

### III. Specific Requests for Comments

The NRC is seeking comments that address the following questions:

1. Is the proposed collection of information necessary for the NRC to properly perform its functions? Does the information have practical utility?
2. Is the estimate of the burden of the information collection accurate?
3. Is there a way to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected?
4. How can the burden of the information collection on respondents be minimized, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology?

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 18th day of June 2015.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Tremaine Donnell,**

*NRC Clearance Officer, Office of Information Services.*

[FR Doc. 2015-15389 Filed 6-22-15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[NRC-2015-0155]

### 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 May 28, 2015, to June 10, 2015. The last biweekly notice was published on June 9, 2015.

**DATES:** Comments must be filed by July 23, 2015. A request for a hearing must be filed by August 24, 2015.

**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-2015-0155. Address questions about NRC dockets to Carol Gallagher; telephone: 301-415-3463; 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: OWFN-12-H08, 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 Burkhardt, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington DC 20555-0001; telephone: 301-415-1384, email: [Janet.Burkhardt@nrc.gov](mailto:Janet.Burkhardt@nrc.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

#### I. Obtaining Information and Submitting Comments

##### A. Obtaining Information

Please refer to Docket ID NRC-2015-0155 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-2015-0155.

- *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). 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-2015-0155, facility name, unit number(s), application date, and subject in your comment submission.

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 into ADAMS.

#### II. 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 unless the Commission finds an imminent danger to 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 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, in some instances, 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 "Obtaining Information and Submitting Comments" section of this document.

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

*Date of amendment request:* April 30, 2015. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML15125A149.

*Description of amendment request:* The proposed amendments would modify the Emergency Action Levels for the CNS based on Nuclear Energy Institute (NEI) 99-01, Revision 6, "Development of Emergency Action Levels for Non-Passive Reactors."

*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.

These changes affect the CNS Emergency Plan and do not alter any of the requirements of the Operating License or the Technical Specifications. The proposed changes do not modify any plant equipment and do not impact any failure modes that could lead to an accident. Additionally, the proposed changes do not impact the consequence of any analyzed accident since the changes do not affect any equipment related to accident mitigation. Based on this discussion, the proposed amendment does not 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.

These changes affect the CNS Emergency Plan and do not alter any of the requirements of the Operating License or the Technical Specifications. They do not modify any plant equipment and there is no impact on the capability of the existing equipment to perform their intended functions. No system setpoints are being modified and no changes are being made to the method in which plant

operations are conducted. No new failure modes are introduced by the proposed changes. The proposed amendment does not introduce accident initiators or malfunctions that would cause a new or different kind of 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 amendment involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety?

Response: No.

These changes affect the CNS Emergency Plan and do not alter any of the requirements of the Operating License or the Technical Specifications. The proposed changes do not affect any of the assumptions used in the accident analysis, not do they affect any operability requirements for equipment important to plant safety.

Therefore, the proposed changes will not result in a significant reduction in the margin of safety as defined in the bases for technical specifications covered in this license amendment request.

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, NC 28202.

*NRC Branch Chief:* Robert J. Pascarelli.

Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC, Docket Nos. 50–413 and 50–414, Catawba Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2, York County, South Carolina; Docket Nos. 50–369 and 50–370, McGuire Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2, Mecklenburg County, North Carolina; and Docket Nos. 50–269, 50–270, and 50–287, Oconee Nuclear Station, Units 1, 2, and 3, Oconee County, South Carolina

*Date of amendment request:* April 16, 2015. A publicly-available version is available at ADAMS Accession No. ML15119A224.

*Description of amendment request:* The amendment would modify Technical Specification (TS) requirements regarding steam generator tube inspections and reporting as described in Technical Specification Task Force (TSTF)-510, Revision 2, "Revision to Steam Generator Program Inspection Frequencies and Tube Sample Selection."

*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 change revises the Steam Generator (SG) Program to modify the frequency of verification of SG tube integrity and SG tube sample selection. A steam generator tube rupture (SGTR) event is one of the design basis accidents that are analyzed as part of a plant's licensing basis. The proposed SG tube inspection frequency and sample selection criteria will continue to ensure that the SG tubes are inspected such that the probability of [an] SGTR is not increased. The consequences of a SGTR are bounded by the conservative assumptions in the design basis accident analysis. The proposed change will not cause the consequences of [an] SGTR to exceed those assumptions.

Therefore, it is concluded that this change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

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

Response: No.

The proposed changes to the Steam Generator Program will not introduce any adverse changes to the plant design basis of postulated accidents resulting from potential tube degradation. The proposed change does not affect the design of the SGs or their method of operation. In addition, the proposed change does not impact any other plant system or component.

Therefore, it is concluded that this change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

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

Response: No.

The SG tubes in pressurized water reactors are an integral part of the reactor coolant pressure boundary and, as such, are relied upon to maintain the primary system's pressure and inventory. As part of the reactor coolant pressure boundary, the SG tubes are unique in that they are also relied upon as a heat transfer surface between the primary and secondary systems such that residual heat can be removed from the primary system. In addition, the SG tubes also isolate the radioactive fission products in the primary coolant from the secondary system. In summary, the safety function of [an] SG is maintained by ensuring the integrity of its tubes.

[SG] tube integrity is a function of the design, environment, and the physical condition of the tube. The proposed change does not affect tube design or operating environment. The proposed change will continue to require monitoring of the physical condition of the SG tubes such that there will not be a reduction in the margin of safety compared to the current requirements.

Therefore, it is concluded that 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:* Lara S. Nichols, Associate General Counsel, Duke Energy Corporation, 526 South Church Street—EC07H, Charlotte, NC 28202.

*NRC Branch Chief:* Robert J. Pascarelli.

Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC, Docket Nos. 50–369 and 50–370, McGuire Nuclear Station (MNS), Units 1 and 2, Mecklenburg County, North Carolina

*Date of amendment request:* May 7, 2015. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML15141A047.

*Description of amendment request:* The proposed amendments would modify the Emergency Action Levels for the MNS based on Nuclear Energy Institute (NEI) 99–01, Revision 6, "Development of Emergency Action Levels for Non-Passive Reactors."

*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.

These changes affect the MNS Emergency Plan and do not alter any of the requirements of the Operating License or the Technical Specifications. The proposed changes do not modify any plant equipment and do not impact any failure modes that could lead to an accident. Additionally, the proposed changes do not impact the consequence of any analyzed accident since the changes do not affect any equipment related to accident mitigation. Based on this discussion, the proposed amendment does not 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.

These changes affect the MNS Emergency Plan and do not any of the requirements of the Operating License or the Technical Specifications. They do not modify any plant equipment and there is no impact on the capability of the existing equipment to perform its intended functions. No system setpoints are being modified and no changes

are being made to the method in which plant operations are conducted. No new failure modes are introduced by the proposed changes. The proposed amendment does not introduce accident initiators or malfunctions that would cause a new or different kind of 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 amendment involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety?

Response: No.

These changes affect the MNS Emergency Plan and do not alter any of the requirements of the Operating License or the Technical Specifications. The proposed changes do not affect any of the assumptions used in the accident analysis, nor do they affect any operability requirements for equipment important to plant safety.

Therefore, the proposed changes will not result in a significant reduction in the margin of safety as defined in the bases for technical specifications covered in this license amendment request.

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, NC 28202.

*NRC Branch Chief:* Robert J. Pascarelli.

Entergy Operations, Inc., Docket Nos. 50–313 and 50–368, Arkansas Nuclear One, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Pope County, Arkansas

*Date of amendment request:* May 20, 2015. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML15140A611.

*Description of amendment request:* The amendments would revise the full implementation date (Milestone 8) of the Arkansas Nuclear One, Units 1 and 2, Cyber Security Plan (CSP), and revise the associated Physical Protection license conditions for each Renewed Facility Operating License.

*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 CSP Implementation Schedule is administrative in nature. This 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 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 CSP 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 components 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 for operation, limiting safety system settings, and safety limits specified in the technical specifications. The proposed change to the CSP Implementation Schedule is administrative in nature. In addition, the milestone date delay for full implementation of the CSP has no substantive impact because other measures have been taken which provide adequate protection during this period of time. Because there is no change to established safety margins as a 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:* Joseph A. Aluise, Associate General Counsel—

Nuclear, Entergy Services, Inc., 639 Loyola Avenue, New Orleans, Louisiana 70113.

*NRC Branch Chief:* Michael T. Markley.

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

*Date of amendment request:* May 12, 2015. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML15132A722.

*Description of amendment request:* The proposed change revises and adds Surveillance Requirements to verify that the system locations susceptible to gas accumulation are sufficiently filled with water and to provide allowances that permit performance of the verification. The licensee stated that the proposed amendment is consistent with Technical Specification Task Force (TSTF)-523, Revision 2, "Generic Letter 2008–01, Managing Gas Accumulation."

*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 revises [and] adds Surveillance Requirements (SRs) that require verification that the Emergency Core Cooling System (ECCS), the Residual Heat Removal (RHR) System, and the Containment Spray (CS) System are not rendered inoperable due to accumulated gas and to provide allowances which permit performance of the revised verification. Gas accumulation in the subject systems is not an initiator of any accident previously evaluated. As a result, the probability of any accident previously evaluated is not significantly increased. The proposed SRs ensure that the subject systems continue to be capable to perform their assumed safety function and are not rendered inoperable due to gas accumulation. Thus, the consequences of any accident previously evaluated are not significantly increased.

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 revises [and] adds SRs that require verification that the ECCS, the RHR System, and the CS System are not rendered inoperable due to accumulated gas and to provide allowances which permit performance of the revised verification. The

proposed change does not involve a physical alteration of the plant (*i.e.*, no new or different type of equipment will be installed) or a change in the methods governing normal plant operation. In addition, the proposed change does not impose any new or different requirements that could initiate an accident. The proposed change does not alter assumptions made in the safety analysis and is consistent with the safety analysis assumptions.

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.

The proposed change revises [and] adds SRs that require verification that the ECCS, the RHR System, and the CS System are not rendered inoperable due to accumulated gas and to provide allowances which permit performance of the revised verification. The proposed change adds new requirements to manage gas accumulation in order to ensure the subject systems are capable of performing their assumed safety functions. The proposed SRs are more comprehensive than the current SRs and will ensure that the assumptions of the safety analysis are protected. The proposed change does not adversely affect any current plant safety margins or the reliability of the equipment assumed in the safety analysis.

Therefore, there are no changes being made to any safety analysis assumptions, safety limits or limiting safety system settings that would adversely affect plant safety as a result of the proposed change.

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:* Leigh D. Perry, SVP & General Counsel of Operations and Nuclear, Southern Nuclear Operating Company, 40 Iverness Center Parkway, Birmingham, AL 35201.

*NRC Branch Chief:* Robert J. Pascarelli.

Southern Nuclear Operating Company, Inc., Docket No. 50-424, Vogtle Electric Generating Plant, Unit 1 (VEGP), Burke County, Georgia

*Date of amendment request:* June 4, 2015. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML15155B593.

*Description of amendment request:* The licensee proposes to modify the VEGP Technical Specifications to provide a one-time change to Limiting Condition for Operation (LCO) 3.5.2, "ECCS [Emergency Core Cooling

System]—Operating." This LCO requires that two ECCS trains be OPERABLE in Modes 1, 2, or 3. An ECCS train consists of a centrifugal charging system, a safety injection (SI) system, and a residual heat removal (RHR) system. Condition 3.5.2.A requires that, if one of the required trains is inoperable, and that 100 percent of the ECCS flow equivalent to a single OPERABLE ECCS train is available, then the inoperable train must be restored to OPERABLE status in 72 hours. Otherwise, the reactor must be taken to Mode 3 in 6 hours and to Mode 4 in 12 hours.

The proposed amendment revises the Completion Time (CT) for Condition 3.5.2.A from 72 hours to 7 days to allow for replacement of the train 1A RHR pump motor. This change will be applicable only one time on VEGP prior to the Cycle 19 shutdown.

*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 emergency core cooling systems (ECCS), including the Residual Heat Removal system, are designed for the mitigation of design basis accidents or transients, such as a Loss of Coolant Accident (LOCA).

They are not designed, nor do they serve, for the prevention of those events. Consequently, the proposed amendment does not increase the probability of a previously evaluated accident occurring.

Should an accident occur during the period of time that the RHR pump is out of service, the remaining ECCS components would serve to provide the minimum amount of flow assumed in the accident analyses. Even assuming failure of a charging pump or an SI system on either of the trains, sufficient ECCS flow would still be provided to the reactor vessel to mitigate the consequences of the event. Furthermore, a risk informed analysis performed in support of this amendment request demonstrates that the consequences of an accident are not significantly increased. As such, the proposed change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of a previously evaluated accident.

Also, appropriate compensatory measures will be implemented during the time of the extended Completion Time for the RHR pumps. These actions are intended to decrease the chances of an initiating event occurring during the time of the extended CT and also to minimize the chances of losing any ECCS components.

For the above reasons, the proposed changes will not result in 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 accident from any accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

Replacement of the 1A RHR pump motor for the extended Completion Time period does not introduce any new or unanalyzed modes of operation. The replacement of the pump motor does not involve any unanalyzed modifications to the design or operational limits of the RHR system. Therefore, no new failure modes or accident precursors are created due to the motor replacement during the extended Completion Time.

For the reasons noted above, the proposed change will not create the possibility of a new or different accident from any previously evaluated.

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

Response: No.

The margin of safety is related to the ability of the fission product barriers to perform their design functions during and following an accident situation. These barriers include the fuel cladding, the reactor coolant system, and the containment. The performance of these fission product barriers will not be significantly affected by the proposed change. The risk implications of this amendment request were evaluated and found to be acceptable.

During the extended Completion Time for the 1A RHR pump, the ECCS will remain capable of providing adequate flow to the reactor vessel to mitigate the consequences of a design basis event such as LOCA. Also, compensatory actions will be put in place to minimize the probability of an initiating event during the extended CT period as well as to minimize the chances of a loss of one of the remaining ECCSs. A risk informed analysis has also been performed which shows that the incremental plant risk has increased by an acceptable amount.

For the reasons noted above, there is no 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:* Jennifer M. Buettner, Associate General Counsel, Southern Nuclear Operating Company, 40 Iverness Center Parkway, Birmingham, AL 35201.

*NRC Branch Chief:* Robert J. Pascarelli.

Southern Nuclear Operating Company, Inc., Docket Nos. 50-424 and 50-425, Vogtle Electric Generating Plant, Units 1 and 2 (VEGP), Burke County, Georgia

*Date of amendment request:* May 6, 2015. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML15128A239.

*Description of amendment request:*

The licensee proposes to modify the VEGP Technical Specifications to incorporate risk-informed requirements for selected Required Action end states. Specifically, the proposed change would permit a Required Action end state of Mode 4 rather than an end state of Mode 5. The licensee states that the proposed changes are consistent with Technical Specification Task Force (TSTF) Technical Change Traveler 432-A, Revision 1.

*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 modifies the end state (e.g., mode or other specified condition) which the Required Actions specify must be entered if compliance with the Limiting Conditions for Operation (LCO) is not restored. The requested Technical Specifications (TS) permit an end state of Mode 4 rather than an end state of Mode 5 contained in the current TS. In some cases, other Conditions and Required Actions are revised to implement the proposed change. Required Actions are not an initiator of any accident previously evaluated. Therefore, the proposed change does not affect the probability of any accident previously evaluated. The affected systems continue to be required to be operable by the TS and the Completion Times specified in the TS to restore equipment to operable status or take other remedial Actions remain unchanged.

WCAP-16294-NP-A, Rev. 1, "Risk-Informed Evaluation of Changes to [Technical Specification] Required Action Endstates for Westinghouse NSSS PWRs [nuclear steam supply system pressurized-water reactors]," demonstrates that the proposed change does not significantly increase the consequences of any accident previously evaluated. [WCAP-16294-NP-A, Rev. 1 is publicly available in ADAMS at Accession No. ML103430249.]

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 modifies the end state (e.g., mode or other specified condition) which the Required Actions specify must be entered if compliance with the LCO is not restored. In some cases, other Conditions and Required Actions are revised to implement the proposed change. The change does not involve a physical alteration of the plant (i.e., no new or different type of equipment will

be installed) or a change in the methods governing normal plant operation. In addition, the change does not impose any new requirements. The change does not alter assumptions made in the safety analysis.

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.

The proposed change modifies the end state (e.g., mode or other specified condition) which the Required Actions specify must be entered if compliance with the LCO is not restored. In some cases, other Conditions and Required Actions are revised to implement the proposed change. Remaining within the Applicability of the LCO is acceptable because WCAP-16294-NP-A demonstrates that the plant risk in MODE 4 is similar to or lower than MODE 5. As a result, no margin of safety is significantly affected.

Therefore, the proposed changes do not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

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

*Attorney for licensee:* Jennifer M. Buettner, Associate General Counsel, Southern Nuclear Operating Company, 40 Inverness Center Parkway, Birmingham, AL 35201.

*NRC Branch Chief:* Robert J. Pascarella.

Southern Nuclear Operating Company, Inc., Docket Nos. 50-424 and 50-425, Vogtle Electric Generating Plant (VEGP), Units 1 and 2, Burke County, Georgia

*Date of amendment request:* May 12, 2015. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML15132A662.

*Description of amendment request:* The licensee proposes to adopt Technical Specification Task Force (TSTF) traveler TSTF-523, Revision 2, "Generic Letter 2008-01, Managing Gas Accumulation" (ADAMS Accession No. ML13053A075), which is an approved change to the standard technical specifications, into the VEGP, Units 1 and 2 technical specifications.

*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 revises or adds Surveillance Requirements (SRs) that require verification that the Emergency Core Cooling System (ECCS), the Residual Heat Removal (RHR) System, and the Containment Spray (CS) System are not rendered inoperable due to accumulated gas and to provide allowances which permit performance of the revised verification. Gas accumulation in the subject systems is not an initiator of any accident previously evaluated. As a result, the probability of any accident previously evaluated is not significantly increased. The proposed SRs ensure that the subject systems continue to be capable to perform their assumed safety function and are not rendered inoperable due to gas accumulation. Thus, the consequences of any accident previously evaluated are not significantly increased.

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 revises or adds SRs that require verification that the ECCS, the RHR System, and the CS System are not rendered inoperable due to accumulated gas and to provide allowances which permit performance of the revised verification. The proposed change does not involve a physical alteration of the plant (i.e., no new or different type of equipment will be installed) or a change in the methods governing normal plant operation. In addition, the proposed change does not impose any new or different requirements that could initiate an accident. The proposed change does not alter assumptions made in the safety analysis and is consistent with the safety analysis assumptions.

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.

The proposed change revises or adds SRs that require verification that the ECCS, the RHR System, and the CS System are not rendered inoperable due to accumulated gas and to provide allowances which permit performance of the revised verification. The proposed change adds new requirements to manage gas accumulation in order to ensure the subject systems are capable of performing their assumed safety functions. The proposed SRs are more comprehensive than the current SRs and will ensure that the assumptions of the safety analysis are protected. The proposed change does not adversely affect any current plant safety margins or the reliability of the equipment assumed in the safety analysis.

Therefore, there are no changes being made to any safety analysis assumptions, safety limits or limiting safety system settings that would adversely affect plant safety as a result of the proposed change.

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:* Jennifer M. Buettner, Associate General Counsel, Southern Nuclear Operating Company, 40 Inverness Center Parkway, Birmingham, AL 35201.

*NRC Branch Chief:* Robert J. Pascarelli.

STP Nuclear Operating Company, Docket Nos. 50-498 and 50-499, South Texas Project, Units 1 and 2 (STP), Matagorda County, Texas

*Date of amendment request:* April 23, 2015. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML15121A818.

*Description of amendment request:* The amendment would modify the STP Technical Specification (TS) requirements regarding steam generator tube inspections and reporting based on Technical Specification Task Force (TSTF)-510-A, Revision 2, "Revision to Steam Generator Program Inspection Frequencies and Tube Sample Selection." The proposed change revises the TS Limiting Condition for Operation 3.4.5, "Steam Generator Tube Integrity"; Surveillance Requirement 4.4.5.2; Administrative Controls Specification 6.8.3.o, "Steam Generator Program"; and TS 6.9.1.7, Steam Generator Tube Inspection Report. The proposed changes address implementation of inspection periods and other administrative changes.

The NRC staff issued a Notice of Availability of models for plant-specific adoption of TSTF-510, Revision 2, in the **Federal Register** on October 27, 2011 (76 FR 66763), as part of the Consolidated Line Item Improvement Process (CLIIP). The notice referenced a model safety evaluation and model no significant hazards consideration determination published in the **Federal Register** on August 2, 2002 (67 FR 50475).

*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 revises the Steam Generator (SG) Program to modify the frequency of verification of SG tube integrity and SG tube sample selection. A steam generator tube rupture (SGTR) event is one of the design basis accidents that are analyzed as part of a plant's licensing basis. The proposed SG tube inspection frequency and sample selection criteria will continue to ensure that the SG tubes are inspected such that the probability of [an] SGTR is not increased. The consequences of [an] SGTR are bounded by the conservative assumptions in the design basis accident analysis. The proposed change will not cause the consequences of [an] SGTR to exceed those assumptions. The proposed change to reporting requirements and clarifications of the existing requirements have no [effect] on the probability or consequences of SGTR.

Therefore, it is concluded that this change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

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

Response: No.

The proposed changes to the Steam Generator Program will not introduce any adverse changes to the plant design basis or postulated accidents resulting from potential tube degradation. The proposed change does not affect the design of the SGs or their method of operation. In addition, the proposed change does not impact any other plant system or component.

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

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

Response: No.

The SG tubes in pressurized water reactors are an integral part of the reactor coolant pressure boundary and, as such, are relied upon to maintain the primary system's pressure and inventory. As part of the reactor coolant pressure boundary, the SG tubes are unique in that they are also relied upon as a heat transfer surface between the primary and secondary systems such that residual heat can be removed from the primary system. In addition, the SG tubes also isolate the radioactive fission products in the primary coolant from the secondary system. In summary, the safety function of [an] SG is maintained by ensuring the integrity of its tubes.

Steam generator tube integrity is a function of the design, environment, and the physical condition of the tube. The proposed change does not affect tube design or operating environment. The proposed change will continue to require monitoring of the physical condition of the SG tubes such that there will not be a reduction in the margin of safety compared to the current requirements.

Therefore, it is concluded that 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 standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the request for amendments involves no significant hazards consideration.

*Attorney for licensee:* Steve Frantz, Esq., Morgan, Lewis & Bockius, 1111 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20004.

*NRC Branch Chief:* Michael T. Markley.

Tennessee Valley Authority, Docket Nos. 50-259, 50-260, and 50-296, Browns Ferry Nuclear Plant, Units 1, 2, and 3, Limestone County, Alabama

*Date of amendment request:* March 9, 2015. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML15068A407.

*Description of amendment request:* The amendment would revise the Technical Specifications (TSs) definition of "Shutdown Margin" (SDM) to require calculation of the SDM at a reactor moderator temperature of 68 degrees Fahrenheit (°F) or a higher temperature that represents the most reactive state throughout the operating cycle. This change is needed to address new boiling water reactor (BWR) fuel designs, which may be more reactive at shutdown temperatures above 68 °F. This proposed change is in accordance with the industry Technical Specifications Task Force (TSTF) initiative identified as Change Traveler TSTF-535, Revision 0, "Revise Shutdown Margin Definition to Address Advanced Fuel Designs." The availability of this TS improvement was announced in the **Federal Register** published on February 26, 2013 (78 FR 13100), as part of NRC's Consolidated Line Item Improvement Process.

*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 revises the definition of SDM. SDM is not an initiator to any accident previously evaluated. Accordingly, the proposed change to the definition of SDM has no effect on the probability of any accident previously evaluated. SDM is an assumption in the analysis of some previously evaluated accidents and inadequate SDM could lead to an increase in consequences for those accidents. However, the proposed change revises the SDM



definition to ensure that the correct SDM is determined for all fuel types at all times during the fuel cycle. As a result, the proposed change does not adversely affect the consequences of any 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 revises the definition of SDM. The change does not involve a physical alteration of the plant (*i.e.*, no new or different type of equipment will be installed) or a change in the methods governing normal plant operations. The change does not alter assumptions made in the safety analysis regarding SDM.

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

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

Response: No.

The proposed change revises the definition of SDM. The change does not alter the manner in which safety limits, limiting safety system settings or limiting conditions for operation are determined. The proposed change ensures that the SDM assumed in determining safety limits, limiting safety system settings, or limiting conditions for operation is correct for all BWR fuel types at all times during the fuel cycle.

Therefore, the proposed change 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:* General Counsel, Tennessee Valley Authority, 400 West Summit Hill Drive, 6A West Tower, Knoxville, TN 37902.

*NRC Branch Chief:* Shana R. Helton.

Virginia Electric and Power Company, Docket Nos. 50–280 and 50–281, Surry Power Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Surry County, Virginia

*Date of amendment request:* January 14, 2015. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML15021A130.

*Description of amendment request:* The amendments would add a Technical Specification (TS) Surveillance Requirement (SR) [TS 4.11.C.5.d] to verify the Safety Injection (SI) System locations susceptible to gas accumulation are sufficiently filled with

water and to provide allowances, which permit performance of the verification.

*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 adds a Surveillance Requirement (SR) that requires verification that the SI System is not rendered inoperable due to accumulated gas and to provide allowances which permit performance of the revised verification. Gas accumulation in the SI System is not an initiator of any accident previously evaluated. As a result, the probability of any accident previously evaluated is not significantly increased. The proposed SR ensures that the SI System continues to be capable of performing its assumed safety function and is not rendered inoperable due to gas accumulation. Thus, the consequences of any accident previously evaluated are not significantly increased.

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 adds [an] SR that requires verification that the SI System is not rendered inoperable due to accumulated gas and to provide allowances which permit performance of the revised verification. The proposed change does not involve a physical alteration of the plant (*i.e.*, no new or different type of equipment will be installed) or a change in the methods governing normal plant operation. In addition, the proposed change does not impose any new or different requirements that could initiate an accident. The proposed change does not alter assumptions made in the safety analysis and is consistent with the safety analysis assumptions.

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.

The proposed change adds [an] SR that requires verification that the SI System is not rendered inoperable due to accumulated gas and to provide allowances which permit performance of the revised verification. The proposed change adds a new requirement to manage gas accumulation to ensure the SI System is capable of performing its assumed safety functions. The proposed SR is comprehensive and will ensure that the assumptions of the safety analysis are protected. The proposed change does not adversely affect any current plant safety

margins or the reliability of the equipment assumed in the safety analysis. Therefore, there are no changes being made to any safety analysis assumptions, safety limits, or limiting safety system settings that would adversely affect plant safety as a result of the proposed change.

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

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

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

*NRC Branch Chief:* Robert J. Pascarelli.

### III. Previously Published 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 following notice was previously published as a separate individual notice. The notice content was the same as above. It was published as an individual notice either because time did not allow the Commission to wait for this biweekly notice or because the action involved exigent circumstances. It is repeated here because the biweekly notice lists all amendments issued or proposed to be issued involving no significant hazards consideration.

For details, see the individual notice in the **Federal Register** on the day and page cited. This notice does not extend the notice period of the original notice.

*Tennessee Valley Authority, Docket No. 50–390, Watts Bar Nuclear Plant, Unit 1, Rhea County, Tennessee*

*Date of amendment request:* April 1, 2015, as supplemented by letter dated May 7, 2015. Publicly-available versions are in ADAMS under Accession Nos. ML15096A151 and ML15127A511, respectively.

*Brief description of amendment request:* The amendment would revise the approved Cyber Security Plan and license condition and clarify the demarcation point between digital components under NRC jurisdiction and those under the jurisdiction of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

*Date of publication of individual notice in Federal Register:* June 1, 2015 (80 FR 31076).

*Expiration dates of individual notice:* July 1, 2015 (public comments); July 31, 2015 (hearing requests).

#### IV. 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 "Obtaining Information and Submitting Comments" section of this document.

*Entergy Gulf States Louisiana, LLC, and Entergy Operations, Inc., Docket No. 50-458, River Bend Station, Unit 1, West Feliciana Parish, Louisiana*

*Date of amendment request:* July 29, 2013, as supplemented by letters dated September 23, 2014, January 12, and March 30, 2015.

*Brief description of amendment:* The amendment added a permanent exception to the River Bend Station, Unit 1 Technical Requirements Manual (TRM) Section 3.9.14, "Crane Travel—

Spent and New Fuel Storage, Transfer, and Upper Containment Fuel Pools," to allow for movement of fuel pool gates over fuel assemblies for maintenance. This exception will also be described by a revision to the Updated Safety Analysis Report (USAR) Section 9.1.2.2.2, "Fuel Building Fuel Storage," and Section 9.1.2.3.3, "Protection Features of Spent Fuel Storage Facilities."

*Date of issuance:* June 2, 2015.

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

*Amendment No.:* 186. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML15117A575; documents related to this amendment are listed in the Safety Evaluation enclosed with the amendment.

*Facility Operating License No. NPF-47:* The amendment revised the TRM and the USAR.

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* December 10, 2013 (78 FR 74181). The supplements dated September 23, 2014, January 12, and March 30, 2015, provided additional information that clarified the application, did not expand the scope of the application as originally noticed, and did not change the NRC 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 June 2, 2015.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

*FirstEnergy Nuclear Operating Company, et al., Docket No. 50-440, Perry Nuclear Power Plant, Unit No. 1, Lake County, Ohio*

*Date of application for amendment:* January 9, 2015, as supplemented by letter dated May 6, 2015.

*Brief description of amendment:* The amendment revised the operating license to extend the completion date for full implementation of Perry Nuclear Power Plant Cyber Security Plan from the beginning of July 2015 to the end of December 2017.

*Date of issuance:* June 10, 2015.

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

*Amendment No.:* 167. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML15133A502; documents related to this amendment are listed in the Safety Evaluation enclosed with the amendment.

*Facility Operating License No. NPF-58:* The amendment revised the License.

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* April 7, 2015 (80 FR 18658). The supplemental letter dated May 6, 2015, 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.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated June 10, 2015.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

*Florida Power & Light Company, et al., Docket Nos. 50-335 and 50-389, St. Lucie Plant, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, St. Lucie County, Florida.*

*Date of application for amendment:* June 9, 2014, as supplemented by letter dated April 3, 2015.

*Brief description of amendment:* The amendments clarify the requirement for the Shift Technical Advisor (STA) in TS 6.2.2.e to allow the STA position be filled for each unit by a dedicated STA, an STA qualified Shift Supervisor, or an STA qualified Senior Reactor Operator. Additionally, the dedicated STA or the STA qualified Shift Supervisor can fill the STA position on both units.

*Date of issuance:* June 1, 2015.

*Effective date:* As of the date of issuance and shall be implemented within 90 days of issuance.

*Amendment Nos.:* 221 and 171. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML14350A008; documents related to these amendments are listed in the Safety Evaluation enclosed with the amendments.

*Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-67 and NPF-16:* Amendments revised the license and technical specifications.

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* September 30, 2014 (79 FR 58818). The supplement dated April 3, 2015, provided additional information that clarified the application, did not expand the scope of the application as originally noticed, and did not change the staff's original proposed no significant hazards consideration determination as published in the **Federal Register**.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated June 1, 2015.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

*Florida Power & Light Company, et al., Docket Nos. 50-335 and 50-389, St. Lucie Plant, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, St. Lucie County, Florida.*

*Date of amendment request:* June 30, 2014, as supplemented by letter dated August 19, 2014.

*Brief description of amendments:* The amendments revised the completion

date for Milestone 8, full implementation, of the Cyber Security Plan from December 31, 2015, to December 17, 2017.

*Date of Issuance:* June 5, 2015.

*Effective date:* As of the date of issuance and shall be implemented within 90 days of issuance.

*Amendment Nos.:* 222 and 172. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML15121A182; documents related to these amendments are listed in the Safety Evaluation enclosed with the amendments.

*Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-67 and NPF-16:* Amendments revised the Facility Operating Licenses and Technical Specifications.

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* November 4, 2014 (79 FR 65431).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated June 5, 2015.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

*Florida Power & Light Company, Docket Nos. 50-250 and 50-251, Turkey Point Nuclear Generating Unit Nos. 3 and 4, Miami-Dade County, Florida*

*Date of amendment requests:* June 28, 2012, as supplemented by letters dated September 19, 2012; March 18, April 16, and May 15, 2013; January 7, April 4, June 6, July 18, September 12, November 5, and December 2, 2014; and February 18, 2015.

*Brief description of amendments:* The amendments transition the Turkey Point Nuclear Generating Unit Nos. 3 and 4 fire protection program to a new risk-informed, performance-based alternative in accordance with 10 CFR 50.48(c), which incorporates by reference the National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) Standard 805 (NFPA 805), "Performance-Based Standard for Fire Protection for Light Water Reactor Electric Generating Plants," 2001 Edition. Copies of NFPA 805 may be purchased from the NFPA Customer Service Department, 1 Batterymarch Park, P.O. Box 9101, Quincy, Massachusetts 02269-9101 and in PDF format through the NFPA Online Catalog (<http://www.nfpa.org>) or by calling 1-800-344-3555 or 617-770-3000. Copies are also available for inspection at the NRC Library, Two White Flint North, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland 20852-2738, and at the NRC PDR, One White Flint North, Room O1-F15, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland 20852-2738.

*Date of issuance:* May 28, 2015.

*Effective date:* As of the date of issuance and shall be implemented as

described in the transition license conditions.

*Amendment Nos.:* 262 and 257. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML15061A237; documents related to these amendments are listed in the Safety Evaluation enclosed with the amendments.

*Renewed Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-31 and DPR-41:* Amendments revised the Renewed Facility Operating Licenses and Technical Specifications.

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* February 4, 2014 (79 FR 6648). The supplemental letters dated January 7, April 4, June 6, July 18, September 12, November 5, and December 2, 2014; and February 18, 2015, 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 28, 2015.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

*Nebraska Public Power District, Docket No. 50-298, Cooper Nuclear Station (CNS), Nemaha County, Nebraska*

*Date of amendment request:* July 14, 2014.

*Brief description of amendment:* The amendment deleted CNS Technical Specification (TS) 5.5.3, "Post Accident Sampling," thereby eliminating the program requirements to have and maintain the post-accident sampling system. The changes are consistent with NRC-approved Industry/Technical Specification Task Force (TSTF) Standard Technical Specification Change Traveler, TSTF-413, "Elimination of Requirements for a Post Accident Sampling System (PASS)." The availability of this TS improvement was announced in the **Federal Register** on March 20, 2002 (67 FR 13027), as part of the consolidated line item improvement process. CNS will continue to have the ability to obtain samples, utilizing PASS, following an accident.

*Date of issuance:* May 29, 2015.

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

*Amendment No.:* 250. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML15135A005; documents related to this amendment are listed in the Safety Evaluation enclosed with the amendment.

*Renewed Facility Operating License No. DPR-46:* Amendment revised the Facility Operating License and Technical Specifications.

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* September 30, 2014 (79 FR 58819).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 29, 2015.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

*Northern States Power Company—Minnesota, Docket No. 50-263, Monticello Nuclear Generating Plant (MNGP), Wright County, Minnesota*

*Date of amendment request:* July 15, 2013, as supplemented by letters dated January 31, 2014, March 12, 2014, April 29, 2014, May 9, 2014 (two letters), and November 11, 2014.

*Brief description of amendment:* The amendment revised the Technical Specifications (TSs) to reflect the use of fuel and safety analysis methods appropriate for the AREVA ATRIUM 10XM fuel bundle design. Specifically, the changes affect TS 2.1, "Safety Limits," to revise the reactor steam dome pressure safety limit value; TS 4.2.1, "Fuel Assemblies," to more accurately reflect the fuel assembly design feature as a "water channel" as opposed to a "water rod;" and TS 5.6.3, "Core Operating Limits Report (COLR)," to add AREVA safety analysis methods to the references list used in determining core operating limits in the COLR.

*Date of issuance:* June 5, 2015.

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

*Amendment No.:* 188. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Package Accession No. ML15072A143; documents related to this amendment are listed in the Safety Evaluation enclosed with the amendment.

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

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* September 9, 2014 (79 FR 53460). The supplemental letter dated November 11, 2014, 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 June 5, 2015.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

*PPL Susquehanna, LLC, Docket Nos. 50-387 and 50-388, Susquehanna Steam Electric Station, Units 1 and 2, Luzerne County, Pennsylvania*

*Date of amendment request:* July 11, 2014, as supplemented by letters dated October 24, 2014, November 6, 2014, November 25, 2014, December 10, 2014, January 5, 2015, January 13, 2015, March 9, 2015, March 13, 2015, March 18, 2015, March 31, 2015, April 24, 2015, and May 1, 2015.

*Brief description of amendments:* By Order dated April 10, 2015, as published in the **Federal Register** on April 20, 2015 (80 FR 21767), the NRC approved an indirect license transfer for Renewed Facility Operating Licenses NPF-14 and NPF-22 for the Susquehanna Steam Electric Station, Units 1 and 2. This amendment reflects the indirect transfer of the licenses to Talen Energy Corporation and the name change of the licensee from PPL Susquehanna, LLC to Susquehanna Nuclear, LLC.

*Date of issuance:* June 1, 2015.

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

*Amendment Nos.:* 262 for Unit 1 and 243 for Unit 2. A publicly-available version of the Amendment and the Order are in ADAMS under Accession Nos. ML15054A066 and ML15054A058, respectively; documents related to these amendments are listed in the Safety Evaluation enclosed with the Order dated April 10, 2015. Subsequent to the issuance of the Order, the licensee submitted letters dated April 24, 2015 (ADAMS Accession No. ML15127A263), and May 1, 2015 (ADAMS Accession No. ML15133A335). These letters provided additional notifications of regulatory approvals and the closing transaction date, as was required by the Order.

*Renewed Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-14 and NPF-22:* The amendments revised the Renewed Facility Operating Licenses.

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* October 6, 2014 (79 FR 60192). The supplemental letters dated October 24, 2014, November 6, 2014, November 25, 2014, December 10, 2014, January 5, 2015, January 13, 2015, March 9, 2015, March 13, 2015, March 18, 2015, March 31, 2015, April 24, 2015, and May 1, 2015, contained clarifying information, did not expand the application beyond the scope of the notice as originally published in the **Federal Register**, and did not affect the applicability of the generic no

significant hazards consideration determination.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated April 10, 2015.

*Comments received:* Yes. The comments received on the License Transfer Request are addressed in the Safety Evaluation dated April 10, 2015.

*Southern California Edison Company, et al., Docket Nos. 50-206, 50-361, 50-362, and 72-041 San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station (SONGS), Units 1, 2, and 3, and the Independent Spent Fuel Storage Installation, San Diego County, California*

*Date of amendment request:* March 31, 2014, as supplemented by letters dated October 21, 2014, and April 29, 2015.

*Brief description of amendment:* The amendments revised the SONGS emergency action level scheme to reflect the low likelihood of any credible accident at the facility in its permanently shutdown and defueled condition that could result in radiological releases requiring offsite protective measures.

*Date of issuance:* June 5, 2015.

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

*Amendment Nos.:* Unit 1—166; Unit 2—228; Unit 3—221. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML15105A349; documents related to these amendments are listed in the Safety Evaluation enclosed with the amendments.

*Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-13, NPF-10, and NPF-15:* The amendments revised the emergency action levels.

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* December 23, 2014 (79 FR 77048). The supplemental letter dated April 29, 2015, provided additional information that clarified the application, did not expand the scope of the application as originally noticed, and did not change the NRC staff's original proposed no significant hazards consideration determination as published in the **Federal Register**.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated June 5, 2015.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

*Southern Nuclear Operating Company, Inc., Docket Nos. 50-424 and 50-425, Vogtle Electric Generating Plant (VEGP), Units 1 and 2, Burke County, Georgia and Southern Nuclear Operating Company, Inc., Docket Nos. 50-348 and 50-364, Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant (Farley), Units 1 and 2, Houston County, Alabama*

*Date of application for amendment:* September 17, 2014, as supplemented by letter dated February 13, 2015.

*Brief description of amendments:* The amendments revised the Technical Specification (TS) Surveillance Requirement 3.1.3.2 and TS 5.6.5 related to the moderator temperature coefficient.

*Date of issuance:* June 2, 2015.

*Effective date:* As of its date of issuance and shall be implemented within 90 days from the date of issuance.

*Amendment Nos.:* Farley Unit 1—198, Farley Unit 2—194, VEGP Unit 1—174, VEGP Unit 2—156. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML15083A098, documents related to these amendments are listed in the Safety Evaluation enclosed with the amendments.

*Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-2, NPF-8, NPF-68, NPF-81:* The amendments revised the Renewed Facility Operating Licenses and Technical Specifications.

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* December 2, 2014 (79 FR 71455). The supplemental letter dated February 13, 2015, provided additional information that clarified the application, did not expand the scope of the application as originally noticed, and did not change the staff's original proposed no significant hazards consideration determination as published in the **Federal Register**.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated June 2, 2015.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

*Tennessee Valley Authority, Docket No. 50-390, Watts Bar Nuclear Plant, Unit 1, Rhea County, Tennessee*

*Date of amendment request:* July 24, 2014.

*Brief description of amendment:* The amendment revised the reactor coolant pump flywheel inspection surveillance requirements to extend the allowable inspection interval to 20 years. The NRC staff issued a notice of availability of a model safety evaluation and model no significant hazards consideration (NSHC) determination for referencing in license amendment applications in the

**Federal Register** on October 22, 2003 (68 FR 60422). The licensee affirmed the applicability of the model NSHC determination in its application dated July 24, 2014.

*Date of issuance:* May 28, 2015.

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

*Amendment No.:* 99. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML15092A761; documents related to this amendment are listed in the Safety Evaluation enclosed with the amendment.

*Facility Operating License No. NPF-90:* Amendment revised the Facility Operating License and Technical Specifications.

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* September 30, 2014 (79 FR 58827).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 28, 2015.

NSHC determination comments received: No.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 12th day of June 2015.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**A. Louise Lund,**

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

[FR Doc. 2015-15275 Filed 6-22-15; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7590-01-P**

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[NRC-2015-0020]

### Information Collection: NRC Request for Sodium Iodide I-131 Treatment and Patient Release Information

**AGENCY:** Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice of submission to the Office of Management and Budget; request for comment.

**SUMMARY:** The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) has recently submitted a proposed collection of information to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review. The information collection is entitled, "NRC Request for Sodium Iodide I-131 Treatment and Patient Release Practices."

**DATES:** Submit comments by July 23, 2015.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit comments directly to the OMB reviewer at: Vlad Dorjets, Desk Officer, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, (3150-XXXX), NEOB-10202, Office of Management

and Budget, Washington, DC 20503; telephone: 202-395-7315, email: [Vladik\\_Dorjets@omb.eop.gov](mailto:Vladik_Dorjets@omb.eop.gov).

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Tremaine Donnell, NRC Clearance Officer, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001; telephone: 301-415-6258; email: [INFOCOLLECTS.Resource@nrc.gov](mailto:INFOCOLLECTS.Resource@nrc.gov).

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

#### I. Obtaining Information and Submitting Comments

##### A. Obtaining Information

Please refer to Docket ID NRC 2015-0020 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 2015-0020. A copy of the collection of information and related instructions may be obtained without charge by accessing Docket ID NRC 2015-0020 on this Web site.

- *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). The supporting statement and Patient Release **Federal Register** Notice (FRN) Soliciting Information is available in ADAMS under Accession No. ML15134A123.

- *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.

- *NRC's Clearance Officer:* A copy of the collection of information and related instructions may be obtained without charge by contacting the NRC's Clearance Officer, Tremaine Donnell, Office of Information Services, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001; telephone: 301-415-6258; email: [INFOCOLLECTS.Resource@NRC.GOV](mailto:INFOCOLLECTS.Resource@NRC.GOV).

##### B. Submitting Comments

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

Under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. chapter 35), the NRC recently submitted a proposed collection of information to OMB for review entitled, "NRC Request for Sodium Iodide I-131 Treatment and Patient Release Practices." The NRC hereby informs potential respondents that an agency may not conduct or sponsor, and that a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number.

The NRC published an FRN with a 60-day comment period on this information collection on March 3, 2015; 80 FR 11471, entitled "NRC Request for Sodium Iodide I-131 Treatment and Patient Release Practices."

1. *The title of the information collection:* "NRC Request for Sodium Iodide I-131 Treatment and Patient Release Practices."

2. *OMB approval number:* An OMB control number has not yet been assigned to this proposed information collection.

3. *Type of submission:* New.

4. *The form number if applicable:* Not Applicable.

5. *How often the collection is required or requested:* Once.

6. *Who will be required or asked to respond:* Medical professional organizations, physicians, patients, patient advocacy groups, NRC and Agreement State medical use licensees, Agreement States, and other interested individuals who use, receive, license or have interest in the use of I-131 sodium iodide (hereafter referred to as "I-131") for the treatment of thyroid conditions.