

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

BEFORE THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD PANEL

In the Matter of	)	
	)	
	)	
LUMINANT GENERATION CO. LLC	)	Docket Nos. 52-034 & 52-035
	)	
	)	
(Comanche Peak Nuclear Power Plant,	)	
Units 3 & 4)	)	

NRC STAFF'S ANSWER TO PETITIONERS' MOTION TO ADMIT NEW CONTENTION  
REGARDING THE SAFETY AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE NRC TASK  
FORCE REPORT ON THE FUKUSHIMA DAI-ICHI ACCIDENT

INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to 10 CFR § 2.309(h)(1), the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission ("NRC" or "Commission") Staff hereby responds to the motion to reopen the record to allow the admission of a proposed new contention based on the NRC Task Force 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")(ADAMS Accession No. ML111861807), filed August 11, 2011, with the Commission, by Public Citizen, the Sustainable Energy and Economic Development Coalition ("SEED Coalition"), and Lon Burnam (collectively, "Petitioners"). Motion to Reopen the Record and Admit Contention Regarding the Safety and Environmental Implications of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission Task Force Report on the Fukushima Dai-ichi Accident (August 11, 2011) ("Motion"); Contention Regarding NEPA Requirement to Address Safety and Environmental Implications of the Fukushima Task Force Report (August 11, 2011) ("Proposed Contention"). For the reasons set forth below, the Motion and Proposed Contention fail to meet the Commission's requirements for reopening the record or admitting a new contention. Therefore, the NRC Staff opposes the admission of the new contention.

## PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

On September 19, 2008, the Luminant Generation Company LLC (“Applicant”) submitted an application for combined licenses (COL) for two US-Advanced Pressurized Water Reactors (US-APWRs) to be located adjacent to the existing Comanche Peak Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2, near Glen Rose in Somervell County, Texas. Luminant Generation Company, LLC; Notice of Receipt and Availability of Application for a Combined License, 73 Fed. Reg. 66,276 (Nov. 7, 2008). The proposed units will be known as Comanche Peak Nuclear Power Plant, Units 3 & 4. See Comanche Peak Nuclear Power Plant, Units 3 & 4, COL Application, Part 1, Administrative and Financial Information, at 8 (Rev. 2) (June 28, 2011) (ML11186A867).

In response to the Notice of Hearing on the Application,<sup>1</sup> published on February 5, 2009, the Petitioners submitted a “Petition for Intervention and Request for Hearing” on April 6, 2009. On August 6, 2009, the Board issued a Memorandum and Order finding that Intervenors had established standing and proffered at least one admissible contention. *Luminant Generation Company, LLC* (Comanche Peak Nuclear Power Plant, Units 3 & 4), LBP-09-17, 70 NRC 311, 318 (2009). Currently, there are no admitted contentions and the Board has terminated the contested proceeding. *Luminant Generation Company, LLC* (Comanche Peak Nuclear Power Plant, Units 3 & 4), LBP-11-04, 73 NRC \_\_, \_\_ (Feb. 24, 2011) (slip op. at 40). On March 11, 2011, the Petitioners filed a “Petition for Review” of the Board’s decision<sup>2</sup> denying their contentions related to the Applicant’s compliance with 10 C.F.R. § 52.80(d) and 10 C.F.R. § 50.54(hh)(2). The petition for review is currently pending before the Commission.

Between April 14 -18, 2011, an “Emergency Petition to Suspend All Pending Reactor Licensing Decisions and Related Rulemaking Decisions Pending Investigation of Lessons Learned from Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear Power Station Accident” (Emergency Petition) was

---

<sup>1</sup> 74 Fed. Reg. 6177 (Feb. 5, 2009).

<sup>2</sup> *Luminant Generation Company, LLC* (Comanche Peak Nuclear Power Plant, Units 3 & 4), LBP-10-05, 71 NRC \_\_ (Mar. 11, 2010) (slip op.).

filed in various NRC proceedings before the Commission. During this time period, a declaration of Dr. Arjun Makhijani was also filed in various NRC proceedings to support the Emergency Petition. Declaration of Dr. Arjun Makhijani in Support of Emergency Petition to Suspend all Reactor Licensing Decisions and Related Rulemaking Decisions Pending Investigation of Lessons Learned from the Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear Power Station Accident (April 19, 2011) (ML1111107910) ("First Makhijani Declaration"). Neither the Emergency Petition nor the First Makhijani Declaration was ever filed in this proceeding, although this proceeding was listed in the caption and Robert Eye signed the Emergency Petition as Counsel for the Petitioners in this proceeding. The Staff and Applicant filed answers to the Emergency Petition on May 2, 2011. NRC Staff Answer to Emergency Petition to Suspend All Pending Reactor Licensing Decisions and Related Rulemaking Decisions Pending Investigation of Lessons Learned from Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear Power Station Accident (May 2, 2011); Luminant Generation Company LLC's Answer in Opposition to Emergency Petition to Suspend Licensing Proceedings (May 2, 2011). The Commission has not yet issued a ruling on the Emergency Petition.

On August 11, 2011, the Petitioners filed their Motion to reopen the record and admit their Proposed Contention, along with supporting declarations and a rulemaking petition. Declaration of Dr. Arjun Makhijani Regarding Safety and Environmental Significance of NRC Task Force Report Regarding Lessons Learned from Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear Power Station Accident (August 8, 2011) ("Second Makhijani Declaration"); Declaration of Standing by Tom Smith (August 11, 2011), Declaration of Standing by Karen Hadden (August 11, 2011), Declaration of Standing by Nita O'Neal (August 11, 2011), and Declaration of Standing by Lon Burnam (August 11, 2011) (collectively, "Standing Declarations"); Rulemaking Petition to Rescind Prohibition Against Consideration of Environmental Impacts of Severe Reactor and Spent Fuel Pool Accidents and Request to Suspend Licensing Decision (August 11, 2011) ("Rulemaking Petition"). On August 30, 2011, the Commission issued an Order referring the Petitioners' Motion and Proposed Contention to the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel

(ASLBP) for appropriate action. Order (Referring Motions to the ASLBP) (Aug. 30, 2011) (unpublished).

### LEGAL STANDARDS

The admissibility of new and amended contentions is governed by 10 C.F.R. § 2.309(f)(2) and 2.309(f)(1). New or amended contentions filed after the initial filing period may be admitted only with leave of the presiding officer if, in accordance with 10 C.F.R. § 2.309(f)(2), the contention meets the following requirements:

- (i) The information upon which the amended or new contention is based was not previously available;
- (ii) The information upon which the amended or new contention is based is materially different than information previously available; and
- (iii) The amended or new contention has been submitted in a timely fashion based on the availability of the subsequent information.

10 C.F.R. § 2.309(f)(2)(i)-(iii).

Additionally, a new or amended contention must also meet the general contention admissibility requirements of 10 C.F.R. § 2.309(f)(1). *Id.* In accordance with 10 C.F.R. § 2.309(f)(1), an admissible contention must:

- (i) Provide a specific statement of the issue of law or fact to be raised or controverted . . . ;
- (ii) Provide a brief explanation of the basis for the contention;
- (iii) Demonstrate that the issue raised in the contention is within the scope of the proceeding;
- (iv) Demonstrate that the issue raised in the contention is material to the findings the NRC must make to support the action that is involved in the proceeding;
- (v) Provide a concise statement of the alleged facts or expert opinions which support the requestor's/petitioner's position on the issue and on which the petitioner intends to rely at hearing, together with references to the specific sources and documents on which the requestor/petitioner intends to rely to support its position on the issue;

- (vi) . . . provide sufficient information to show that a genuine dispute exists with the applicant/licensee on a material issue of law or fact. This information must include references to specific portions of the application (including the applicant's environmental report and safety report) that the petitioner disputes and the supporting reasons for each dispute, or, if the petitioner believes that the application fails to contain information on a relevant matter as required by law, the identification of each failure and the supporting reasons for the petitioner's belief. . . .

10 C.F.R. § 2.309(f)(1)(i)-(vi). The Commission has emphasized that the rules on contention admissibility are “strict by design.” *Dominion Nuclear Connecticut, Inc.* (Millstone Nuclear Power Station, Units 2 and 3), CLI-01-24, 54 NRC 349, 358 (2001), *petition for reconsideration denied*, CLI-02-01, 55 NRC 1 (2002). Failure to comply with any of these requirements is grounds for the dismissal of a contention. *Private Fuel Storage, L.L.C.* (Independent Spent Fuel Storage Installation), CLI-99-10, 49 NRC 318, 325 (1999). “Mere ‘notice pleading’ does not suffice.” *Amergen Energy Co., LLC* (Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station), CLI-06-24, 64 NRC 111, 119 (2006) (internal quotation omitted).

Finally, a contention that does not qualify for admission as a new contention under § 2.309(f)(2) may still be admitted if it meets the provisions governing nontimely contentions set forth in 10 C.F.R. § 2.309(c)(1).<sup>3</sup> Pursuant to 10 C.F.R. § 2.309(c)(2), each of the factors is

---

<sup>3</sup> 10 C.F.R. § 2.309(c)(1) requires a balancing of the following factors to the extent that they apply to a particular nontimely filing:

- (i) Good cause, if any, for the failure to file on time;
- (ii) The nature of the requestor's/petitioner's right under the Act to be made a party to the proceeding;
- (iii) The nature and extent of the requestor's/petitioner's property, financial or other interest in the proceeding;
- (iv) The possible effect of any order that may be entered in the proceeding on the requestor's/petitioner's interest;
- (v) The availability of other means whereby the requestor's/petitioner's interest will be protected;
- (vi) The extent to which the requestor's/petitioner's interests will be represented by existing parties;
- (vii) The extent to which the requestor's/petitioner's participation will broaden the issues or delay the proceeding; and
- (viii) The extent to which the requestor's/petitioner's participation may reasonably be expected to assist in developing a sound record.

required to be addressed in the requestor's nontimely filing. The first factor, whether good cause exists for the failure to file on time, is the "most important" and entitled to the most weight. *Amergen Energy Co., LLC* (License Renewal for Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station), CLI-09-07, 69 NRC 235, 261 (2009). Where no showing of good cause for the lateness is tendered, "petitioner's demonstration on the other factors must be particularly strong." *Texas Utilities Electric Co.* (Comanche Peak Steam Electric Station, Units 1 & 2), CLI-92-12, 36 NRC 62, 73 (1992) (quoting *Duke Power Co.* (Perkins Nuclear Station, Units 1, 2 & 3), ALAB-431, 6 NRC 460, 462 (1977)).

## DISCUSSION

### I. The Petitioners Have Standing

A petitioner who is admitted as a party in one proceeding must re-establish standing once the original proceeding is dismissed—he may not simply rely on standing established in the prior proceeding. *Texas Utilities Electric Co.* (Comanche Peak Steam Electric Station, Unit 2), CLI-93-4, 37 NRC 156, 162-63 (1993). The NRC staff agrees that the Petitioners have satisfied the requirements for re-establishing standing. See Motion at 7 – 8; Standing Declarations.

### II. The Petitioners Have Not Met the Commission's Requirements for Reopening the Record or Admitting a Nontimely Contention

In their Motion to reopen the record in this proceeding and admit their new Proposed Contention, the Petitioners assert that the "Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for Combined Licenses (COLs) for Comanche Peak Units 3 and 4 (NUREG-1943) (August 2010)" ("FEIS") fails to address the "extraordinary environmental and safety implications of the findings and recommendations raised by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) in its, "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

---

10 C.F.R. § 2.309(c)(1)(i)-(viii).

Report”).” Motion at 1. The Petitioners also contend that reopening the record and admitting the new contention is necessary to ensure that the NRC “fulfills its nondiscretionary duty under the National Environmental Policy Act (“NEPA”) to consider the new and significant information set forth in the Task Force Report” before issuing COLs for Comanche Peak Units 3 and 4. *Id.* at 1-2.

The Commission has stated that a petitioner seeking to introduce a new contention after the record has been closed should “address the reopening standards contemporaneously with a late-filed intervention petition, which must satisfy the standards for both contention admissibility and late filing.” *Dominion Nuclear Conn., Inc.* (Millstone Nuclear Power Station, Unit 3), CLI-09-5, 69 NRC 115, 124 (2009). Section 2.326(a) of the Commission’s regulations set forth the reopening standards. Specifically, section 2.326(a) states that a motion to reopen a closed proceeding to consider additional evidence will not be granted unless the following criteria are satisfied:

- (1) The motion must be timely. However, an exceptionally grave issue may be considered in the discretion of the presiding officer even if untimely presented;
- (2) The motion must address a significant safety or environmental issue, and
- (3) The motion must demonstrate that a materially different result would be or would have been likely had the newly proffered evidence been considered initially.

10 CFR § 2.326(a). As set forth below, the Petitioners fail to meet the reopening standards.

The Commission has held that “the standard for admitting a contention after the record is closed is higher than for an ordinary late-filed contention.” *Private Fuel Storage, LLC* (Independent Spent Fuel Storage Installation), CLI-05-12, 61 NRC 345, 350 (2005). In the context of an environmental issue, the motion to reopen standard is analogous to the standard for requiring a supplemental EIS. See *Private Fuel Storage, LLC* (Independent Spent Fuel Storage Installation), CLI-06-3, 63 NRC 19, 27 (2006). The NRC staff must prepare a supplement to a final environmental impact statement if: “(1) [t]here are substantial changes in

the proposed action that are relevant to environmental concerns; or (2) [t]here are new and significant circumstances or information relevant to environmental concerns and bearing on the proposed action or its impacts.” 10 CFR § 51.92(a)(1)-(2). Any “new information must paint a ‘*seriously*’ different picture of the environmental landscape.” *PFS*, CLI-06-3, 63 NRC at 28, quoting *National Committee for the New River, Inc. v. Fed. Energy Regulatory Comm’n*, 373 F.3d 1323, 1330 (D.C. Cir. 2004) (emphasis in original).

The Petitioners do not meet the reopening standards outlined in § 2.326(a)(2)-(3) because their proffered contention does not address a significant environmental issue, nor does it demonstrate that a materially different result would be likely if the Petitioners’ new contention had been raised at the beginning of the proceeding. Moreover, the Petitioners have not demonstrated how the environmental impacts of the proposed action would be altered at all, much less how there are substantial changes in the proposed action or new and significant circumstances or information relevant to environmental concerns that have bearing on the proposed action. See 10 C.F.R. § 51.92(a)(1)-(2).

In their Motion, the Petitioners assert that the environmental issues raised in their contention are significant “and exceptionally grave because the Task Force questions the adequacy of the NRC’s current regulatory program to protect public health and safety and makes major recommendations for upgrades to the program.” Motion at 5. The Petitioners also assert that a materially different result would be likely if the NRC had considered the new information set forth in the Task Force Report. *Id.* at 5. The Petitioners assert that the Task Force Report recommends that severe accident mitigation alternatives (SAMAs) should be imposed as mandatory measures. *Id.* at 5. If SAMAs were imposed, the Petitioners assert that the environmental analysis would have to consider the implications of the Task Force’s conclusion that “compliance with current NRC safety standards does not adequately protect public health and safety from severe accidents and their environmental effects.” *Id.* The Petitioners also assert that if reactors are unable to comply with new mandatory requirements,

licenses may be denied and that the cost of adopting the recommendation may likely be significant. *Id.* at 5.

However, the Task Force Report specifically states that “in light of the low likelihood of an event beyond the design basis of a U.S. nuclear power plant and the current mitigation capabilities at those facilities . . . continued operation and continued licensing activities do not pose an imminent risk to the public health and safety.” Task Force Report at 18, 73. Moreover, the Task Force Report concludes that “the current regulatory approach and regulatory requirements continue to serve as a basis for the reasonable assurance of adequate protection of public health and safety until the [recommended actions] have been implemented.” *Id.* at 73. The Petitioners simply assert that the environmental implications of the Task Force Report should be considered without indicating what any of those environmental implications would actually be. Thus, the Petitioners do not raise a significant environmental issue in their motion because they have not shown that the current analysis contained in the FEIS is inadequate and would need to be supplemented.

The Petitioners’ claims that imposition of SAMAs may result in denial of licenses and higher costs similarly do not raise a significant environmental issue because they are based on an inaccurate premise, namely that the Task Force Report recommends imposition of SAMAs. As further discussed in Section III.D. of this Answer, the Task Force Report does not make such a recommendation. Moreover, even if additional measures were imposed, the Petitioners have not shown how the Applicant would be unable to comply with them, such that the Commission would deny the COLs the Applicant has applied for, or that the costs of compliance would be so great so as to materially alter the environmental impacts of Comanche Peak Units 3 and 4.

The Petitioners have failed to meet the reopening standards in § 2.326. Accordingly, the Petitioners’ late filed petition to intervene should be denied.

### III. The Petitioners Have Not Submitted an Admissible Contention

#### A. Proposed Contention:

The EIS for Comanche Peak Units 3 & 4 fails to satisfy the requirements of NEPA because it does not address new and significant environmental implications of the findings and recommendations raised by the NRC's Fukushima Task Force Report. As required by 10 C.F.R. § 51.92(a)(2) and 40 C.F.R. § 1502.9(c), these implications must be addressed in a supplemental Draft EIS.

Proposed Contention at 4.

According to the Petitioners, the Proposed Contention is based on a conclusion in the Task Force Report that the level of protection currently provided by NRC regulations is inadequate to ensure protection of public health, safety, and the environment. Proposed Contention at 2, 6; *see also* Second Makhijani Declaration ¶¶5, 11. From this starting point, the Petitioners argue that “[t]he conclusions and recommendations presented in the Task Force Report fully satisfy the two-pronged test under NEPA regulations and case law for ‘new and significant information’ whose environmental implications must be considered before the NRC may make a decision” on any new reactor licensing. Proposed Contention at 10. The Petitioners therefore claim that any conclusions in environmental documents associated with the Comanche Peak Units 3 & 4 COL application must be revisited, because compliance with NRC safety regulations is no longer sufficient to ensure that environmental impacts of accidents are acceptable. *Id.* at 11; *see also* Second Makhijani Declaration ¶ 11.

The Petitioners also make several distinct claims regarding both the content of the Task Force Report and the deficiencies they allege in environmental documents issued in COL proceedings. First, the Petitioners claim that new reactor environmental licensing documents do not adequately address the environmental analysis of design basis accidents, severe accidents, and severe accident mitigation alternatives (“SAMAs”). Proposed Contention at 11-13. Second, the Petitioners assert that the Task Force Report requires supplementation of environmental documents in the Comanche Peak Units 3 & 4 COL proceeding to address recommendations

related to seismic and flooding events. *Id.* at 13-14. Finally, the Petitioners argue that all twelve recommendations in the Task Force Report be considered in the Comanche Peak Units 3 & 4 environmental review before licensing decisions are made. *Id.* at 14-17.

As further discussed below, the Proposed Contention is barred to the extent that it challenges existing NRC safety regulations, is not supported by the Task Force Report with respect to severe accident analyses under NEPA, and includes several additional claims that are not supported by the Task Force Report. In addition, because the Comanche Peak Final EIS has been issued, a supplement to the EIS is not necessary unless the standards in 10 C.F.R. § 51.92(a) are satisfied. As the Commission has held, supplementation is not required unless the new information “present[s] a seriously different picture of the environmental impact of the proposed project from what was previously envisioned.” *Hydro Resources, Inc.* (P.O. Box 777, Crownpoint, NM 87313), CLI-06-29, 64 NRC 417, 419 (2006) (internal quotation marks omitted). The Petitioners come nowhere close to showing a genuine dispute over whether this high threshold has been met. For these reasons and others discussed below, the Proposed Contention fails to satisfy the contention pleading rules in 10 C.F.R. §§ 2.309 and 2.335 and should be rejected.

**B. To the Extent the Proposed Contention Challenges Existing Safety Regulations, It Is Barred by NRC Regulations**

The Proposed Contention is styled as a contention regarding both the safety and environmental implications of the Task Force Report. Proposed Contention at 1. According to the Petitioners, “[t]he NRC’s current regulatory scheme requires significant re-evaluation and revision in order to expand or upgrade the design basis for reactor safety as recommended by the Task Force Report.” *Id.* at 9. The Petitioners also challenge 10 C.F.R. §§ 52.47(a)(23) and 52.79(a)(38), apparently on the grounds that these regulations are subject to cost-benefit analysis. *Id.* at 8.

To the extent the Proposed Contention is intended to challenge existing NRC safety regulations, it is barred from consideration in adjudicatory proceedings by 10 C.F.R. § 2.335(a). Pursuant to this regulation, “no rule or regulation of the Commission, or any provision thereof . . . is subject to attack by way of discovery, proof, argument, or other means in any adjudicatory proceeding subject to this part.” 10 C.F.R. § 2.335(a). Petitioners seeking a waiver of this rule in a particular proceeding must meet the standards set forth in 10 C.F.R. § 2.335(b), something the Petitioners have not attempted here. For this reason, to the extent the Proposed Contention is meant as a challenge to the adequacy of current NRC safety regulations, it is not adjudicable in this proceeding and must be rejected.<sup>4</sup>

C. The Proposed Contention is Not Supported by the Task Force Report with Respect to Severe Accidents

The Petitioners’ overarching argument, that the Task Force Report demonstrates the inadequacy of current NRC safety regulations and therefore of all related environmental reviews, is not supported by the Task Force Report itself. The Petitioners assert that their Proposed Contention is based on a conclusion in the Task Force Report that the level of protection currently provided by NRC regulations is inadequate to ensure protection of public health, safety, and the environment, and that the environmental implications of the report’s recommendations must be considered before any new reactor licensing decision. Proposed Contention at 2; see *a/so* Second Makhijani Declaration ¶ 11. The Task Force does not make this conclusion; rather, it states that “continued operation and continued licensing activities do not pose an imminent risk to the public health and safety and are not inimical to the common defense and security.” Task Force Report at 18. The Task Force notes that the level of safety associated with adequate protection of public health and safety has improved over time and

---

<sup>4</sup> The NRC Staff notes that a Petition for Rulemaking under 10 C.F.R. § 2.802 has also been submitted in response to the Task Force Report. To the extent any interested person desires a specific change to NRC regulations, filing a petition for rulemaking is the correct procedural approach. The Petitioners, themselves, recognize that some of the issues they raise may be more appropriate for generic resolution by rulemaking, Proposed Contention at 4, and the Petition for Rulemaking provides further indication that the Proposed Contention is intended in part to challenge Commission rules.

should continue to improve “supported by new scientific information, technologies, methods, and operating experience,” but does not state that the current level of protection is inadequate. *Id.* Furthermore, the Task Force Report does not take any position on NRC’s environmental reviews. It is well established that a document cited by a petitioner as the supporting basis for a contention is subject to scrutiny, both for what it does and does not say. When a report is the central support for a contention, the contents of that report in its entirety are before the Board and subject to the Board’s scrutiny. *See, e.g., Yankee Atomic Electric Co.* (Yankee Nuclear Power Station), LBP-96-2, 43 NRC 61, 90 (1996); *rev’d in part on other grounds*, CLI-96-7, 43 NRC 235 (1996). *See also Southern Nuclear Operating Co.* (Early Site Permit for the Vogtle ESP Site), LBP-07-3, 65 NRC 237, 254 (2007) (“the material provided in support of a contention will be carefully examined by the Board to confirm that on its face it does supply an adequate basis for the contention”). Because this central element of the Petitioners’ argument is not supported by the document that serves as the grounds for filing their Proposed Contention, the Petitioners have not provided a sufficient basis for the contention or sufficient information to show that a genuine dispute with the Applicant exists. One of the most important claims made in the Proposed Contention therefore fails to meet the requirements of 10 C.F.R. § 2.309(f)(1)(ii) and (vi).

The Petitioners appear to believe that the Task Force Report calls for a change to the way accidents are treated in environmental documents. *See* Proposed Contention at 10-13. The Task Force does discuss the distinction between design basis accidents and severe or beyond design basis accidents. Task Force Report at 17-22. It suggests creating a new category of events designated as “extended design-basis” and including a number of existing regulatory requirements under this heading. *Id.* at 20.

The Petitioners appear to have interpreted this section of the Task Force Report as support for a claim either that severe accidents are not currently addressed in NRC environmental reviews, or that the way they are addressed must be changed. *See* Proposed

Contention at 10-13. To the extent that the Petitioners intend the former interpretation, they are simply incorrect. The Environmental Standard Review Plan (“ESRP”), which provides guidance for all NRC COL reviews, includes instructions for NRC staff reviewers to consider the environmental impacts of both design-basis accidents and severe accidents. See *generally* NUREG-1555, *Environmental Standard Review Plan*, Chapter 7 (Oct. 1999). The Comanche Peak Units 3 & 4 FEIS addresses the environmental impacts of design basis accidents at 5-68, 5-96 through 5-100, 5-115, 5-124, 7-31, 7-32, 9-65, 9-92, and 9-115, and of severe accidents at 5-96, 5-97, and 5-100 through 5-110. A petitioner’s imprecise reading of a reference document does not create a contention suitable for litigation. *Georgia Institute of Technology* (Georgia Tech Research Reactor, Atlanta, Ga.), LBP-95-6, 41 NRC 281, 300 (1995). This portion of the Proposed Contention, like the previous portion, fails to demonstrate the existence of a genuine dispute with the Applicant, and is therefore inadmissible pursuant to 10 C.F.R. § 2.309(f)(1)(vi).

D. The Challenge to the Adequacy of the Comanche Peak Severe Accident Review is Unsupported by the Task Force Report and Therefore Untimely

To the extent that the Petitioners intend instead to question the adequacy of the Comanche Peak Units 3 & 4 FEIS with respect to its analysis of the environmental consequences of accidents, the Petitioners have not cited any part of the Task Force Report in support of their claims. See Proposed Contention at 11-12. Rather, this portion of their argument is based on assertions by the Petitioners’ expert, Dr. Arjun Makhijani, that

a major overarching step that needs to be taken is to integrate into the design basis for NRC safety requirements an expanded list of severe accidents and events, based on current scientific understanding and evaluations. This would ensure that potential mitigation measures are evaluated on the basis of whether they are needed for safety and not whether they are merely desirable. Should the NRC fail to incorporate an expanded list of severe accident requirements in the design basis of reactors, then a conclusion that the design provides for adequate protection to the public against severe accident risks could not be justified.

Second Makhijani Declaration ¶ 7. The Petitioners rephrase Dr. Makhijani’s assertions as a claim that the Task Force recommends “the incorporation of accidents formerly classified as

‘severe’ or ‘beyond design basis’ into the design basis.” Proposed Contention at 11. Based on this rephrasing, the Petitioners argue that this recommendation requires the re-evaluation of the Comanche Peak Units 3 & 4 FEIS environmental conclusions. *Id.* at 11-12.

Neither Dr. Makhijani’s Declaration nor the Proposed Contention text cites to the Task Force Report in support of this proposition. Indeed, both ignore contrary statements within the Task Force Report itself, including the statement that “[t]he Task Force envisions a framework in which the current design-basis requirements (i.e., for anticipated operational occurrences and postulated accidents) would remain largely unchanged” and the proposal to establish a new “extended design-basis” category for both current beyond design-basis regulatory requirements and any future rules that may be added. Task Force Report at 21.

With respect to this portion of the Proposed Contention, the Petitioners’ assertions are untimely in that they are not based on any new information contained in the Task Force Report and could have been filed on a number of occasions prior to that report’s publication. Related claims were, in fact, made in Dr. Makhijani’s April 2011 declaration accompanying the Emergency Petition currently pending before the Commission. See First Makhijani Declaration ¶¶ 16, 33-35. Any specific challenges to the Applicant’s environmental report or the FEIS could have been raised at any time following publication of those documents. NRC regulations permit the filing of new or amended contentions

only with leave of the presiding officer upon a showing that (i) [t]he information upon which the amended or new contention is based was not previously available; (ii) [t]he information upon which the amended or new contention is based is materially different than information previously available; and (iii) [t]he amended or new contention has been submitted in a timely fashion based on the availability of the subsequent information.

10 C.F.R. § 2.309(f)(2). The Petitioners have not cited to any allegedly new information in the Task Force Report that supports their argument regarding “the incorporation of accidents formerly classified as ‘severe’ or ‘beyond design basis’ into the design basis,” and this portion of their new contention is therefore untimely. See Proposed Contention at 11.

The Petitioners have also failed to show good cause for their untimely filing, as required by 10 C.F.R. § 2.309(c)(1)(i). Good cause for late filing is the most important factor to consider when evaluating whether an untimely filing will be accepted, and failure to meet this factor requires a compelling showing regarding the other factors. See *Commonwealth Edison Co.* (Braidwood Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2), CLI-86-8, 23 NRC 241, 244 (1986); *Long Island Lighting Co.* (Shoreham Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1), ALAB-743, 18 NRC 387, 397 (1983). Of the remaining factors in 10 C.F.R. § 2.309(c)(1), (vii) and (viii) also disfavor the Petitioners, as the issues they raise would broaden the proceeding, result in delays, and not contribute to a sound record. The other factors favor the Petitioners or are neutral. However, given the importance of 10 C.F.R. § 2.309(c)(1)(i), (vii), and (viii), this untimely portion of the Proposed Contention should not be entertained.

The Proposed Contention also fails to supply an adequate basis or demonstrate the existence of a genuine dispute with the Applicant on a material issue of law or fact. In part, this failure may be related to the Petitioners' assumption, evident throughout their pleading, that only design-basis accidents and not severe accidents are associated with mandatory safety regulations. See Proposed Contention at 2, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, and 13. The Task Force Report itself notes the potential for confusion associated with this issue, and observes that

the phrase "beyond design basis" is vague, sometimes misused, and often misunderstood. Several elements of the phrase contribute to these misunderstandings. *First, some beyond-design-basis considerations have been incorporated into the requirements and therefore directly affect reactor designs.* The phrase is therefore inconsistent with the normal meaning of the words. In addition, there are many other beyond-design-basis considerations that are not requirements. The phrase therefore fails to convey the importance of the requirements to which it refers.

Task Force Report at 19 (emphasis added). The Task Force Report makes recommendations regarding the a new regulatory framework for mandatory requirements related to beyond design-basis considerations, including a terminology change intended to clarify the nature of these requirements, but does not propose changes to current design-basis requirements. *Id.* at

20-21. As noted above, a petitioner's imprecise reading of a reference document does not create a contention suitable for litigation. *Georgia Tech*, LBP-95-6, 41 NRC at 300. The Petitioners' arguments related to this issue therefore fail to provide an adequate basis for an admissible contention, in violation of 10 C.F.R. § 2.309(f)(1)(ii), or to demonstrate the existence of a material dispute as required by 10 C.F.R. § 2.309(f)(1)(vi).

E. The Discussion of SAMAs is Not Supported by the Task Force Report

The Proposed Contention also includes an argument related to SAMAs, which are considered in NRC environmental reviews. See, e.g., *Comanche Peak Units 3 & 4 FEIS* at 5-107, 5-109, 5-110. According to the Petitioners, the Task Force Report includes a recommendation that all SAMAs be incorporated into the set of features required in all nuclear power plants "*without regard to their cost* as fundamentally required for all NRC standards that set requirements for adequate protection of health and safety." Proposed Contention at 13 (emphasis in original). Neither the Task Force Report nor the declaration submitted in support of the Proposed Contention contains any statement to that effect; further, as noted in Sections III.B. and C. above, the Task Force Report makes no reference to SAMAs or any other portion of NRC's environmental reviews. Because neither the Task Force Report nor the declaration submitted with the contention contains such a statement, this portion of the Proposed Contention fails to satisfy the requirements of both 10 C.F.R. § 2.309(f)(1)(v), which requires factual or expert support for a contention, and 10 C.F.R. § 2.309(f)(1)(vi), which requires a demonstration of a genuine dispute with the Applicant on a material issue of law or fact.

The recommendations in the Task Force Report, were they to be adopted, would have no impact on the nature of SAMA analysis. SAMA analyses, which are related to the probabilistic risk assessment (PRA) requirement of 10 C.F.R. § 50.34(f)(1)(i) and include cost-benefit analysis by definition, are intended "to review and evaluate plant-design alternatives that could significantly reduce the radiological risk from a severe accident." See ESRP at 7.3-1 to 7.3-5. As the Commission has stated, SAMAs are safety enhancements intended to reduce the

risk of severe accidents. *Entergy Nuclear Generation Co. and Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc.* (Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station), CLI-10-11, 71 NRC 287, 290-91 (2010). A SAMA analysis examines the extent to which implementation of the SAMA would decrease the probability-weighted consequences of the analyzed severe accident sequences. *Id.* at 291. “Significantly, NRC SAMA analyses are not a substitute for, and do not represent, the NRC NEPA analysis of potential impacts of severe accidents.” *Id.* at 316. Rather, SAMA analyses are rooted in a cost-beneficial assessment:

SAMA analysis is used for determining whether particular SAMAs would sufficiently reduce risk – e.g., by reducing frequency of core damage or frequency of containment failure – for the SAMA to be cost-effective to implement. The SAMA analysis therefore is a [PRA] analysis. If the cost of implementing a particular SAMA is greater than its estimated benefit, the SAMA is not considered cost-beneficial to implement.

*Id.* at 291. For a SAMA analysis, the “goal is *only* to determine what safety enhancements are cost-effective to implement.” *Id.* at 317(emphasis added). A SAMA analysis, including cost-benefit considerations, is specifically required by NRC regulations governing the environmental review of standard design certification applications. See 10 C.F.R. § 51.55(a). Design features required by safety regulations are not subject to SAMA analysis in the environmental review, even if they are related to severe accidents, because the SAMA analysis only considers mitigation *alternatives*, that is, features that are not already incorporated into the design.

In making their argument, the Petitioners appear to merge concepts related to mandatory safety regulations under 10 C.F.R. Parts 50 and 52 with the SAMA analysis process. As noted above, the Petitioners incorrectly allege that 10 C.F.R. §§ 52.47(a)(23) and 52.79(a)(38) are subject to cost-benefit analysis, a proposition they support with citations to discussions related to the SAMA analysis for the AP1000 design certification rule and not with any references to NRC safety regulations or the Task Force Report. Proposed Contention at 8. Furthermore, the Petitioners assert that “the Task Force effectively recommends a complete overhaul of the NRC’s system for mitigating severe accidents through consideration of SAMAs.

*Id.* at 11. According to the Petitioners, the NRC's current strategy related to severe accidents is limited to the SAMA analysis prepared as part of the environmental review and any voluntary measures adopted at a specific facility. *Id.*

In so arguing, the Petitioners ignore those regulations mentioned in the Task Force Report that do impose mandatory safety requirements related to severe accidents, and which the Task Force identifies as elements to be incorporated into their proposed "extended design-basis" regulatory framework. Task Force Report at 20-21. These include the station blackout rule in 10 C.F.R. § 50.63, the rules governing anticipated transient without scram in 10 C.F.R. § 50.62, the maintenance rule in 10 C.F.R. § 50.65, the aircraft impact rule in 10 C.F.R. § 50.150, the rule for protection against beyond design-basis fires and explosions in 10 C.F.R. § 50.54(hh), and others. *Id.* at 20. Furthermore, the Petitioners ignore the Task Force's observation that 10 C.F.R. §§ 52.47(a)(23), which applies to design certifications, and 52.79(a)(38), which applies to COLs, have "clearly established . . . defense-in-depth severe accident requirements for new reactors, . . . thus bringing unity and completeness to the defense-in-depth concept." *Id.* By disregarding these regulatory requirements and focusing on the cost-benefit analysis conducted as part of the SAMA review in the EIS, the Petitioners misunderstand the NRC's current approach to severe accidents, as well as the Task Force's recommendations.

To the extent Petitioners are using the term "SAMA" as shorthand for new design features they wish to see implemented at nuclear facilities, the correct procedural option is to file a Petition for Rulemaking under 10 C.F.R. § 2.802 rather than contentions in individual proceedings. The Petitioners, themselves, concede that some of the issues they raise may be resolved more appropriately by rulemaking than in site-specific proceedings. Proposed Contention at 3-4. The Petitioners have not, however, identified any such feature or features here.

The possibility that the Petitioners are using the term “SAMA” outside its usual NEPA context may be the reason they assert that certain mandatory safety regulations are “subject to cost-benefit analysis.” See Proposed Contention at 8. As stated above, SAMA analyses conducted pursuant to NEPA use cost-benefit analyses to evaluate potential design alternatives for use at specific facilities. As discussed in Section III.C, safety regulations in 10 C.F.R. Parts 50 and 52 do not, regardless of whether they apply to design-basis or severe accident phenomena.<sup>5</sup> Whatever the Petitioners’ intent in using the “SAMA” terminology, however, nothing in this portion of their argument meets the requirements of 10 C.F.R. § 2.309(f)(1).

F. Assertions Related to the Alternatives Analysis in the EIS are Also Unsupported by the Task Force Report and Do Not Include an Admissible Contention

The Petitioners’ final NEPA-related claim is that making SAMAs mandatory would affect the outcome of NRC’s environmental reviews in two ways. First, the Petitioners argue that making SAMAs mandatory would improve plant safety. Proposed Contention at 12. Second, the Petitioners assert that imposing new mandatory safety features would raise the cost of new reactors and could affect the alternatives analysis in the FEIS. *Id.*; see also Second Makhijani Declaration ¶¶ 13-24. According to the Petitioners, “these costs may be significant, showing

---

<sup>5</sup> It appears that the Petitioners have drawn incorrect inferences from *Union of Concerned Scientists v. NRC*, which they cite in their pleading. Proposed Contention at 9, citing 824 F.2d 108, 120 (D.C. Cir., 1987). As stated in this case, the AEA

prohibits the Commission from considering costs in setting the level of adequate protection and requires the Commission to impose backfits, regardless of cost, on any plant that fails to meet this level. The Act allows the Commission to consider costs only in deciding whether to establish or whether to enforce through backfitting safety requirements that are not necessary to provide adequate protection.

824 F.2d at 119-20. This distinction, which relates to NRC decisions about making new regulations and applying them to existing licensees by imposing a backfit, does not open the door to the use of cost-benefit analysis by license applicants with respect to safety features required by current mandatory safety rules. The distinction between design-basis and beyond design-basis phenomena, which the Petitioners consider central to their argument, therefore has no connection to the question of whether a given safety feature is mandatory or not.

that other alternatives such as the no-action alternative and other alternative electricity production sources may be more attractive.” *Id.*

The first of these claims does nothing to invalidate the analysis in the Comanche Peak Units 3 & 4 FEIS. If additional safety measures were to be imposed on reactors for any reason, the result would likely be to lower accident risks and therefore reduce accident impacts below those stated in the FEIS. Any environmental analysis carried out under the current regulations would therefore be conservative.

The second claim states what appears to be the essence of the Petitioners’ NEPA contention, namely that the alternative analysis in the Comanche Peak Units 3 & 4 FEIS is inadequate. If this is intended as the core of the Proposed Contention, then the proposed contention as a whole is untimely for the reasons discussed in Section III.C above. As in that section, the argument that increased costs for nuclear facilities will alter the alternatives analysis in environmental reviews for new reactors has been submitted previously in connection with the Emergency Petition currently pending before the Commission. See First Makhijani Declaration ¶ 35. Additionally, contentions challenging the alternatives analysis in the Comanche Peak Units 3 & 4 COL application could have been filed at any time since the application became available. This portion of the Proposed Contention should therefore be rejected for timeliness reasons alone.

In addition to the timeliness issue, the Proposed Contention also fails to meet the pleading requirements of 10 C.F.R. § 2.309(f)(1). The text of the Proposed Contention does not mention specific recommendations in the Task Force Report or raise a challenge to any portion of the Comanche Peak Units 3 & 4 COL application. The accompanying declaration does list a number of specific items that, according to Dr. Makhijani, are likely to substantially increase the cost of nuclear reactors in general. Second Makhijani Declaration ¶¶ 13-24. Many of these are clearly inapplicable to the Comanche Peak Units 3 & 4 proceeding in that they recommend specific upgrades to the existing reactor fleet rather than any changes related to new reactors.

See *id.* ¶¶ 15, 19, 21, 22, & 23. Others, such as a recommendation to review design certifications with respect to station blackout and spent fuel pool issues, are not drawn from the Task Force Report directly, but rather represent Dr. Makhijani's inferences. See *id.* ¶ 20. Even with respect to the others, however, Dr. Makhijani makes no attempt to relate his assertions to the Comanche Peak Units 3 & 4 FEIS alternatives analysis, and merely asserts that significantly increased costs are likely. Second Makhijani Declaration ¶¶ 9, 10, 13-24. The Petitioners do not focus the claims made in Dr. Makhijani's declaration, which is extremely broad and has been filed in multiple proceedings, on any specific alleged defect in the Comanche Peak Units 3 & 4 COL application. For these reasons, this portion of the Proposed Contention fails to meet the basis requirement of 10 C.F.R. § 2.309(f)(1)(ii), or the requirements in 10 C.F.R. § 2.309(f)(1)(v) - (vi) that petitioners provide supporting information to show a genuine dispute with the applicant on a material issue of law or fact.

In addition, the Petitioners' assertions regarding the proposed reactors' costs fail to meet the materiality requirements of 10 C.F.R. § 2.309(f)(1)(iv) and (vi) because reactor costs are not material to the Comanche Peak Units 3 & 4 environmental review. In the *Summer* COL proceeding, the Commission held that contentions related to reactor costs "were potentially relevant only if an environmentally preferable alternative had been identified." See *South Carolina Electric & Gas Co. & South Carolina Public Service Authority (Also Referred to as Santee Cooper)* (Virgil C. Summer Nuclear Station, Units 2 and 3), CLI-10-21, 72 NRC \_\_\_, \_\_\_ (Aug. 27, 2010) (slip op. at 4). The Commission provided the basis for this holding in a previous decision in the same proceeding:

[N]either NEPA nor any other statute gives us the authority to reject an applicant's proposal solely because an alternative might prove less costly financially. Monetary considerations come into play in only the opposite fashion — i.e., if an alternative to the applicant's proposal is environmentally preferable, then we must determine whether the environmental benefits conferred by that alternative are worthwhile enough to outweigh any additional cost needed to achieve them.

*South Carolina Electric & Gas Co. & South Carolina Public Service Authority (Also Referred to as Santee Cooper)* (Virgil C. Summer Nuclear Station, Units 2 and 3), CLI-10-1, 71 NRC 1, 23-24 (2010) (quoting *Consumers Power Co.* (Midland Plant, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-458, 7 NRC 155, 162 (1978)). In *Summer*, the possibility of an environmentally preferable alternative remained only if the petitioners' alternatives contention was admissible, and the Commission therefore stated that should the licensing board reject this alternatives contention, then it must also reject the petitioners' cost-related contentions. *Summer*, CLI-10-21, 72 NRC at \_\_\_\_ (slip op. at 4). In the instant proceeding, the FEIS analyzes alternatives and concludes that none of them are environmentally preferable. See Comanche Peak Units 3 & 4 FEIS at 9-6 through 9-33. In addition, there are no pending or admitted alternatives contentions in this proceeding. Therefore, the Petitioners' assertions regarding reactors costs are not material to this proceeding and do not form an admissible basis for their proposed contention. See 10 C.F.R. § 2.309(f)(1)(iv), (vi).

G. The Petitioners' Further Assertions Related to Environmental Implications of the Task Force Report are Unsupported and Inadmissible

The Petitioners' further assertions that the Task Force Report requires supplementation of environmental documents in the Comanche Peak Units 3 & 4 COL proceeding to address recommendations related to seismic and flooding events also does not accurately reflect the Task Force Report's contents. The Petitioners cite portions of the Task Force Report that recommend existing licensees reevaluate seismic and flooding hazards at their sites and make any necessary changes to structures, systems, and components that are important to safety. Proposed Contention at 13-14, citing Task Force Report at 29-30. The Petitioners conclude that, as a consequence of this recommendation, the environmental documents in the Comanche Peak Units 3 & 4 COL proceedings are incomplete and require supplementation. *Id.* However, the Task Force Report states clearly that all current design certification and COL applicants address seismic and flooding issues adequately under existing regulations and guidance. Task

Force Report at 71. As noted in Section III.B. above, a referenced document may be scrutinized both for what it does and what it does not say. *Yankee Atomic*, LBP-96-2, 43 NRC at 90. Thus, this portion of the contention is not supported by fact or expert opinion and fails to demonstrate the existence of a genuine dispute, in contravention of the requirements of 10 C.F.R. § 2.309(f)(1)(v) and (vi).

Finally, the assertion that all twelve of the task force's recommendations must be addressed in environmental documents prior to COL issuance is not supported by the report itself. As stated previously, the Task Force Report makes no mention of environmental reviews. It also recommends specific strategies for addressing its recommendations in the safety reviews of design certification and COL applications. Task Force Report at 71-72. The Petitioners do not address this portion of the report, which specifically states that not all recommendations related to the existing reactor fleet apply to new reactors. This portion of the Proposed Contention, like the previous portions, therefore also fails to satisfy the requirements of 10 C.F.R. § 2.309(f)(1)(v) and (vi).

### CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, the NRC staff submits that the Petitioners have not met the Commission's requirements under 10 C.F.R. § 2.326 for reopening the record, and that the Petitioners have not met the Commission's contention admissibility requirements under 10 C.F.R. §§ 2.309(c), 2.309(f)(1)(ii),(iv), (v), and (vi), and 2.335. Accordingly, the Petitioners' Proposed Contention should be dismissed.

**/Signed (electronically) by/**

Susan H. Vrahoretis  
Counsel for NRC Staff  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Mail Stop O-15 D21  
Washington, DC 20555-0001  
(301) 415-4075  
Susan.Vrahoretis@nrc.gov

Dated at Rockville, Maryland  
this 6th day of September, 2011

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

BEFORE THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD PANEL

In the Matter of )  
)  
)  
LUMINANT GENERATION CO. LLC ) Docket Nos. 52-034 & 52-035  
)  
)  
(Comanche Peak Nuclear Power Plant, )  
Units 3 & 4) )

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that copies of the NRC STAFF'S ANSWER TO PETITIONERS' MOTION TO ADMIT NEW CONTENTION REGARDING THE SAFETY AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE NRC TASK FORCE REPORT ON THE FUKUSHIMA DAI-ICHI ACCIDENT have been served upon the following persons by Electronic Information Exchange this 6<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2011:

Chief Administrative Judge  
E. Roy Hawkins  
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel  
Mail Stop – T-3 F23  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20555-0001

Office of Commission Appellate  
Adjudication  
Mail Stop O-16C1  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC 20555-0001  
E-mail:OCAAmail@nrc.gov

Steven P. Frantz  
Jonathan M. Rund  
Martin J. O'Neill  
Stephen J. Burdick  
Timothy P. Matthews  
Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP  
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20004  
Phone: 202-739-3000  
Fax: 202-739-3001  
E-mail: sfrantz@morganlewis.com  
jrund@morganlewis.com  
martin.o'neill@morganlewis.com  
sburdick@morganlewis.com  
tmatthews@morganlewis.com

Office of the Secretary  
ATTN: Docketing and Service  
Mail Stop: O-16C1  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC 20555-0001  
E-mail: HEARINGDOCKET@nrc.gov

Robert V. Eye  
Kauffman & Eye  
Suite 202  
112 SW 6th Ave.  
Topeka KS 66603  
bob@kauffmaneye.com

- 2 -

**/Signed (electronically) by/**  
Susan H. Vrahoretis  
Counsel for NRC Staff  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Mail Stop O-15 D21  
Washington, DC 20555-0001  
(301) 415-4075  
Susan.Vrahoretis@nrc.gov

Dated at Rockville, Maryland  
this 6th day of September, 2011

- 2 -