

August 3, 2012

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

BEFORE THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD

In the Matter of)	
)	
FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY)	Docket Nos. 52-040-COL and 52-041-COL
)	
(Turkey Point Units 6 and 7))	

NRC STAFF ANSWER TO JOINT INTERVENORS' MOTION
FOR LEAVE TO FILE A NEW CONTENTION

INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to 10 C.F.R. § 2.309(h)(1), the Staff of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (Staff) herein responds to the "Intervenors' Motion For Leave To File A New Contention Concerning Temporary Storage And Ultimate Disposal Of Nuclear Waste At Turkey Point Nuclear Power Plant" (Motion) dated July 9, 2012, filed by the Southern Alliance for Clean Energy, the National Parks Conservation Association, Dan Kipnis, and Mark Oncavage (collectively, Joint Intervenors). The Motion raises a new contention based on the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeal's June 8, 2012 opinion in *New York v. NRC*, 681 F.3d 471 (D.C. Cir. 2012). As explained below, the new contention would be admissible if the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board (Board) presiding over this proceeding rules on it after the D.C. Circuit issues the mandate for that decision. But, if the Board rules before the issuance of the mandate, then the Commission's existing regulations bar admission of the contention, and the Board should dismiss it without prejudice to timely refiling upon issuance of the court's mandate.

BACKGROUND

I. Procedural History

This proceeding concerns the Florida Power & Light Company (FPL or Applicant) application for combined licenses (COLs) for Units 6 and 7 at the Turkey Point facility in Miami-Dade County, Florida. Notice of Receipt and Availability of Application for a Combined License, 74 Fed. Reg. 38,477 (Aug. 3, 2009). The Joint Intervenors filed a petition to intervene in August 2010. Petition for Intervention (Aug. 17, 2010) (ADAMS Accession No. ML102300582) (Petition). The Board granted the Petition upon finding that the Joint Intervenors had shown standing and had proffered at least one admissible contention. *Florida Power & Light Co.* (Turkey Point Nuclear Generating Plant, Units 6 and 7), LBP-11-06, 73 NRC 149, 171-72, 188-194 (2011).¹ FPL subsequently revised its application and moved to dismiss the contention as moot, and the Joint Intervenors responded with a motion to amend its admitted contention, which the Board granted in part. *Florida Power & Light Co.* (Turkey Point Units 6 and 7), LBP-12-09, 75 NRC ___, ___ (May 2, 2012) (slip op. at 3-4, 20).²

On June 8, 2012, the United States Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit vacated the NRC's Waste Confidence Decision Update and Temporary Storage Rule and remanded those rulemakings back to the agency. *New York v. NRC*, 681 F.3d at 483. Shortly thereafter, the Joint Intervenors, together with various other organizations including CASE, submitted a petition requesting that the NRC "suspend its final licensing decisions in all pending NRC licensing proceedings pending completion of the remanded proceedings[.]" See Petition to Suspend Final Decisions in All Pending Reactor Licensing Proceedings Pending Completion of

¹ The Board also granted a hearing request filed by Citizens Allied for Safe Energy (CASE), and admitted two of its contentions in part. *Turkey Point*, LBP-11-06, 73 NRC at 171-72. On May 2, 2012, the Board dismissed CASE from this proceeding. *Turkey Point*, LBP-12-07, 74 NRC ___ (slip op. at 22).

² On July 19, 2012, FPL requested summary disposition of the Joint Intervenors' currently pending contention (NEPA Contention 2.1). [FPL's] Motion for Summary Disposition of Joint Intervenors' Amended Contention 2.1 (July 19, 2012). Answers to FPL's motion for summary disposition are due on August 8, 2012, and that motion remains pending. See 10 C.F.R. § 2.1205(b) (allowing 20 days for an answer to a motion for summary disposition).

Remanded Waste Confidence Proceedings, at 3 (June 18, 2012) (ADAMS Accession No. ML12170A858) (Suspension Petition). In the Suspension Petition, the Joint Intervenors also requested that the Commission establish a 60-day timetable for submitting new site-specific contentions based on the D.C. Circuit's ruling. *Id.* at 12.

In its response to the Suspension Petition, the Staff stated that the Commission's normal adjudicatory procedures in 10 C.F.R. Part 2 provide "well-understood and appropriate means for raising contentions based on new information[.]" See NRC Staff's Answer to Petition to Suspend Final Decisions in All Pending Reactor Licensing Proceedings Pending Completion of Remanded Waste Confidence Proceedings, at 4-5 (June 25, 2012). The Joint Intervenors then filed the instant Motion, which the Staff now answers.

II. The NRC's Waste Confidence Decision

In the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), Congress announced a national policy "to create and maintain conditions under which man and nature can exist in productive harmony." 42 U.S.C. § 4331(a). NEPA requires the NRC to prepare an environmental impact statement (EIS) to support a major Federal action, such as issuing a license for a power reactor. 42 U.S.C. § 4332. The NRC regulations in 10 C.F.R. Part 51 govern this process. Among other things, these regulations require applicants to submit an environmental report (ER) as part of a license application to aid the NRC in conducting its environmental analysis. 10 C.F.R. § 51.41.

Before acting on a power reactor license application, NEPA requires the NRC to address the environmental impacts of operation, including on-site storage and disposal of the reactor's spent fuel after the licensed period of operation ends. *Minnesota v. NRC*, 602 F.2d 412, 414-15, 419 (D.C. Cir. 1979). In the past, "the Commission sensibly has chosen to address high-level waste disposal generically." *Duke Energy Corp.* (Oconee Nuclear Station, Units 1, 2, and 3), CLI-99-11, 49 NRC 328, 345 (1999). The agency has most recently addressed issues pertaining to spent fuel storage and disposal in its "Waste Confidence Decision Update,"

75 Fed. Reg. 81,037 (Dec. 23, 2010) (Waste Confidence Decision) and a temporary storage rulemaking, “Consideration of Environmental Impacts of Temporary Storage of Spent Fuel after Cessation of Reactor Operation,” Final Rule, 75 Fed. Reg. 81,032 (Dec. 23, 2010) (Temporary Storage Rule).

The Waste Confidence Decision Update and the Temporary Storage Rule support generic findings in 10 C.F.R. § 51.23(a) regarding the impacts of spent fuel storage after the licensed period of operation. See 10 C.F.R. § 51.23(a); Motion at 4. The Commission rendered several findings in § 51.23(a). Two of those findings are (1) that spent fuel “can be stored safely and without significant environmental impacts for at least 60 years beyond the licensed life for operation” and (2) that “there is reasonable assurance that sufficient mined geologic repository capacity will be available . . . when necessary.” 10 C.F.R. § 51.23(a). 10 C.F.R. § 51.23(b) relies on § 51.23(a) to exclude “discussion of any environmental impact of spent fuel storage [during] the period following the term of the reactor operating license” from any EIS, Environmental Assessment, or ER. 10 C.F.R. § 51.23(b). .

DISCUSSION

The Joint Intervenors base the proposed contention on the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals’ recent decision in *New York v. NRC*, 681 F.3d 471, 473 (D.C. Cir. 2012). The D.C. Circuit’s decision vacated the NRC’s updated Waste Confidence Decision and its Temporary Storage Rule and remanded those rulemakings to the NRC. *Id.* at 483. The proposed contention states as follows:

The Environmental Report for Turkey Point Units 6 & 7 does not satisfy NEPA because it does not include a discussion of the environmental impacts of spent fuel storage after cessation of operation, including the impacts of spent fuel pool leakage, spent fuel pool fires, and failing to establish a spent fuel repository, as required by the U.S. Court of Appeals in *State of New York v. NRC*, No. 11-1045 (June 8, 2012). Therefore, unless and until the NRC conducts such an analysis, no license may be issued.

Motion at 4. At root, the Motion asserts that because the generic findings in the Commission's rulemaking have been vacated, "the NRC no longer has any legal basis for Section 51.23(b), which relies on those findings to exempt both the agency staff and license applicants from addressing long-term spent fuel storage impacts in individual licensing proceedings." *Id.* at 4-5.

Although the contention was filed after the initial deadline for submitting contentions in this proceeding, the Joint Intervenors assert that they meet the standards of § 2.309(f)(2) for late-filed contentions. *Id.* at 6-7. Considering the holding of the D.C. Circuit and that the Motion was filed within 30 days of the ruling, the Staff agrees that the Joint Intervenors have sufficiently demonstrated the timeliness of their filing under that regulation.

The Board has previously discussed the Commission's standards for contention admissibility, which prohibit challenges to existing Commission regulations. *See Turkey Point*, LBP-11-06, 73 NRC at 170 n.16; 10 C.F.R. § 2.335.³ The Joint Intervenors recognize that "because the mandate has not yet issued in *State of New York*, this contention may be premature." Motion at 2. Indeed, the Commission has observed, "A court acts only through its mandate. When a mandate is stayed, a decision has no binding effect" *Public Service Co. of New Hampshire* (Seabrook Station, Units 1 and 2), CLI-76-17, 4 NRC 451, 466 (1976) (*citing Bailey v. Henslee*, 309 F.2d 840, 844 (8th Cir. 1962)). Thus, when a board suspended a construction permit because an appellate decision invalidated a relevant NRC regulation, the Commission overturned the board, in part, because that mandate had not yet issued. *Id.* at 467. Moreover, licensing boards have typically found contentions premature, and therefore inadmissible, when those contentions relied on court decisions for which a mandate had not issued. *E.g., Cleveland Elec. Illuminating Co.* (Perry Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2),

³ See 10 C.F.R. § 2.335(a) (noting that unless a party seeks a waiver of Commission regulations, "no rule or regulation of the Commission, or any provision thereof, concerning the licensing of production and utilization facilities . . . is subject to attack by way of discovery, proof, argument, or other means in any adjudicatory proceeding").

LBP-82-53, 16 NRC 196, 205 (1982).⁴ As the licensing board in *Perry* stated, “Until that mandate is issued, the rules of the Commission remain in effect and this Board continues to be bound by them. As a result, the Court of Appeals’ decision does not as yet provide a ground for” an admissible contention.⁵ *Id.*

Under the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure, a “court’s mandate must issue 7 days after the time to file a petition for rehearing expires, or 7 days after entry of an order denying a timely petition for panel rehearing, petition for rehearing en banc or motion for stay of mandate, whichever is later.” Fed. R. App. P. 41(b). On July 6, 2012, at the Commission’s request, the D.C. Circuit extended the period of time to file a petition for rehearing of *New York v. NRC* to August 22, 2012. *New York v. NRC*, No. 11-1045 (D.C. Cir. July 6, 2012) (order granting unopposed motion to extend time period to seek rehearing). As a result, under Rule 41(b), the mandate is not likely to issue until at least August 29, 2012. Accordingly, because 10 C.F.R. § 51.23(b) remains in effect until the mandate issues, NRC regulations will continue to require the Board to exclude the Joint Intervenors’ contention until the court issues the mandate. *Seabrook Station*, CLI-76-17, 4 NRC at 466. Consequently, the admissibility of the underlying contention depends on whether the mandate has issued when this Board rules on the Motion.

If the D.C. Circuit’s mandate issues before the Board rules on the contention’s admissibility, upon the mandate’s issuance, the contention as pled would satisfy each of the § 2.309(f)(1) criteria and would be admissible as a contention of omission. See Motion at 4-6.

⁴ But see *Louisiana Power and Light Co.* (Waterford Steam Electric Station, Unit 3), LBP-82-100, 16 NRC 1550, 1556-57 (1982) (noting that because “the mandate of that case has not been issued . . . we have deferred our rulings on these requests”).

⁵ The Commission recognizes its responsibility to “act promptly and constructively in effectuating the decisions of the courts.” *Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corp.* (Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station), CLI-76-14, 4 NRC 163, 166 (1976). Further, the Commission understands that “all that the mandate does is to effectuate the court of appeal’s judgment by formally returning the proceeding to the NRC[;] the eventual – legally required – issuance of the mandate is hardly an ‘unanticipated event.’” *Pacific Gas & Elec. Co.* (Diablo Canyon Power Plant Independent Spent Fuel Storage Installation), CLI-06-27, 64 NRC 399, 401 (2006). Thus, the Commission, of course, could decide to act prior to issuance of the court’s mandate. *Vermont Yankee*, CLI-76-14, 4 NRC at 166. However, in the instant case, the Board cannot admit a contention that challenges an NRC regulation before a court of appeals issues its mandate striking down that regulation.

This determination, however, would remain subject to direction or action taken by the Commission in response to the D.C. Circuit's ruling, including any generic rulemaking action and issuance of any Commission instruction with respect to how contentions based on the court's ruling are to be addressed in individual NRC proceedings. For example, in the event that the Commission solely undertakes a generic rulemaking approach to address these issues, the contention may need to be dismissed. See, e.g., *Oconee*, CLI-99-11, 49 NRC at 345 ("Licensing Boards 'should not accept in individual license proceedings contentions which are (or are about to become) the subject of general rulemaking by the Commission.'").

If the D.C. Circuit's mandate has not issued by the time the Board rules on the contention, then 10 C.F.R. § 51.23 will remain in place. That regulation excludes from NRC NEPA documents any need to consider the environmental impacts of onsite spent fuel storage after the licensed term of operation. Because the contention demands such consideration (Motion at 4), the contention at present would constitute an impermissible attack on existing Commission regulations. 10 C.F.R. § 2.335(a). Accordingly, pending the issuance of the court's mandate, the Board should reject the contention, subject to refiling without prejudice when, and if, the mandate issues. If the Joint Intervenors refile the contention after the court issues the mandate, it would be timely if filed within 30 days of the mandate's issuance and would be admissible provided the claims it raises do not become the subject of a generic rulemaking. 10 C.F.R. § 2.309(f)(2); *Oconee*, CLI-99-11, 49 NRC at 345.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the Staff agrees with the Joint Intervenors that the contention would be admissible upon issuance of the D.C. Circuit's mandate in *New York v. NRC*. However, if the Board rules before that time, the contention must be rejected as an impermissible challenge to NRC regulations. Finally, the admission of this contention is subject to any further action by the Commission, including commencement of a generic rulemaking to

address these matters and the issuance of instructions as to how the contention should be addressed.

Respectfully submitted,

/Signed (electronically) by/

Robert M. Weisman
Counsel for the NRC Staff
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Mail Stop O-15 D21
Washington, DC 20555-0001
(301) 415-1696
Robert.Weisman@nrc.gov

Dated at Rockville, Maryland
this 3rd day of August, 2012

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

BEFORE THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD

In the Matter of)	
)	
)	
FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY)	Docket Nos. 52-040 & 52-041
)	
(Turkey Point Units 6 and 7))	

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that copies of the "NRC STAFF ANSWER TO JOINT INTERVENORS' MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE A NEW CONTENTION" has been served upon the following persons by Electronic Information Exchange this 3rd day of August, 2012:

Administrative Judge, Chairman E. Roy Hawkens Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel Mail Stop – T-3 F23 U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, D.C. 20555-0001 E-mail: Roy.Hawkens@nrc.gov	Office of Commission Appellate Adjudication Mail Stop O-16C1 U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, D.C. 20555-0001 E-mail: OCAEmail@nrc.gov
--	---

Administrative Judge Dr. Michael F. Kennedy Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel Mail Stop – T-3 F23 U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, D.C. 20555-0001 E-mail: Michael.Kennedy@nrc.gov	Office of the Secretary ATTN: Docketing and Service Mail Stop: O-16C1 U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, D.C. 20555-0001 E-mail: HEARINGDOCKET@nrc.gov
--	---

Administrative Judge Dr. William C. Burnett Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel Mail Stop – T-3 F23 U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, D.C. 20555-0001 E-mail: William.Burnett2@nrc.gov	William C. Garner Gregory T. Stewart Nabors, Giblin & Nickerson, P.A. 1500 Mahan Dr., Suite 200 Tallahassee, FL 32308 Email: bgarner@ngnlaw.com; gstewart@ngnlaw.com
---	--

Mindy Goldstein
Turner Environmental Law Clinic
Emory University School of Law
1301 Clifton Rd.
Atlanta, GA 30322
Email: magolds@emory.edu

Richard Grosso
Everglades Law Center, Inc.
3305 College Ave.
Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33314
Email: Richard@evergladeslaw.org

Mitchell S. Ross
James M. Petro, Jr.
Counsel for the Applicant
Florida Power & Light Co.
Mail Stop LAW/JB
700 Universe Blvd.
Juno Beach, FL 33408
E-mail: Mitch.Ross@fpl.com
james.petro@fpl.com

John H. O'Neill, Jr.
Matias F. Travieso-Diaz
Counsel for the Applicant
Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw Pittman LLP
2300 N Street, NW
Washington, DC 20037-1128
E-mail: John.O'Neill@pillsburylaw.com;
Matias.Travieso-Diaz@pillsburylaw.com;

Steven C. Hamrick
Counsel for the Applicant
Florida Power & Light Co.
801 Pennsylvania Ave., Ste. 220
Washington, D.C. 20004
Email: Steven.Hamrick@fpl.com

Barry White
Citizens Allied for Safe Energy
10001 S.W. 129th Terr.
Miami, FL 33176
Email: bwtamia@bellsouth.net

/Signed (electronically) by/

Robert M. Weisman
Counsel for the NRC Staff
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Mail Stop O-15 D21
Washington, D.C. 20555-0001
(301) 415-1696
(301) 415-3725 fax
Robert.Weisman@nrc.gov

Dated at Rockville, Maryland
this 3rd day of August, 2012