HOPE P

The Honorable Richard L. Ottinger, Chairman Subcommittee on Energy Conservation and Power Committee on Energy and Commerce United States House of Representatives Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Mr. Chairman:

Enclosed for your information is an announcement that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission staff has proposed a \$40,000 civil penalty against Florida Power and Light Company concerning the Turkey Point nuclear plant.

It is planned to mail this information to the news media today, February 2, 1984.

Sincerely,

Carlton Kammerer, Director Office of Congressional Affairs

Enclosure: As stated

cc: Rep. Carlos Moorhead

IDENTICAL LETTER SENT TO: Sen. Simpson/cc: Sen. Hart

Rep. Udal1/cc: Rep. Lujan

Rep. Markey/cc: Rep. Marlenee

Sen. Chiles Sen. Hawkins Rep. Fascell Rep. Pepper

8510230027 851004 PDR FDIA JACOBS84-478 PDI

OFFICE JACOBS 84-478 PDR

OFFICE COMBA Nac

DATE 242 84

NRC FORM 318 110/801 NRCM 0240 OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

☆ U.S. GPO 1983-400-24



UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Office of Public Affairs Washington, D.C. 20555

No. 84-16 Tel. 301/492-7715 (Thursday, February 2, 1984)

NRC STAFF PROPOSES \$40,000 FINE AGAINST FPL FOR ALLEGED VIOLATION AT TURKEY POINT PLANT

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission staff has proposed a \$40,000 civil penalty against Florida Power and Light Company (FPL) for alleged violation of NRC radiation protection requirements at the Turkey Point nuclear plant near Homestead, Florida.

James P. O'Reilly, NRC Regional Administrator in Atlanta, told FPL in a letter that the enforcement action stems from an incident on October 14, 1983, when inadequate management controls permitted two workers to enter a locked, high radiation area of Turkey Point Unit 3 without obtaining a required radiation work permit. As a result, the workers received exposures of 1.3 rems and 0.20 rem respectively within about one minute.

While neither of these exposures violated NRC limits, Mr. O'Reilly said in his letter: "The NRC is concerned that this violation of regulatory requirements could have resulted in the workers exceeding the dose limits for exposure to ionizing radiation...It is fortuitous that neither worker remained in the area for a longer period of time." He said a "basic cause" of the event was FPL's failure to establish management controls that would have assured plant management involvement in the decision to enter a potentially hazardous area.

Mr. O'Reilly added that FPL could have been fined an additional \$10,000 because it did not take preventive steps suggested by an NRC Information Notice in December 1982. An additional fine was not proposed, however, because FPL promptly reported this incident after it occurred, even though it was not required to be reported.

Mr. O'Reilly said the company has since corrected its management procedures.

FPL has 30 days to pay the civil penalty or to protest it in whole or in part.

12