

United States of America  
Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board

Before Administrative Judges:

Alex S. Karlin, Chair  
Dr. Anthony J. Baratta  
Dr. William M. Murphy

In the Matter of:  PROGRESS ENERGY FLORIDA, INC. Combined License Application for Levy County Units 1 & 2	Dockets Numbers 52-029-COL and 52-030-COL August 11, 2011
---	---

**Contention 5 on Severe Accident Impact on Multiple Sites -- Submitted for  
Reconsideration by the The Ecology Party of Florida, Nuclear Information and  
Resource Service and the Green Party of Florida**

---

The resubmission of contention is offered as part of a multi-document filing. Legal discussions are contained in the other documents filed today, including the Motion for Leave to offer a new contention (13) and to resubmit this contention 5 from the original Petition to Intervene and Request for a Hearing of February 5, 2009. The Ecology Party of Florida, Nuclear Information and Resource Service and the Green Party of Florida (Intervenors) incorporate here by reference the discussion of the NRC's report entitled Recommendations for Enhancing Reactor Safety in the 21st Century: The Near-Term Task Force Review of Insights from the Fukushima Dai-ichi Accident at 20-21 (July 12, 2011) ("Task Force Report") on pages 1 - 4 of CONTENTION 13 REGARDING NEPA REQUIREMENT TO ADDRESS SAFETY AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE FUKUSHIMA TASK FORCE REPORT also filed today, August 11, 2011. We note that the Task Force put considerable emphasis on the need for the Commission to consider, and re-consider the possible impacts of accidents at multiple

units and the impact of accidents at one unit on other units. Contention 5 is squarely within the concerns raised by the Task Force Report and deserves reconsideration. This request is timely.

From Page 72 of the February 2009 Petition to Intervene:

CONTENTION 5 Proximity of Proposed Site to Crystal River Nuclear Power Station Not Assessed in SAMA Analysis

PEF relies on the Westinghouse probabilistic risk assessment ("PRA") which as cited in contention 1, was done in the Rev 15 phase of non-certified design. To date there is not an updated PRA for Rev 16 as incorporated in PEF's COLA, nor for Rev 17 that it appears has now supplanted Rev 16 in consideration for certification. Therefore the entire SAMA section does not appear to be relevant at this time. Nonetheless, there is a striking omission in the COL part 3, Environment Report, Chapter 7 on severe accidents, there is no consideration of the impact of a severe radiological accident at Crystal River Energy Complex ("CREC"). An accident at the nuclear unit at CREC could disrupt normal operations at Levy County units 1 and 2 and should be analyzed in the SAMA analysis for this COL. There is an additional concern that the safety provisions for control room operators at Levy County 1 and 2 if the AP 1000 is utilized, will presume that the source of any radiological disruption originates from an AP 1000. If however, the source of the radiological emergency is, in fact CREC, the protective measures supplied may not be sufficient due to the different assumptions for AP 1000s

cited in section 7.2.1 of the PEF Environment Report.

Respectfully Submitted,

\_\_\_\_\_/s/\_\_\_\_\_  
Mary Olson  
Nuclear Information and Resource Service  
Southeast Office,  
PO Box 7586  
Asheville, North Carolina 28802  
828-252-8409

on behalf of the Co-Interveners

August 11, 2011