

February 2, 1984

✓^{4E}
PR

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. Udall/cc: Rep. Lujan
Rep. Markey/cc: Rep. Marlenee
Sen. Chiles
Sen. Hawkins
Rep. Fascell
Rep. Pepper

8510230027 851004
PDR FOIA
JACOBS84-478 PDR

65

OFFICE	COMB						
SURNAME	COMB						
DATE	2/2/84						



**UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**
Office of Public Affairs
Washington, D.C. 20555

NO. 84-16
Tel. 301/492-7715

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
(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.