

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD

Before Administrative Judges:

Lawrence G. McDade, Chairman  
Dr. Michael F. Kennedy  
Dr. Richard E. Wardwell

In the Matter of

ENTERGY NUCLEAR OPERATIONS, INC.

(Indian Point Nuclear Generating Units 2 and 3)

Docket Nos. 50-247-LR and 50-286-LR

ASLBP No. 07-858-03-LR-BD01

August 16, 2012

ORDER

(Denying Entergy's Motion in Limine Seeking to Exclude Portions of Intervenors' Direct Evidence Addressing Contention NYS-38/RK-TC-5)

On November 10, 2011, the Board admitted Contention NYS-38/RK-TC-5 (NYS-38), which arose from the issuance of the August 2011 Supplement to the NRC Staff's Safety Evaluation Report (SSER), and challenged the adequacy of Entergy's Aging Management Programs (AMPs) for several safety-related components.<sup>1</sup> More specifically, this contention alleged that, rather than presenting existing plans for review, Entergy's commitment to the future development of certain AMPs failed to satisfy the requirements of 10 C.F.R. §§ 54.21(a)(3) and (c)(1)(iii), and 42 U.S.C. §§ 2133(b) and (d) and 2232(a).<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Licensing Board Memorandum and Order (Admitting New Contention NYS-38/RK-TC-5) (Nov. 10, 2011) at 1–2, 12 (unpublished).

<sup>2</sup> See id. at 2.

Intervenors New York and Riverkeeper filed their NYS-38 Initial Statement of Position, direct testimony, and corresponding exhibits on June 19, 2012.<sup>3</sup> In response, Entergy filed a motion in limine to exclude portions of this Statement of Position, direct testimony, and exhibits.<sup>4</sup> That motion is the subject of this Order.

In its motion, Entergy argues that “Intervenors’ prefiled [NYS-38] testimony and other submittals challenge—for the first time—the adequacy of [Entergy’s] Commitment 42[ as set forth in the SSER] concerning Entergy’s analysis or inspections of steam generator tube-to-tubesheet welds.”<sup>5</sup> According to Entergy, Commitment 42 is outside the four specifically admitted bases for NYS-38, which correspond directly to Entergy Commitments 30, 41, 43, and 44.<sup>6</sup> Thus, Entergy seeks to exclude the portions of Intervenors’ NYS-38 direct testimony and corresponding submittals that address Commitment 42 because, according to Entergy, these portions of the testimony and corresponding submittals are “irrelevant to the contention as pled and admitted.”<sup>7</sup>

Intervenors New York and Riverkeeper oppose Entergy’s motion in limine by arguing that “Entergy’s [motion] is factually in error because the scope of NYS-38 . . . encompasses all the proposed plans to address cracking in the steam generator that may cause cracks in safety related components where Entergy is not now providing the details of its proposed

---

<sup>3</sup> See Revised Certificates of Service (June 20, 2012) (certifying that John J. Sipos served copies of the State of New York and Riverkeeper’s Initial Statement of Position in Support of Contention NYS-38/RK-TC-5, the Pre-filed Testimony of Drs. David J. Duquette and Richard Lahey, the Report of Dr. David J. Duquette, and Exhibits NYS000375 through NYS00397 on June 19, 2012).

<sup>4</sup> See Entergy’s Motion in Limine to Exclude Portions of Intervenors’ Prefiled Direct Testimony, Expert Report, Statement of Position, and Exhibits for Contention NYS-38/RK-TC-5 (Safety Commitments) (July 6, 2012).

<sup>5</sup> Id. at 2.

<sup>6</sup> See id.

<sup>7</sup> Id. at 3.

approaches.”<sup>8</sup> These Intervenors further argue that Entergy’s motion in limine essentially ignores the Board’s December 6, 2011, Clarification Order, which elucidates that NYS-38 is a broad challenge to Entergy’s Commitments—delineated in the SSER—and thus is not limited specific commitments.<sup>9</sup>

We agree with New York and Riverkeeper. On November 21, 2011, Entergy moved for clarification regarding the scope of NYS-38.<sup>10</sup> Through this motion for clarification, Entergy sought to limit the scope of NYS-38 to Applicant’s Commitment 41, which does not encompass the potential aging effect of primary stress corrosion cracking in steam generator divider plate assemblies.<sup>11</sup>

On December 6, 2011, we issued an Order resolving Entergy’s Motion for Clarification, in which we did not limit the scope of NYS-38 to Entergy’s Commitment 41.<sup>12</sup> Instead we found that “[t]he language of our November 10, 2011 Memorandum and Order did not limit NYS-38/RK-TC-5 solely to Commitment 41. Rather, in finding [NYS-38] admissible, we admitted the Intervenors’ ‘broad’ contention, which relied on ‘multiple bases’ including the ‘claim that there is insufficient information in Entergy’s recent commitments’ that were addressed in the SSER.”<sup>13</sup>

Entergy’s current motion in limine once again attempts to limit the scope of NYS-38. In denying this motion we reiterate that NYS-38 is a broad contention, the scope of which is not

---

<sup>8</sup> State of New York and Riverkeeper’s Joint Answer to Entergy’s Motion in Limine to Exclude Portions of Intervenors’ Prefiled Direct Testimony, Expert Report, Statement of Position, and Exhibits for Contention NYS-38/RK-TC-5 (July 16, 2012) at 4.

<sup>9</sup> See id. at 3–4.

<sup>10</sup> See Licensing Board Order (Granting Entergy’s Motion for Clarification of Licensing Board Memorandum and Order Admitting Contention NYS-38/RK-TC-5)( Dec. 6, 2011) at 1 (unpublished) (citing Applicant’s Motion for Clarification of Licensing Board Memorandum and Order Admitting Contention NYS-38/RK-TC-5 (Nov. 21, 2011) at 1–4).

<sup>11</sup> See id. at 2.

<sup>12</sup> See id. at 3.

<sup>13</sup> Id.

limited to Entergy Commitments 30, 41, 43, and 44. Instead it broadly encompasses the claim that there is insufficient information in Entergy's Commitments as addressed in the SSER. Accordingly, Entergy's instant Motion in limine is denied.

It is so ORDERED.

FOR THE ATOMIC SAFETY  
AND LICENSING BOARD

*/RA/*

---

Lawrence G. McDade, Chairman  
ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE

Rockville, Maryland  
August 16, 2012

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

In the Matter of )  
)  
ENTERGY NUCLEAR OPERATIONS, INC. ) Docket Nos. 50-247-LR  
) and 50-286-LR  
(Indian Point Nuclear Generating, )  
Units 2 and 3) )

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that copies of the foregoing **ORDER (Denying Entergy's Motion in Limine to Exclude Portions of Intervenor's Direct Evidence Addressing Contention NYS-38/RK-TC-5)** have been served upon the following persons by Electronic Information Exchange.

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Office of Commission Appellate Adjudication  
Mail Stop O-7H4M  
Washington, DC 20555-0001  
[ocaamail@nrc.gov](mailto:ocaamail@nrc.gov)

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

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

Sherwin E. Turk, Esq.  
Edward L. Williamson, Esq.  
Beth N. Mizuno, Esq.  
David E. Roth, Esq.  
Brian Harris, Esq.  
Mary B. Spencer, Esq.  
Anita Ghosh, Esq.  
Karl Farrar, Esq.  
Brian Newell, Paralegal  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Office of the General Counsel  
Mail Stop O-15D21  
Washington, DC 20555-0001  
[sherwin.turk@nrc.gov](mailto:sherwin.turk@nrc.gov); [edward.williamson@nrc.gov](mailto:edward.williamson@nrc.gov)  
[beth.mizuno@nrc.gov](mailto:beth.mizuno@nrc.gov); [brian.harris@nrc.gov](mailto:brian.harris@nrc.gov)  
[david.roth@nrc.gov](mailto:david.roth@nrc.gov); [mary.spencer@nrc.gov](mailto:mary.spencer@nrc.gov)  
[anita.ghosh@nrc.gov](mailto:anita.ghosh@nrc.gov); [karl.farrar@nrc.gov](mailto:karl.farrar@nrc.gov)  
[brian.newell@nrc.gov](mailto:brian.newell@nrc.gov)

Lawrence G. McDade, Chair  
Administrative Judge  
[lawrence.mcdade@nrc.gov](mailto:lawrence.mcdade@nrc.gov)

Richard E. Wardwell  
Administrative Judge  
[richard.wardwell@nrc.gov](mailto:richard.wardwell@nrc.gov)

Michael F. Kennedy  
Administrative Judge  
[michael.kennedy@nrc.gov](mailto:michael.kennedy@nrc.gov)

Anne Siarnacki, Law Clerk  
[anne.siarnacki@nrc.gov](mailto:anne.siarnacki@nrc.gov)  
Shelbie Lewman, Law Clerk  
[shelbie.lewman@nrc.gov](mailto:shelbie.lewman@nrc.gov)  
James Maltese, Law Clerk  
[james.maltese@nrc.gov](mailto:james.maltese@nrc.gov)

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

**ORDER (Denying Entergy's Motion in Limine to Exclude Portions of Intervenors' Direct Evidence Addressing Contention NYS-38/RK-TC-5)**

William C. Dennis, Esq.  
Assistant General Counsel  
Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc.  
440 Hamilton Avenue  
White Plains, NY 10601  
[wdennis@entergy.com](mailto:wdennis@entergy.com)

Elise N. Zoli, Esq.  
Goodwin Procter, LLP  
Exchange Place  
53 State Street  
Boston, MA 02109  
[ezoli@goodwinprocter.com](mailto:ezoli@goodwinprocter.com)

Kathryn M. Sutton, Esq.  
Paul M. Bessette, Esq.  
Martin J. O'Neill, Esq.  
Raphael Kuyler, Esq.  
Jonathan M. Rund, Esq.  
Lena Michelle Long, Esq.  
Laura Swett, Esq.  
Lance Escher, Esq.  
Mary Freeze, Legal Secretary  
Antoinette Walker, Legal Secretary  
Morgan, Lewis & Bockius, LLP  
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20004  
[ksutton@morganlewis.com](mailto:ksutton@morganlewis.com)  
[martin.oneill@morganlewis.com](mailto:martin.oneill@morganlewis.com)  
[rkuyler@morganlewis.com](mailto:rkuyler@morganlewis.com)  
[jrund@morganlewis.com](mailto:jrund@morganlewis.com)  
[llong@morganlewis.com](mailto:llong@morganlewis.com); [lswett@morganlewis.com](mailto:lswett@morganlewis.com)  
[lescher@morganlewis.com](mailto:lescher@morganlewis.com)  
[mfreeze@morganlewis.com](mailto:mfreeze@morganlewis.com)  
[awalker@morganlewis.com](mailto:awalker@morganlewis.com)

Clint Carpenter, Esq.  
Bobby Burchfield, Esq.  
Matthew Leland, Esq.  
McDermott, Will and Emery LLP  
600 13<sup>th</sup> Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20005  
[ccarpenter@mwe.com](mailto:ccarpenter@mwe.com); [bburchfield@mwe.com](mailto:bburchfield@mwe.com)  
[mleland@mwe.com](mailto:mleland@mwe.com)

Thomas F. Wood, Esq.  
Daniel Riesel, Esq.  
Victoria Shiah Treanor, Esq.  
Adam Stolorow, Esq.  
Jwala Gandhi, Paralegal  
Peng Deng, Paralegal  
Counsel for Town of Cortlandt  
Sive, Paget & Riesel, P.C.  
460 Park Avenue  
New York, NY 10022  
[driesel@sprlaw.com](mailto:driesel@sprlaw.com); [vtreanor@sprlaw.com](mailto:vtreanor@sprlaw.com)  
[astolorow@sprlaw.com](mailto:astolorow@sprlaw.com); [jgandhi@sprlaw.com](mailto:jgandhi@sprlaw.com)  
[pdeng@sprlaw.com](mailto:pdeng@sprlaw.com)

Phillip Musegaas, Esq.  
Deborah Brancato, Esq.  
Ramona Cearley, Secretary  
Riverkeeper, Inc.  
20 Secor Road  
Ossining, NY 10562  
[phillip@riverkeeper.org](mailto:phillip@riverkeeper.org); [dbrancato@riverkeeper.org](mailto:dbrancato@riverkeeper.org)  
[rcearley@riverkeeper.org](mailto:rcearley@riverkeeper.org)

Melissa-Jean Rotini, Esq.  
Assistant County Attorney  
Office of Robert F. Meehan,  
Westchester County Attorney  
148 Martine Avenue, 6<sup>th</sup> Floor  
White Plains, NY 10601  
[MJR1@westchestergov.com](mailto:MJR1@westchestergov.com)

Manna Jo Greene, Environmental Director  
Steven C. Filler  
Karla Raimundi  
Hudson River Sloop Clearwater, Inc.  
724 Wolcott Ave.  
Beacon, NY 12508  
[mannajo@clearwater.org](mailto:mannajo@clearwater.org); [stephenfiller@gmail.com](mailto:stephenfiller@gmail.com)  
[karla@clearwater.org](mailto:karla@clearwater.org)

Docket Nos. 50-247-LR and 50-286-LR

**ORDER (Denying Entergy's Motion in Limine to Exclude Portions of Intervenors' Direct Evidence Addressing Contention NYS-38/RK-TC-5)**

Matthew W. Swinehart, Esq.  
Covington & Burling LLP  
1201 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20004  
[mwinehart@cov.com](mailto:mwinehart@cov.com)

Michael J. Delaney, Esq.  
Director, Energy Regulatory Affairs  
NYC Department of Environmental Protection  
59-17 Junction Boulevard  
Flushing, NY 11373  
[mdelaney@dep.nyc.gov](mailto:mdelaney@dep.nyc.gov)

John Louis Parker, Esq.  
Office of General Counsel, Region 3  
New York State Department  
of Environmental Conservation  
21 South Putt Corners Road  
New Paltz, NY 12561-1620  
[jlparker@gw.dec.state.ny.us](mailto:jlparker@gw.dec.state.ny.us)

John J. Sipos, Esq.  
Charles Donaldson, Esq.  
Assistant Attorneys General  
Office of the Attorney General  
of the State of New York  
Elyse Houle, Legal Support  
The Capitol  
State Street  
Albany, New York 12224  
[John.Sipos@ag.ny.gov](mailto:John.Sipos@ag.ny.gov);  
[charlie.donaldson@ag.ny.gov](mailto:charlie.donaldson@ag.ny.gov)  
[elyse.houle@ag.ny.gov](mailto:elyse.houle@ag.ny.gov)

Robert D. Snook, Esq.  
Assistant Attorney General  
Office of the Attorney General  
State of Connecticut  
55 Elm Street  
P.O. Box 120  
Hartford, CT 06141-0120  
[robert.snook@po.state.ct.us](mailto:robert.snook@po.state.ct.us)

Janice A. Dean, Esq.  
Assistant Attorney General  
Kathryn Liberatore, Esq.  
Office of the Attorney General  
of the State of New York  
120 Broadway, 26<sup>th</sup> Floor  
New York, New York 10271  
[janice.dean@ag.ny.gov](mailto:janice.dean@ag.ny.gov);  
[kathryn.liberatore@ag.ny.gov](mailto:kathryn.liberatore@ag.ny.gov)

Sean Murray, Mayor  
Kevin Hay, Village Administrator  
Village of Buchanan  
Municipal Building  
236 Tate Avenue  
Buchanan, NY 10511-1298  
[SMurray@villageofbuchanan.com](mailto:SMurray@villageofbuchanan.com)  
[Administrator@villageofbuchanan.com](mailto:Administrator@villageofbuchanan.com)

[Original signed by Christine M. Pierpoint]  
Office of the Secretary of the Commission

Dated at Rockville, Maryland  
this 16<sup>th</sup> day of August 2012