **52:**12 **53:**2,13, 17 **54**:10 **55**:12 **57**:10 **58**:2, 16 **64**:7 **67**:7 stated [1] 40:7 **statements** [4] **49**:16 **50**: 15.16.18 **states** [17] **10**:15 **13**:7,10 **14:**16,18 **16:**25 **17:**17 **20:**1, 3 **28**:17 **29**:11,12 **31**:5 **44**: 25 **58**:6 **59**:8 **66**:10 state's [1] 16:24 **statistic** [1] **43**:21 **statute** [24] **6**:15 **7**:12 **11**: 20 12:14 16:6 21:23 28:1. 16 **33:**18 **37:**17 **38:**19,20 40:1.8 41:11.22 42:23 43:1. 2 **49**:21 **51**:12 **52**:25 **62**:22 **64**:24 **statutes** [3] **13**:8 **49**:4,22

statute's [1] 41:3 **statutory** [2] **42**:24 **55**:8 **steps** [1] **46**:22 **still** [1] **11**:7 **stop** [6] **34**:18 **35**:1,3,13 **36**: 13 64:8 **stored** [1] **33**:13 straight [2] 63:20 64:8 straightforward [2] 18: 15 **52:**24 strong [1] 57:18 stuck [2] 6:24 21:14 **study** [2] **65:**3,8 **subjective** [6] **15**:3,8 **23**: 22 **40**:10 **50**:19 **51**:20 submission [4] 36:25 48: 18 **51**:25 **52**:4 successfully [1] 28:13 sufficient [2] 27:3 32:7 suggested [1] 12:11 **suggests** [1] **61**:24 **supporting** [1] **17**:18 suppose [12] 9:18,18 27:9, 12 **33**:9 **55**:2 **58**:23 **59**:9 **64**: 10,10,11,14 **surely** [1] **58:**25 surreptitiously [2] 57:10,

system [2] 14:10 42:8

sustain [1] 27:3

systems [1] 65:16

tailing [3] 9:23 34:19,19 tailings [18] 33:12 35:2,3, 13 **36:**7,13,18,20 **39:**13 **45:** 13 **51:**15 **63:**24 **64:**3 **65:**4, 11,14,15,23 talked [1] 42:20 talks [1] 51:13 tasking [1] 65:2 **technical** [1] **60**:17 **techniques** [1] **64**:19 tells [1] 19:9 ten [1] 45:23 tenth [2] 21:9,15

term [1] 23:23 terminology [1] **55**:25 terms [3] 6:18,19 11:14 test [1] 26:15 **text** [8] **12:**24,25 **24:**13,20 **26:**17 **38:**19 **40:**7 **52:**25 themselves [1] **44:**23 theory [1] **59**:5 there's [21] 19:24 20:5,8 **26:**23 **28:**12 **29:**2 **31:**22 **43:** 21 **45**:6 **46**:5 **52**:6,6 **53**:11 61:7,8,11,13,23 62:5,9 64:9 they've [3] 27:19 61:2 66: 12 thinks [2] 17:22.24 third [2] 11:9 61:15 though [2] 14:20 38:8

thousand [1] 35:12 threat [1] 64:4 three [1] 61:7 tied [2] 55:15,16 toby [1] 30:16 together [2] 31:17 37:5 ton [3] 43:24 44:11,11 tons [2] 27:14 44:19 top [1] 51:4 totally [1] 29:17 touch [1] 23:2 tough [1] 41:23 tourism [1] 44:5 traditional [2] 66:11,12 transfer [1] 56:15 transmission [1] 66:13

treatment [1] 65:16 trick [1] 67:9 trucking [1] 23:16 truckload [1] 44:14 trucks [1] 23:17 true [1] 20:9 truth [1] 48:9 try [2] 36:16 41:12 trying [3] 11:19 12:18 44: turned [1] 39:6

turns [2] 36:12 53:12

two [14] **13**:7,10 **14**:25 **20**:

19 **25:**21 **29:**7 **32:**5 **35:**6 **37:**

treated [1] 15:1

5,7 **41:**25 **53:**14 **63:**23 **64:**5 type [3] 27:25 28:2 66:16 typically [1] 16:14

U

ugly [2] 27:10,14 under [8] 7:8 8:13 17:21 **25**:5 **30**:5 **36**:4 **42**:8 **47**:17 undermine [3] 28:14,18

undermining [3] 23:8 28:

understand [6] 21:9 25: 10 **37**:11 **58**:8,24 **64**:22 understanding [1] 23:25 undertake [1] 26:10 undisputed [1] 30:23 undisturbed [1] 63:3 unearthing [1] 64:14 united [4] 17:17 44:25.25 **58:**6 unleashing [1] 40:9

unless [2] 63:21,21 unlike [4] 23:6 41:9 42:4,5 un-nrc [1] 38:3 unregulated [1] 19:7 unsafe [1] 25:2 unsuitable [2] 23:16 29:

until [4] 56:10,20,22 63:4 unusual [1] 14:8

up [7] 6:9 23:15,18 31:6 42: 13 **47**:8 **53**:9

upstream [1] 7:11 uranium [24] 17:22 18:3.3 **24**:25 **25**:1 **30**:25 **31**:1 **33**:

12,15 **43:**12,24,25 **44:**17,22, 24 **45**:5 **59**:21 **61**:9 **62**:4 **63**:

5,21 **64:**14 **65:**1,3 uses [1] 43:13

using [4] 7:16 9:17 30:5 64:

utah [2] 53:16,16

utah's [1] 54:22

valley [8] 21:1 23:11 39:17, 20 **53:**1,6,12 **54:**18 variety [3] 6:1 25:7 62:16

various [2] 58:25 60:16 vast [1] 39:19 vermont [3] 11:17 52:11 53:6 version [1] 57:18 view [2] 42:14 44:2 virginia [23] 9:16,19 17:21 18:20 19:3 25:12 27:9,11, 13,14 33:9,13 42:17 43:14 44:3 45:2,12,20,24 46:12 63:23 64:25 65:3 virginia's [5] 10:2 19:2 44: 2,7 63:6

W

vote [2] 12:10 51:2

wanted [6] 16:12 17:8 19: 6 **42**:19 **46**:23 **50**:1 wanting [1] 18:24 wants [2] 28:19 67:14 warrant [1] 52:6 **wastewater** [1] **65**:12 way [30] 11:4,9 12:13,25 15: 7 **16**:3 **19**:22 **21**:7 **23**:24 **24**: 12 **27:**15 **31:**22 **35:**16 **37:**7. 8 **42**:5,15,25 **45**:14 **46**:4 **47**: 14,15 **54:**9,16 **58:**23 **59:**9, 18 **60:**4,6 **64:**9 ways [6] 13:8 32:5 35:13 **41:**7 **63:**23 **64:**5 well-known [1] 48:24 well-pleaded [1] 48:10 western [1] 45:4 whatsoever [2] 39:22 53: 19 whether [18] 6:25 7:17 9:9. 13 **15**:12 **19**:20 **20**:6 **21**:23 **37:**12,13 **38:**14 **41:**17,18 **45**:10 **47**:8 **62**:6,14 **66**:21 white [1] 8:12 whole [3] 54:10,25 57:7 whom [1] 41:1 who's [1] 41:6 wide [1] 62:16 will [6] 13:17 28:13 29:14 **36**:13 **41**:2 **67**:9 win [2] 26:21 47:18 wins [1] **24**:22

57:11
without [3] 31:19,20 62:12
word [1] 40:16
words [2] 31:18 49:23
work [3] 15:5 49:4 55:1
workable [1] 15:22
workers [1] 9:21
works [1] 34:19
world [5] 8:13 37:15 45:21,
25 46:5
written [3] 11:1,13 41:14
wrongly [1] 50:4

Y

yankee [1] 53:7 years [1] 49:10 yellow [2] 32:20 40:11

Heritage Reporting Corporation

within [4] 8:12 9:11 54:10