UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

BEFORE THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD

In the Matter of:	)	
	)	Docket No. 50-443-LA-2
NEXTERA ENERGY SEABROOK, LLC	)	
	)	September 28, 2020
(Seabrook Station Unit 1)	)	
	)	

NEXTERA'S ANSWER OPPOSING C-10'S MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE A REPLY AND MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE INT053

I. INTRODUCTION

On August 31, 2020, C-10 Research and Education Foundation ("C-10") filed a series of post-Initial Decision[1] motions ("PID Motions") on the above-captioned docket.[2] On September 10, 2020, NextEra Energy Seabrook LLC ("NextEra") and the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission ("NRC") Staff each submitted answers responding to those Motions ("PID Answers").[3] Now, C-10 has filed a motion seeking leave to reply to the PID Answers ("Motion to Reply") and a motion for leave to file another new exhibit, INT053 ("Motion to File INT053")

1 *NextEra Energy Seabrook, LLC* (Seabrook Station Unit 1), LBP-20-9, 92 NRC __ (Aug. 21, 2020) (slip op.).

2 C-10 Research and Education Foundation's Motion for Partial Reconsideration and Motion to Re-Open the Record for Consideration of Supplemental Testimony Regarding License Conditions in LBP-20-9 (Aug. 31, 2020) (ML20244A321) (accompanied by the Declaration by Victor E. Saouma, Ph.D in Support of C-10 Research and Education Foundation's Motion to Re-open the Record (Aug. 28, 2020) (ML20244A323), and a proposed new Exhibit INT052, Supplemental Testimony of Victor E. Saouma, Ph.D Regarding LBP-20-09 (Aug. 28, 2020) (ML20244A314) (Proprietary)).

3 NextEra's Answer Opposing C-10's Motion to Re-open the Record for Consideration of Supplemental Testimony (Sept. 10, 2020) (ML20254A235) ("NextEra Reopening Answer"); NextEra's Answer Opposing C-10's Motion for Leave and Motion for Partial Reconsideration of LBP 20-9 (Sept. 10, 2020) (ML20254A234) ("NextEra Reconsideration Answer"); NRC Staff's Answer to C-10's Motion for Partial Reconsideration and to Reopen the Record (Sept. 10, 2020) (ML20254A238) ("Staff Answer") (accompanied by the Affidavit of Angela Buford, Bryce Lehman, Jacob Philip, and George Thomas in Response to C-10's Motion for Partial Reconsideration and to Reopen the Record (Sept. 10, 2020) (ML20254A239) ("Staff Affidavit")).

(collectively, "New Motions").[4] However, 10 C.F.R. § 2.323(c) provides that C-10 has "no right" to file a reply here.[5] Instead, the regulations state that permission to file a reply may be granted "*only* in compelling circumstances," which requires a demonstration by the moving party "that it could not reasonably have anticipated the arguments to which it seeks leave to reply."[6]

In accordance with 10 C.F.R. § 2.323(c), NextEra submits this Answer opposing the New Motions. As explained below, C-10 does not remotely demonstrate "compelling circumstances." The Motion to Reply fails, on its face, to make this demonstration. And a review of the proposed Reply and INT053—which, as matter of law, neither the Board nor the parties are required to undertake—reveals that they present no "compelling circumstances" either. Thus, the Board should (and has plentiful grounds to) deny the Motion to Reply. Furthermore, C-10 failed to consult the other parties regarding its Motion to File INT053, and failed to present any argument for why good cause allegedly exists for its request. Accordingly, the Motion to File INT053 must be rejected on both procedural and substantive grounds.

II. THE BOARD SHOULD DENY THE MOTION TO FILE INT053

For the many reasons articulated in the PID Answers, the Board should deny C-10's Motion to Reopen the evidentiary record in this proceeding. Assuming the Board agrees, and the record remains closed (as it has been for several months),[7] there is no basis for permitting the

---

4 C-10 Research and Education Foundation's Motion for Leave to File Reply to Oppositions to Motion for Partial Reconsideration of LBP-20-09 (Sept. 17, 2020) (ML20261H604) ("New Motions") (accompanied by C-10 Research and Education Foundation's Reply to Oppositions to Motion for Partial Reconsideration and Motion to Re-open the Record for consideration of Supplemental Testimony Regarding License Conditions in LBP-20-09 (Sept. 17, 2020) (ML20261H601) (Proprietary), and another proposed new Exhibit INT053, Rebuttal Supplemental Testimony of Victor E. Saouma, Ph.D Regarding License Conditions in LBP-20-09 (Sept. 17, 2020) (ML20261H600) (Proprietary)).

5 By virtue of its filing of the Motion, C-10 acknowledges the applicability of this prohibition in the instant context.

6 10 C.F.R. § 2.323(c) (emphasis added).

7 Order (Admitting Exhibits, Closing the Record of the September 2019 Evidentiary Hearing, and Providing Additional Instruction for Supplemental Proposed Finding) at 2 (Jan. 17, 2020) (ML20017A076) ("Order Closing Record").

filing of another evidentiary exhibit. Nevertheless, even assuming *arguendo* the Board granted the Motion to Reopen, C-10's request to file INT053 should be rejected on independent grounds—both procedural and substantive.

First, the NRC's rules of practice and procedure at 10 C.F.R. § 2.323(b) have long required that, before filing a motion, a moving party must "contact other parties in the proceeding" and make a "sincere effort" to "resolve the issue(s) raised in the motion," and then include a certification in the motion regarding this consultation. The New Motions, here, present two distinct "issue(s)." Therein, C-10 requests leave to file a reply and "C-10 *also* requests leave to file the attached Ex. INT053."[8] However, C-10 only consulted the other parties on *one* issue raised in the New Motions: C-10's request to file a new *legal pleading*.[9] C-10 never mentioned in its consultation an intent to also file a new *evidentiary exhibit* including additional opinions by Dr. Saouma. Accordingly, the plain language of 10 C.F.R. § 2.323(b) dictates that the Motion to File INT053 "must be rejected."

Furthermore, even if C-10 had consulted on its Motion to File INT053, its request should be rejected for the additional reason that it fails to demonstrate "good cause." The Motion to File INT053 fails entirely to acknowledge this standard or advance a single argument as to it. The Board previously rejected an attempt by C-10 to file additional exhibits because "C-10 proffered no justification which satisfies the good cause standard."[10] The same result is warranted here, where C-10 proffered no justification *at all*.[11]

---

8 New Motions at 1 (emphasis added).

9 *See* Attachment 1, Email from D. Curran to P. Bessette et al., "Consultation pursuant to 10 CFR 2.323" (Sept. 16, 2020 3:36 PM).

10 Licensing Board Order (Granting C-10's Motion to Compel Mineralogical Data and Request to Submit Supplemental Written Testimony concerning the data; Denying C-10's Motion to Submit Additional Exhibits) at 22 (Nov. 25, 2019) (ML19329D913).

11 Even to the extent the Motion to File INT053 could be viewed as containing an inexplicit generalized assertion that good cause exists because INT053 is probative, this too is insufficient. *See id*. at 23 ("Commission

III. THE BOARD SHOULD DENY THE MOTION TO REPLY

A. The Motion to Reply Fails to Demonstrate "Compelling Circumstances"

In its Motion to Reply, C-10 offers five bases, (a) through (e), as purported justification for the proposed Reply. More specifically, basis (a) articulates C-10's desire to summarize and highlight certain statements in the Staff's Answer, which C-10 characterizes as "concessions" allegedly supporting its position.[12] In basis (b), C-10 argues that it should be allowed to "respond[] to criticisms by the NRC Staff and NextEra," and afforded a further opportunity to demonstrate the alleged necessity of its proposed changes.[13] Similarly, in basis (c), C-10 asserts a need to criticize the "expertise" of NRC Staff witnesses—which it already attempted to do in the earlier proceedings—and a need to characterize NextEra's Answers (*i.e.*, legal pleadings) as mere "comments by its attorneys."[14] C-10 claims, in basis (d), that it should have an opportunity to respond to arguments in the PID Answers that allegedly are "inconsistent with LBP-20-09 and NRC Staff guidance."[15] And in basis (e), C-10 claims a reply is necessary so that it can discuss alleged inconsistencies in LBP-20-09—a topic covered in its earlier filings—and proffer further commentary on the license conditions imposed therein.[16] However, as explained below, C-10 has not demonstrated that any of these constitute "compelling circumstances," as required by 10 C.F.R. § 2.323(c).

---

precedent does not contemplate using the probative value of evidence filed after deadlines to satisfy the good cause standard.").

12 New Motions at 2.

13 *Id*. at 2-3.

14 *Id*. at 3.

15 *Id*.

16 *Id*. at 3-4.

As to bases (a), (b), (c), and (e), the Motion to Reply offers nothing more than a conclusory assertion that these bases constitute "compelling circumstances."[17] But, a bare declaration by a movant that the applicable legal standard has been satisfied, however, does not make it so. Rather, C-10 bears the burden to "demonstrate"[18] satisfaction. At a minimum, C-10 could have advanced some argument—or some reasoned explanation—as to *why* these bases allegedly constitute "compelling circumstances." But it did not do so. Thus, the Motion to Reply fails—on its face—to satisfy C-10's affirmative burden.

In basis (d), C-10 presents an attenuated *reference* to the "compelling circumstances" standard by claiming that it "could not have anticipated" certain arguments in the PID Answers.[19] But, once again, C-10's single, unexplained, conclusory sentence falls far short of *demonstrating* the claimed satisfaction. As noted above, this basis asserts that C-10 needs an opportunity to respond to arguments in the PID Answers that allegedly are "inconsistent with LBP-20-09 and NRC Staff guidance."[20] However, the Motion to Reply does not identify *which* arguments in the PID Answers allegedly were inconceivable in C-10's view; it does not explain *how* those unidentified arguments supposedly are inconsistent with LBP-20-09 or agency guidance (nor does it identify any specific guidance); and it offers no theory as to *why* these unspecified "inconsistencies" in these unspecified arguments somehow present a material circumstance—much less a *compelling* one—that warrants an extraordinary opportunity to file additional pleadings at this stage of the proceeding. At bottom, the Motion to Reply does not

---

17 *Id*. at 2.

18 10 C.F.R. § 2.323(c) (permitting a reply "where the moving party *demonstrates*" compelling circumstances) (emphasis added).

19 New Motions at 3.

20 *Id*.

articulate any reasoned argument—which is solely C-10's burden—capable of "demonstrating" "compelling circumstances."

B. No "Compelling Circumstances" Are Presented in the Attachments to the Motion to Reply

As a matter of settled law, a pleading must demonstrate satisfaction of the applicable legal standard. Merely submitting an attachment and declaring victory is not enough.[21] Where the pleading itself fails to marshal facts and law to carry this burden, the Board and the other parties are under no further obligation to review other documents, identify potential support, or speculate about potential legal arguments.[22] That is C-10's job, and it has not done so here. Nevertheless, even if the Board were permitted,[23] or the other parties were required, to review the proposed Reply and INT053 to identify potential legal and factual theories and support, the outcome would be the same. As detailed below, these documents expose C-10's mere desire to clutter the already voluminous docket with filings that reiterate previous arguments, proffer ordinary rebuttal, and raise untimely new arguments beyond the permissible scope of a reply. In sum, none of these presents a "compelling circumstance" warranting a reply.

---

[21] *Duke Energy Corp.* (Oconee Nuclear Station, Units 1, 2, & 3), 49 NRC 328, CLI-99-11 (1999) (holding that a pleading which provided "no analysis" against the legal standards was insufficient where "[a]ll the Petitioners did here was attach" another document that allegedly supported their conclusory assertions); *Pub. Serv. Co. of N.H.* (Seabrook Station, Units 1 and 2), CLI-89-3, 29 NRC 234, 241 (1989) ("The Commission cannot be faulted for not having searched for a needle that may be in a haystack.").

[22] *See FirstEnergy Nuclear Operating Co.* (Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1), CLI-12-8, 75 NRC 393, 404 n.67 (2012) (The Commission "'should not be expected to sift unaided through . . . other documents . . . to piece together and discern a party's argument and the grounds for its claims.'") (quoting *Entergy Nuclear Generation Co.* (Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station), CLI-09-11, 69 NRC 529, 534 (2009)).

[23] *DTE Elec. Co.* (Fermi Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 2), CLI-15-18, 82 NRC 135, 146 n.53 (quoting *Hall v. Bellmon*, 935 F.2d 1106, 1110 (10th Cir. 1991) (cautioning that it is not the proper role of the Board to "assume the role of advocate").

1. C-10's Commentary In the Proposed Reply Does Not Support a Finding of "Compelling Circumstances"

As a general matter, the proposed Reply contains no discussion of relevant NRC case law. It contains no citations to NRC regulations.[24] Indeed, the only mention of a legal standard in the entirety of the proposed Reply appears in a brief, partial quote from the *Staff's* Answer to the PID Motions.[25] Fundamentally, it is unclear how the Board could conclude that "compelling circumstances" warrant the filing of an additional *legal pleading* that does not discuss the *law*.

First, C-10 characterizes the Staff's Answer and quotes LIC-101 (an internal office instruction mentioned by Staff) as alleged support for its request to "comment on" the license conditions.[26] But, even assuming *arguendo* that these characterizations were accurate, neither C-10's failure to identify this alleged support at the outset, nor its desire to offer characterizations of an answer pleading, give rise to an opportunity to supplement thinly-supported motions via reply pleading. C-10 also seeks to rebut Staff's conclusion that C-10's Motion to Reopen fails to identify a "significant safety issue," as required by 10 C.F.R. § 2.326.[27] But C-10 fails to explain why it "could not reasonably have anticipated" this argument. C-10 is represented by counsel with decades of experience in NRC proceedings. Any suggestion that experienced counsel could not have anticipated a basic challenge to C-10's satisfaction of the applicable legal threshold is simply not credible.[28]

---

[24] The first sentence of the proposed Reply refers to "10 C.F.R. §§ 2.32(e)." However, Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations does not contain a section 32. To the extent this was intended to reference 10 C.F.R. § 2.323(e), the reference is inapt because that provision discusses motions for reconsideration; it does not, as the proposed Reply suggests, authorize the filing of a reply.

[25] Proposed Reply at 1.

[26] *Id*. at 2-3.

[27] *Id*. at 3-4 (citing Staff Answer at 3-4).

[28] *Tenn. Valley Auth.* (Sequoyah Nuclear Plant, Units 1 & 2), CLI-14-3, 79 NRC 31, 35 (2014) ("an experienced litigant in our proceedings . . . should reasonably have anticipated" straightforward objections to the legal elements of an argument).

Additionally, C-10 seeks to rebut NextEra's arguments regarding licensee discretion.[29] In INT052, Dr. Saouma offered an unexplained assertion—without citation to any legal, factual, or precedential support—that "License Condition (d) leaves too much discretion to NextEra."[30] NextEra's Answers squarely responded to that claim, which should surprise no one. C-10 also wants to challenge NextEra's statement that the Board "already considered—and rejected" Dr. Saouma's demand for "error bars."[31] Despite the Board's clear awareness of the "error bar" concept advocated by Dr. Saouma,[32] and a nearly-200 page decision that directly discusses this concept but declines to impose a corresponding requirement, C-10 responds that the Board's rejection does not amount to a "holding" in LBP-20-9.[33] Semantics aside, C-10 once again fails to explain why it "could not reasonably have anticipated" either of these straightforward arguments.[34]

C-10 further criticizes the "expertise" of the NRC Staff's affiants.[35] But these attacks are nothing new. C-10 devoted an inordinate amount of its written and oral testimony challenging the competency of other witnesses, other reviewers, and the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards ("ACRS").[36] C-10's desire to recycle these criticisms simply does not present a

---

29 Proposed Reply at 4 (citing "NextEra Answer" at 6). It is unclear whether this refers to the NextEra Reopening Answer or the NextEra Reconsideration Answer.

30 INT052 at 2.

31 Proposed Reply at 4 (citing "NextEra Answer" at 8 (citing LBP-20-09, slip op. at 164)). This appears to refer to the NextEra Reconsideration Answer.

32 The phrase "error bar" appears 36 times in the transcript of the evidentiary hearing. Tr. at 214-1203.

33 Proposed Reply at 5.

34 C-10 also claims that the prior discussion was limited to Dr. Saouma's *original* demand for "error bars," which related to the Modulus Correlation, whereas Dr. Saouma's *newest* error bar discussion allegedly pertains to something else. Proposed Reply at 5. Notwithstanding the dubious nature of this characterization, *see infra* Part III.B.2 (explaining that INT053 makes clear that Dr. Saouma is challenging the Modulus Correlation), C-10 fails to explain how NextEra's reference to LBP-20-9—the fundamental document at issue in the PID Motions—unfairly prejudiced C-10 in any way.

35 Proposed Reply at 5.

36 *See, e.g.*, INT001-R-00-BD01, Pre-filed Testimony of Victor E. Saouma, Ph.D Regarding Scientific Evaluation of NextEra's Aging Management Program for ASR at the Seabrook Nuclear Power Plant at 5, 7-9,

"compelling circumstance." C-10 also criticizes NextEra's Answers because they were not accompanied by "expert testimony."[37] To be clear, the evidentiary record in this proceeding was closed by an Order of the Board that remains in effect to this day.[38] Thus, the filing of "expert testimony" is prohibited by law unless and until a superseding order reopens the record. Moreover, the PID Motions raise legal questions (i.e., whether the legal criteria for reconsideration and reopening have been satisfied) that can be resolved on the legal pleadings alone. In any event, C-10's desire to criticize NextEra for following the law does not give rise to some "compelling circumstance" warranting a reply.

Finally, in Section II.B., C-10 provides four brief bullets noting C-10's agreement or disagreement with Staff's discussion of the License Conditions. But the proposed Reply contains no further explanation as to why "compelling circumstances" require an opportunity to do so. Ultimately, nothing in the proposed Reply supplies the legal justification (which C-10 failed to address in its Motion to Reply) for its submission.

2. Dr. Saouma's Commentary In INT053 Does Not Support a Finding of "Compelling Circumstances"

As noted above, NextEra believes that the PID Motions and the New Motions can be resolved on the pleadings alone. Furthermore, the law is clear that the Board and the other parties are under no obligation to review external documents to identify potential support relevant to the applicable legal thresholds.[39] Nevertheless, due to the continued accumulation of untimely, unauthorized, "supplemental" expert testimony and factual declarations in this

34-36 (Corrected June 20, 2019); INT028-00-BD01, Pre-Filed Rebuttal Testimony of Victor E. Saouma, Ph.D Regarding Scientific Evaluation of NextEra's Aging Management Program for Alkali-Silica Reaction at the Seabrook Nuclear Power Plant Submitted on Behalf of C-10 Research and Education Fund at 4, 7-8, 10-12, 43-44 (Aug. 23, 2019).

37 Proposed Reply at 5.

38 *See* Order Closing Record at 2.

39 *See supra* Part III.B.

proceeding, NextEra is left with little choice at this juncture but to evaluate the substance of INT053 to identify any potentially "compelling" circumstances.[40] NextEra enlisted its expert witnesses John Simons, Christopher Bagley, and Edward Carley to provide their professional engineering opinions in this regard. As explained below, and as detailed in their corresponding Affidavit attached hereto,[41] the repetitive arguments and ordinary rebuttal presented in INT053 do not identify any unresolved safety or technical issues that are significant or material to the License Conditions imposed by the Board.

As to License Condition (c) and the monitoring frequency of control extensometers, INT053 reiterates Dr. Saouma's insistence on a requirement to use "error bars."[42] However, as explained in NextEra's Affidavit, this amounts to little more than another challenge regarding uncertainty in the Modulus Correlation.[43] But the Board already considered such arguments and concluded they were "unpersuasive."[44] Thus, INT053 does not identify any safety-significant issue related to License Condition (c),[45] and C-10's desire to revive and supplement its arguments in an untimely reply pleading is not a "compelling circumstance."

Regarding License Condition (d) and the speculated potential for rebar failure or yielding, INT053 reiterates Dr. Saouma's demand for a prescriptive "acoustic sensor"

---

40 *See also* NextEra Reopening Answer at 8 ("if the Board grants the Motion to Reopen, it should issue a corresponding scheduling order for the submission of responsive testimony from NextEra and the NRC Staff.")

41 Attachment 2, Affidavit of John Simons, Christopher Bagley, and Edward Carley in Support of NextEra's Answer Opposing C-10's Motion for Leave to File a Reply and Motion for Leave to File INT053 (Sept. 28, 2020) ("NextEra Affidavit"). Consistent with the discussion *supra* that filing of evidentiary exhibits is prohibited, NextEra is submitting the affidavit as support for this answer, as permitted by 10 C.F.R. § 2.323(c), and is not seeking admission of the affidavit as an exhibit of record.

42 INT053 at 2-5.

43 NextEra Affidavit at 2-3.

44 *Id*. at 3; *Seabrook*, LBP-20-9, 92 NRC at __ (slip op. at 169).

45 NextEra Affidavit at 3.

monitoring requirement.[46] Dr. Saouma's key argument is that a prescriptive acoustic monitoring requirement is "essential to reduce the level of uncertainty."[47] But, the Board already determined that it need not consider alternative methodologies—including acoustic monitoring.[48] Indeed, among the numerous experimental methodologies discussed by Dr. Saouma in his earlier testimony, he explicitly characterized acoustic monitoring "as having the lowest level of accuracy."[49] Thus, INT053 does not identify any safety-significant issue related to License Condition (d),[50] and C-10's desire to file a reply to simply repeat this line of argument is not a "compelling circumstance."

In License Condition (e), the Board imposed a requirement to evaluate expansion rates and adjust monitoring intervals if expansion "significantly exceeds 0.2 mm/m (0.02%) through-thickness expansion per year."[51] In INT053, Dr. Saouma repeats his request that the Board delete the words "significantly exceeds" and impose a prescriptive threshold of 0.2 mm/m per year, and also states his disagreement with Staff's competing proposal to impose a prescriptive threshold of 0.24 mm/m per year.[52] As detailed in NextEra's Affidavit, there is no safety-related reason that the Board's original language must be replaced with either of these prescriptive values.[53] At bottom, C-10's desire to file additional pleadings and exhibits that do not identify

---

46 INT053 at 5.

47 NextEra Affidavit at 3-5.

48 *Id*. at 4-5; *Seabrook*, LBP-20-9, 92 NRC at __ (slip op. at 145).

49 NextEra Affidavit at 4-5.

50 *Id*. at 5.

51 *Seabrook*, LBP-20-9, 92 NRC at __ (slip op. at 193).

52 INT053 at 6.

53 NextEra Affidavit at 5-6.

any unresolved safety or technical issue[54] is insufficient to demonstrate "compelling circumstances."

Finally, with regard to the License Condition (f) requirement that NextEra perform "petrographic analysis to detect internal microcracking and delamination," INT052 advocated for a prescriptive requirement that the analysis detect cracks as small as 10 μm.[55] In INT053, Dr. Saouma acknowledges Staff's observation that industry standards for petrography such as ASTM C856 provide adequate guidance regarding petrographic analysis.[56] Nevertheless, in INT053, Dr. Saouma states that either this standard or his 10 μm definition must be prescriptively added to License Condition (f).[57] However, as explained in NextEra's Affidavit (which is consistent with the Staff's position), the Board's original wording in License Condition (f) is sufficient because (1) the condition is appropriately interpreted as requiring adherence to current industry standard petrography practices, (2) NextEra has long used ASTM C856 to perform petrography at Seabrook (and in the LSTP), and (3) reference to one particular standard, which could be superseded by a subsequent industry standard, would be inappropriate as a long-term license condition.[58] Thus, INT053 does not identify any safety-significant issues in this regard,[59] and C-10's desire to submit further pleadings on this topic does not conjure "compelling circumstances."

* * *

54 *Id*. at 6.

55 INT052 at 4-5.

56 INT053 at 5-6.

57 *Id*. at 6.

58 NextEra Affidavit at 6-7.

59 *Id*. at 7.

Ultimately, nothing in the Motion to Reply, the proposed Reply, or proposed exhibit INT053 "demonstrates" "compelling circumstances." Thus, C-10 has not satisfied its burden under 10 C.F.R. § 2.323(c) to justify the need for a reply.

IV. CONCLUSION

For the reasons articulated above, the Board should deny C-10's New Motions, disregard the proposed Reply, and disregard INT053.

Respectfully submitted,

Executed in Accord with 10 C.F.R. § 2.304(d)
Steven Hamrick, Esq.
NEXTERA ENERGY SEABROOK, LLC
801 Pennsylvania Ave., NW Suite 220
Washington, D.C. 20004
(202) 349-3496
steven.hamrick@fpl.com

Executed in Accord with 10 C.F.R. § 2.304(d)
Paul M. Bessette, Esq.
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
(202) 739-5796
paul.bessette@morganlewis.com

Signed (electronically) by Ryan K. Lighty
Ryan K. Lighty, Esq.
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
(202) 739-5274
ryan.lighty@morganlewis.com

Counsel for NextEra Energy Seabrook, LLC

Dated in Washington, DC
this 28th day of September 2020

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

BEFORE THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD

In the Matter of:	)	
	)	Docket No. 50-443-LA-2
NEXTERA ENERGY SEABROOK, LLC	)	
	)	September 28, 2020
(Seabrook Station Unit 1)	)	

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Pursuant to 10 C.F.R. § 2.305, I certify that, on this date, the foregoing "NextEra's Answer Opposing C-10's Motion for Leave to File a Reply and Motion for Leave to File INT053" and Attachments 1 and 2 thereto were served upon the Electronic Information Exchange (the NRC's E-Filing System), in the above-captioned proceeding.

Signed (electronically) by Ryan K. Lighty

Ryan K. Lighty, Esq.
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
(202) 739-5274
ryan.lighty@morganlewis.com

Counsel for NextEra Energy Seabrook, LLC

DB1/ 116244683