Therefore, the NRC hereby grants UNE a one-time exemption from the requirements of 10 CFR 50.71(e)(3)(iii) pertaining to the CCNPP Unit 3 COL application to allow submittal of the next FSAR update, no later than March 29, 2013.

Pursuant to 10 CFR 51.22, the NRC has determined that the exemption request meets the applicable categorical exclusion criteria set forth in 10 CFR 51.22(c)(25), and the granting of this exemption will not have a significant impact on the human environment.

This exemption is effective upon issuance.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 8th day of January 2013.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

John Segala,

Chief, Licensing Branch 1, Division of New Reactor Licensing, Office of New Reactors.

[FR Doc. 2013–01145 Filed 1–18–13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[NRC–2013–0012]

Biweekly Notice; Applications and Amendments to Facility Operating Licenses and Combined Licenses Involving No Significant Hazards Considerations

Background

Pursuant to Section 189a.(2) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission or NRC) is publishing this regular biweekly notice. The Act requires the Commission publish notice of any amendments issued, or proposed to be issued and grants the Commission the authority to issue and make immediately effective any amendment to an operating license or combined license, as applicable, upon a determination by the Commission that such amendment involves no significant hazards consideration, notwithstanding the pendency before the Commission of a request for a hearing from any person.

This biweekly notice includes all notices of amendments issued, or proposed to be issued from December 27, 2012 to January 9, 2013. The last biweekly notice was published on January 8, 2013 (78 FR 1267).

ADDRESSES: You may access information and comment submissions related to this document, which the NRC possesses and are publically available, by searching on *http://www.regulations.gov* under Docket ID NRC–2013–0012. You may submit comments by any of the following methods:

- *Federal Rulemaking Web site:* Go to *http://www.regulations.gov* and search for Docket ID NRC–2013–0012. Address questions about NRC dockets to Carol Gallagher; telephone: 301–492–3668; email: *Carol.Gallagher@nrc.gov.*
- *Mail comments to:* Cindy Bladey, Chief, Rules, Announcements, and Directives Branch (RADB), Office of Administration, Mail Stop: TWB–05–B01M, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001.
- *Fax comments to:* RADB at 301–492–3446.

For additional direction on accessing information and submitting comments, see ''Accessing Information and Submitting Comments'' in the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section of this document.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Accessing Information and Submitting Comments

A. Accessing Information

Please refer to Docket ID NRC–2013–0012 when contacting the NRC about the availability of information regarding this document. You may access information related to this document by any of the following methods:

- *Federal Rulemaking Web site:* Go to *http://www.regulations.gov* and search for Docket ID NRC–2013–0012.
- *NRC's Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS):* You may access publicly-available documents online in the NRC Library at *http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html.* To begin the search, select ''*ADAMS Public Documents''* and then select ''*Begin Web-based ADAMS Search.''* For problems with ADAMS, please contact the NRC's Public Document Room (PDR) reference staff at 1–800–397–4209, 301–415–4737, or by email to *pdr.resource@nrc.gov.* Documents may be viewed in ADAMS by performing a search on the document date and docket number.
- *NRC's PDR:* You may examine and purchase copies of public documents at the NRC's PDR, Room O1–F21, One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland 20852.

B. Submitting Comments

Please include Docket ID NRC–2013–0012 in the subject line of your comment submission, in order to ensure that the NRC is able to make your comment submission available to the public in this docket.

The NRC cautions you not to include identifying or contact information that that you do not want to be publicly disclosed in your comment submission. The NRC will post all comment submissions at *http://www.regulations.gov* as well as enter the comment submissions into ADAMS. The NRC does not routinely edit comment submissions to remove identifying or contact information.

If you are requesting or aggregating comments from other persons for submission to the NRC, then you should inform those persons not to include identifying or contact information that they do not want to be publicly disclosed in their comment submission. Your request should state that the NRC does not routinely edit comment submissions to remove such information before making the comment submissions available to the public or entering the comment submissions into ADAMS.

Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendments to Facility Operating Licenses and Combined 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 section 50.92 of Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR), 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 take action prior to the expiration of either the comment period or the notice period, it will publish in the **Federal Register** a notice of issuance. 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.

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 or combined 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 NRC's PDR, located at One White Flint North, Room O1–F21, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland 20852. The NRC regulations are accessible electronically from the NRC Library on the NRC's Web site at *http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/doc-collections/cfr/*. If a request for a hearing or petition for leave to intervene is filed by the above date, 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 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 or petitioner; (2) the nature of the requestor's/petitioner's right under the Act to be made a party to the proceeding; (3) the nature and extent of the requestor's/petitioner's property, financial, or other 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/petitioner's interest. The petition must also identify 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, 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, then 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 submission 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 10 days prior to the filing deadline, the participant should contact the Office of the Secretary by email at *hearing.docket@nrc.gov*, or by telephone at 301–415–1677, to request (1) a digital identification (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 the 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 the 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 the Electronic Information Exchange System, users will be required to install a Web browser plug-in from the NRC's 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 site at *http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/e-submittals.html*.

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 the NRC guidance available on the NRC's 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 email notice confirming receipt of the document. The E-Filing system also distributes an email notice that provides access to the document to the NRC's Office of the General Counsel and any others who have advised the Office of the Secretary 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 email at *MSHD.Resource@nrc.gov*, or by a toll-free call at 1–866 672–7640. 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, express mail, or 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 the NRC's electronic hearing docket which is available to the public at *http://ehd1.nrc.gov/ehd/*, 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. Requests for hearing, petitions for leave to intervene, and motions for leave to file new or amended contentions that are filed after the 60-day deadline will not be entertained absent a determination by the presiding officer that the filing demonstrates good cause by satisfying the following three factors in 10 CFR 2.309(c)(1): (i) The information upon which the filing is based was not previously available; (ii) the information upon which the filing is based is materially different from information previously available; and (iii) the filing has been submitted in a timely fashion based on the availability of the subsequent information.

For further details with respect to this license amendment application, see the application for amendment which is available for public inspection at the NRC's PDR, located at One White Flint North, Room O1–F21, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland 20852. Publicly available documents created or received at the NRC are accessible electronically through ADAMS in the NRC Library at *http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html*. Persons who do not have access to ADAMS or who encounter problems in accessing the documents located in ADAMS, should contact the NRC's PDR Reference staff at 1–800–397–4209, 301–415–4737, or by email to *pdr.resource@nrc.gov*.

Detroit Edision, Docket No. 50–341, Fermi 2, Monroe County, Michigan

Date of amendment request: November 13, 2012.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would modify Technical Specification requirements to operate ventilation systems with charcoal filters for 10 hours each in accordance with Technical Specifications Task Force (TSTF)–522, Revision 0, ''Revise Ventilation System Surveillance Requirements to Operate for 10 hours per Month.''

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 proposed change replaces an existing Surveillance Requirement to operate the SGT System and CREF System equipped with electric heaters for a continuous 10 hour period every 31 days with a requirement to operate the systems for 15 continuous minutes with heaters operating.

These systems are not accident initiators and therefore, these changes do not involve a significant increase in the probability of an accident. The proposed system and filter testing changes are consistent with current regulatory guidance for these systems and will continue to assure that these systems perform their design function which may include mitigating accidents. Thus the change does not involve a significant increase in the consequences of an accident.

Therefore, it is concluded that this change does not involve a significant increase in the probability 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.

The proposed change replaces an existing Surveillance Requirement to operate the SGT System and CREF System equipped with electric heaters for a continuous 10 hour period every 31 days with a requirement to operate the systems for 15 continuous minutes with heaters operating.

The change proposed for these ventilation systems does not change any system operations or maintenance activities. Testing requirements will be revised and will continue to demonstrate that the Limiting Conditions for Operation are met and the system components are capable of performing their intended safety functions. The change does not create new failure modes or mechanisms and no new accident precursors are generated.

Therefore, it is concluded that this change does 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.

The proposed change replaces an existing Surveillance Requirement to operate the SGT System and CREF System equipped with electric heaters for a continuous 10 hour period every 31 days with a requirement to operate the systems for 15 continuous minutes with heaters operating.

The design basis for the ventilation systems' heaters is to heat the incoming air which reduces the relative humidity. The heater testing change proposed will continue to demonstrate that the heaters are capable of heating the air and will perform their design function. The proposed change is consistent with regulatory guidance.

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: Bruce R. Masters, DTE Energy, General Counsel—Regulatory, 688 WCB, One Energy Plaza, Detroit, MI 48226–1279.

NRC Branch Chief: Robert D. Carlson.

Dominion Nuclear Connecticut, Inc., Docket No. 50–336, Millstone Power Station, Unit 2, New London County, Connecticut

Date of amendment request: December 17, 2012.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would revise the Millstone Power Station, Unit 2 (MPS2) Technical Specification (TS) Surveillance Requirement 4.4.3.2 to remove the requirement to perform the quarterly surveillance for a pressurizer power-operated relief valve (PORV) block valve that is being maintained closed in accordance with TS 3.4.3 Action a. The proposed change is consistent with the requirements of the standard Technical Specification for Combustion Engineering plants (NUREG–1432).

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

Criterion 1

Will operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed change involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

The block valve for the pressurizer PORV is not a potential accident initiator. Therefore, not requiring a surveillance of the block valve while it is being used to isolate its associated PORV will not increase the probability of an accident previously evaluated. Not requiring the surveillance of the block valve may slightly reduce the probability of a loss of coolant accident from a stuck open PORV since it will eliminate the challenge to the PORV from the pressure transient that results from cycling the block valve.

The PORVs or the PORV block valves are not credited in the MPS2 Final Safety Analysis Report (FSAR), Chapter 14, ''Safety Analysis,'' for event mitigation. If pressurizer spray is not available or is not effective, either one or the two pressurizer PORVs may be manually actuated to depressurize the RCS in response to certain transients. Not performing the surveillance on the block valve is not relevant to the primary system for depressurizing the RCS (pressurizer spray). The block valves have been demonstrated by operating experience to be reliable and are also subject to the motor-operated valve testing program. Consequently, the proposed change does not significantly reduce the confidence that the block valve can be opened to permit manual actuation of the PORV to depressurize the RCS.

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

Criterion 2

Will operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed change create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

The proposed change only affects the performance of the surveillance test for the block valve and does not involve any physical alteration of plant equipment or introduce any operating configurations not previously evaluated. The pressurizer PORV block valves provide isolation for a postulated stuck-open or leaking PORV. Isolation is satisfied with the block valve closed in accordance with SR 4.4.3.2. PORV block valve closure is not credited in FSAR Chapter 14 for inadvertent opening of the PORV event mitigation.

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

Criterion 3

Will operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed change involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety?

Response: No.

Margin of safety is related to the confidence in the ability of the fission product barriers to perform their design functions during and following an accident. These barriers include the fuel cladding, the reactor coolant system, and the containment system. These barriers are not significantly affected by the changes proposed herein. The margin of safety is established through the design of the plant structures, systems, and components, the parameters within which the plant is operated, and the establishment of setpoints for the actuation of equipment relied upon to respond to an event, and thereby protect the fission product barriers. The proposed change to the surveillance requirement for the presurrizer PORV block valve does not affect the assumptions in any accident analysis.

Therefore, the proposed change 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 request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Attorney for licensee: Lillian M. Cuoco, Senior Counsel, Dominion Resources Services, Inc., 120 Tredegar Street, RS–2, Richmond, VA 23219.

NRC Branch Chief: George A. Wilson.

Luminant Generation Company LLC, Docket Nos. 50–445 and 50–446, Comanche Peak Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2, Somervell County, Texas

Date of amendment request: October 2, 2012.

Brief description of amendments: The amendments would revise Technical Specification (TS) 3.3.1, ''Reactor Trip System (RTS) Instrumentation,'' and TS 3.3.2, ''Engineered Safety Feature Actuation System (ESFAS) Instrumentation,'' to relocate the TS requirements for the following instruments to the Technical Requirements Manual (TRM), a licensee-controlled document, under 10 CFR 50.59:

- Pressurizer Water level—High (RTS Function No. 9)
- Trip of all Main Feedwater Pumps (ESFAS Function No. 6.g)
- ESFAS Interlock, Reactor Trip, P–4 (ESFAS Function No. 8.a)

The proposed changes would relocate the TS requirements in their entirety and not result in deletion or alteration of any RTS or ESFAS requirements. The proposed relocation of the TS requirements for these RTS and ESFAS instrument Functions is based on the

application of the TS criteria of 10 CFR 50.36(c)(2)(ii).

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. Do the proposed changes involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

The proposed change to the TS does not affect the initiators of any analyzed accident. In addition, operation in accordance with the proposed TS change will continue to ensure that the previously evaluated accidents will be mitigated as analyzed. Thus, the proposed change does not adversely affect the design function or operation of any structures, systems, and components important to safety.

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

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

Response: No.

The proposed change does not involve a physical alteration of the plant (no new or different type of equipment will be installed). The proposed change does not create any new failure modes for existing equipment or any new limiting single failures. Additionally the proposed change does not involve a change in the methods governing normal plant operation and all safety functions will continue to perform as previously assumed in accident analyses. Thus, the proposed change does not adversely affect the design function or operation of any structures, systems, and components important to safety.

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

3. Do the proposed changes involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety?

Response: No.

The proposed change will not adversely affect the operation of plant equipment or the function of equipment assumed in the accident analyses. The proposed changes to the RTS and ESFAS TS requirements do not change the RTS or ESFAS design and capability to perform the required safety functions consistent with the assumptions of the applicable safety analyses. In addition, operation in accordance with the proposed TS change will continue to ensure that the previously evaluated accidents will be mitigated as analyzed.

Therefore, the proposed change does not involve a 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: Timothy P. Matthews, Esq., Morgan, Lewis and Bockius, 1111 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20004.

NRC Branch Chief: Michael T. Markley.

NextEra Energy Seabrook, LLC Docket No. 50–443, Seabrook Station, Unit 1, Rockingham County, New Hampshire

Date of amendment request: December 20, 2012.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment will revise the Seabrook Technical Specifications (TS) TS 6.7.6.m, ''Reactor Coolant Pump Flywheel Inspection Program.'' The proposed amendment will extend the reactor coolant pump (RCP) motor flywheel examination frequency from the currently approved 10-year inspection interval, to an interval not to exceed 20 years. The changes are consistent with Industry/Technical Specification Task Force (TSTF) Standard Technical Specification Change Traveler, TSTF–421, ''Revision to RCP Flywheel Inspection Program (WCAP–15666).'' The availability of this TS improvement was announced in the **Federal Register** on October 22, 2003, as part of the consolidated line item improvement process (CLIIP).

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 (NSHC) through incorporation by reference of the NSHC published in the **Federal Register** Notice dated June 24, 2003 (68 FR 37590), which is presented below:

Criterion 1—The Proposed Change Does Not Involve a Significant Increase in the Probability or Consequences of an Accident Previously Evaluated

The proposed change to the RCP flywheel examination frequency does not change the response of the plant to any accidents. The RCP will remain highly reliable and the proposed change will not result in a significant increase in the risk of plant operation. Given the extremely low failure probabilities for the RCP motor flywheel during normal and accident conditions, the extremely low probability of a loss-of-coolant accident (LOCA) with loss of offsite power (LOOP), and assuming a conditional core damage probability (CCDP) of 1.0 (complete failure of safety systems), the core damage frequency (CDF) and change in risk would still not exceed the NRC's acceptance guidelines contained in RG 1.174 (<1.0E–6 per year). Moreover, considering the uncertainties involved in this evaluation, the risk associated with the postulated failure of an RCP motor flywheel is significantly low. Even if all four RCP motor flywheels are considered in the bounding plant configuration case, the risk is still acceptably low.

The proposed change does not adversely affect accident initiators or precursors, nor alter the design assumptions, conditions, or configuration of the facility, or the manner in which the plant is operated and maintained; alter or prevent the ability of structures, systems, components (SSCs) from performing their intended function to mitigate the consequences of an initiating event within the assumed acceptance limits; or affect the source term, containment isolation, or radiological release assumptions used in evaluating the radiological consequences of an accident previously evaluated. Further, the proposed change does not increase the type or amount of radioactive effluent that may be released offsite, nor significantly increase individual or cumulative occupational/public radiation exposure. The proposed change is consistent with the safety analysis assumptions and resultant consequences.

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

Criterion 2—The Proposed Change Does Not Create the Possibility of a New or Different Kind of Accident From Any Accident Previously

The proposed change in flywheel inspection frequency does not involve any change in the design or operation of the RCP. Nor does the change to examination frequency affect any existing accident scenarios, or create any new or different accident scenarios. Further, the change does not involve a physical alteration of the plant (i.e., no new or different type of equipment will be installed) or alter the methods governing normal plant operation. In addition, the change does not impose any new or different requirements or eliminate any existing requirements, and does not alter any assumptions made in the safety analysis. The proposed change is consistent with the safety analysis assumptions and current plant operating practice. Therefore, the proposed change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

Criterion 3—The Proposed Change Does Not Involve a Significant Reduction in a Margin of Safety

The proposed change does not alter the manner in which safety limits, limiting safety system settings, or limiting conditions for operation are determined. The safety analysis acceptance criteria are not impacted by this change. The proposed change will not result in plant operation in a configuration outside of the design basis. The calculated impact on risk is insignificant and meets the acceptance criteria contained in RG 1.174. There are no significant mechanisms for inservice degradation of the RCP flywheel. Therefore, the proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of

50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves NSHC.

Attorney for licensee: James Petro, Florida Power & Light Company, P.O. Box 14000, Juno Beach, FL 33408–0420.

NRC Branch Chief: Meena Khanna.

PSEG Nuclear LLC, Docket No. 50–272, Salem Nuclear Generating Station, Unit 1, Salem County, New Jersey

Date of amendment request: May 8, 2012.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would revise Salem Unit 1 Technical Specification (TS) 6.8.4.i, ''Steam Generator (SG) Program,'' to permanently exclude portions of the tube below the top of the steam generator tubesheet from periodic steam generator tube inspections. In addition, this amendment proposes to revise TS 6.9.1.10, ''Steam Generator Tube Inspection Report,'' to provide permanent reporting requirements that have been previously established on an interim basis.

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, with the NRC staff edits in square brackets:

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

Response: No.

The previously analyzed accidents are initiated by the failure of plant structures, systems, or components. The proposed change that alters the steam generator inspection criteria does not have a detrimental impact on the integrity of any plant structure, system, or component that initiates an analyzed event. The proposed change will not alter the operation of, or otherwise increase the failure probability of any plant equipment that initiates an analyzed accident.

Of the applicable accidents previously evaluated, the limiting transients with consideration to the proposed change to the steam generator tube inspection and repair criteria are the steam generator tube rupture (SGTR) event, the steam line break (SLB) and the feedline break (FLB) postulated accidents.

Addressing the SGTR event, the required structural integrity margins of the steam generator tubes and the tube-to-tubesheet joint over the H* distance will be maintained. Tube rupture in tubes with cracks within the tubesheet is precluded by the presence of the tubesheet and constraint provided by the tube-to-tubesheet joint. Tube burst cannot occur within the thickness of the tubesheet. The tube-to-tubesheet joint constraint results from the hydraulic expansion process, thermal expansion mismatch between the tube and tubesheet, from the differential pressure between the primary and secondary side, and tubesheet deflection. The structural margins against burst, as discussed in Regulatory Guide (RG) 1.121, ''Bases for Plugging Degraded PWR [pressurized-water reactor] Steam Generator Tubes,'' and TS 6.8.4.i are maintained for both normal and postulated accident conditions.

The proposed change has no impact on the structural or leakage integrity of the portion of the tube outside of the tubesheet. The proposed change maintains structural and leakage integrity of the steam generator tubes consistent with the performance criteria in TS 6.8.4.i. Therefore, the proposed change results in no significant increase in the probability of the occurrence of a SGTR accident.

At normal operating pressures, leakage from tube degradation below the proposed limited inspection depth is limited by the tube-to-tubesheet joint. Consequently, negligible normal operating leakage is expected from degradation below the inspected depth within the tubesheet region. The consequences of an SGTR event are not affected by the primary to secondary leakage flow during the event as primary to secondary leakage flow through a postulated tube that has been pulled out of the tubesheet is essentially equivalent to a severed tube. Therefore, the proposed changes do not result in a significant increase in the consequences of a SGTR.

The consequences of a SLB or FLB are also not significantly affected by the proposed changes. The leakage analysis shows that the primary-to-secondary leakage during a SLB/FLB event would be less than or equal to that assumed in the Updated Safety Analysis Report.

Primary-to-secondary leakage from tube degradation in the tubesheet area during the limiting accidents (i.e., SLB/FLB) is limited by flow restrictions. These restrictions result from the crack and tube-to-tubesheet contact pressures that provide a restricted leakage path above the indications and also limit the degree of potential crack face opening as compared to free span indications.

The leakage factor for Salem Unit 1, for a postulated SLB/FLB, has been calculated as 2.16. Specifically, for the condition monitoring (CM) assessment, the component of leakage from the prior cycle from below the H* distance will be multiplied by a factor of 2.16 and added to the total leakage from any other source and compared to the allowable accident induced leakage limit. For the operational assessment (OA), the difference in the leakage between the allowable leakage and the accident induced leakage from sources other than the tubesheet expansion region will be divided by 2.16 and compared to the observed operational leakage.

The probability of an SLB/FLB is unaffected by the potential failure of a steam generator tube as the failure of the tube is not an initiator for an SLB/FLB event. SLB/FLB leakage is limited by leakage flow restrictions resulting from the leakage path above potential cracks through the tube-to-tubesheet crevice. The leak rate during all postulated accident conditions that model primary-to-secondary leakage (including locked rotor and control rod ejection) has been shown to remain within the accident analysis assumptions for all axial and or circumferentially orientated cracks occurring 15.21 inches below the top of the tubesheet. The accident analysis calculations have an assumption of 0.6 gpm [gallons per minute] at room temperature (gpmRT) primary-to-secondary leakage in a single SG and 1 gpm at room temperature (gpmRT) total primary-to-secondary leakage for all SGs. This apportioned primary-to-secondary leakage is used in the Main Steam Line Break and Locked Rotor accidents. Primary-to-secondary leakage of 1 gpm at room temperature (gpmRT) from all SGs, conservatively modeled to be released from a single location to maximize control room dose consequences, is used in the Control Rod Ejection (CRE) accident. The TS operational leak rate limit is 150 gallons per day (gpd) (0.104 gpmRT). The maximum accident leak rate ratio for Salem Unit 1 is 2.16 (Revised Table 9–7, Reference 15, [of the licensee's amendment request dated May 8, 2012]). Consequently, this results in significant margin between the conservatively estimated accident leakage and the allowable accident leakage.

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

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

Response: No.

The proposed change alters the steam generator inspection and reporting criteria. It does not introduce any new equipment, create new failure modes for existing equipment, or create any new limiting single failures. Plant operation will not be altered, and safety functions will continue to perform as previously assumed in accident analyses.

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 change involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety?

Response: No.

The proposed change alters the steam generator inspection and reporting criteria. It maintains the required structural margins of the steam generator tubes for both normal and accident conditions. NEI 97–06 and RG 1.121, are used as the bases in the development of the limited tubesheet inspection depth methodology for determining that steam generator tube integrity considerations are maintained within acceptable limits. RG 1.121 describes a method acceptable to the NRC for meeting GDC [General Design Criteria] 14, ''Reactor Coolant Pressure Boundary,'' GDC 15, ''Reactor Coolant System Design,'' GDC 31, ''Fracture Prevention of Reactor Coolant Pressure Boundary,'' and GDC 32, ''Inspection of Reactor Coolant Pressure Boundary,'' by reducing the probability and consequences of a SGTR. RG 1.121 concludes that by determining the limiting safe conditions for tube wall degradation, the probability and consequences of a SGTR are

reduced. This RG uses safety factors on loads for tube burst that are consistent with the requirements of Section III of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME) Code.

For axially-oriented cracking located within the tubesheet, tube burst is precluded due to the presence of the tubesheet. For circumferentially-oriented cracking, the H* Analysis documented in Section 3, [of the licensee's amendment request dated May 8, 2012,] defines a length of degradation-free expanded tubing that provides the necessary resistance to tube pullout due to the pressure induced forces, with applicable safety factors applied. Application of the limited hot and cold leg tubesheet inspection criteria will preclude unacceptable primary to secondary leakage during all plant conditions. The methodology for determining leakage provides for large margins between calculated and actual leakage values in the proposed limited tubesheet inspection depth criteria.

Therefore, the proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in any margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, and with the changes noted above in square brackets, 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: Jeffrie J. Keenan, PSEG Nuclear LLC—N21, P.O. Box 236, Hancocks Bridge, NJ 08038.

NRC Branch Chief: Meena K. Khanna.

Notice of Issuance of Amendments to Facility Operating Licenses and Combined Licenses

During the period since publication of the last biweekly notice, the Commission has issued the following amendments. The Commission has determined for each of these amendments that the application complies with the standards and requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), and the Commission's rules and regulations. The Commission has made appropriate findings as required by the Act and the Commission's rules and regulations in 10 CFR Chapter I, which are set forth in the license amendment.

A notice of consideration of issuance of amendment to facility operating license or combined license, as applicable, proposed no significant hazards consideration determination, and opportunity for a hearing in connection with these actions, was published in the **Federal Register** as indicated.

Unless otherwise indicated, the Commission has determined that these amendments satisfy the criteria for categorical exclusion in accordance with 10 CFR 51.22. Therefore, pursuant to 10 CFR 51.22(b), no environmental impact statement or environmental assessment need be prepared for these amendments. If the Commission has prepared an environmental assessment under the special circumstances provision in 10 CFR 51.22(b) and has made a determination based on that assessment, it is so indicated.

For further details with respect to the action see (1) the applications for amendment, (2) the amendment, and (3) the Commission's related letter, Safety Evaluation and/or Environmental Assessment as indicated. All of these items are available for public inspection at the NRC's Public Document Room (PDR), located at One White Flint North, Room O1–F21, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland 20852. Publicly available documents created or received at the NRC are accessible electronically through the Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS) in the NRC Library at *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's Reference staff at 1–800–397–4209, 301–415–4737 or by email to *pdr.resource@nrc.gov.*

Dominion Nuclear Connecticut, Inc., Docket No. 50–336, Millstone Power Station, Unit 2, New London County, Connecticut

Date of amendment request: July 31, 2012.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would revise the Millstone Power Station, Unit 2 Technical Specification requirements regarding steam generator tube inspections and reporting as described in TSTF–510, Revision 2, ''Revision to Steam Generator Program Inspection Frequencies and Tube Sample Selection;'' however, Dominion Nuclear Connecticut, Inc. is proposing minor variations and deviations from TSTF–510.

Date of issuance: January 4, 2013.

Effective date: As of the date of issuance, and shall be implemented within 60 days.

Amendment No.: 312.

Renewed Facility Operating License No. DPR–65: Amendment revised the License and Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in ***Federal Register:*** September 4, 2012 (77 FR 53926).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated January 4, 2013.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Entergy Gulf States Louisiana, LLC, and Entergy Operations, Inc., Docket No. 50–458, River Bend Station, Unit 1 (RBS), West Feliciana Parish, Louisiana

Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc., Docket Nos. 50–155 and 72–043 (ISFSI), Big Rock Point Plant (Big Rock), Charlevoix County, Michigan

Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc., Docket Nos. 50–003, 50–247 and 50–286, Indian Point Nuclear Generating Units 1, 2 and 3 (IP1, IP2, and IP3), Westchester County, New York

Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc., Docket No. 50–333, James A. FitzPatrick Nuclear Power Plant (FitzPatrick), Oswego County, New York

Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc., Docket No. 50–255, Palisades Nuclear Plant (Palisades), Van Buren County, Michigan

Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc., Docket No. 50–293, Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station (Pilgrim), Plymouth County, Massachusetts

Entergy Nuclear Vermont Yankee, LLC and Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc., Docket No. 50–271, Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station (VY), Vernon, Vermont

Entergy Operations, Inc., Docket Nos. 50–313 and 50–368, Arkansas Nuclear One, Units 1 and 2 (ANO1 and ANO2), Pope County, Arkansas

Entergy Operations, Inc., System Energy Resources, Inc., South Mississippi Electric Power Association, and Entergy Mississippi, Inc., Docket No. 50–416, Grand Gulf Nuclear Station, Unit 1 (GGNS), Claiborne County, Mississippi

Entergy Operations, Inc., Docket No. 50–382, Waterford Steam Electric Station, Unit 3 (Waterford), St. Charles Parish, Louisiana

Date of application for amendment: December 13, 2011, as supplemented by letters dated May 21, and November 20, 2012.

Brief description of amendment: The amendments approved changes to the Quality Assurance Program Manual (QAPM) and Technical Specifications (TSs) for the above specified plants. The proposed changes standardize unit staff qualification requirements for the Entergy fleet. Certain changes to the QAPM are a reduction in commitment and, in accordance with 10 CFR 50.54(a)(4), NRC approval is required prior to implementation.

Date of issuance: December 28, 2012.

Effective date: As of the date of issuance and shall be implemented 120 days from the date of issuance.

Amendment Nos.: ANO1—248; ANO2—296; FitzPatrick—304; GGNS—193; IP2—271; IP3—248; Palisades—

249; Pilgrim—239; RBS—178; VY—253; and Waterford—240.

Facility Operating License Nos. DPR–51, NPF–6, NPF–29, NPF–47, NPF–38, DPR–59, DPR–35, DPR–26, DPR–64, DPR–20, and DPR–28: The amendments revise the Facility Operating Licenses and Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in ***Federal Register:*** March 20, 2012 (77 FR 16274). The supplemental letters dated May 21 and November 20, 2012, provided additional information that clarified the application, did not expand the scope of the application as originally noticed, and did not change the staff's original proposed no significant hazards consideration determination as published in the **Federal Register**.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated December 28, 2012.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Omaha Public Power District, Docket No. 50–285, Fort Calhoun Station, Unit 1, Washington County, Nebraska

Date of amendment request: December 23, 2011, as supplement by letter dated June 18, 2012.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revised the Technical Specifications (TSs) to incorporate a new Radial Peaking Factor definition and to clarify Limiting Condition for Operation 2.10.2(6), ''Shutdown CEA [Control Element Assembly] Insertion Limit During Power Operation.'' Specifically, the amendment removed requirements for, and references to, the ''Unrodded Integrated Radial Peaking Factor.'' The amendment also added a definition of, and references to, the ''Maximum Radial Peaking Factor ($F_R{}^T$).'' Additional clarifications and editorial changes were made to TS 2.10, ''Reactor Core.''

Date of issuance: December 31, 2012.

Effective date: As of the date of issuance and shall be implemented within 120 days of issuance.

Amendment No.: 269.

Renewed Facility Operating License No. DPR–40: The amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in ***Federal Register:*** April 17, 2012 (74 FR 22816). The supplemental letter dated June 18, 2012, provided additional information that clarified the application, did not expand the scope of the application as originally noticed, and did not change the staff's original proposed no significant hazards consideration determination as published in the **Federal Register**.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a safety evaluation dated December 31, 2012.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Docket Nos. 50–275 and 50–323, Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, San Luis Obispo County, California

Date of application for amendment: January 5, 2012.

Brief description of amendment: The amendments revised the Diablo Canyon Power Plant, Units 1 and 2, Final Safety Analysis Report Update Section 4.3.2.2, ''Power Distribution,'' to allow the use of the Westinghouse Electric Company LLC's Best Estimate Analyzer for the Core Operations-Nuclear (BEACON) Power Distribution Monitoring System methodology as described in WCAP–12472–P–A, Addendum 1–A, ''BEACON Core Monitoring and Operation Support System,'' January 2000.

Date of issuance: January 9, 2013.

Effective date: As of its date of issuance and shall be implemented within 120 days from the date of issuance. Implementation of the amendments shall also include revision of the Final Safety Analysis Report Update as described in the licensee's letter dated January 5, 2012.

Amendment Nos.: Unit 1—214; Unit 2—216.

Facility Operating License Nos. DPR–80 and DPR–82: The amendments revised the Facility Operating Licenses.

Date of initial notice in ***Federal Register:*** May 15, 2012 (77 FR 28633).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated January 9, 2013.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Southern Nuclear Operating Company, Inc., Docket Nos. 50–348 and 50–364, Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2, Houston County, Alabama

Date of amendment request: January 18, 2012.

Brief description of amendment request: The amendment revises Technical Specification (TS) Surveillance Requirements 3.4.11.1 and 3.4.11.4 by removing requirements no longer applicable to Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant, Unit 2.

Date of issuance: December 27, 2012.

Effective date: As of the date of issuance and shall be implemented within 30 days from the date of issuance.

Amendment No.: 186.

Facility Operating License No. NPF–8:

Date of initial notice in ***Federal Register:*** October 2, 2012 (77 FR 60152).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated December 27, 2012.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 11th day of January 2013.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Michele G. Evans,

Director, Division of Operating Reactor Licensing, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 2013–01010 Filed 1–18–13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Sunshine Act; Meeting Notice

AGENCY HOLDING THE MEETINGS: Nuclear Regulatory Commission, [NRC–2013–0001].

DATES: Weeks of January 21, 28, February 4, 11, 18, 25, 2013.

PLACE: Commissioners' Conference Room, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland.

STATUS: Public and Closed.

Week of January 21, 2013

There are no meetings scheduled for the week of January 21, 2013.

Week of January 28, 2013—Tentative

Thursday, January 31, 2013

8:55 a.m. Affirmation Session (Public Meeting) (Tentative)

Enforcement Orders Directed to All Operating Boiling Water Reactor Licensees with Mark I and Mark II Containments and All Power Reactor Licensees and Holders of Construction Permits in Active or Deferred Status (EA–12–050 and EA–12–051); Pilgrim Watch Appeal of LBP–12–14 (Tentative).

This meeting will be webcast live at the Web address—*www.nrc.gov*.

9:00 a.m. Briefing on Public Participation in NRC Regulatory Decision-Making (Public Meeting) (Contact: Lance Rakovan, 301–415–2589).

This meeting will be webcast live at the Web address—*www.nrc.gov*.

Friday, February 1, 2013

9:30 a.m. Briefing on Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) and Small Business Programs (Public Meeting) (Contact: Sandra Talley, 301–415–8059).

This meeting will be webcast live at the Web address—*www.nrc.gov*.