

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

Before Administrative Judges:

Alex S. Karlin, Chairman  
Dr. Anthony J. Baratta  
Dr. Randall J. Charbeneau

In the Matter of

PROGRESS ENERGY FLORIDA, INC.

(Levy County Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2)

Docket Nos. 52-029-COL, 52-030-COL

ASLBP No. 09-879-04-COL-BD01

March 19, 2012

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

(Ruling on Motion for Leave to File Proposed Contentions 14 and 14A)

On February 13, 2012, the Green Party of Florida, the Ecology Party of Florida, and the Nuclear Information and Resource Service (collectively “Intervenors”) filed a motion for leave to file a new contention, denominated as Contention 14 or C14.<sup>1</sup> In the alternative, the Intervenors asked that the same contention (strangely, now denominated Contention 14A or C14A) be admitted but held in abeyance until the issuance of the record of decision on the final environmental impact statement (FEIS) on the proposed new nuclear reactors. Id. at 5. On March 9, 2012, Progress Energy Florida, Inc. (Applicant) and the NRC Staff filed answers opposing the motion.<sup>2</sup> On March 16, 2012, the Intervenors filed a reply. C14 Intervenors’ Reply to Answers from Staff and Applicant (Mar. 16, 2012) (Reply).

For the following reasons, the motion is denied.

---

<sup>1</sup> Motion for Leave to File Contention 14: Proposed Levy County Site for Two AP1000 Reactors Does Not Comply with Existing State and Federal Law (Feb. 13, 2012) (Motion).

<sup>2</sup> Progress Energy’s Answer Opposing Joint Intervenors’ Motion to Admit Proposed Contentions 14 and 14A (Mar. 9, 2012); NRC Staff Answer to Joint Intervenors’ Motion for Leave to File New Contention 14 (Mar. 9, 2012).

First, the motion does not comply with the certification requirement set forth in 10 C.F.R. § 2.323(b) (“A motion must be rejected if it does not include a certification by the attorney or representative . . . that the movant has made a sincere effort to contact other parties in the proceeding and resolve the issue(s) raised in the motion, and that the movant’s efforts to resolve the issue(s) have been unsuccessful.”). The Board reminded the parties of this requirement in our first prehearing conference, Tr. at 449-50, and incorporated this requirement into the initial scheduling order (ISO). LBP-09-22, 70 NRC 640, 649 (2009). The consultation requirements are designed to avoid unnecessary briefing, litigation, and cost. As this adjudication approaches the evidentiary hearing stage, it is even more important that all parties comply with the consultation requirements specified in 10 C.F.R. § 2.323(b) and the ISO.

Second, the motion for leave to file the new contention(s) is denied because it does not meet the criteria of 10 C.F.R. § 2.309. Specifically, the motion and proposed C14/14A are untimely under 10 C.F.R. § 2.309(f)(2)(iii), and the Intervenors have not justified these nontimely filings under 10 C.F.R. § 2.309(c).

As the Intervenors acknowledge, the motion for leave to file C14/14A does not satisfy the timeliness criterion of 10 C.F.R. § 2.309(f)(2)(iii). Motion at 4. The Intervenors admit that the proposed new contention(s) are based on State and Federal statutes that “have been ‘on the books’ for twenty years.” *Id.* The fact that, subjectively, the Intervenors only recently became aware of this information does not make the motion timely.<sup>3</sup> Thus, the motion and C14/14A cannot be admitted under 10 C.F.R. § 2.309(f)(2).

Given that the Intervenors admitted that the motion is untimely under 10 C.F.R. § 2.309(f)(2)(iii), they could have attempted to justify the admission of C14/14A under the

---

<sup>3</sup> See LBP-09-10, 70 NRC 51, 142 (2009); Memorandum and Order (Denying Contention 12A) (Mar. 29, 2011) at 10 (unpublished).

balancing test specified in 10 C.F.R. § 2.309(c). We have repeatedly reminded the Intervenors of this “good cause” alternative. See LBP-09-10, 70 NRC at 138; LBP-09-22, 70 NRC at 647. But the motion does not even attempt to address this option. And the reply cavalierly suggests that “dumb ignorance” constitutes good cause. Reply at 16. Upon examination of this record, we see no reason to think that the motion meets the balancing test of 10 C.F.R. § 2.309(c) or that C14/14A should be admitted as a nontimely contention under this regulation.

Finally, we note that the Intervenors request that we admit C14A and hold it in abeyance until the NRC issues the record of decision on the FEIS. We have just denied the admission of C14 and C14A. Accordingly, we see no reason to reverse ourselves and admit the contention (and hold it in abeyance). This part of the Intervenors’ motion is denied as moot.<sup>4</sup>

Any party aggrieved by this Order may file a petition for interlocutory review by the Commission in accordance with the provisions of 10 C.F.R. § 2.341(f)(2). Any such petition for review must be filed within fifteen (15) days of service of this Memorandum and Order.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

THE ATOMIC SAFETY  
AND LICENSING BOARD

*/RA/*

---

Alex S. Karlin, Chairman  
ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE

*/RA/*

---

Dr. Anthony J. Baratta  
ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE

*/RA/*

---

Dr. Randall Charbeneau  
ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE

Rockville, Maryland  
March 19, 2012

---

<sup>4</sup> Given that the Intervenors have failed to satisfy the essential prerequisites of 10 C.F.R. § 2.309(f)(2)(iii) or 10 C.F.R. § 2.309(c), it is unnecessary for the Board to determine whether the allegations contained in C14/14A are within the scope of this proceeding.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

In the Matter of )  
 )  
PROGRESS ENERGY FLORIDA, INC. ) Docket Nos. 52-029-COL  
 ) and 52-030-COL  
 (Levy County Nuclear Power Plant )  
 Units 1 and 2) )  
 )  
 (Combined License) )

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that copies of the foregoing MEMORANDUM AND ORDER (RULING ON MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE PROPOSED CONTENTIONS 14 AND 14A) have been served upon the following persons by Electronic Information Exchange.

Office of Commission Appellate  
Adjudication  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Mail Stop: O-16C1  
Washington, DC 20555-0001  
E-mail: [ocaamail@nrc.gov](mailto:ocaamail@nrc.gov)

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

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

Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw Pittman, LLP  
2300 N. Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20037-1122  
Counsel for Progress Energy Florida, Inc.  
John H. O'Neill, Esq.

Alex S. Karlin, Chair  
Administrative Judge  
E-mail: [ask2@nrc.gov](mailto:ask2@nrc.gov)

Alison Crane, Esq.  
Michael G. Lepre, Esq.  
Jason P. Parker, Esq.  
Stefanie Nelson George, Esq.  
Kimberly Harshaw, Esq.

Anthony J. Baratta  
Administrative Judge  
E-mail: [Anthony.baratta@nrc.gov](mailto:Anthony.baratta@nrc.gov)

Stephen Markus  
E-mail:

Randall J. Charbeneau  
Administrative Judge  
E-mail: [Randall.Charbeneau@nrc.gov](mailto:Randall.Charbeneau@nrc.gov)

[john.oneill@pillsburylaw.com](mailto:john.oneill@pillsburylaw.com)  
[alison.crane@pillsburylaw.com](mailto:alison.crane@pillsburylaw.com)  
[michael.lepre@pillsburylaw.com](mailto:michael.lepre@pillsburylaw.com)  
[jason.parker@pillsburylaw.com](mailto:jason.parker@pillsburylaw.com)  
[stefanie.george@pillsburylaw.com](mailto:stefanie.george@pillsburylaw.com)  
[kimberly.harshaw@pillsburylaw.com](mailto:kimberly.harshaw@pillsburylaw.com)  
[stephen.markus@pillsburylaw.com](mailto:stephen.markus@pillsburylaw.com)

Joshua A. Kirstein, Law Clerk  
E-mail: [josh.kirstein@nrc.gov](mailto:josh.kirstein@nrc.gov)

Matthew Flyntz, Law Clerk  
[matthew.flyntz@nrc.gov](mailto:matthew.flyntz@nrc.gov)

Docket Nos. 52-029-COL and 52-030-COL  
 MEMORANDUM AND ORDER (RULING ON MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE PROPOSED  
 CONTENTIONS 14 AND 14A)

Office of the General Counsel  
 U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
 Mail Stop O-15D21  
 Washington, DC 20555-0001  
 Marian Zabler, Esq.  
 Sara Kirkwood, Esq.  
 Jody Martin, Esq.  
 Michael Spencer, Esq.  
 Kevin Roach, Esq.  
 Lauren Goldin, Esq.  
 Emily Monteith, Esq.  
 Joseph Gilman, Paralegal  
 Karin Francis, Paralegal  
 E-mail:  
[marian.zabler@nrc.gov](mailto:marian.zabler@nrc.gov)  
[sara.kirkwood@nrc.gov](mailto:sara.kirkwood@nrc.gov)  
[jody.martin@nrc.gov](mailto:jody.martin@nrc.gov)  
[michael.spencer@nrc.gov](mailto:michael.spencer@nrc.gov)  
[kevin.roach@nrc.gov](mailto:kevin.roach@nrc.gov)  
[laura.goldin@nrc.gov](mailto:laura.goldin@nrc.gov)  
[emily.moneith@nrc.gov](mailto:emily.moneith@nrc.gov)  
[joseph.gilman@nrc.gov](mailto:joseph.gilman@nrc.gov)  
[karin.francis@nrc.gov](mailto:karin.francis@nrc.gov)

OGC Mail Center : [OGCMailCenter@nrc.gov](mailto:OGCMailCenter@nrc.gov)

Alachua County Green Party, Green  
 Party of Florida  
 P.O. Box 190  
 Alachua, FL  
 Michael Canney, Co-Chair  
 E-mail: [alachuagreen@windstream.net](mailto:alachuagreen@windstream.net)

Nuclear Information & Resource Service  
 P.O. Box 7586  
 Asheville, NC 28802  
 Mary Olson,  
 NIRS Southeast Regional Coordinator  
 E-mail: [maryo@nirs.org](mailto:maryo@nirs.org)

Nuclear Information Resource Service  
 6390 Carroll Avenue, #340  
 Takoma Park, MD 20912  
 Michael Mariotte, Executive Director  
 E-mail: [nirsnet@nirs.org](mailto:nirsnet@nirs.org)

Ecology Party of Florida  
 641 SW 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue  
 Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33315  
 Cara Campbell, Chair  
 Gary Hecker  
 E-mail: [levynuke@ecologyparty.org](mailto:levynuke@ecologyparty.org)

[Original signed by Evangeline S. Ngbea]

---

Office of the Secretary of the Commission

Dated at Rockville, Maryland  
 this 19<sup>th</sup> day of March 2012