Notice of Permit Applications Received Under the Antarctic Conservation Act of 1978 (Pub. L. 95–541)

AGENCY: National Science Foundation.

ACTION: Notice of Permit Applications Received under the Antarctic Conservation Act of 1978, Pub. L. 95–541.

SUMMARY: The National Science Foundation (NSF) is required to publish notice of permit applications received to conduct activities regulated under the Antarctic Conservation Act of 1978. NSF has published regulations under the Antarctic Conservation Act at Title 45 Part 670 of the Code of Federal Regulations. This is the required notice of permit applications received.

DATES: Interested parties are invited to submit written data, comments, or views with respect to this permit application by June 10, 2010. This application may be inspected by interested parties at the Permit Office, address below.

ADDRESSES: Comments should be addressed to Permit Office, Room 755, Office of Polar Programs, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, Virginia 22230.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Nadene G. Kennedy at the above address or (703) 292–7405.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The National Science Foundation, as directed by the Antarctic Conservation Act of 1978 (Pub. L. 95–541), as amended by the Antarctic Science, Tourism and Conservation Act of 1996, has developed regulations for the establishment of a permit system for various activities in Antarctica and designation of certain animals and certain geographic areas requiring special protection. The regulations establish such a permit system to designate Antarctic Specially Protected Areas. The applications received are as follows:

1. Applicant, Diana H. Wall, Natural Resource Ecology Laboratory, Colorado State University, 200 West Lake, Fort Collins, CO 80523–1499.

Activity for Which Permit is Requested

Enter Antarctic Specially Protected Areas (ASPA) and Import into the USA. The applicant plans to enter the Canada Glacier area (ASPA 131) to collect a number of soil and sediment samples that represent all microhabitats found in the area. The microhabitats in question includes barren dry soils, moist to wet soils, and soils and sediment associated with mosses, lichens and algal mats. The applicant will extract nematodes, tardigrades and rotifers from these soils for identification and classification. The collection of these samples will help to investigate the distribution of soil fauna within the McMurdo Dry Valleys and their influence on the ecosystem function, and to understand the implications of future climate changes.

Location

Canada Glacier (ASPA 131), Taylor Dry Valley.

Dates

December 2, 2010 to January 31, 2011.

Nadene G. Kennedy, Permit Officer, Office of Polar Programs.

NRC–2010–0168

Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendments to Facility Operating Licenses, Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity for a Hearing

The Commission has made a proposed determination that the following amendment requests involve no significant hazards consideration. Under the Commission’s regulations in Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations (10 CFR), Section 50.92(c), this means that operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; or (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. The basis for this proposed determination for each amendment request is shown below. The Commission is seeking public comments on this proposed determination. Any comments received within 30 days after the date of publication of this notice will be considered in making any final determination.

The Commission will not issue the amendment until the expiration of 60 days after the date of publication of this notice. The Commission may issue the license amendment before expiration of the 60−day period provided that its final determination is that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration. In addition, the Commission may issue the amendment prior to the expiration of the 30−day comment period should circumstances change during the 30−day comment period such that failure to act in a timely way would result, for example, in derating or shutdown of the facility. Should the Commission make a final No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, any hearing will take place after issuance. The Commission expects that the need to take this action will occur very infrequently.

Written comments may be submitted by mail to the Chief, Rules, Announcements and Directives Branch (RADB), TBW−08−B01M, Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001, and should cite the publication date and page number of this Federal
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NRC–2010–0168

Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendments to Facility Operating Licenses, Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity for a Hearing

The Commission has made a proposed determination that the following amendment requests involve no significant hazards consideration. Under the Commission’s regulations in Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations (10 CFR), Section 50.92(c), this means that operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; or (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. The basis for this proposed determination for each amendment request is shown below. The Commission is seeking public comments on this proposed determination. Any comments received within 30 days after the date of publication of this notice will be considered in making any final determination.

Normally, the Commission will not issue the amendment until the expiration of 60 days after the date of publication of this notice. The Commission may issue the license amendment before expiration of the 60−day period provided that its final determination is that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration. In addition, the Commission may issue the amendment prior to the expiration of the 30−day comment period should circumstances change during the 30−day comment period such that failure to act in a timely way would result, for example, in derating or shutdown of the facility. Should the Commission make a final No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, any hearing will take place after issuance. The Commission expects that the need to take this action will occur very infrequently.

Written comments may be submitted by mail to the Chief, Rules, Announcements and Directives Branch (RADB), TBW−08−B01M, Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001, and should cite the publication date and page number of this Federal
Register notice. Written comments may also be faxed to the RADB at 301–492–3446. Documents may be examined, and/or copied for a fee, at the NRC’s Public Document Room (PDR), located at One White Flint North, Public File Area 01F21, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland.

Within 60 days after the date of publication of this notice, any person(s) whose interest may be affected by this action may file a request for a hearing and a petition to intervene with respect to issuance of the amendment to the subject facility operating license. Requests for a hearing and a petition for leave to intervene shall be filed in accordance with the Commission’s “Rules of Practice for Domestic Licensing Proceedings” in 10 CFR part 2. Interested person(s) should consult a current copy of 10 CFR 2.309, which is available at the Commission’s PDR, located at One White Flint North, Public File Area 01F21, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland, or at http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/doc-collections/ct/par002/par002-0309.html. Publicly available records will be accessible from the Agencywide Documents Access and Management System’s (ADAMS) Public Electronic Reading Room on the Internet at the NRC Web site, http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm.html. If a request for a hearing or petition for leave to intervene is filed within 60 days, the Commission or a presiding officer designated by the Commission or by the Chief Administrative Judge of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, will rule on the request and/or petition; and the Secretary or the Chief Administrative Judge of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board will issue a notice of a hearing or an appropriate order.

As required by 10 CFR 2.309, a petition for leave to intervene shall be set forth with particularity the interest of the petitioner in the proceeding, and how that interest may be affected by the results of the proceeding. The petition should specifically explain the reasons why intervention should be permitted with particular reference to the following general requirements: (1) The name, address, and telephone number of the requestor/petitioner; (2) the nature of the requestor’s petition or the right under the Act to be made a party to the proceeding; (3) the nature and extent of the requestor’s interest in the proceeding; and (4) the possible effect of any decision or order which may be entered in the proceeding on the requestor’s interest. The petition must also set forth the specific contentions which the requestor/petitioner seeks to have litigated at the proceeding.

Each contention must consist of a specific statement of the issue of law or fact to be raised or controverted. In addition, the requestor/petitioner shall provide a brief explanation of the bases for the contention and a concise statement of the alleged facts or expert opinion which support the contention and on which the requestor/petitioner intends to rely in proving the contention at the hearing. The requestor/petitioner must also provide references to those specific sources and documents of which the petitioner is aware and on which the requestor/petitioner intends to rely to establish those facts or expert opinion. The petition must include sufficient information to show that a genuine dispute exists with the applicant on a material issue of law or fact. Contentions shall be limited to matters within the scope of the amendment under consideration. The contention must be one which, if proven, would entitle the requestor/petitioner to relief. A requestor/petitioner who fails to satisfy these requirements with respect to at least one contention will not be permitted to participate as a party.

Those permitted to intervene become parties to the proceeding, subject to any limitations in the order granting leave to intervene, and have the opportunity to participate fully in the conduct of the hearing.

If a hearing is requested, and the Commission has not made a final determination on the issue of no significant hazards consideration, the Commission will make a final determination on the issue of no significant hazards consideration. The final determination will serve to decide when the hearing is held. If the final determination is that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration, the Commission may issue the amendment and make it immediately effective, notwithstanding the request for a hearing. Any hearing held would take place after issuance of the amendment. If the final determination is that the amendment request involves a significant hazards consideration, any hearing held would take place before the issuance of any amendment.

All documents filed in NRC adjudicatory proceedings, including a request for hearing, a petition for leave to intervene, any motion or other document filed in the proceeding prior to the issuance of a request for hearing or petition to intervene, and documents filed by interested governmental entities participating under 10 CFR 2.315(c), must be filed in accordance with the NRC E-Filing rule (72 FR 49139, August 28, 2007). The E-Filing process requires participants to submit and serve all adjudicatory documents over the internet, or in some cases to mail copies on electronic storage media. Participants may not submit paper copies of their filings unless they seek an exemption in accordance with the procedures described below.

To comply with the procedural requirements of E-Filing, at least ten (10) days prior to the filing deadline, the participant should contact the Office of the Secretary by e-mail at hearing.docket@nrc.gov, or by telephone at (301) 415–1677, to request (1) a digital ID certificate, which allows the participant (or its counsel or representative) to digitally sign documents and access the E-Submittal server for any proceeding in which it is participating; and (2) advise the Secretary that the participant will be submitting a request or petition for hearing (even in instances in which the participant, or its counsel or representative, already holds an NRC-issued digital ID certificate). Based upon this information, the Secretary will establish an electronic docket for the hearing in this proceeding if the Secretary has not already established an electronic docket.

Information about applying for a digital ID certificate is available on NRC’s public Web site at http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/e-submittals/apply-certificates.html. System requirements for accessing the E-Submittal server are detailed in NRC’s “Guidance for Electronic Submission,” which is available on the agency’s public Web site at http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/e-submittals.html. Participants may attempt to use other software not listed on the Web site, but should note that the NRC’s E-Filing system does not support unlisted software, and the NRC Meta System Help Desk will not be able to offer assistance in using unlisted software.

If a participant is electronically submitting a document to the NRC in accordance with the E-Filing rule, the participant must file the document using the NRC’s online, Web-based submission form. In order to serve documents through EIE, users will be required to install a Web browser plug-in from the NRC Web site. Further information on the Web-based submission form, including the installation of the Web browser plug-in, is available on the NRC’s public Web...

Once a participant has obtained a digital ID certificate and a docket has been created, the participant can then submit a request for hearing or petition for leave to intervene. Submissions should be in Portable Document Format (PDF) in accordance with NRC guidance available on the NRC public Web site at http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/e-submittals.html. A filing is considered complete at the time the documents are submitted through the NRC’s E-Filing system. To be timely, an electronic filing must be submitted to the E-Filing system no later than 11:59 p.m. Eastern Time on the due date. Upon receipt of a transmission, the E-Filing system time-stamps the document and sends the submitter an e-mail notice confirming receipt of the document. The E-Filing system also distributes an e-mail notice that provides access to the document to the NRC Office of the General Counsel and any other system that they wish to participate in the proceeding, so that the filer need not serve the documents on those participants separately. Therefore, applicants and other participants (or their counsel or representative) must apply for and receive a digital ID certificate before a hearing request/petition to intervene is filed so that they can obtain access to the document via the E-Filing system.

A person filing electronically using the agency’s adjudicatory E-Filing system may seek assistance by contacting the NRC Meta System Help Desk through the “Contact Us” link located on the NRC Web site at http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/e-submittals.html, by e-mail at MSHD.Resource@nrc.gov, or by a toll-free call at (866) 672–7640. The NRC Meta System Help Desk is available between 8 a.m. and 8 p.m., Eastern Time, Monday through Friday, excluding government holidays.

Participants who believe that they have a good cause for not submitting documents electronically must file an exemption request, in accordance with 10 CFR 2.302(g), with their initial paper filing requesting authorization to continue to submit documents in paper format. Such filings must be submitted by: (1) First class mail addressed to the Office of the Secretary of the Commission, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001, Attention: Rulemaking and Adjudications Staff; or (2) courier, expedited delivery service to the Office of the Secretary, Sixteenth Floor, One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland 20852, Attention: Rulemaking and Adjudications Staff. Participants filing a document in this manner are responsible for serving the document on all other participants. Filing is considered complete by first-class mail as of the time of deposit in the mail, or by courier, express mail, or expedited delivery service upon depositing the document with the provider of the service. A presiding officer, having granted an exemption request from using E-Filing, may require a participant or party to use E-Filing if the presiding officer subsequently determines that the reason for granting the exemption from use of E-Filing no longer exists.

Documents submitted in adjudicatory proceedings will appear in NRC’s electronic hearing docket which is available to the public at http://ehd.nrc.gov/EHD_Proceeding/home.asp, unless excluded pursuant to an order of the Commission, or the presiding officer. Participants are requested not to include personal privacy information, such as social security numbers, home addresses, or home phone numbers in their filings, unless an NRC regulation or other law requires submission of such information. With respect to copyrighted works, except for limited excerpts that serve the purpose of the adjudicatory filings and would constitute a Fair Use application, participants are requested not to include copyrighted materials in their submission.

Petitions for leave to intervene must be filed no later than 60 days from the date of publication of this notice. Non–timely filings will not be entertained absent a determination by the presiding officer that the request or petition should be granted or that the contentions should be admitted, based on a balancing of the factors specified in 10 CFR 2.309(c)(1)(i)–(viii).

For further details with respect to this amendment action, see the application for amendment which is available for public inspection at the Commission’s PDR, located at One White Flint North, Public File Area 01F21, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland. Publicly available records will be accessible electronically from the ADAMS Public Electronic Reading Room on the Internet at the NRC Web site, http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html. If you do not have access to ADAMS or if there are problems in accessing the documents located in ADAMS, contact the PDR Reference staff at 1–800–397–4209, 301–415–4737, or by e-mail to pdr.resource@nrc.gov.

Exelon Generation Company, LLC, Docket Nos. 50–373 and 50–374, LaSalle County Station, Units 1 and 2, LaSalle County, Illinois

Date of amendment request: January 27, 2010.

Description of amendment request: This amendment request contains sensitive unclassified non-safeguards information (SUNSI). The proposed amendments would revise the Operating License and Technical Specifications (TS) to implement an increase of approximately 1.65 percent in rated thermal power from the current licensed thermal power (CLTP) of 3,489 megawatts thermal (MWT) to 3,546 MWT. The proposed changes are based on increased feedwater (FW) flow measurement accuracy, which will be achieved by utilizing International (formerly Caldon) CheckPlus™ Leading Edge Flow Meter (LEFM) ultrasonic flow measurement instrumentation. LEFM instrumentation is currently installed in LaSalle County Station (LaSalle), Unit 1 and will be installed in LaSalle, Unit 2 in refueling outage L2R13, currently scheduled to complete in March 2011.

A. Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:

As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

1. Does the proposed change involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

The reviews and evaluations performed to support the proposed uprate included all components and systems that could be affected by this change. All systems will function as designed, and all performance requirements for these systems have been evaluated and were found acceptable.

The primary loop components (e.g., reactor vessel, reactor internals, control rod drive housings, piping and supports, and recirculation pumps) remain within their applicable structural limits and will continue to perform their intended design functions. Thus, there is no increase in the probability of a structural failure of these components. The nuclear steam supply systems will continue to perform their intended design functions during normal and accident conditions. The balance of plant systems and components continue to meet their applicable structural limits and will continue to perform their intended design functions. Thus, there is no increase in the probability of a failure of these components. The safety relief valves and containment isolation valves meet design sizing requirements at the uprated power level. Because the integrity of the plant will not be affected by operation at
the uprated condition, Exelon Generation Company, LLC (EGC) has concluded that all structures, systems, and components required to mitigate a transient remain capable of fulfilling their intended functions. A majority of the current safety analyses remain applicable, since they were performed at power levels that bound operation at a core power of 3546 MWt. Other analyses previously performed at the current power level have either been evaluated or re-performed for the increased power level. The results demonstrate that acceptance criteria of the applicable analyses continue to be met at the uprated conditions. As such, all applicable accident analyses continue to comply with the relevant event acceptance criteria. The analyses performed to assess the effects of mass and energy releases remain valid. The source terms used to assess radiological consequences have been reviewed and determined to bound operation at the uprated condition. The proposed changes to add test requirements to the revised TS instrument function ensure that instruments will function as required to initiate protective systems or actuate mitigating systems at the point assumed in the applicable safety analysis. Surveillance tests are not an initiator to any accident previously evaluated. As such, the probability of any accident previously evaluated is not affected. The added test requirements ensure that the systems and components required by the TS are capable of performing any mitigation function assumed in the accident analysis. Therefore, the changes do not involve a significant increase in the probability of or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. Does the proposed change create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

No new accident scenarios, failure mechanisms, or single failures are introduced as a result of the proposed change. The results demonstrate that acceptance criteria previously required for the mitigation of a transient remain capable of fulfilling their intended design functions. The proposed changes have no adverse effects on any safety-related system or component and do not challenge the performance or integrity of any safety-related system. The proposed changes to add test requirements to the revised TS instrument function do not involve a physical alteration of the plant (i.e., no new or different type of equipment will be installed, nor will there be a change in the methods governing normal plant operation). The change does not alter assumptions made in the safety analysis, but ensures that the instruments behave as assumed in the accident analysis. The proposed change is consistent with the safety analysis assumptions. Therefore, the proposed changes do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

3. Does the proposed change involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety?

Response: No.

Operation at the uprated power condition does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. Analyses of the primary fission product barriers have concluded that relevant design criteria remain satisfied, both from the standpoint of the integrity of the primary fission product barrier, and from the standpoint of compliance with the required acceptance criteria. As appropriate, all evaluations have been performed using methods that have either been reviewed or approved by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC), or that remain in compliance with regulatory review guidance and standards.

The proposed changes to add test requirements to the revised TS instrument function establish instrument performance criteria in TS that are currently required by plant procedures. The testing methods and acceptance criteria for systems, structures, and components, specified in applicable codes and standards (or alternatives approved for use by the NRC) will continue to be met as described in the plant licensing basis including the updated final safety analysis report. There is no impact to safety analysis acceptance criteria as described in the plant licensing basis because no change is made to the accident analysis assumptions. Therefore, the proposed changes do not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee’s analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Attorney for licensee: Mr. Bradley J. Fewell, Associate General Counsel, Exelon Nuclear, 4300 Winfield Road, Warrenville, IL 60555.

NRC Branch Chief: Stephen J. Campbell.

Northern States Power Company—Minnesota, Docket Nos. 50–282 and 50–306, Prairie Island Nuclear Generating Plant, Units 1 and 2 (PINGP), Goodhue County, Minnesota

Date of amendment request: December 22, 2009.

Description of amendment request: This amendment request contains sensitive unclassified non-safeguards information (SUNSI). The proposed amendment requests approval for application of leak-before-break (LBB) methodology to piping systems attached to the reactor coolant pressure boundary. No Technical Specification changes are requested.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

1. Does the proposed amendment involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

Overall protection system performance will remain within the bounds of the previously performed accident analyses. The design of the protection systems will be unaffected. The reactor protection system and engineered safety feature actuation system will continue to function in a manner consistent with the plant design basis. All design, material, and construction standards that were applicable prior to the request are maintained.

For the PINGP, the bounding accident for pipe breaks is a Large Break Loss of Coolant Accident (LLOCA). Since the application of the LBB Analysis verifies the integrity of the piping attached to the reactor coolant system, the probability of a previously evaluated accident is not increased. The consequences of a LLOCA have been previously evaluated and found to be acceptable. The application of the LBB Analysis will cause no change in the dose analysis associated with a LLOCA, and therefore, does not affect the consequences of an accident.

The proposed amendment will not alter any assumptions or change any mitigation actions in the radiological consequence evaluations in the Updated Safety Analysis Report (USAR).

Therefore, the proposed amendment does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. Does the proposed amendment create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

No new accident scenarios, failure mechanisms, or single failures are introduced as a result of the proposed change. All systems, structures, and components previously required for the mitigation of an event remain capable of fulfilling their intended design function. The proposed change has no adverse effects on any safety-related systems or components and does not challenge the performance or integrity of any safety related system. Further, there are no changes in the method by which any safety-related plant system performs its safety function. This amendment will not affect the normal method of power operation or change any operating parameters.

Therefore, the proposed change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

3. Does the proposed amendment involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety?

Response: No.

Margin of safety is related to the ability of the fission product barriers to perform their design functions during and following accident conditions. These barriers include the fuel cladding, the reactor coolant system, and the containment. The proposed amendment request does not involve a change to any of these barriers.
The proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety because the proposed changes do not reduce the margin of safety that exists in the present PINGP Technical Specifications or USAR. The operability requirements of the Technical Specifications are consistent with the initial condition assumptions of the safety analyses. The proposed change does not affect any Technical Specification Action statement requirements. This proposed amendment uses LBB technology with leakage monitoring to show that it is acceptable to exclude the dynamic effects associated with postulated pipe ruptures from the licensing basis for the systems evaluated that are attached to the reactor coolant system RCS. The enclosed analysis demonstrates that the LBB margins discussed in NUREG-1061 Volume 3 are satisfied. Therefore, the proposed amendment does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment requests involve no significant hazards consideration.

**Attorney for licensee:** Peter M. Glass, Assistant General Counsel, Xcel Energy Services, Inc., 414 Nicollet Mall, Minneapolis, MN 55401. **NRC Branch Chief:** Robert J. Pascarelli.

**Northern States Power Company—Minnesota, Docket Nos. 50–282 and 50–306, Prairie Island Nuclear Generating Plant, Units 1 and 2, Goodhue County, Minnesota**

**Date of amendment request:** December 28, 2009.

**Description of amendment request:** This amendment request contains sensitive unclassified non-safeguards information (SUNS). The proposed amendment would increase the licensed rated thermal power (RTP) as a result of a measurement uncertainty recapture (MUR) power uprate (PU). The proposed change would increase the licensed RTP level by 1.64 percent from 1650 megawatts thermal (MWt) to 1677 MWt for both units. The request is based on reduced uncertainty in the RTP measurement achieved by installation of a Caldon Leading Edge Flow Meter (LEFM) Checkplus™ System used to measure feedwater flow and temperature.

**Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:** As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

1. The proposed change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.
   There are no changes as a result of the MUR PU to the design or operation of the plant that could affect system, component, or accident mitigative functions. All systems and components will function as designed and the applicable performance requirements have been evaluated and found to be acceptable.
   The reduction in power measurement uncertainty allows for the accident and transient safety analyses to continue to be used without modification. This is because the preceding safety analyses were performed or evaluated at either 102 percent of 1650 MWt or higher. Those accidents or transients that were reanalyzed for MUR concluded that the existing analyses remain bounding and the conclusions presented in the Updated Safety Analysis Report remain valid.
   Analyses at these power levels support a core power level of 1677 MWt with a measurement uncertainty of 0.36 percent. Radiological consequences were performed at 102 percent of 1650 MWt (or higher) and continue to be bounding.
   The primary loop components were evaluated for the effects of MUR PU conditions. These analyses also demonstrate the components will continue to perform their intended design functions.
   All of the Nuclear Steam Supply System (NSSS) systems will continue to perform their intended design functions during normal and accident conditions. The auxiliary systems and components continue to comply with the applicable structural limits and will continue to perform their intended design functions. The NSSS/Balance of Plant interface systems were evaluated and will continue to perform their intended design functions. Plant electrical equipment was also evaluated and will continue to perform within their design ratings.
   Based on the above, the proposed change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. The proposed change does not involve the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.
   No new accident scenarios, failure mechanisms, or single failures are introduced as a result of the proposed change. The LEFM has been analyzed, and system failures will not adversely affect any safety-related system or any structures, systems or components required for transient mitigation. Structures, systems and components previously required for mitigation of an event remain capable of fulfilling their intended function at the uprated power level. The proposed change has no adverse effects on any safety-related systems or components and does not challenge the performance or integrity of any safety-related system.
   The proposed changes do not adversely affect any current system interfaces or create any new interfaces that could result in an accident or malfunction of a different kind from previously evaluated. Operating at the proposed RTP does not create any new accident initiators or precursors. Credible malfunctions are bounded by the current accident analyses of record or recent evaluations demonstrating that applicable criteria are still met with the proposed changes.
   Based on the above, the proposed change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

3. The proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety.
   Operation at the 1677 MWt core power does not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety. The current accident analyses have been previously performed with a 2-percent power measurement uncertainty or at a core power bounding the 1677 MWt. System and component analyses have been completed at operating conditions that envelop the MUR uprated operating conditions. Analyses of the primary fission product barriers at uprated core powers have concluded that all relevant plant operating conditions remain satisfied in regard to integrity and compliance with the regulatory acceptance criteria. Evaluations have been reviewed and approved by the NRC or are in compliance with applicable regulatory review guidance and standards.
   Based on the above, the proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

**Attorney for licensee:** Peter M. Glass, Assistant General Counsel, Xcel Energy Services, Inc., 414 Nicollet Mall, Minneapolis, MN 55401. **NRC Branch Chief:** Robert J. Pascarelli.

**Order Imposing Procedures for Access to Sensitive Unclassified Non-Safeguards Information for Contention Preparation**

**Exelon Generation Company, LLC, Docket Nos. 50–373 and 50–374, LaSalle County Station, Units 1 and 2, LaSalle County, Illinois**

**Northern States Power Company—Minnesota, Docket Nos. 50–282 and 50–306, Prairie Island Nuclear Generating Plant, Units 1 and 2 (PINGP), Goodhue County, Minnesota**

A. This Order contains instructions regarding how potential parties to this proceeding may request access to documents containing Sensitive Unclassified Non-Safeguards Information (SUNS).

B. Within 10 days after publication of this notice of hearing and opportunity to
petition for leave to intervene, any potential party who believes access to SUNSI is necessary to respond to this notice may request such access. A "potential party" is any person who intends to participate as a party by demonstrating standing and filing an admissible contention under 10 CFR 2.309. Requests for access to SUNSI submitted later than 10 days after publication will not be considered absent a showing of good cause for the late filing, addressing why the request could not have been filed earlier.

C. The requestor shall submit a letter requesting permission to access SUNSI to the Office of the Secretary, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001, Attention: Rulemakings and Adjudications Staff, and provide a copy to the Associate General Counsel for Hearings, Enforcement and Administration, Office of the General Counsel, Washington, DC 20555–0001. The expedited delivery or courier mail address for both offices is: U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Office of the Secretary and the Office of the General Counsel are Hearing.Docket@nrc.gov and OGCmailcenter@nrc.gov, respectively. The requestor shall include the following information:

1. A description of the licensing basis and specificity for a proffered version of the information requested must explain why publicly-available information in order to meaningfully address the requestor’s basis for the need for the information.

2. The name and address of the potential party and a description of the potential party’s particularized interest that could be harmed by the action identified in C.1.

3. The identity of the individual or entity requesting access to SUNSI and the requestor’s basis for the need for the information in order to meaningfully participate in this adjudicatory proceeding. In particular, the request must explain why publicly-available versions of the information requested would not be sufficient to provide the basis and specificity for a proffered contention.

D. Based on an evaluation of the information submitted under paragraph C.3 the NRC staff will determine within 10 days of receipt of the request whether:

1. There is a reasonable basis to believe the petition is likely to establish standing to participate in this NRC proceeding; and

2. The requestor has established a legitimate need for access to SUNSI.

E. If the NRC staff determines that the requestor satisfies both D.1 and D.2 above, the NRC staff will notify the requestor in writing that access to SUNSI has been granted. The written notification will contain instructions on how the requestor may obtain copies of the requested documents, and any other conditions that may apply to access to those documents. These conditions may include, but are not limited to, the signing of a Non-Disclosure Agreement or Affidavit or Protective Order setting forth terms and conditions to prevent the unauthorized or inadvertent disclosure of SUNSI by each individual who will be granted access to SUNSI.

F. Filing of Contentions. Any contentions in these proceedings that are based upon the information received as a result of the request made for SUNSI must be filed by the requestor no later than 25 days after the requestor is granted access to that information. However, if more than 25 days remain between the date the petitioner is granted access to the information and the deadline for filing all other contentions (as established in the notice of hearing or opportunity for hearing), the petitioner may file its SUNSI contentions by that later deadline.

G. Review of Denials of Access. (1) If the request for access to SUNSI is denied by the NRC staff either after a determination on standing and need for access, or after a determination on trustworthiness and reliability, the NRC staff shall immediately notify the requestor in writing, briefly stating the reason or reasons for the denial.

(2) The requestor may challenge the NRC staff’s adverse determination by filing a challenge within 5 days of receipt of that determination with: (a) the presiding officer designated in this proceeding; or (b) if no presiding officer has been appointed, the Chief Administrative Judge, or if he or she is unavailable, another administrative judge, or an administrative law judge with jurisdiction pursuant to 10 CFR 2.318(a); or (c) if another officer has been designated to rule on information access issues, with that officer.

H. Review of Grants of Access. A party other than the requestor may challenge an NRC staff determination granting access to SUNSI whose release would harm that party’s interest independent of the proceeding. Such a challenge must be filed with the Chief Administrative Judge within 5 days of the notification by the NRC staff of its grant of access.

If challenges to the NRC staff determinations are filed, these procedures give way to the normal process for litigating disputes concerning access to information. The availability of interlocutory review by the Commission of orders ruling on such NRC staff determinations (whether granting or denying access) is governed by 10 CFR 2.311.

I. The Commission expects that the NRC staff and presiding officers (and any other reviewing officers) will consider and resolve requests for access to SUNSI, and motions for protective orders, in a timely fashion in order to minimize any unnecessary delays in identifying those petitioners who have standing and who have propounded contentions meeting the specificity and basis requirements in 10 CFR part 2. Attachment 1 to this Order summarizes the general target schedule for processing and resolving requests under these procedures.

It is so ordered.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 3rd day of May 2010.

For the Commission.

Annette L. Vietti-Cook,
Secretary of the Commission.

Attachment 1—General Determination Schedule for Processing and Resolving Requests for Access to Sensitive Unclassified Non-Safeguards Information in This Proceeding

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Event/activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Publication of Federal Register notice of hearing and opportunity to petition for leave to intervene, including order with instructions for access requests.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 While a request for hearing or petition to intervene in this proceeding must comply with the filing requirements of the NRC’s E-Filing Rule, the initial request to access SUNSI under these procedures should be submitted as described in this paragraph.

2 Any motion for Protective Order or draft Non-Disclosure Affidavit or Agreement for SUNSI must be filed with the presiding officer or the Chief Administrative Judge if the presiding officer has not yet been designated, within 30 days of the deadline for the receipt of the written access request.

3 Requestors should note that the filing requirements of the NRC’s E-Filing Rule (72 FR 49138; August 26, 2007) apply to appeals of NRC staff determinations (because they must be served on a presiding officer or the Commission, as applicable), but not to the initial SUNSI request submitted to the NRC staff under these procedures.
Day | Event/activity
---|---
10 | Deadline for submitting requests for access to Sensitive Unclassified Non-Safeguards Information (SUNSI) with information: Supporting the standing of a potential party identified by name and address; describing the need for the information in order for the potential party to participate meaningfully in an adjudicatory proceeding.
60 | Deadline for submitting petition for intervention containing: (i) Demonstration of standing; (ii) all contentions whose formulation does not require access to SUNSI (+25 Answers to petition for intervention; +7 requestor/petitioner reply).
20 | Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff informs the requestor of the staff's determination whether the request for access provides a reasonable basis to believe standing can be established and shows need for SUNSI. (NRC staff also informs any party to the proceeding whose interest independent of the proceeding would be harmed by the release of the information.) If NRC staff makes the finding of need for SUNSI and likelihood of standing, NRC staff begins document processing (preparation of redactions or review of redacted documents).
25 | If NRC staff finds no “need” or no likelihood of standing, the deadline for requestor/petitioner to file a motion seeking a ruling to reverse the NRC staff’s denial of access; NRC staff files copy of access determination with the presiding officer (or Chief Administrative Judge or other designated officer, as appropriate). If NRC staff finds “need” for SUNSI, the deadline for any party to the proceeding whose interest independent of the proceeding would be harmed by the release of the information to file a motion seeking a ruling to reverse the NRC staff’s grant of access.
30 | Deadline for NRC staff reply to motions to reverse NRC staff determination(s).
40 | (Receipt +30) If NRC staff finds standing and need for SUNSI, deadline for NRC staff to complete information processing and file motion for Protective Order and draft Non-Disclosure Affidavit. Deadline for applicant/licensee to file Non-Disclosure Agreement for SUNSI.
A | If access granted: Issuance of presiding officer or other designated officer decision on motion for protective order for access to sensitive information (including schedule for providing access and submission of contentions) or decision reversing a final adverse determination by the NRC staff.
A + 3 | Deadline for filing executed Non-Disclosure Affidavits. Access provided to SUNSI consistent with decision issuing the protective order.
A + 28 | Deadline for submission of contentions whose development depends upon access to SUNSI. However, if more than 25 days remain between the petitioner’s receipt of (or access to) the information and the deadline for filing all other contentions (as established in the notice of hearing or opportunity for hearing), the petitioner may file its SUNSI contentions by that later deadline.
A + 53 | (Contention receipt +25) Answers to contentions whose development depends upon access to SUNSI.
A + 60 | (Answer receipt +7) Petitioner/Intervenor reply to answers.
> A + 60 | Decision on contention admission.

---

**NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

**[NRC–2010–0002]**

**Sunshine Federal Register Notice**

**AGENCY HOLDING THE MEETINGS:** Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**DATES:** Weeks of May 10, 17, 24, 31, June 7, 14, 2010.

**PLACE:** Commissioners’ Conference Room, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland.

**STATUS:** Public and closed.

**Week of May 10, 2010**

*Tuesday, May 11, 2010*

9:30 a.m. Briefing on Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs (FSME) Programs, Performance, & Future Plans (Public Meeting). (Contact: George Deegan, 301–415–7834).

This meeting will be Webcast live at the Web address—http://www.nrc.gov.

**Week of May 17, 2010**

There are no meetings scheduled for the week of May 17, 2010.

**Week of May 24, 2010**

**Tentative**

*Thursday, May 27, 2010*  
9:30 a.m. Briefing on the Results of the Agency Action Review Meeting (AARM) (Public Meeting). (Contact: Nathan Sanfilippo, 301–415–3951.)  
This meeting will be Webcast live at the Web address—http://www.nrc.gov.

**Week of May 31, 2010**

**Tentative**

There are no meetings scheduled for the week of May 31, 2010.

**Week of June 7, 2010**

**Tentative**

*Wednesday, June 9, 2010*  
1:30 p.m. Meeting with the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards (Public Meeting). (Contact: Cayetano Santos, 301–415–7270.)  
This meeting will be Webcast live at the Web address—http://www.nrc.gov.

**Week of June 14, 2010**

**Tentative**

There are no meetings scheduled for the week of June 14, 2010.

*The schedule for Commission meetings is subject to change on short notice. To verify the status of meetings, call (recording)—(301) 415–1292. Contact person for more information: Rochelle Baval, (301) 415–1651.*

**Additional Information**

By a vote of 4–1 on April 29 and 30, 2010, the Commission determined pursuant to U.S.C. 552(e) and § 9.107(a) of the Commission’s rules to have a closed meeting—Discussion of Adjudicatory Issues (Closed—Ex. 10) on April 30, 2010, with less than one week notice to the public.

The NRC Commission Meeting Schedule can be found on the Internet at: http://www.nrc.gov/about-nrc/policy-making/schedule.html.

The NRC provides reasonable accommodation to individuals with disabilities where appropriate. If you need a reasonable accommodation to participate in these public meetings, or need this meeting notice or the transcript or other information from the public meetings in another format (e.g. braille, large print), please notify Angela Bolduc, Chief, Employee/Labor Relations and Work Life Branch, at 301–492–2230, TDD: 301–415–2100, or by e-mail at angela.bolduc@nrc.gov.

Determinations on requests for reasonable accommodation will be made on a case-by-case basis.

This notice is distributed electronically to subscribers. If you no longer wish to receive it, or would like to be added to the distribution, please contact the Office of the Secretary, Washington, DC 20555 (301–415–1969), or send an e-mail to darlene.wright@nrc.gov.