

our offerings that will improve the overall visitor experience. NARA invites the public to comment on the proposed information collection pursuant to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.

**DATES:** Written comments must be received on or before July 28, 2014 to be assured of consideration.

**ADDRESSES:** Comments should be sent to: Paperwork Reduction Act Comments (ISSD), Room 4400, National Archives and Records Administration, 8601 Adelphi Rd, College Park, MD 20740-6001; or faxed to 301-713-7409; or electronically mailed to [tamee.fechhelm@nara.gov](mailto:tamee.fechhelm@nara.gov).

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Please direct requests for additional information, copies of the proposed information collection, or copies of the supporting statement to Tamee Fechhelm at telephone number 301-837-1694, or fax number 301-713-7409.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Pursuant to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104-13), NARA invites the general public and other Federal agencies to comment on proposed information collections. The comments and suggestions should address one or more of the following points: (a) Whether the proposed information collection is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of NARA; (b) the accuracy of NARA's estimate of the burden of the proposed information collection; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including the use of information technology; and (e) whether small businesses are affected by this collection. NARA will summarize submitted comments and include the summary in NARA's request for Office of Management and Budget (OMB) approval of the information collection. All comments will become a matter of public record. In this notice, NARA is soliciting comments concerning the following information collection:

*Title:* NARA Visitors Study

*OMB number:* 3095-0067

*Agency form number:* N/A

*Type of review:* Regular

*Affected public:* Visitors to the National Archives Experience in Washington, DC

*Estimated number of respondents:* 200

*Estimated time per response:* 12 minutes

*Frequency of response:* On occasion (when a person visits the NAE in Washington, DC)

*Estimated total annual burden hours:* 40 hours

**Abstract:** The general purpose of this voluntary data collection is to benchmark the performance of the NAE in relation to other history museums. Information collected from visitors will assess overall impact, expectations, presentation, logistics, motivation, demographic profile, and learning experience. Once NARA has analyzed it, this collected information will assist NARA in determining the NAE's success in achieving its goals.

Dated: May 19, 2104.

**Swarnali Haldar,**

*Acting Executive for Information Services/ CIO.*

[FR Doc. 2014-12145 Filed 5-23-14; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7515-01-P**

## NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS ADMINISTRATION

[NARA-2014-033]

### Office of Government Information Services (OGIS), Freedom of Information Act Advisory Committee Meeting

**AGENCY:** National Archives and Records Administration.

**ACTION:** Notice of meeting.

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. app 2) and the second United States Open Government National Action Plan (NAP) released on December 5, 2013, NARA announces the following committee meeting to discuss improvements to the administration of FOIA and its policy matters.

**DATES:** The meeting is on June 24, 2014, from 10 a.m. to 1 p.m.

**ADDRESSES:** National Archives and Records Administration; 700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Archivist's Board Room, Washington, DC 20408.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** This meeting will be open to the public. However, due to space limitations and access procedures, individuals planning to attend must submit their name, email, and telephone number to the Office of Government Information Services (OGIS) no later than Tuesday, June 10, 2014. OGIS will call or email with additional instructions for access to the meeting, and will provide updates on the OGIS blog post.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Christa Lemelin, Designated Federal Officer for this committee, at NARA/OGIS, 800 N. Capital Street NW., Washington, DC 20007; by telephone at (202) 741-5773; or by email at

[Christa.Lemelin@nara.gov](mailto:Christa.Lemelin@nara.gov). You may also contact OGIS at [OGIS@NARA.gov](mailto:OGIS@NARA.gov).

Dated: May 21, 2014.

**Patrice Little Murray,**

*Acting Committee Management Officer.*

[FR Doc. 2014-12146 Filed 5-23-14; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7515-01-P**

## NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

### Notice of Permits Issued Under the Antarctic Conservation Act of 1978

**AGENCY:** National Science Foundation.

**ACTION:** Notice of permits issued under the Antarctic Conservation Act of 1978, Public Law 95-541.

**SUMMARY:** The National Science Foundation (NSF) is required to publish notice of permits issued under the Antarctic Conservation Act of 1978. This is the required notice.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Li Ling Hamady, ACA Permit Officer, Division of Polar Programs, Rm. 755, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, VA 22230. Or by email: [ACApermits@nsf.gov](mailto:ACApermits@nsf.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** On April 16, 2014 the National Science Foundation published a notice in the **Federal Register** of a permit application received. The permit was issued on May 19, 2014 to: Andrew G. Fountain Permit No. 2014-031.

**Nadene G. Kennedy,**

*Polar Coordination Specialist, Division of Polar Programs.*

[FR Doc. 2014-12031 Filed 5-23-14; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7555-01-P**

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[NRC-2014-0122]

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

**AGENCY:** Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**ACTION:** Biweekly notice.

**SUMMARY:** Pursuant to Section 189a. (2) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is publishing this regular biweekly notice. The Act requires the Commission to 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 April 31, 2014 to May 14, 2014. The last biweekly notice was published on May 13, 2014.

**DATES:** Comments must be filed by June 26, 2014. A request for a hearing must be filed by July 28, 2014.

**ADDRESSES:** You may submit comments by any of the following methods (unless this document describes a different method for submitting comments on a specific subject):

- *Federal Rulemaking Web site:* Go to <http://www.regulations.gov> and search for Docket ID NRC-2014-0122. Address questions about NRC dockets to Carol Gallagher; telephone: 301-287-3422; email: [Carol.Gallagher@nrc.gov](mailto:Carol.Gallagher@nrc.gov). For technical questions, contact the individual listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section of this document.

- *Mail comments to:* Cindy Bladey, Office of Administration, Mail Stop: 3WFN-06-A44M, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001.

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

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Shirley Rohrer, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001; telephone: 301-415-5411, email: [Shirley.Rohrer@nrc.gov](mailto:Shirley.Rohrer@nrc.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**I. Accessing Information and Submitting Comments**

*A. Accessing Information*

Please refer to Docket ID NRC-2014-0122 when contacting the NRC about the availability of information regarding this document. You may access publicly-available information related to this action by any of the following methods:

- *Federal Rulemaking Web site:* Go to <http://www.regulations.gov> and search for Docket ID NRC-2014-0122.

- *NRC's Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS):* You may access publicly

available documents online in the ADAMS Public Documents collection 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](mailto: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-2014-0122 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 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.

**I. Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendments to Facility Operating Licenses and Combined Licenses and Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination**

The Commission has made a proposed determination that the following amendment requests involve no significant hazards consideration. Under the Commission's regulations in § 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.

*A. Opportunity To Request a Hearing and Petition for Leave To Intervene*

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 "Agency Rules of Practice and Procedure" 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's 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.

#### *B. Electronic Submissions (E-Filing)*

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's 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 email at [hearing.docket@nrc.gov](mailto: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/getting-started.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 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 NRC'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's public Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/e-submittals.html>, by email to [MSHD.Resource@nrc.gov](mailto: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. However, a request to intervene will require including information on local residence in order

to demonstrate a proximity assertion of interest in the proceeding. 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 three factors in 10 CFR 2.309(c)(1)(i)-(iii).

For further details with respect to these license amendment applications, see the application for amendment which is available for public inspection in ADAMS and at the NRC's PDR. For additional direction on accessing information related to this document, see the "Accessing Information and Submitting Comments" section of this document.

Florida Power and Light Company, et al. (FPL), Docket Nos. 50-335 and 50-389, St. Lucie Plant, Units 1 and 2, St. Lucie County, Florida

*Date of amendment request:* February 26, 2014. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML14077A265.

*Description of amendment request:* The amendments would revise technical specification (TS) requirements for mode change limitations in Limited Condition for Operation (LCO) 3.0.4 and Surveillance Requirements 4.0.4. The proposed changes would be consistent with the NRC approved Industry Technical Specification Task Force (TSTF) Standard TS change TSTF-359, "Increase Flexibility in Mode Restraints," Revision 9.

The NRC issued a notice of opportunity for comment in the **Federal Register** (FR) on August 2, 2002 (67 FR 50475), on possible amendments concerning TSTF-359, including a model safety evaluation and model no significant hazards consideration (NSHC) determination, using the consolidated line item improvement process (CLIP). Subsequently, on April 4, 2003, the NRC published the Notice of Availability for TSTF-359, Revision 8 in the **Federal Register** (68 FR 16579). That Notice announced the availability of this TS improvement through the CLIP. The NRC subsequently made two modifications in response to comments,

as well as one editorial change, which have been incorporated into TSTF-359, Revision 9. The changes proposed in the licensee's submittal are, therefore, based on TSTF-359, Revision 9. FPL affirmed the applicability of the following NSHC determination in its application dated February 26, 2014.

*Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:* As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), an analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, as was published in the **Federal Register** 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 allows entry into a mode or other specified condition in the applicability of a TS, while in a TS condition statement and the associated required actions of the TS. Being in a TS condition and the associated required actions is not an initiator of any accident previously evaluated. Therefore, the probability of an accident previously evaluated is not significantly increased. The consequences of an accident while relying on required actions as allowed by proposed LCO 3.0.4, are no different than the consequences of an accident while entering and relying on the required actions while starting in a condition of applicability of the TS. Therefore, the consequences of an accident previously evaluated are not significantly affected by this change. The addition of a requirement to assess and manage the risk introduced by this change will further minimize possible concerns.

Therefore, this 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 previously evaluated.

The proposed change does not involve a physical alteration of the plant (no new or different type of equipment will be installed). Entering into a mode or other specified condition in the applicability of a TS, while in a TS condition statement and the associated required actions of the TS, will not introduce new failure modes or effects and will not, in the absence of other unrelated failures, lead to an accident whose consequences exceed the consequences of accidents previously evaluated. The addition of a requirement to assess and manage the risk introduced by this change will further minimize possible concerns.

Thus, this change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from an accident previously evaluated.

Criterion 3—The proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety.

The proposed change allows entry into a mode or other specified condition in the applicability of a TS, while in a TS condition statement and the associated required actions

of the TS. The TS allow operation of the plant without the full complement of equipment through the conditions for not meeting the TS Limiting Conditions for Operation (LCO). The risk associated with this allowance is managed by the imposition of required actions that must be performed within the prescribed completion times. The net effect of being in a TS condition on the margin of safety is not considered significant. The proposed change does not alter the required actions or completion times of the TS. The proposed change allows TS conditions to be entered, and the associated required actions and completion times to be used in new circumstances. This use is predicated upon the licensee's performance of a risk assessment and the management of plant risk. The change also eliminates current allowances for utilizing required actions and completion times in similar circumstances, without assessing and managing risk. The net change to the margin of safety is insignificant.

Therefore, this change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

Based upon the reasoning presented above and the previous discussion of the amendment request, the requested change does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

The NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

*Attorney for licensee:* William S. Blair, Managing Attorney—Nuclear, Florida Power & Light, 700 Universe Blvd., MS LAW/JB, Juno Beach, FL 33408–0420.

*Acting NRC Branch Chief:* Lisa M. Regner.

Indiana Michigan Power Company (I&M), Docket Nos. 50–315 and 50–316, Donald C. Cook Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2, Berrien County, Michigan

*Date of amendment request:* March 7, 2014. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML14071A435.

*Description of amendment request:* The proposed amendment would revise the Donald C. Cook Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2, Technical Specification 5.5.14, “Containment Leakage Rate Testing Program,” by adopting Nuclear Energy Institute (NEI) 94–01 Revision 3–A, “Industry Guideline for Implementing Performance-Based Option of 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J” (ADAMS Accession No. ML12221A202), as the implementing document for the performance-based Option B of 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J.

*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 revision to TS 5.5.14 changes the testing period to a permanent 15-year interval for Type A testing (10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J, Option B, ILRT). The current test interval of 10 years would be extended to 15 years from the last Type A test. The proposed extension to Type A testing does not involve a significant increase in the consequences of an accident since research documented in NUREG–1493, “Performance-Based Containment System Leakage Testing Requirements,” September 1995, has found that, generically, very few potential containment leakage paths are not identified by Type B and C tests. NUREG–1493 concluded that reducing the Type A testing frequency to one per twenty years was found to lead to an imperceptible increase in risk. A high degree of assurance is provided through testing and inspection that the containment will not degrade in a manner detectable only by Type A testing. The last Type A test (November 2006) shows leakage to be below acceptance criteria, indicating a very leak tight containment. Inspections required by the ASME Code Section XI (Subsections IWE and IWL) and Maintenance Rule monitoring (10 CFR 50.65, “Requirements for Monitoring the Effectiveness of Maintenance at Nuclear Power Plants[”]) are performed in order to identify indications of containment degradation that could affect that leak tightness. Types B and C testing required by [technical specifications (TSs)] will identify any containment opening such as valves that would otherwise be detected by the Type A tests. These factors show that a Type A test interval extension will not represent a significant increase in the consequences of an accident.

The proposed amendment involves changes to the [Donald C. Cook Nuclear Plant (CNP)] Units 1 and 2 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J Testing Program Plan. The proposed amendment does not involve a physical change to the plant or a change in the manner in which the units are operated or controlled. The primary containment function is to provide an essentially leak tight barrier against the uncontrolled release of radioactivity to the environment for postulated accidents. As such, the containment itself and the testing requirements to periodically demonstrate the integrity of the containment exist to ensure the plant's ability to mitigate the consequences of an accident, and do not involve any accident precursors or initiators.

Therefore, the probability of occurrence of an accident previously evaluated is not significantly increased by the proposed amendment.

The proposed amendment adopts the [U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC)]-accepted guidelines of [Nuclear Energy Institute (NEI)] 94–01, Revision 3–A, for development of the CNP performance-based leakage testing program. Implementation of these guidelines continues to provide adequate assurance that during design basis

accidents, the primary containment and its components will limit leakage rates to less than the values assumed in the plant safety analyses. The potential consequences of extending the [integrated leak rate testing (ILRT)] interval from 10 years to 15 years have been evaluated by analyzing the resulting changes in risk. The increase in risk in terms of person-rem per year resulting from design basis accidents was estimated to be acceptably small, and the increase in the [large early release frequency (LERF)] resulting from the proposed change was determined to be within the guidelines published in NRC [Regulatory Guide (RG)] 1.174. Additionally, the proposed change maintains defense-in-depth by preserving a reasonable balance among prevention of core damage, prevention of containment failure, and consequence mitigation. [Indiana Michigan Power Company (I&M)] has determined that the increase in [conditional containment failure probability (CCFP)] due to the proposed change would be very small.

Therefore, it is concluded that the proposed amendment does not significantly increase the 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 revision to TS 5.5.14 changes the testing period to a permanent 15-year interval for Type A testing (10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J, Option B, ILRT)]. The current test interval of 10 years, based on past performance, would be extended to 15 years from the last Type A test (November 2006). The proposed extension to Type A testing does not create the possibility of a new or different type of accident since there are no physical changes being made to the plant and there are no changes to the operation of the plant that could introduce a new failure mode creating an accident or affecting the mitigation of an accident.

Therefore, the proposed amendment 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 revision to TS 5.5.14 changes the testing period to a permanent 15-year interval for Type A testing (10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J, Option B, ILRT)]. The current test interval of 10 years, based on past performance, would be extended to 15 years from the last Type A test (November 2006). The proposed extension to Type A testing will not significantly reduce the margin of safety. NUREG–1493, “Performance-Based Containment System Leakage Testing Requirements,” September 1995, generic study of the effects of extending containment leakage testing, found that a 20 year extension to Type A leakage testing resulted in an imperceptible increase in risk to the public. NUREG–1493 found that, generically, the design containment leakage rate contributes about 0.1% to the individual risk and that the decrease in Type A testing frequency would have a minimal

effect on this risk since 95% of the potential leakage paths are detected by Type C testing. Regular inspections required by the ASME Code Section XI (Subsections IWE and IWL) and maintenance rule monitoring (10 CFR 50.65, "Requirements for Monitoring the Effectiveness of Maintenance at Nuclear Power Plants[") will further reduce the risk of a containment leakage path going undetected.

The proposed amendment adopts the NRC-accepted guidelines of NEI 94-01, Revision 3-A, for development of the CNP performance-based leakage testing program, and establishes a 15-year interval for the performance of the primary containment ILRT. The amendment does not alter the manner in which safety limits, limiting safety system setpoints, or limiting conditions for operation are determined. The specific requirements and conditions of the 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J Testing Program Plan, as defined in the TS, ensure that the degree of primary containment structural integrity and leak-tightness that is considered in the plant safety analyses is maintained. The overall containment leakage rate limit specified by the TS is maintained, and the Type A, B, and C containment leakage tests will continue to be performed at the frequencies established in accordance with the NRC-accepted guidelines of NEI 94-01, Revision 3-A. Containment inspections performed in accordance with other plant programs serve to provide a high degree of assurance that the containment will not degrade in a manner that is detectable only by an ILRT. In addition, CNP has a containment monitoring capability for the detection of gross containment leakage that may develop during power operation. This combination of factors ensures that evidence of containment structural degradation is identified in a timely manner. Furthermore, a risk assessment using the current CNP PRA model concluded that extending the ILRT test interval from 10 years to 15 years results in a very small change to the CNP risk profile.

Therefore, the proposed amendment does not involve a significant reduction in 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:* Robert B. Haemer, Senior Nuclear Counsel, One Cook Place, Bridgman, MI 49106.  
*NRC Branch Chief:* Robert D. Carlson.

Southern Nuclear Operating Company  
Docket Nos.: 52-025 and 52-026, Vogtle Electric Generating Plant (VEGP) Units 3 and 4, Burke County, Georgia

*Date of amendment request:* April 18, 2014. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML14108A196.

*Description of amendment request:* The proposed license amendment request would revise the Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (UFSAR) in regard to Tier 2\* information related to fire area boundaries. These changes add three new fire zones in the middle annulus to provide enclosures for the Class 1E electrical containment penetrations in accordance with UFSAR Appendix 9A, Subsection 9A.3.1.1.15. The addition of the three new fire zones extended the fire area boundaries for three existing fire areas and therefore constitutes a change to Tier 2\* information. Additionally, the licensee proposed changes that require revisions to UFSAR Tier 2 information involving changes to plant-specific Tier 2\* information.

*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.

The proposed middle annulus fire barrier reconfiguration for the electrical penetrations would not adversely affect any safety-related equipment or function. The modified configuration for the Class 1E electrical containment penetration enclosures will maintain the fire protection function (i.e., barrier) as evaluated in Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (UFSAR), thus, the probability of a Class 1E electrical containment penetration failure is not significantly increased. The safe shutdown fire analysis is not affected, and the fire protection analysis results are not adversely affected. The proposed changes do not involve any accident, initiating event or component failure; thus, the probabilities of previously evaluated accidents are not affected. The maximum allowable leakage rate specified in the Technical Specifications is unchanged, and radiological material release source terms are not affected; thus, the radiological releases in the accident analyses are not affected.

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.

The addition of enclosures constructed of three-hour rated fire barriers to separate the fire zones in the middle annulus for the Class 1E electrical penetration assemblies will maintain the fire protection function as evaluated in the UFSAR. The addition of the fire barriers does not affect the function of the Class 1E electrical containment

penetrations or electrical penetration assemblies, and thus, does not introduce a new failure mode. The addition of the fire barriers does not create a new fault or sequence of events that could result in a radioactive material release.

Therefore, the proposed amendment does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident.

3. Does the proposed amendment involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety?  
Response: No.

The use of enclosures constructed of three-hour rated fire barriers to separate the fire zones in the middle annulus for the Class 1E electrical penetration assemblies will maintain the fire protection function as evaluated in the UFSAR. The use of the fire barriers does not affect the ability of the Class 1E electrical containment penetrations, electrical penetration assemblies, or the containment to perform their design function. The Class 1E electrical containment penetrations and electrical penetration assemblies within the enclosures continue to comply with the existing design codes and regulatory criteria, and do not affect any safety limit. The use of fire barriers and enclosures to separate the Class 1E electrical penetration assemblies does not adversely affect any margin of safety.

Therefore, the proposed amendment 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:* M. Stanford Blanton, Blach & Bingham LLP, 1710 Sixth Avenue North, Birmingham, AL 35203-2015.

*NRC Branch Chief:* Lawrence J. Burkhart.

### III. 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 can be accessed as described in the "Accessing Information and Submitting Comments" section of this document.

Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC, Docket Nos. 50–269, 50–270 and 50–287, Oconee Nuclear Station, Units 1, 2 and 3, Oconee County, South Carolina

*Date of application for amendments:* October 30, 2012, as supplemented on January 21, June 11, September 3, October 21, and December 2, 2013.

*Brief description of amendments:* The amendments create new Technical Specification (TS) 3.7.19, "Spent Fuel Pool Cooling (SFPC) Purification System Isolation from Borated Water Storage Tank (BWST)," and 3.9.8, "Reverse Osmosis (RO) System Operating Restrictions for Spent Fuel Pool (SFP)," for the operation of an RO system to remove silica from the BWSTs and SFPs.

*Date of Issuance:* April 30, 2014.

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

*Amendment Nos.:* 385, 387, and 386. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML14106A418; documents related to these amendments are listed in the Safety Evaluation enclosed with the amendments.

*Renewed Facility Operating License Nos. DPR–38, DPR–47, and DPR–55:* Amendments revised the license and the TSs.

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* November 26, 2013, 78 FR 70591.

The supplemental letters dated January 21, June 11, September 3,

October 21, and December 2, 2013, provided additional information that clarified the application, did not expand the scope of the application as noticed, and did not change the staff's 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 April 30, 2014.

*No significant hazards consideration comments received:* No.

Exelon Generation Company, LLC, and PSEG Nuclear LLC, Docket Nos. 50–277 and 50–278, Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station, Units 2 and 3, York and Lancaster Counties, Pennsylvania

*Date of application for amendments:* June 10, 2013, as supplemented by letter dated November 6, 2013.

*Brief description of amendments:* The amendments modify the Technical Specifications (TSs) and Facility Operating Licenses (FOLs) to: (1) Increase the allowable as-found safety relief valve (SRV) and safety valve (SV) lift setpoint tolerance from  $\pm 1\%$  to  $\pm 3\%$ ; (2) increase the required number of operable SRVs and SVs from 11 to 12; and (3) increase the Standby Liquid Control System pump discharge pressure from 1255 pounds per square inch gauge (psig) to 1275 psig.

*Date of issuance:* May 5, 2014.

*Effective date:* As of the date of issuance, to be implemented within 60 days.

*Amendments Nos.:* 290 and 293. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML14079A102; documents related to these amendments are listed in the Safety Evaluation enclosed with the amendments.

*Renewed Facility Operating License Nos. DPR–44 and DPR–56:* The amendments revised the FOLs and TSs.

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* December 26, 2013 (78 FR 78406). The letter dated November 6, 2013, provided clarifying information that did not change the initial proposed no significant hazards consideration determination or expand the application beyond the scope of the original **Federal Register** notice.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 5, 2014.

*No significant hazards consideration comments received:* No.

NextEra Energy Point Beach, LLC, Docket Nos. 50–266 and 50–301, Point Beach Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2, Town of Two Creeks, Manitowac County, Wisconsin

*Date of amendment request:* June 4, 2013.

*Description of amendment:* The license amendment revised Technical Specifications 5.3.1 and 6.9.1.7 to allow the use of Optimized ZIRLO™ as an approved fuel rod cladding material at the Point Beach Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2; added two approved analytical methods; and made minor corrections to the titles of two approved topical reports.

*Date of issuance:* May 9, 2014.

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

*Amendment Nos.:* 249 and 253. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML14058B029; documents related to these amendments are listed in the Safety Evaluation enclosed with the amendments.

*Facility Operating License Nos. DPR–24 and DPR–27:* The amendment revised the Renewed Facility Operating License and the Technical Specifications.

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* October 29, 2013 (78 FR 64545).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 9, 2014.

*No significant hazards consideration comments received:* No.

Northern States Power Company—Minnesota, Docket No. 50–263, Monticello Nuclear Generating Plant, Wright County, Minnesota

*Date of application for amendment:* January 4, 2013.

*Brief description of amendment:* The amendment revises the Technical Specification (TS) Surveillance Requirement (SR) 3.6.4.3.1 and SR 3.7.4.1 which currently require operating the standby gas treatment (SGT) and control room emergency filtration (CREF) systems for at least 10 continuous hours with the heaters operating every 31 days. The SRs are changed to require at least 15 continuous minutes of ventilation system operation without heaters operating every 31 days, and include TS Bases changes summarizing and clarifying the purpose of the TSs in accordance with TS Task Force (TSTF) Standard Technical Specifications Change Traveler TSTF–522, Revision 0, "Revise Ventilation System Surveillance Requirements to Operate for 10 hours

per Month” (ADAMS Accession No. ML100890316). The amendment also removes the electric heater output testing requirement from TS 5.5.6, “Ventilation Filter Testing Program (VFTP).”

*Date of issuance:* May 2, 2014.

*Effective date:* This amendment is effective as of its date of issuance and shall be implemented within 120 days from the date of issuance.

*Amendment No.:* 181. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML14058A825; documents related to this amendment are listed in the Safety Evaluation enclosed with the amendment.

*Facility Operating License No. DPR-22:* This amendment revises the Renewed Facility Operating License and the Technical Specifications.

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* March 4, 2013 (78 FR 14134). The supplemental letter dated December 27, 2013, 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 May 2, 2014.

*No significant hazards consideration comments received:* No.

Southern Nuclear Operating Company Docket Nos. 52-025 and 52-026, Vogtle Electric Generating Plant (VEGP) Units 3 and 4, Burke County, Georgia

*Date of amendment request:* April 25, 2013, as supplemented by the letter dated November 21, 2013.

*Brief description of amendment:* The amendment revises Tier 2\* and associated Tier 2 information, incorporated into the VEGP Units 3 and 4 Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (UFSAR). Specifically, the amendment revises the following information related to fire area boundaries: (1) Various Annex Building and Turbine Building layout changes, (2) Turbine Building Stairwell S08 changes to support egress functions, and (3) an Annex Building Heating, Ventilation and Air Conditioning shaft UFSAR figure clarification.

*Date of issuance:* May 1, 2014.

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

*Amendment No.:* 19. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML14050A445; documents related to these amendments

are listed in the Safety Evaluation enclosed with the amendments.

*Facility Combined Licenses No. NPF-91 and NPF-92:* Amendment revised the Facility Combined Licenses.

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* July 9, 2013, 2013 (78 FR 41118).

The Commission’s related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 1, 2014.

*No significant hazards consideration comments received:* No.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 19th day of May 2014.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Michele G. Evans,**

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

[FR Doc. 2014-12018 Filed 5-23-14; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7590-01-P**

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 72-1048: EA-14-044: NRC-2014-0098]

### In the Matter of Tennessee Valley Authority, Watts Bar Nuclear Plant Independent Spent Fuel Storage Installation: Order Modifying License (Effective Immediately)

**AGENCY:** Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**ACTION:** Order; modification.

**SUMMARY:** The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) has issued a general license to the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA), authorizing the operation of the Watts Bar Nuclear Plant Independent Spent Fuel Storage Installation (ISFSI), in accordance with its regulations. The Order is being issued to Exelon because Exelon has identified near term plans to store spent fuel in an ISFSI under the general license provisions of the NRC’s regulations.

**ADDRESSES:** Please refer to Docket ID NRC-2014-0098 when contacting the NRC about the availability of information regarding this document. You may access publicly-available information related to this action by the following methods:

- Federal Rulemaking Web site: Go to <http://www.regulations.gov> and search for Docket ID NRC-2014-0098. Address questions about NRC dockets to Carol Gallagher; telephone: 301-287-3422; email: [Carol.Gallagher@nrc.gov](mailto:Carol.Gallagher@nrc.gov). For technical questions, contact the individual listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section of this document.

- NRC’s Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS): You may obtain publicly available documents online in the ADAMS Public Documents collection 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](mailto:pdr.resource@nrc.gov).

- 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.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** L. Raynard Wharton, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001; telephone: 301-287-9196; email: [Raynard.Wharton@nrc.gov](mailto:Raynard.Wharton@nrc.gov).

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### I. Introduction

Pursuant to § 2.106 of Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR), the NRC is providing notice, in the matter of Watts Bar Nuclear Plant Independent Spent Fuel Storage Installation (ISFSI) Order Modifying License (Effective Immediately).

##### II. Further Information

##### I

The NRC has issued a general license to TVA, authorizing the operation of an ISFSI, in accordance with the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and 10 CFR Part 72. This Order is being issued to TVA because TVA has identified near-term plans to store spent fuel in an ISFSI under the general license provisions of 10 CFR Part 72. The Commission’s regulations at 10 CFR 72.212(b)(5), 10 CFR 50.54(p)(1), and 10 CFR 73.55(c)(5) require licensees to maintain safeguards contingency plan procedures to respond to threats of radiological sabotage and to protect the spent fuel against the threat of radiological sabotage, in accordance with 10 CFR Part 73, Appendix C. Specific physical security requirements are contained in 10 CFR 73.51 or 73.55, as applicable.

Inasmuch as an insider has an opportunity equal to, or greater than, any other person, to commit radiological sabotage, the Commission has determined these measures to be prudent. Comparable Orders have been issued to all licensees that currently store spent fuel or have identified near-