

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

**BEFORE THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD PANEL**

---

**In the Matter of  
South Texas Project Nuclear Operating Co.  
Application for the South Texas Project  
52-013  
Units 3 and 4  
Combined Operating License**

**Docket Nos. 52-012,**

**September 13, 2011**

---

**INTERVENORS' REPLY TO OPPOSITIONS TO ADMISSION OF NEW  
CONTENTION**

Pursuant to 10 C.F.R. § 2.309(h)(2), Intervenor's hereby reply to the oppositions submitted by the Applicant NRC Staff to Intervenor's new contention seeking consideration of the environmental implications of the Fukushima Task Force Report. Intervenor's respectfully submit that the arguments by Applicant and Staff regarding the timeliness and admissibility of the contention are without merit and therefore the contention should be admitted.

The arguments raised by Applicant and Staff in response to Intervenor's contention are similar or identical to arguments made by the applicant and staff in response to Fukushima Task Force Report-related contentions that were filed in other reactor licensing proceedings on the same day. Intervenor's attach and incorporate by reference the attached Reply Memorandum, which addresses the most common arguments that are made in the responses and was prepared by counsel for intervenors in

several of the cases.<sup>1</sup> The Reply Memorandum also discusses the effect of the NRC Commissioners' recent decision regarding the Emergency Petition that was submitted by SACE and many other intervenors and petitioners in April 2011. *Union Electric Co., d/b/a/ Ameren Missouri* (Callaway Plant, Unit 2), et al., CLI-11-05, \_\_ NRC \_\_ (Sept. 9, 2011) ("CLI-11-05").<sup>2</sup>

In addition, Intervenors hereby reply to arguments by Applicant and NRC Staff that the contention is not specific and therefore fails to meet the NRC's standard for admissibility of contentions. This argument is incorrect. Intervenors specifically challenge the failure of the EIS to address the significant environmental implications of the findings and recommendations raised by the NRC's Fukushima Task Force Report. Contention at 4-9. The contention also specifically identifies the language in the EIS in which the environmental impacts of the proposed reactor are described as insignificant. *Id.* at 11.

Intervenor's demand has yet to be satisfied in any respect. Neither the NRC nor Applicant has prepared a single document under the National Environmental Policy Act that addresses the environmental implications of the Fukushima accident or the Task Force Report. Unless and until the NRC or Applicant makes some attempt to satisfy NEPA, Intervenor's contention of omission is admissible.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Reply Memorandum was prepared by Intervenors' counsel in the Watts Bar and Diablo Canyon license renewal proceedings.

<sup>2</sup> Because the applicant and the NRC Staff have not had an opportunity to address the effect of CLI-11-05 on the timeliness and admissibility of SACE's contention, SACE would not object to a response by the applicant and the Staff to their arguments regarding the relevance of CLI-11-05 to their contention.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/Robert V. Eye

Robert V. Eye, Kan. Sup. Ct.

No.10689

Kauffman & Eye

123 SE 6<sup>th</sup> Ave., Suite 200

Topeka, Kansas 66603

785-234-4040

[bob@kauffmaneye.com](mailto:bob@kauffmaneye.com)

## **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on September 13, 2011 a copy of Intervenor's "REPLY TO OPPOSITIONS TO ADMISSION OF NEW CONTENTION" was served by the Electronic Information Exchange on the following recipients:

Administrative Judge  
Michael M. Gibson, Chair  
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel  
Mail Stop T-3 F23  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC 20555-0001  
E-mail: mmg3@nrc.gov

Administrative Judge  
Dr. Randall J. Charbeneau  
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel  
Mail Stop T-3 F23  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC 20555-0001  
E-mail: Randall.Charbeneau@nrc.gov

Administrative Judge  
Dr. Gary S. Arnold  
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel  
Mail Stop T-3 F23  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC 20555-0001  
E-mail: gxa1@nrc.gov

Office of the General Counsel  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Mail Stop O-15D21  
Washington, DC 20555-0001  
Michael Spencer, Sara Kirkwood,  
Jessica Bielecki, Anthony Wilson  
E-mail: Michael.Spencer@nrc.gov  
Sara.Kirkwood@nrc.gov  
Jessica.Bielecki@nrc.gov  
Anthony.Wilson@nrc.gov

Office of the Secretary  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Rulemakings and Adjudications Staff

Washington, DC 20555-0001  
E-mail: hearingdocket@nrc.gov

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

Counsel for STP Nuclear Operating Company  
Steven P. Frantz  
Stephen J. Burdick  
Alvin Gutterman  
John E. Matthews  
Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP  
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
Phone: 202-739-3000  
Fax: 202-739-3001  
E-mail: sfrantz@morganlewis.com  
sburdick@morganlewis.com  
agutterman@morganlewis.com  
jmatthews@morganlewis.com

*Signed (electronically) by Robert V. Eye*

Robert V. Eye  
Counsel for the Petitioners  
Kauffman & Eye  
123 SE 6<sup>th</sup> Ave., Suite 200  
Topeka, KS 66603  
E-mail: bob@kauffmaneye.com