

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION  
ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD

Before Administrative Judges:  
E. Roy Hawkens, Chairman  
Dr. Michael F. Kennedy  
Dr. William C. Burnett

In the Matter of )  
 )  
FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY )  
 )  
Turkey Point Units 6 and 7 )  
 )  
Combined License Application )

Docket Nos. 52-040-COL  
and 52-041-COL

August 11, 2011

**MOTION TO ADMIT NEW CONTENTION REGARDING  
THE SAFETY AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS OF  
THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION TASK FORCE REPORT ON  
THE FUKUSHIMA DAI-ICHI ACCIDENT**

**I. INTRODUCTION**

Pursuant to 10 C.F.R. § 2.309 Citizens Allied for Safe Energy, Inc., (CASE) hereby moves to admit a new contention challenging the adequacy of the Turkey Point 6 & 7 Combined License Application, Environmental Report, Rev. 2 (the "ER")) on the basis that it fails to address the extraordinary environmental and safety implications of the findings and recommendations raised by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Fukushima Task Force (the "Task Force") in its report, "Recommendations for Enhancing Reactor Safety in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century: The Near-Term Task Force Review of Insights From the Fukushima Dai-ichi Accident" (July 12, 2011) ("Task Force Report"). Intervenors respectfully submit that admitting the new contention is necessary to

ensure that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (“NRC” or the “Commission”) fulfills its non-discretionary duty under the National Environmental Policy Act (“NEPA”) to consider the new and significant information set forth in the Task Force Report before it issues a Combined License (COL) for Turkey Point 6 & 7.

This motion is supported by a Certificate Required by 10 C.F.R. § 2.323(b).

## **II. BACKGROUND**

On August 17, 2010 CASE filed a petition to intervene in the COL proceeding for Turkey Point 6 & 7. On February 28, 2011, this Board found that CASE had established standing and admitted a narrowed version of CASE’s contentions for a hearing. A hearing date on that contention has yet to be established.

## **III. DISCUSSION**

To be admitted for hearing, a new contention must satisfy the six general requirements set forth in 10 C.F.R. § 2.309(f)(1), and the timeliness requirements set forth in either 10 C.F.R. § 2.309(f)(2) (governing timely contentions) or 10 C.F.R. § 2.309(c) (governing non-timely contentions). As provided in the accompanying contention, each of the requirements set forth in 10 C.F.R. § 2.309(f)(1) is satisfied. Furthermore, CASE maintains that this Motion and accompanying contention are timely, and the requirements of 10 C.F.R. § 2.309(f)(2) are also satisfied. In the event this Board determines that this Motion and the accompanying contention are not timely, however, CASE also maintains that the requirements of 10 C.F.R. § 2.309(c) are satisfied.

- A. This Motion and the Accompanying Contention Satisfy the Requirements for Admission of a Timely Contention Set Forth in 10 C.F.R. § 2.309(f)(2).**

The NRC has adopted a three-part standard for assessing timeliness. *See* 10 C.F.R. § 2.309(f)(2). The Motion and accompanying contention are timely.

**1. The Information Upon Which the Motion and Accompanying Contention are Based was not Previously Available.**

The availability of material information “is a significant factor in a Board’s determination of whether a motion based on such information is timely filed.” Houston Lighting & Power Co. (South Texas Project, Units 1 & 2), LBP-85-19, 21 NRC 1707, 1723 (1985) (internal citations omitted). This Motion and the accompanying contention are based upon information contained within the Task Force Report, which was not released until July 12, 2011. Before issuance of the Task Force Report, the information material to the contention was simply unavailable.

**2. The Information Upon Which the Motion and Accompanying Contention are Based is Materially Different than Information Previously Available.**

Only five months ago, a nuclear accident occurred at the Fukushima Dai-ichi Nuclear Power Plant. In the wake of the accident, the Task Force was established and instructed by the NRC to provide:

A systematic and methodical review of [NRC] processes and regulations to determine whether the agency should make additional improvements to its regulatory system and to make recommendations to the Commission for its policy direction, in light of the accident at the Fukushima Dai-ichi Nuclear Power Plant.

Task Force Report at vii. In response to that directive, the Task Force made twelve “overarching” recommendations to “strengthen the regulatory framework for protection against natural disasters, mitigation and emergency preparedness, and to improve the effectiveness of NRC’s programs.” *Id.* at viii. In these recommendations the Task Force, for the first time since the Three Mile Island accident occurred in 1979, fundamentally questioned the adequacy of the current level of safety provided by the NRC’s program for nuclear reactor regulation.

In the ER, FPL assumes that compliance with existing NRC safety regulations is sufficient to ensure that the environmental impacts of accidents are acceptable. The information in the Task Force Report refutes this assumption and is materially different from the information upon which the ER is based. *See* attached contention and Declaration of Dr. Arjun Makhijani.

**3. The Motion and Accompanying Contention are Timely Based on the Availability of the New Information.**

CASE has submitted this Motion and accompanying contention in a timely fashion. The NRC customarily recognizes as timely contentions that are submitted within thirty (30) days of the occurrence of the triggering event. Shaw Areva MOX Services, Inc. (Mixed Oxide Fuel Fabrication Facility), LBP-08-10, 67 NRC 460, 493 (2008). The Task Force Report, upon which the contention is based, was published on July 12, 2001. Because they were filed within thirty (30) days of publication of the Task Force Report, this Motion and accompanying contention are timely.

**B. The New Contention Satisfies the Standards For Non-Timely Contentions Set Forth in 10 C.F.R. § 2.309(c).**

Pursuant to § 2.309(c), determination on any “nontimely” filing of a contention must be based on a balancing of eight factors, the most important of which is “good cause, if any, for the failure to file on time.” Crow Butte Res., Inc. (North Trend Expansion Project), LBP-08-6, 67 NRC 241 (2008). As set forth below, each of the factors favors admission of the accompanying contention.

**1. Good Cause.**

Good cause for the late filing is the first, and most important element of 10 C.F.R. § 2.309(c)(1). Private Fuel Storage, L.L.C. (Independent Spent Fuel Storage Installation), CLI-00-02, 51 NRC 77, 79 (2000). Newly arising information has long been recognized as providing the

requisite “good cause.” See Consumers Power Co. (Midland Plant, Units 1 & 2), LBP-82-63, 16 NRC 571, 577 (1982), citing Indiana & Michigan Elec. Co. (Donald C. Cook Nuclear Plant, Units 1 & 2), CLI-72-75, 5 AEC 13, 14 (1972). Thus, the NRC has previously found good cause where (1) a contention is based on new information and, therefore, could not have been presented earlier, and (2) the intervenor acted promptly after learning of the new information. Texas Utils. Elec. Co. (Comanche Peak Steam Electric Station, Units 1 & 2), CLI-92-12, 36 NRC 62, 69-73 (1992).

As noted above, the information on which this Motion and accompanying contention are based is taken from the Task Force Report, which was issued on July 12, 2011 and analyzes NRC processes and regulations in light of the Fukushima accident, an event that occurred a mere five months ago. This Motion and accompanying contention are being submitted less than thirty (30) days after issuance of the Task Force Report.

Accordingly, the Intervenors have good cause to submit this Motion and the accompanying contention now.

## **2. Nature of the Intervenors’ Right to be A Party to the Proceeding.**

CASE has a right to participate in this proceeding because it has standing and has submitted admissible contentions. See 10 C.F.R. Para 2.309,42 U.S.C. # 2339(a)(1).

## **3. Nature of Intervenors’ Interest in the Proceeding.**

CASE seeks to protect its members’ health, safety and lives; almost all of CASE’s members live within 25 miles of Turkey Point and many live within 10 miles. CASE also seeks to protect the health and safety of the general public and to protect the environment by ensuring that the NRC fulfills its non-discretionary duty under NEPA to consider the new and significant

information set forth in the Task Force Report before it issues aCOL for Turkey Point 6 & 7.. Moreover, CASE has an interest in this proceeding because of the “obvious potential for offsite consequences” to their members’ health and safety. Diablo Canyon, 56 NRC at 426-27, citing Florida Power & Light Co. (Turkey Point Nuclear Generating Plant, Units 3 and 4), LBP-01-6, 53 NRC 138, 146, *aff’d*, CLI-01-17, 54 NRC 3 (2001).

#### **4. Possible Effect of an Order on CASE’S Interest in the Proceeding.**

As noted above, CASE’S interest in a safe, clean, and healthful environment would be served by the issuance of an order requiring the NRC to fulfill its non-discretionary duty under NEPA to consider new and significant information before making a licensing decision. *See Silva v. Romney*, 473 F.2d 287, 292 1st Cir. 1973). Compliance with NEPA ensures that environmental issues are given full consideration in “the ongoing programs and actions of the Federal Government.” Marsh v. Oregon Natural Res. Council, 490 U.S. 360, 371 n.14 (1989).

#### **5. Availability of Other Means to Protect the Intervenors’ Interests.**

With regard to this factor, the question is not whether other parties may protect Intervenors’ interests, but rather whether there are other means by which Intervenors may protect their own interests. Long Island Lighting Co. (Jamesport Nuclear Power Station, Units 1 & 2), ALAB-292, 2 NRC 631 (1975). Quite simply, no other means exist. Only through this hearing does CASE have a right that is judicially enforceable to seek compliance by NRC with NEPA before the COL for Turkey Point 6 & 7 is issued, permitting these new reactors to operate and impose severe accident risks on Intervenors and the individuals they represent.

#### **6. Extent CASE’s Interests are Represented by Other Parties.**

No other party can represent Intevenors’ interests in protecting the health, safety, and environment of themselves and their members. While the concerns raised by the

Joint Intervenors and CASE may be consolidated at some point in the future, such consolidation should not impact a determination as to whether CASE'S interests are currently represented by other parties. 1 As of the date of the filing, no party can represent CASE's interests.

**. Extent That Participation Will Broaden the Issues .**

While CASE'S participation may broaden or delay the proceeding, this factor may not be relied upon to deny this Motion or exclude the contention because the NRC has a non-discretionary duty under NEPA to consider new and significant information that arises before it makes its licensing decision. Marsh, 490 U.S. at 373-4. Moreover, as a hearing date for CASE's admitted contentions has not yet been scheduled, admission of the new contention will not delay the hearing

**7. Extent to which CASE Will Assist in the Development of a Sound Record.**

CASE will assist in the development of a sound record, as their contention is supported by the expert opinion of a highly qualified expert, Dr. Arjun Makhijani. *See* attached Makhijani Declaration. *See also* Pacific Gas & Elec. Co. (Diablo Canyon Power Plant Independent Spent Fuel Storage Installation), CLI-08-01, 67 NRC 1, 6 (2008) (finding that, when assisted by experienced counsel and experts, participation of a petitioner may be reasonably expected to contribute to the development of a sound record). Furthermore, as a matter of law, NEPA requires consideration of the new and significant information set forth in the Task Force Report. *See* 10 C.F.R. § 51.92(a)(2). A sound record cannot be developed without such consideration.

**C. The New Contention Satisfies the Standards For Admission of Contentions Set Forth in 10 C.F.R. § 2.309(f)(1).**

As discussed in the accompanying contention, the standards for admission of a contention set forth in 10 C.F.R. § 2.309(f)(1) are satisfied.

#### **IV. CONCLUSION**

For the foregoing reasons, this Motion should be granted and the accompanying contention admitted.

Respectfully submitted this 11<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2011.

/signed electronically by/

Barry J. White  
Authorized Representative  
Citizens Allied for Safe Energy, Inc.  
10001 SW 129 Terrace  
Miami, FL 33176  
Phone: 305-251-1960  
Fax: 305-251-1676  
Email: [bwtamia@bellsouth.net](mailto:bwtamia@bellsouth.net)

#### **CERTIFICATE REQUIRED BY 10 C.F.R. § 2.323(b)**

I certify that on August 10, 2011 I contacted all other parties to these proceedings as Good Faith Consultation. FPL responded that they would oppose all motions in this matter. NRC staff advised that they would await the filing to take positions on the contentions.

/signed electronically by/

Barry J. White  
Authorized Representative  
Citizens Allied for Safe Energy, Inc.  
10001 SW 129 Terrace  
Miami, FL 33176  
Phone: 305-251-1960  
Fax: 305-251-1676  
Email: [bwtamia@bellsouth.net](mailto:bwtamia@bellsouth.net)

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION  
ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD PANEL

Before the Licensing Board:

E. Roy Hawkens, Chair  
Dr. Michael F. Kennedy  
Dr. William C. Burnett

In the Matter of )  
 )  
Florida Power & Light Company ) Docket No. 52-040 and 52-041  
 )  
 )  
Combined License Application for )  
Turkey Point Units 6 & 7 )  
\_\_\_\_\_ )

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I, Barry J. White, hereby certify that copies of the document above and all documents related to this motion were served upon the following persons by Electronic Information Exchange and/or electronic mail.

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory  
Commission  
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board  
Panel  
Mail Stop: T-3 F23  
Washington, DC 20555-0001  
Joshua Kirstein, Law Clerk, ALSB  
Email: [josh.kirstein@nrc.gov](mailto:josh.kirstein@nrc.gov)

E. Roy Hawkens  
Administrative Judge, Chair  
Email: [roy.hawkens@nrc.gov](mailto:roy.hawkens@nrc.gov)  
Dr. Michael F. Kennedy  
Administrative Judge  
Email: [michael.kennedy@nrc.gov](mailto:michael.kennedy@nrc.gov)

Dr. William C. Burnett  
Administrative Judge  
Email: [william.burnett2@nrc.gov](mailto:william.burnett2@nrc.gov)  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory  
Commission  
Office of the General Counsel  
Mail Stop: 0-15 D21

Washington, DC 20555-0001  
Robert Weisman, Esq.  
Marian Zabler, Esq.  
Sara Kirkwood, Esq.  
Sara Price, Esq.  
Joseph Gilman, Paralegal  
Karin Francis, Paralegal  
Email: [Robert.Weisman@nrc.gov](mailto:Robert.Weisman@nrc.gov);  
[marian.zabler@nrc.gov](mailto:marian.zabler@nrc.gov);  
[sara.kirkwood@nrc.gov](mailto:sara.kirkwood@nrc.gov);  
[sara.price@nrc.gov](mailto:sara.price@nrc.gov);  
[joseph.gilman@nrc.gov](mailto:joseph.gilman@nrc.gov);  
[karin.francis@nrc.gov](mailto:karin.francis@nrc.gov)

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory  
Commission  
Office of Commission Appellate  
Adjudication  
Mail Stop: 0-7H4M  
Washington, DC 20555-0001  
Email: [ocaamail@nrc.gov](mailto:ocaamail@nrc.gov)  
OGC Mail Center: Members of this  
office have received a copy of this filing

by EIE service.

Florida Power & Light Company  
700 Universe Blvd.  
Juno Beach, Florida 33408  
Mitchell S. Ross  
Vice President & General Counsel –  
Nuclear  
Email: [mitch.ross@fpl.com](mailto:mitch.ross@fpl.com)

Florida Power & Light Company  
801 Pennsylvania Ave. NW Suite 220  
Washington, DC 20004  
Steven C. Hamrick, Esq.  
Mitchell S. Ross  
Email: [steven.hamrick@fpl.com](mailto:steven.hamrick@fpl.com);  
[mitchell.ross@fpl.com](mailto:mitchell.ross@fpl.com)

Counsel for the Applicant  
Pillsbury, Winthrop, Shaw, Pittman,  
LLP  
2300 N Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20037-1122  
Alison M. Crane, Esq.  
Stefanie Nelson George, Esq.  
John H. O'Neill, Esq.  
Matias F. Travieso-Diaz, Esq.  
Maria Webb, Paralegal  
Email: [alison.crane@pillsburylaw.com](mailto:alison.crane@pillsburylaw.com);  
[stephanie.george@pillsburylaw.com](mailto:stephanie.george@pillsburylaw.com);  
[john.oneill@pillsburylaw.com](mailto:john.oneill@pillsburylaw.com);  
[matias.travieso-diaz@pillsburylaw.com](mailto:matias.travieso-diaz@pillsburylaw.com);  
[maria.webb@pillsburylaw.com](mailto:maria.webb@pillsburylaw.com);

Counsel for Mark Oncavage, Dan  
Kipnis, Southern Alliance for Clean  
Energy and National Parks  
Conservation  
Association Turner Environmental Law  
Clinic Emory University School of Law

1301 Clifton Rd. SE  
Atlanta, GA 30322  
Lawrence D. Sanders, Esq.  
Mindy Goldstein, Esq.  
Email: [lsande3@emory.edu](mailto:lsande3@emory.edu);  
[magolds@emory.edu](mailto:magolds@emory.edu)

Counsel for Mark Oncavage, Dan  
Kipnis,  
Southern Alliance for Clean Energy and  
National Parks Conservation  
Association  
Everglades Law Center, Inc.  
3305 College Avenue  
Ft. Lauderdale, Florida 33314  
Richard Grosso, Esq.  
Email: [richard@evergladeslaw.org](mailto:richard@evergladeslaw.org)

Counsel for the Village of Pinecrest  
Nabors, Giblin & Nickerson, P.A.  
1500 Mahan Drive, Suite 200  
Tallahassee, FL 32308  
William C. Garner, Esq.  
Gregory T. Stewart, Esq.  
Email: [bgarner@ngnlaw.com](mailto:bgarner@ngnlaw.com);  
[gstewart@ngnlaw.com](mailto:gstewart@ngnlaw.com)

Citizens Allied for Safe Energy, Inc.  
10001 SW 129 Terrace  
Miami, FL 33176  
Barry J. White  
Email: [bwtamia@bellsouth.net](mailto:bwtamia@bellsouth.net)

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Office of the Secretary of the  
Commission  
Mail Stop: O-16C1  
Washington, DC 20555-0001  
Email: [hearingdocket@nrc.gov](mailto:hearingdocket@nrc.gov)

Dated: August 11, 2011

/signed electronically by/

Barry J. White

Authorized Representative

Citizens Allied for Safe Energy, Inc.

10001 SW 129 Terrace

Miami, Florida 33176

Email: [bwtamia@bellsouth.net](mailto:bwtamia@bellsouth.net)