

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[NRC–2014–0230]

Applications and Amendments to Facility Operating Licenses and Combined Licenses Involving Proposed No Significant Hazards Considerations and Containing Sensitive Unclassified Non-Safeguards Information and Order Imposing Procedures for Access to Sensitive Unclassified Non-Safeguards Information**AGENCY:** Nuclear Regulatory Commission.**ACTION:** License amendment request; opportunity to comment, request a hearing, and petition for leave to intervene; order.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) received and is considering approval of three amendment requests. The amendment requests are for Catawba Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2; R.E. Ginna Nuclear Power Plant; and St. Lucie Plant, Units 1 and 2. For each amendment request, the NRC proposes to determine that they involve no significant hazards consideration. In addition, each amendment request contains sensitive unclassified non-safeguards information (SUNSI).

DATES: Comments must be filed by December 4, 2014. A request for a hearing must be filed by January 5, 2015. Any potential party as defined in § 2.4 of Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR), who believes access to SUNSI is necessary to respond to this notice must request document access by November 14, 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–2014–0230. Address questions about NRC dockets to Carol Gallagher; telephone: 301–287–3422; email: Carol.Gallagher@nrc.gov.

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

For additional direction on obtaining information and submitting comments, see “Obtaining Information and Submitting Comments” in the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section of this document.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Janet C. Burkhardt, Office of Nuclear

Reactor Regulation, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001; telephone: 301–415–1384, email: Janet.Burkhardt@nrc.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**I. Obtaining Information and Submitting Comments***A. Obtaining Information*

Please refer to Docket ID NRC–2014–0230 when contacting the NRC about the availability of information for this action. You may obtain 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–2014–0230.
- *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. The ADAMS accession number for each document referenced (if it is available in ADAMS) is provided the first time that it is mentioned in the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section.

- *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–2014–0230 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 posts all comment submissions at <http://www.regulations.gov> as well as entering 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.

II. Background

Pursuant to Section 189a.(2) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), the NRC is publishing this 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 notice includes notices of amendments containing SUNSI.

III. 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 10 CFR 50.92, 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 within 60 days, the Commission or a presiding officer designated by the Commission or by the Chief Administrative Judge of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, will rule on the request and/or petition; and the Secretary or the Chief Administrative Judge of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board will issue a notice of a hearing or an appropriate order.

As required by 10 CFR 2.309, a petition for leave to intervene shall 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 set forth the specific contentions which the requestor/petitioner seeks to have litigated at the proceeding.

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

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

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

any amendment unless the Commission finds an imminent danger of the health or safety of the public, in which case it will issue an appropriate order or rule under 10 CFR part 2.

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 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/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, 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 this amendment action, 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>. 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.

Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC., Docket Nos. 50-413 and 50-414, Catawba Nuclear Station (Catawba), Units 1 and 2, York County, South Carolina

Date of amendment request: June 23, 2014. A redacted, publicly-available, version is available in ADAMS under Accession No. ML14176A109.

Description of amendment request: This amendment request contains sensitive unclassified non-safeguards information (SUNSI). The proposed amendments would implement a measurement uncertainty recapture power uprate at Catawba Unit 1 that would increase authorized core power level from 3411 megawatts thermal (MWt) to 3469 MWt. This is an increase of approximately 1.7 percent Rated Thermal Power (RTP). The increase in thermal power is based on the use of Cameron (a.k.a. Caldon) instrumentation to determine core power level with a power measurement uncertainty of approximately 0.3 percent.

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 amendment changes the rated thermal power from 3411 MWt to 3469 MWt; an increase of approximately 1.7% Rated Thermal Power. Duke Energy's evaluations have shown that all structures, systems and components (SSCs) are capable of performing their design function at the uprated power of 3469 MWt. A review

of station accident analyses found that all acceptance criteria are still met at the uprated power of 3469 MWt.

The radiological consequences of operation at the uprated power conditions have been assessed. The proposed power uprate does not affect release paths, frequency of release, or the analyzed reactor core fission product inventory for any accidents previously evaluated in the Updated Final Safety Analysis Report. Analyses performed to assess the effects of mass and energy releases remain valid. All acceptance criteria for radiological consequences continue to be met at the uprated power level.

The proposed change does not involve any change to the design or functional requirements of the safety and support systems. That is, the increased power level neither degrades the performance of, nor increases the challenges to any safety systems assumed to function in the plant safety analysis.

While power level is an input to accident analyses, it is not an initiator of accidents. The proposed change does not affect any accident precursors and does not introduce any accident initiators. The proposed change does not impact the usefulness of the Surveillance Requirements (SRs) in evaluating the operability of required systems and components.

In addition, evaluation of the proposed TS [Technical Specification] changes demonstrates that the availability of equipment and systems required to prevent or mitigate the radiological consequences of an accident is not significantly affected. Since the impact on the systems is minimal, it is concluded that the overall impact on the plant safety analysis is negligible.

Therefore, the proposed amendment does not significantly increase the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

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

Response: No.

No new accident scenarios, failure mechanisms, or single failures are introduced as a result of the proposed change. The installation of the Cameron LEFM [Leading Edge Flow Meter] CheckPlus™ System has been analyzed and failures of the system will have no adverse effect on any safety related system or any SSCs required for transient mitigation. SSCs previously required for the mitigation of a transient continue to be capable of fulfilling their intended design functions. The

proposed change has no adverse effect on any safety related system or component and does not change the performance or integrity of any safety related system.

The proposed change does not adversely affect any current system interfaces or create any new interfaces that could result in an accident or malfunction of a different kind than previously evaluated. Operation at the uprated power level does not create any new accident initiators or precursors. Credible malfunctions are bounded by existing accident analyses of record or new evaluations demonstrating that applicable criteria are still met with the proposed changes.

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 amendment involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety?

Response: No.

Although the proposed amendment increases the Catawba Unit 1 operating power level, the unit retains its margin of safety because it is only increasing power by the amount equal to the reduction in uncertainty in the heat balance calculation. The margins of safety associated with the power uprate are those pertaining to core thermal power. These include fuel cladding, reactor coolant system pressure boundary, and containment barriers. Analyses demonstrate that the current design basis continues to be met after the measurement uncertainty recapture (MUR) power uprate. Components associated with the reactor coolant system pressure boundary structural integrity, including pressure-temperature limits, vessel fluence, and pressurized thermal shock are bounded by the current analyses. Systems will continue to operate within their design parameters and remain capable of performing their intended safety functions.

The current Catawba safety analyses, including the design basis radiological accident dose calculations, bound the power uprate.

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

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

Attorney for licensee: Lara S. Nichols, Associate General Counsel, Duke Energy

Corporation, 526 South Church Street—EC07H, Charlotte, North Carolina, 28202.

NRC Branch Chief: Robert J. Pascarelli.

Exelon Generation Company, LLC., Docket No. 50–244, R.E. Ginna Nuclear Power Plant (Ginna), Wayne County, New York

Date of amendment request: March 28, 2013. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession Nos. ML13093A064 and ML13093A065.

Description of amendment request: This proposed amendment request contains sensitive unclassified non-safeguards information (SUNSI). The proposed amendment requests approval of a new fire protection licensing basis of National Fire Protection Association Standard 805 (NFPA 805), which complies with the requirements of 10 CFR 50.48(a) and 50.48(c), and Regulatory Guide 1.205, Revision 1, "Risk-Informed, Performance-Based Fire Protection for Existing Light-Water Nuclear Power Plants," dated December 2009 (ADAMS Accession No. ML092730314).

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 purpose of the proposed amendment is to permit Ginna to adopt a new fire protection licensing basis that complies with the requirements of 10 CFR 50.48(a) and (c) and the guidance in Regulatory Guide 1.205. The NRC considers that NFPA 805 provides an acceptable methodology and performance criteria for licensees to identify fire protection requirements that are an acceptable alternative to the 10 CFR 50 Appendix R required fire protection features (69 FR 33536, June 16, 2004).

Operation of Ginna in accordance with the proposed amendment does not increase the probability or consequences of accidents previously evaluated. Engineering analyses, which may include engineering evaluations, probabilistic safety assessments, and fire modeling calculations, have been performed to demonstrate that the performance-based requirements of NFPA 805 have been satisfied. The Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (UFSAR) documents the analyses of

design basis accidents at Ginna. The proposed amendment does not affect accident initiators, nor does it alter design assumptions, conditions, or configurations of the facility that would increase the probability of accidents previously evaluated. Further, the changes to be made for fire hazard protection and mitigation do not adversely affect the ability of structures, systems, or components to perform their design functions for accident mitigation, nor do they affect the postulated initiators or assumed failure modes for accidents described and evaluated in the UFSAR. Structures, systems, or components required to safely shutdown the reactor and to maintain it in a safe shutdown condition will remain capable of performing their design functions.

NFPA 805, taken as a whole, provides an acceptable alternative for satisfying General Design Criterion 3 of Appendix A to 10 CFR 50, meets the underlying intent of the NRC's existing fire protection regulations and guidance, and provides for defense-in-depth. The goals, performance objectives, and performance criteria specified in Chapter 1 of the standard ensure that, if there are any increases in core damage frequency or risk, the increase will be small and consistent with the intent of the Commission's Safety Goal Policy.

The proposed amendment will not affect the source term, containment isolation, or radiological release assumptions used in evaluating the radiological consequences of any accident previously evaluated, and equipment required to mitigate an accident remains capable of performing the assumed function(s). The applicable radiological dose criteria will continue to be met.

Based on the above discussion, it is concluded that 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 kind of accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

Operation of Ginna in accordance with the proposed amendment does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated. The proposed change does not alter the requirements or functions for systems required during accident conditions. Implementation of the new fire protection licensing basis, which complies with the requirements of 10 CFR 50.48(a) and (c) and the guidance

in Regulatory Guide 1.205, will not result in new or different accidents.

The proposed amendment does not introduce new or different accident initiators, nor does it alter design assumptions, conditions, or configurations of the facility in such a manner as to introduce new or different accident initiators. The proposed amendment does not adversely affect the ability of structures, systems, or components to perform their design function. Structures, systems, or components required to safely shutdown the reactor and maintain it in a safe shutdown condition remain capable of performing their design functions.

The requirements of NFPA 805 address only fire protection and the impacts of fire on the plant that have previously been evaluated. Thus, implementation of the proposed amendment would not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident beyond those already analyzed in the UFSAR. No new accident scenarios, transient precursors, failure mechanisms, or limiting single failures will be introduced, and there will be no adverse effect or challenges imposed on any safety-related system as a result of the proposed amendment.

Based on the above discussion, it is concluded that 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 amendment involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety?

Response: No.

The purpose of the proposed amendment is to permit Ginna to adopt a new fire protection licensing basis which complies with the requirements in 10 CFR 50.48(a) and (c) and the guidance in Regulatory Guide 1.205. The NRC considers that NFPA 805 provides an acceptable methodology and performance criteria for licensees to identify fire protection systems and features that are an acceptable alternative to the 10 CFR 50 Appendix R required fire protection features (69 Fed. Reg. 33536, June 16, 2004).

The overall approach of NFPA 805 is consistent with the key principles for evaluating license basis changes, as described in Regulatory Guide 1.174, is consistent with the defense-in-depth philosophy, and maintains sufficient safety margins. Engineering analyses, which may include engineering evaluations, probabilistic safety assessments, and fire modeling calculations, have been performed to demonstrate that the performance based

methods do not result in a significant reduction in the margin of safety.

Operation of Ginna in accordance with the proposed amendment does not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety. The proposed amendment 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 affected by this change. The proposed amendment does not adversely affect existing plant safety margins or the reliability of equipment assumed to mitigate accidents in the UFSAR. The proposed amendment does not adversely affect the ability of structures, systems, or components to perform their design function. Structures, systems, or components required to safely shut down the reactor and to maintain it in a safe shutdown condition remain capable of performing their design functions.

Based on the above discussion, it is concluded that the proposed amendment does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

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

Attorney for licensee: Gautam Sen, Sr. Counsel—Exelon Generation Company, LLC, 750 East Pratt Street, 17th Floor, Baltimore, Maryland, 21202.
NRC Branch Chief: Benjamin G. Beasley.

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

Date of amendment request: June 30, 2014, as supplemented by letter dated August 19, 2014. Publicly-available versions are in ADAMS under Accession Nos. ML14192A022 and ML14241A422, respectively.

Description of amendment request: This amendment request contains sensitive unclassified non-safeguards information (SUNSI). The amendments would revise the Cyber Security Plan (CSP) implementation schedule to change the completion date for Milestone 8. Milestone 8 pertains to the date that full implementation of the CSP for all safety, security, and emergency preparedness functions will be achieved.

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 to the Cyber Security Plan implementation schedule is administrative in nature. The change does not alter accident analysis assumptions, add any initiators or affect the function of plant systems or the manner in which systems are operated, maintained, tested, or inspected. The proposed change does not require any plant modifications which affect the performance capability or the structures, systems and components relied upon to mitigate the consequences of postulated accidents and has no impact on the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated. Therefore, the proposed 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 to the Cyber Security Plan implementation schedule is administrative in nature. This proposed change does not alter accident analysis assumptions, add any initiators, or affect the function of plant systems or the manner in which systems are operated, maintained, modified, tested, or inspected. The proposed change does not require any plant modifications which affect the performance capability of the structures, systems and a component relied upon to mitigate the consequences of postulated accidents and does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated. Therefore, the proposed change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

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

Response: No.

Plant safety margins are established through limiting conditions of operation, limiting safety systems settings and safety limits specified in the technical specifications. The proposed change to the Cyber Security Plan implementation schedule is administrative in nature. Because there is no change in these established safety

margins as result of this change, the proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. 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: William S. Blair, Managing Attorney—Nuclear, Florida Power & Light, 700 Universe Blvd., MS LAW/JB, Juno Beach, Florida, 33408–0420.

Acting NRC Branch Chief: Lisa M. Regner.

Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC., Docket Nos. 50–413 and 50–414, Catawba Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2, York County, South Carolina

Exelon Generation Company, LLC., Docket No. 50–244, R.E. Ginna Nuclear Power Plant, Wayne County, New York

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

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

A. This Order contains instructions regarding how potential parties to this proceeding may request access to documents containing SUNSI.

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

C. The requester shall submit a letter requesting permission to access SUNSI to the Office of the Secretary, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001, Attention: Rulemakings and Adjudications Staff, and provide a copy to the Associate General Counsel for Hearings, Enforcement and Administration, Office

of the General Counsel, Washington, DC 20555–0001. The expedited delivery or courier mail address for both offices is: U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland, 20852. The email address for the Office of the Secretary and the Office of the General Counsel are *Hearing.Docket@nrc.gov* and *OGCmailcenter@nrc.gov*, respectively.¹ The request must include the following information:

(1) A description of the licensing action with a citation to this **Federal Register** notice;

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

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

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

(1) There is a reasonable basis to believe the petitioner is likely to establish standing to participate in this NRC proceeding; and

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

E. If the NRC staff determines that the requestor satisfies both D.(1) and D.(2) above, the NRC staff will notify the requestor in writing that access to SUNSI has been granted. The written notification will contain instructions on how the requestor may obtain copies of the requested documents, and any other conditions that may apply to access to those documents. These conditions may include, but are not limited to, the signing of a Non-Disclosure Agreement or Affidavit, or Protective Order² setting forth terms and conditions to prevent the unauthorized or inadvertent

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

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

disclosure of SUNSI by each individual who will be granted access to SUNSI.

F. Filing of Contentions. Any contentions in these proceedings that are based upon the information received as a result of the request made for SUNSI must be filed by the requestor no later than 25 days after the requestor is granted access to that information. However, if more than 25 days remain between the date the petitioner is granted access to the information and the deadline for filing all other contentions (as established in the notice of hearing or opportunity for hearing), the petitioner may file its SUNSI contentions by that later deadline. This provision does not extend the time for filing a request for a hearing and petition to intervene, which must comply with the requirements of 10 CFR 2.309.

G. Review of Denials of Access.

(1) If the request for access to SUNSI is denied by the NRC staff after a determination on standing and need for access, the NRC staff shall immediately notify the requestor in writing, briefly

stating the reason or reasons for the denial.

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

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

If challenges to the NRC staff determinations are filed, these procedures give way to the normal

process for litigating disputes concerning access to information. The availability of interlocutory review by the Commission of orders ruling on such NRC staff determinations (whether granting or denying access) is governed by 10 CFR 2.311.³

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

It is so ordered.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, 21st day of October, 2014.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Richard J. Laufer,
Acting, Secretary of the Commission.

ATTACHMENT 1—GENERAL TARGET SCHEDULE FOR PROCESSING AND RESOLVING REQUESTS FOR ACCESS TO SENSITIVE UNCLASSIFIED NON-SAFEGUARDS INFORMATION IN THIS PROCEEDING

Day	Event/activity
0	Publication of Federal Register notice of hearing and opportunity to petition for leave to intervene, including order with instructions for access requests.
10	Deadline for submitting requests for access to Sensitive Unclassified Non-Safeguards Information (SUNSI) with information: supporting the standing of a potential party identified by name and address; describing the need for the information in order for the potential party to participate meaningfully in an adjudicatory proceeding.
60	Deadline for submitting petition for intervention containing: (i) demonstration of standing; and (ii) all contentions whose formulation does not require access to SUNSI (+25 Answers to petition for intervention; +7 petitioner/requestor reply).
20	U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff informs the requester of the staff's determination whether the request for access provides a reasonable basis to believe standing can be established and shows need for SUNSI. (NRC staff also informs any party to the proceeding whose interest independent of the proceeding would be harmed by the release of the information.) If NRC staff makes the finding of need for SUNSI and likelihood of standing, NRC staff begins document processing (preparation of redactions or review of redacted documents).
25	If NRC staff finds no "need" or no likelihood of standing, the deadline for petitioner/requestor to file a motion seeking a ruling to reverse the NRC staff's denial of access; NRC staff files copy of access determination with the presiding officer (or Chief Administrative Judge or other designated officer, as appropriate). If NRC staff finds "need" for SUNSI, the deadline for any party to the proceeding whose interest independent of the proceeding would be harmed by the release of the information to file a motion seeking a ruling to reverse the NRC staff's grant of access.
30	Deadline for NRC staff reply to motions to reverse NRC staff determination(s).
40	(Receipt +30) If NRC staff finds standing and need for SUNSI, deadline for NRC staff to complete information processing and file motion for Protective Order and draft Non-Disclosure Affidavit. Deadline for applicant/licensee to file Non-Disclosure Agreement for SUNSI.
A	If access granted: issuance of presiding officer or other designated officer decision on motion for protective order for access to sensitive information (including schedule for providing access and submission of contentions) or decision reversing a final adverse determination by the NRC staff.
A + 3	Deadline for filing executed Non-Disclosure Affidavits. Access provided to SUNSI consistent with decision issuing the protective order.
A + 28	Deadline for submission of contentions whose development depends upon access to SUNSI. However, if more than 25 days remain between the petitioner's receipt of (or access to) the information and the deadline for filing all other contentions (as established in the notice of hearing or opportunity for hearing), the petitioner may file its SUNSI contentions by that later deadline.
A + 53	(Contention receipt +25) Answers to contentions whose development depends upon access to SUNSI.
A + 60	(Answer receipt +7) Petitioner/Intervenor reply to answers.
>A + 60	Decision on contention admission.

³Requesters should note that the filing requirements of the NRC's E-Filing Rule (72 FR 49139; August 28, 2007) apply to appeals of NRC

staff determinations (because they must be served on a presiding officer or the Commission, as

applicable), but not to the initial SUNSI request submitted to the NRC staff under these procedures.

[FR Doc. 2014-25530 Filed 11-3-14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

POSTAL REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. MC2015-3 and R2015-2; Order No. 2231]

New Postal Product

AGENCY: Postal Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Commission is noticing a recent Postal Service filing concerning an addition of Discover Financial Services Agreement to the market-dominant product list. This notice informs the public of the filing, invites public comment, and takes other administrative steps.

DATES: *Comments are due:* November 17, 2014.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments electronically via the Commission's Filing Online system at <http://www.prc.gov>. Those who cannot submit comments electronically should contact the person identified in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section by telephone for advice on filing alternatives.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: David A. Trissell, General Counsel, at 202-789-6820.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Table of Contents

- I. Introduction
- II. Notice of Filing
- III. Ordering Paragraphs

I. Introduction

On October 27, 2014, the Postal Service filed a request pursuant to 39 U.S.C. 3622 and 3641, as well as 39 CFR 3010 and 3020, *et seq.*, to add a Discover Financial Services (Discover) negotiated service agreement to the market-dominant product list.¹

Request. In support of its Request, the Postal Service filed a copy of the Board of Governors' Resolution No. 14-07, authorizing a negotiated service agreement with Discover; a copy of the contract; proposed descriptive language changes to the Mail Classification Schedule; a proposed data collection plan; a statement of supporting justification as required by 39 CFR 3020.32, which the Postal Service also asserts satisfies the requirements of 39 CFR 3010.42(b)-(e); and a financial model.

¹ Notice of the United States Postal Service of Filing Request to Add Discover Financial Services Negotiated Service Agreement to the Market-Dominant Product List, October 27, 2014 (Request).

The Postal Service believes that the Discover negotiated service agreement conforms to the policies of the Postal Accountability and Enhancement Act, and meets the statutory standards supporting the desirability of a special classification under 39 U.S.C. 3622(c)(10). *Id.* at 3. In particular, the Postal Service believes the agreement has the potential to enhance the Postal Service's long-term financial position, and it will not cause unreasonable harm to the marketplace. *Id.*

Related contract. The Postal Service indicates that the agreement is designed to increase the total aggregate contribution that the Postal Service receives from mail eligible under its agreement with Discover. *Id.* at 5. The Postal Service states that the implementation date of the agreement will be December 1, 2014 or on a date mutually agreed upon by the Postal Service and Discover, and will expire three years from the implementation date, unless otherwise terminated pursuant to the provisions of the agreement.² *Id.* at 1; Attachment B at 6.

The Postal Service contends that the agreement consists of the following four key components: (1) Annual revenue growth thresholds; (2) a baseline mail volume; (3) tiered rebates based on aggregate gross revenue; and (4) a nonperformance penalty to be paid if the annual revenue growth threshold is not met. *Id.* at 6-10.

- Discover must meet or exceed annual revenue growth thresholds (*i.e.*, 3-6%) to qualify for specific rebate percentages under a tiered structure. The baseline revenue amount to calculate the annual growth thresholds is \$304,053,073.

- Discover must also meet or exceed a baseline volume amount annually (1,256,212,059 pieces in the first year, subsequent contract years' eligible volume depends on volume in prior years) in order to qualify for a rebate.

- The agreement provides for a tiered rebate structure for a portion of the postage paid for eligible mail if such mail (i) meets or exceeds specified annual revenue thresholds, and (ii) exceeds the aggregate total baseline volume for mail eligible under the agreement. *Id.* at 5. The tier 1 and 2

² Pursuant to 39 U.S.C. 3622(c), the Postal Service is required, among other things, to provide public notice of the rate adjustment and provide an opportunity for review by the Commission of at least 45 days before the implementation of any adjustment in rates under section 3622. Accordingly, it initially appears that the implementation date may be no earlier than December 11, 2014, provided the other conditions in Section I.G. of the proposed agreement are satisfied.

rebates are 2.25% and 2.5%, respectively.

- If Discover does not meet the annual revenue growth thresholds provided for in the agreement, Discover must pay the Postal Service a nonperformance penalty of 10% of the difference between the annual revenue growth threshold and the annual revenue actually generated by Discover for mail eligible under the agreement.

Similarly situated mailers. With respect to potential similarly situated mailers, the Postal Service states that it is ready to negotiate and implement functionally equivalent agreements with such mailers. *Id.*, Attachment E at 4. It believes that in assessing the desirability of a similar agreement, the defining characteristics of Discover are its size, large aggregate Standard Mail and First Class postage; its expanding Standard Mail advertising volume; and its declining First Class Mail billing and statement volume. *Id.* at 13.

Notice. The Postal Service represents that it will inform customers of the new classification changes and associated price effects through publication in the **Federal Register**. *Id.* at 2.

II. Notice of Filing

The Commission establishes Docket Nos. MC2015-3 and R2015-2 for consideration of the Request pertaining to the proposed new product and the related contract, respectively.

Interested persons may submit comments on whether the Postal Service's filing in the captioned dockets are consistent with the policies of 39 U.S.C. 3622 and 3642 as well as 39 CFR parts 3010 and 3020. Comments are due no later than November 17, 2014. The filing can be accessed via the Commission's Web site (<http://www.prc.gov>).

The Commission appoints John P. Klingenberg to serve as Public Representative in these dockets.

III. Ordering Paragraphs

It is ordered:

1. The Commission establishes Docket Nos. MC2015-3 and R2015-2 for consideration of the matters raised in each docket.

2. Pursuant to 39 U.S.C. 505, John P. Klingenberg is appointed to serve as an officer of the Commission (Public Representative) to represent the interests of the general public in these proceedings.

3. Comments by interested persons in these proceedings are due no later than November 17, 2014.

4. The Secretary shall arrange for publication of this order in the **Federal Register**.