

**NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

[NRC–2017–0112]

**Biweekly Notice; Applications and Amendments to Facility Operating Licenses and Combined Licenses Involving No Significant Hazards Considerations****AGENCY:** Nuclear Regulatory Commission.**ACTION:** Biweekly notice.

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

This biweekly notice includes all notices of amendments issued, or proposed to be issued, from April 11 to April 24, 2017. The last biweekly notice was published on April 25, 2017.

**DATES:** Comments must be filed by June 8, 2017. A request for a hearing must be filed by July 10, 2017.

**ADDRESSES:** You may submit comments by any of the following methods:

- *Federal Rulemaking Web site:* Go to <http://www.regulations.gov> and search for Docket ID NRC–2017–0112. 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: T–8–D36M, 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–2017–0112, facility name, unit number(s), plant docket number, application date, and subject 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–2017–0112.

- *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 this document.

- *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–2017–0112, facility name, unit number(s), plant docket number, 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 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. 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 if 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. If the Commission takes 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. If the Commission makes 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 persons (petitioner) whose interest may be

affected by this action may file a request for a hearing and petition for leave to intervene (petition) with respect to the action. Petitions shall be filed in accordance with the Commission's "Agency Rules of Practice and Procedure" in 10 CFR part 2. Interested persons should consult a current copy of 10 CFR 2.309. 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/>. Alternatively, a copy of the regulations is available at the NRC's Public Document Room, located at One White Flint North, Room O1-F21, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland 20852. If a petition is filed, the Commission or a presiding officer will rule on the petition and, if appropriate, a notice of a hearing will be issued.

As required by 10 CFR 2.309(d) the petition should specifically explain the reasons why intervention should be permitted with particular reference to the following general requirements for standing: (1) The name, address, and telephone number of the petitioner; (2) the nature of the petitioner's right under the Act to be made a party to the proceeding; (3) the nature and extent of the 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 petitioner's interest.

In accordance with 10 CFR 2.309(f), the petition must also set forth the specific contentions which the petitioner seeks to have litigated in 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 petitioner must 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 petitioner intends to rely in proving the contention at the hearing. The petitioner must also provide references to the specific sources and documents on which the petitioner intends to rely to support its position on the issue. The petition must include sufficient information to show that a genuine dispute exists with the applicant or licensee on a material issue of law or fact. Contentions must be limited to matters within the scope of the proceeding. The contention must be one which, if proven, would entitle the petitioner to relief. A petitioner who fails to satisfy the requirements at 10 CFR 2.309(f) 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. Parties have the opportunity to participate fully in the conduct of the hearing with respect to resolution of that party's admitted contentions, including the opportunity to present evidence, consistent with the NRC's regulations, policies, and procedures.

Petitions must be filed no later than 60 days from the date of publication of this notice. Petitions and motions for leave to file new or amended contentions that are filed after the 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) through (iii). The petition must be filed in accordance with the filing instructions in the "Electronic Submissions (E-Filing)" section of this document.

If a hearing is requested, and the Commission has not made a final determination on the issue of no significant hazards consideration, the Commission will make a final determination on the issue of no significant hazards consideration. The final determination will serve to establish 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 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 the 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.

A State, local governmental body, Federally-recognized Indian Tribe, or agency thereof, may submit a petition to the Commission to participate as a party under 10 CFR 2.309(h)(1). The petition should state the nature and extent of the petitioner's interest in the proceeding. The petition should be submitted to the Commission by July 10, 2017. The petition must be filed in accordance with the filing instructions in the "Electronic Submissions (E-Filing)" section of this document, and should meet the requirements for petitions set forth in this section, except that under 10 CFR 2.309(h)(2) a State, local governmental body, or federally recognized Indian Tribe, or agency

thereof does not need to address the standing requirements in 10 CFR 2.309(d) if the facility is located within its boundaries. Alternatively, a State, local governmental body, Federally-recognized Indian Tribe, or agency thereof may participate as a non-party under 10 CFR 2.315(c).

If a hearing is granted, any person who is not a party to the proceeding and is not affiliated with or represented by a party may, at the discretion of the presiding officer, be permitted to make a limited appearance pursuant to the provisions of 10 CFR 2.315(a). A person making a limited appearance may make an oral or written statement of his or her position on the issues but may not otherwise participate in the proceeding. A limited appearance may be made at any session of the hearing or at any prehearing conference, subject to the limits and conditions as may be imposed by the presiding officer. Details regarding the opportunity to make a limited appearance will be provided by the presiding officer if such sessions are scheduled.

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

All documents filed in NRC adjudicatory proceedings, including a request for hearing and petition for leave to intervene (petition), 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 that request to participate under 10 CFR 2.315(c), must be filed in accordance with the NRC's E-Filing rule (72 FR 49139; August 28, 2007, as amended at 77 FR 46562, August 3, 2012). 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. Detailed guidance on making electronic submissions may be found in the Guidance for Electronic Submissions to the NRC and on the NRC Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/e-submittals.html>. Participants may not submit paper copies of their filings unless they seek an exemption in accordance with the procedures described below.

To comply with the procedural requirements of E-Filing, at least 10 days prior to the filing deadline, the participant should contact the Office of the Secretary by email at [hearing.docket@nrc.gov](mailto:hearing.docket@nrc.gov), or by telephone at 301-415-1677, to (1) request a digital identification (ID) certificate, which allows the participant (or its counsel or representative) to digitally sign submissions and access the E-Filing

system for any proceeding in which it is participating; and (2) advise the Secretary that the participant will be submitting a petition or other adjudicatory document (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>. Once a participant has obtained a digital ID certificate and a docket has been created, the participant can then submit adjudicatory documents. Submissions must be in Portable Document Format (PDF). Additional guidance on PDF submissions is available on the NRC's public Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/electronic-sub-ref-mat.html>. A filing is considered complete at the time the document is 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 document on those participants separately. Therefore, applicants and other participants (or their counsel or representative) must apply for and receive a digital ID certificate before adjudicatory documents are filed so that they can obtain access to the documents via the E-Filing system.

A person filing electronically using the NRC's adjudicatory E-Filing system may seek assistance by contacting the NRC's Electronic Filing 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 Electronic Filing Help Desk is available between 9 a.m. and 6 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 stating why there is good cause for not filing electronically and 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, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland 20852, Attention: Rulemaking and Adjudications Staff. Participants filing adjudicatory documents 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 <https://adams.nrc.gov/ehd>, unless excluded pursuant to an order of the Commission or the presiding officer. If you do not have an NRC-issued digital ID certificate as described above, click cancel when the link requests certificates and you will be automatically directed to the NRC's electronic hearing dockets where you will be able to access any publicly available documents in a particular hearing docket. Participants are requested not to include personal privacy information, such as social security numbers, home addresses, or personal phone numbers in their filings, unless an NRC regulation or other law requires submission of such information. For example, in some instances, individuals provide home addresses in order to demonstrate proximity to a facility or site. 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.

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 obtaining information related to this document, see the "Obtaining Information and Submitting Comments" section of this document.

*Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC, Docket Nos. 50-369 and 50-370, McGuire Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2, Mecklenburg County, North Carolina*

*Date of amendment request:* December 19, 2016. A publicly available version is in Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS) under Accession No. ML16363A349.

*Description of amendment request:* The amendments would modify Technical Specification (TS) 5.5.2, "Containment Leakage Rate Testing Program," by replacing the reference to Regulatory Guide 1.163, "Performance-Based Containment Leak-Test Program," with a reference to Nuclear Energy Institute (NEI) Topical Report NEI 94-01, Revision 3-A, "Industry Guideline for Implementing Performance-Based Option of 10 CFR part 50, Appendix J," dated July 2012, and the conditions and limitations specified in NEI 94-01, Revision 2-A, "Industry Guideline for Implementing Performance-Based Option of 10 CFR part 50, Appendix J," dated October 2008, as the implementation documents used by McGuire Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2, to implement the performance-based leakage testing program in accordance with Option B of 10 CFR part 50, Appendix J. The proposed change would also delete the listing of one-time exceptions previously granted to Integrated Leak Rate Test (ILRT) test frequency.

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

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

Response: No.

The proposed amendment to the Technical Specifications (TS) involves the extension of the McGuire Nuclear Station (MNS) Type A containment integrated leak rate test interval to 15 years and the extension of the Type C test interval to 75 months for selected components. The current Type A test interval of 120 months (10 years) would be extended on a permanent basis to no longer than 15 years from the last Type A test. The current Type C test interval of 60 months for selected components would be extended on a

performance basis to no longer than 75 months. Extensions of up to nine months (total maximum interval of 84 months for Type C tests) are permissible only for non-routine emergent conditions.

The proposed extension does not involve either a physical change to the plant or a change in the manner in which the plant is operated or controlled. The containment is designed to provide an essentially leak tight barrier against the uncontrolled release of radioactivity to the environment for postulated accidents. The containment and the testing requirements invoked to periodically demonstrate the integrity of the containment exist to ensure the plant's ability to mitigate the consequences of an accident, and do not involve the prevention or identification of any precursors of an accident. The change in dose risk for changing the Type A test frequency from three-per-ten years to once-per-fifteen years, measured, as an increase to the total integrated plant risk for those accident sequences influenced by Type A testing, is 0.032 person-rem/year. [Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI)] Report No. 1009325, Revision 2—A states that a very small population dose is defined as an increase of  $\leq 1.0$  person-rem per year, or  $\leq 1\%$  of the total population dose, whichever is less restrictive for the risk impact assessment of the extended ILRT intervals.

Therefore, this proposed extension does not involve a significant increase in the probability of an accident previously evaluated.

As documented in NUREG-1493, Type Band C tests have identified a very large percentage of containment leakage paths, and the percentage of containment leakage paths that are detected only by Type A testing is very small. The MNS Type A test history supports this conclusion.

The integrity of the containment is subject to, two types of failure mechanisms that can be categorized as: (1) Activity based, and; (2) time based. Activity based failure mechanisms are defined as degradation due to system and/or component modifications or maintenance. Local leak rate test requirements and administrative controls such as configuration management and procedural requirements for system restoration ensure that containment integrity is not degraded by plant modifications or maintenance activities. The design and construction requirements of the containment combined with the containment inspections performed in accordance with [American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME) Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code,] Section XI, the Maintenance Rule, and TS requirements serve to provide a high degree of assurance that the containment would not degrade in a manner that is detectable only by a Type A test.

Based on the above, the proposed extensions do not significantly increase the consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The proposed amendment also deletes an exception previously granted to allow one-time extensions of the Unit 1 and Unit 2 ILRT test frequency for MNS. This exception was for activities that have already taken place;

therefore, their deletion is solely an administrative action that has no effect on any component and no impact on how the units are operated.

Therefore, the proposed change does not result in 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 amendment to the TS involves the extension of the MNS Type A containment integrated leak rate test interval to 15 years and the extension of the Type C test interval to 75 months for selected components. The current Type A test interval of 120 months (10 years) would be extended on a permanent basis to no longer than 15 years from the last Type A test. The current Type C test interval of 60 months for selected components would be extended on a performance basis to no longer than 75 months. The containment and the testing requirements to periodically demonstrate the integrity of the containment exist to ensure the plant's ability to mitigate the consequences of an accident do not involve any accident precursors or initiators. The proposed change does not involve a physical change to the plant (*i.e.*, no new or different type of equipment will be installed) or a change to the manner in which the plant is operated or controlled.

The proposed amendment also deletes an exception previously granted to allow one-time extensions of the Unit 1 and Unit 2 ILRT test frequency for MNS. This exception was for activities that will be superseded by this activity; therefore, their deletion is solely an administrative action that does not result in any change in how the units are operated.

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

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

Response: No.

The proposed amendment to TS 5.5.2 involves the extension of the MNS Type A containment integrated leak rate test interval to 15 years and the extension of the Type C test interval to 75 months for selected components. The current Type A test interval of 120 months (10 years) would be extended on a permanent basis to no longer than 15 years from the last Type A test. The current Type C test interval of 60 months for selected components would be extended on a performance basis to no longer than 75 months. This amendment does not alter the manner in which safety limits, limiting safety system set points, or limiting conditions for operation are determined. The specific requirements and conditions of the TS Containment Leak Rate Testing Program exist to ensure that the degree of containment structural integrity and leak tightness that is considered in the plant safety analysis is maintained. The overall containment leak rate limit specified by TS is maintained.

The proposed change involves only the extension of the interval between Type A

containment leak rate tests, and Type C tests for MNS. The proposed surveillance interval extension is bounded by the 15-year ILRT interval, and the 75-month Type C test interval currently authorized within NEI 94-01, Revision 3-A. Industry experience supports the conclusion that Type B and C testing detects a large percentage of containment leakage paths and that the percentage of containment leakage paths that are detected only by Type A testing is small. The containment inspections performed in accordance with [American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME) Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code,] Section XI, TS and the Maintenance Rule serve to provide a high degree of assurance that the containment would not degrade in a manner that is detectable only by Type A testing. The combination of these factors ensures that the margin of safety in the plant safety analysis is maintained. The design, operation, testing methods and acceptance criteria for Type A, B, and C containment leakage tests specified in applicable codes and standards would continue to be met, with the acceptance of this proposed change, since these are not affected by changes to the Type A, and Type C test intervals.

The proposed amendment also deletes an exception previously granted to allow one-time extensions of the Unit 1 and Unit 2 ILRT test frequency for MNS. This exception was for activities that have already taken place; therefore, their deletion is solely an administrative action and does not change how the units are operated and maintained. Thus, there is no reduction in any 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:* Kate B. Nolan, Deputy General Counsel, Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC,

550 South Tryon Street—DEC45A, Charlotte, NC 28202-1802.

*NRC Branch Chief:* Michael T. Markley.

*Exelon Generation Company, LLC, Docket Nos. STN 50-456 and STN 50-457, Braidwood Station, Units 1 and 2, Will County, Illinois*

*Exelon Generation Company, LLC, Docket Nos. STN 50-454 and STN 50-455, Byron Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Ogle County, Illinois*

*Exelon Generation Company, LLC, Docket Nos. 50-317 and 50-318, Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Calvert County, Maryland*

*Exelon Generation Company, LLC, Docket No. 50-461, Clinton Power*

Station, Unit No. 1, DeWitt County, Illinois

Exelon Generation Company, LLC, Docket Nos. 50-237 and 50-249, Dresden Nuclear Power Station, Units 2 and 3, Grundy County, Illinois

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

Exelon Generation Company, LLC, Docket Nos. 50-352 and 50-353, Limerick Generating Station, Units 1 and 2, Montgomery County, Pennsylvania

Exelon Generation Company, LLC, Docket Nos. 50-220 and 50-410, Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2, Oswego County, New York

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

Exelon Generation Company, LLC, Docket Nos. 50-254 and 50-265, Quad Cities Nuclear Power Station, Units 1 and 2, Rock Island County, Illinois

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

Exelon Generation Company, LLC, Docket No. 50-289, Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit 1, Dauphin County, Pennsylvania

*Date of amendment request:* March 28, 2017. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML17087A028.

*Description of amendment request:* The amendments would revise the technical specifications (TSs) based on Technical Specification Task Force (TSTF) Traveler TSTF-529, "Clarify Use and Application Rules" (ADAMS Accession No. ML16062A271). The changes would revise and clarify the TS usage rules for completion times, limiting conditions for operation (LCOs), and surveillance requirements (SRs).

*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 changes to [TS] Section 1.3 and LCO 3.0.4 have no effect on the requirement for systems to be Operable and have no effect on the application of TS actions. The proposed change to SR 3.0.3 (or

equivalent) states that the allowance may only be used when there is a reasonable expectation the surveillance will be met when performed. Since the proposed changes do not significantly affect system Operability, the proposed changes will have no significant effect on the initiating events for accidents previously evaluated and will have no significant effect on the ability of the systems to mitigate accidents previously evaluated.

Therefore, it is concluded that these changes do 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 TS usage rules do not affect the design or function of any plant systems. The proposed changes do not change the Operability requirements for plant systems or the actions taken when plant systems are not operable.

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

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

Response: No.

The proposed changes clarify the application of [TS] Section 1.3 and LCO 3.0.4 and do not result in changes in plant operation. SR 3.0.3 (or equivalent) is revised to allow application of SR 3.0.3 when an SR has not been previously performed if there is reasonable expectation that the SR will be met when performed. This expands the use of SR 3.0.3 while ensuring the affected system is capable of performing its safety function. As a result, plant safety is either improved or unaffected.

Therefore, it is concluded that the 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 requested amendments involve no significant hazards consideration.

*Attorney for licensee:* Tamra Domeyer, Associate General Counsel, Exelon Generation Company, LLC, 4300 Winfield Road, Warrenville, IL 60555.

*NRC Branch Chief:* David J. Wrona.

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

*Date of amendment request:* March 24, 2017. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML17083A083.

*Description of amendment request:* The proposed amendment would revise the emergency plan (E-Plan) for MNGP.

The proposed revisions to the E-Plan are discussed in Section 2.1, "Proposed Changes," of the March 24, 2017, letter and include extending staff augmentation times for Emergency Response Organization (ERO) response functions as well as other changes.

*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 increase in staff augmentation times has no effect on normal plant operation or on any accident initiator or precursors and does not impact the function of plant structures, systems, or components (SSCs).

The proposed change does not alter or prevent the ability of the on-shift ERO to perform their intended functions to mitigate the consequences of an accident or event.

The ability of the ERO to respond adequately to radiological emergencies has been demonstrated as acceptable through a staffing analysis as required by 10 CFR 50, Appendix E, Section IV.A.9.

Therefore, the proposed E-Plan changes do 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 does not impact any accident analysis. The proposed change does not involve a physical alteration of the plant (*i.e.*, no new or different type of equipment will be installed), a change in the method of plant operation, or new operator actions. The proposed change does not introduce failure modes that could result in a new accident, and the change does not alter assumptions made in the safety analysis. The proposed change increases the staff augmentation response times in the E-Plan, which are demonstrated as acceptable through a functional analysis as required by 10 CFR 50, Appendix E, Section IV.A.9. The proposed change does not alter or prevent the ability of the ERO to perform their intended functions to mitigate the consequences of an accident or event.

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.

Margin of safety is associated with confidence in the ability of the fission product barriers (*i.e.*, fuel cladding, reactor coolant system pressure boundary, and containment structure) to limit the level of

radiation dose to the public. The proposed change is associated with the E-Plan staffing and does not impact operation of the plant or its response to transients or accidents. The change does not affect the Technical Specifications. The proposed change does not involve a change in the method of plant operation, and no accident analyses will be affected by the proposed change. Safety analysis acceptance criteria are not affected by this proposed change. The proposed revisions to the E-Plan continue to provide the necessary response staff with the proposed change.

A staffing analysis and a functional analysis were performed for the proposed change focusing on the timeliness of performing major tasks for the functional areas of E-Plan. The analysis concluded that an extension in staff augmentation times would not significantly affect the ability to perform the required E-Plan tasks. Therefore, the proposed change is determined to not adversely affect the ability to meet 10 CFR 50.54(q)(2), the requirements of 10 CFR 50 Appendix E, and the emergency planning standards as described in 10 CFR 50.47 (b).

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:* Peter M. Glass, Assistant General Counsel, Xcel Energy Services, Inc., 414 Nicollet Mall, Minneapolis, MN 55401.

*NRC Branch Chief:* David J. Wrona.

*PSEG Nuclear LLC, Docket No. 50-354, Hope Creek Generating Station, Salem County, New Jersey*

*Date of amendment request:* March 27, 2017. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML17086A071.

*Description of amendment request:* The amendment would revise the Hope Creek Generating Station Technical Specifications by adopting Technical Specifications Task Force (TSTF) Change Traveler TSTF-535, Revision 0, "Revise Shutdown Margin Definition to Address Advanced Fuel Designs" (ADAMS Accession No. ML112200436). Specifically, the proposed amendment would modify the Technical Specification definition of "Shutdown Margin" (SDM) to require calculation of the SDM at a reactor moderator temperature of 68 degrees Fahrenheit or a higher temperature that represents the most reactive state throughout the operating cycle.

*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 of 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 of 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.

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

Response: No.

The proposed change revises the definition of SDM. The proposed 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 [boiling-water reactor] fuel types at all times during the fuel cycle.

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:* Jeffrie J. Keenan, PSEG Nuclear LLC—N21, P.O. Box 236, Hancocks Bridge, NJ 08038.

*NRC Branch Chief:* James G. Danna.

*South Carolina Electric & Gas Company, Docket Nos. 52-027 and 52-028, Virgil C. Summer Nuclear Station Units 2 and 3, Fairfield County, South Carolina*

*Date of amendment request:* March 30, 2017. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML17089A687.

*Description of amendment request:* The requested amendment proposes changes to combined license (COL) Appendix C (and plant-specific Tier 1) Table 3.3-3, which identifies Class 1E divisional cables in various Auxiliary Building fire areas, and involves changes to related Tier 2 information in the Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (UFSAR). The proposed activity revises Table 3.3-3 to add a second note, Note 2, identifying that Class 1E Protection and Safety Monitoring System (PMS) interdivisional fiber-optic cables are terminated in the identified Auxiliary Building fire areas, in addition to the cable divisions currently listed for these areas. "Interdivisional" cables are defined as cables that interconnect PMS divisions, including Division A, B, C, and D cables.

*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 changes to COL Appendix C (and plant-specific Tier 1) Table 3.3-3 and UFSAR Appendix 9A do not involve any accidents which are previously evaluated. The interdivisional cables provide signals associated with some safe shutdown functions in accordance with UFSAR Subsection 7.4.1.1, which describes safe shutdown functions using safety-related systems. Therefore, these cables are required for safe shutdown. Accident analyses as described in UFSAR Ch. 15 are not changed as fire-related events in the Auxiliary Building are evaluated separately in UFSAR Appendix 9A for plant safe shutdown. A concurrent single active component failure independent of a fire is not assumed in this evaluation. Voting logic for PMS control functions is not adversely affected as the fiber-optic cables associated with these PMS cabinets in the specified fire areas function using two-out-of-four (2o04), 2o03, or 1o02 logic. Redundant cable divisions which support PMS functions are routed separately in other fire areas and will not be affected in

the event of a fire in one of the identified fire areas. PMS setpoints for reactor trip functions and engineered safeguards features (ESF) functions as described in UFSAR Table 15.0-4a are not changed as functions provided by the PMS cabinets and cables are not adversely affected. PMS is designed to operate with the loss of a single division. Existing accidents previously evaluated are not affected and do not require further analysis. As described in Appendix 9A, in no case does the spurious actuation of equipment prevent safe shutdown. This conclusion remains valid for the proposed changes.

Changes to the safe shutdown evaluation account for interdivisional fiber-optic cables inside of divisional fire areas; however, safe shutdown functions are not changed. Loss of interdivisional fiber-optic cabling is not a reduction in the safety of the plant as the PMS is designed to operate despite the loss of an entire division. Furthermore, fire protection analyses as described in UFSAR Appendix 9A are not adversely affected by this activity as fire protection requirements and equipment are not changed. Conclusions of the associated safe shutdown evaluations are not changed. No safety-related structure, system, component (SSC) or function is adversely affected by this change. The change does not involve an interface with any SSC accident initiator or initiating sequence of events, and thus, the probabilities of the accidents evaluated in the plant-specific UFSAR are not affected. The proposed changes do not involve a change to the predicted radiological releases due to postulated accident conditions, thus, the consequences of the accidents evaluated in the UFSAR are not affected.

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

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

Response: No.

The proposed changes to COL Appendix C (and plant-specific Tier 1) Table 3.3-3 and UFSAR Appendix 9A do not affect any safety-related equipment, and do not add any new interfaces to safety-related SSCs. No system or design function or equipment qualification is affected by these changes as the changes do not modify any SSCs. The existing interdivisional fiber-optic Class 1E cable routing is acceptable because redundant PMS divisions are routed in separate fire areas and can perform safe shutdown functions as required. Redundant cable divisions will not be affected in the event of a fire in one of the identified fire areas. PMS is designed to operate with the loss of a single division. PMS control functions continue being performed using reduced coincidence logic in the event of a fire when a single division is lost.

The changes do not introduce a new failure mode, malfunction or sequence of events that could affect safety or safety-related equipment. Safe shutdown functions are not changed as a result of this activity as the loss of an entire divisional room does not disable

safe shutdown functions. Separation of cables in the designated Auxiliary Building fire areas is not adversely impacted. A concurrent single active component failure independent of a fire is not assumed in this evaluation as described in UFSAR Appendix 9A. There is no adverse impact to any other fire areas or safe shutdown functions listed in COL Appendix C (and plant-specific Tier 1) Table 3.3-3 and UFSAR Appendix 9A. Changes to the identified cables in the specified fire areas do not affect the operator's ability to safely shut down the plant in the event of a fire. Safe shutdown conclusions identified for each fire area is not changed by these activities as safe shutdown functions are not affected.

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

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

Response: No.

The changes to COL Appendix C (and plant-specific Tier 1) Table 3.3-3 and UFSAR Appendix 9A design information, including fire areas 1201 AF 02, 1201 AF 03, 1202 AF 03, and 1202 AF 04, do not adversely affect the safety-related functions of the safe shutdown Class 1E divisions or any function associated with safe shutdown. Interdivisional fiber-optic cabling is not adversely affected and plant control functions are not changed as PMS is designed to operate with a loss of a single division. This activity does not reduce the margin of safety regarding fire protection within the plant. The changes do not affect any other safety-related equipment or fission product barriers. The requested changes will not affect any design code, function, design analysis, safety analysis input or result, or design/safety margin. No safety analysis or design basis acceptance limit/criterion is challenged or exceeded by the requested changes. Redundant cables are terminated in other fire areas. Voting logic for actuation of PMS control functions is not changed and plant responses to potential spurious actuation are not adversely affected by these activities.

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

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

*Attorney for licensee:* Ms. Kathryn M. Sutton, Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLC, 1111 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20004-2514.

*NRC Branch Chief:* Jennifer Dixon-Herrity.

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

*Date of amendment request:* April 6, 2017. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML17096A765.

*Description of amendment request:*

The requested amendment proposes changes to combined license (COL) Appendix C (and plant-specific Tier 1) Table 3.3-3, which identifies Class 1E divisional cables in various Auxiliary Building fire areas, and involves changes to related Tier 2 information in the Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (UFSAR). The proposed activity revises Table 3.3-3 to add a second note, Note 2, identifying that Class 1E Protection and Safety Monitoring System (PMS) interdivisional fiber-optic cables are terminated in the identified Auxiliary Building fire areas, in addition to the cable divisions currently listed for these areas. "Interdivisional" cables are defined as cables that interconnect PMS divisions, including Division A, B, C, and D cables.

*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 changes to COL Appendix C (and plant-specific Tier 1) Table 3.3-3 and UFSAR Appendix 9A do not involve any accidents which are previously evaluated. The interdivisional cables provide signals associated with some safe shutdown functions in accordance with UFSAR Subsection 7.4.1.1, which describes safe shutdown functions using safety-related systems. Therefore, these cables are required for safe shutdown. Accident analyses as described in UFSAR Ch. 15 are not changed as fire-related events in the Auxiliary Building are evaluated separately in UFSAR Appendix 9A for plant safe shutdown. A concurrent single active component failure independent of a fire is not assumed in this evaluation. Voting logic for PMS control functions is not adversely affected as the fiber-optic cables associated with these PMS cabinets in the specified fire areas function using two-out-of-four (2oo4), two-out-of-three (2oo3), or one-out-of-two (1oo2) logic. Redundant cable divisions which support PMS functions are routed separately in other fire areas and will not be affected in the event of a fire in one of the identified fire areas. PMS setpoints for reactor trip functions and engineered safeguards features (ESF) functions as described in UFSAR Table 15.0-

4a are not changed as functions provided by the PMS cabinets and cables are not adversely affected. PMS is designed to operate with the loss of a single division. Existing accidents previously evaluated are not affected and do not require further analysis. As described in Appendix 9A, in no case does the spurious actuation of equipment prevent safe shutdown. This conclusion remains valid for the proposed changes.

Changes to the safe shutdown evaluation account for interdivisional fiber-optic cables inside of divisional fire areas; however, safe shutdown functions are not changed. Loss of interdivisional fiber-optic cabling is not a reduction in the safety of the plant as the PMS is designed to operate despite the loss of an entire division. Furthermore, fire protection analyses as described in UFSAR Appendix 9A are not adversely affected by this activity as fire protection requirements and equipment are not changed. Conclusions of the associated safe shutdown evaluations are not changed. No safety-related structure, system, component (SSC) or function is adversely affected by this change. The change does not involve an interface with any SSC accident initiator or initiating sequence of events, and thus, the probabilities of the accidents evaluated in the UFSAR are not affected. The proposed changes do not involve a change to the predicted radiological releases due to postulated accident conditions, thus, the consequences of the accidents evaluated in the UFSAR are not affected.

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

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

Response: No.

The proposed changes to COL Appendix C (and plant-specific Tier 1) Table 3.3-3 and UFSAR Appendix 9A do not affect any safety-related equipment, and do not add any new interfaces to safety-related SSCs. No system or design function or equipment qualification is affected by these changes as the changes do not modify any SSCs. The existing interdivisional fiber-optic Class 1E cable routing is acceptable because redundant PMS divisions are routed in separate fire areas and can perform safe shutdown functions as required. Redundant cable divisions will not be affected in the event of a fire in one of the identified fire areas. PMS is designed to operate with the loss of a single division. PMS control functions continue being performed using reduced coincidence logic in the event of a fire when a single division is lost.

The changes do not introduce a new failure mode, malfunction or sequence of events that could affect safety or safety-related equipment. Safe shutdown functions are not changed as a result of this activity as the loss of an entire divisional room does not disable safe shutdown functions. Separation of cables in the designated Auxiliary Building fire areas is not adversely impacted. A concurrent single active component failure

independent of a fire is not assumed in this evaluation as described in UFSAR Appendix 9A. There is no adverse impact to any other fire areas or safe shutdown functions listed in COL Appendix C (and plant-specific Tier 1) Table 3.3-3 and UFSAR Appendix 9A. Changes to the identified cables in the specified fire areas do not affect the operator's ability to safely shut down the plant in the event of a fire. Safe shutdown conclusions identified for each fire area are not changed by these activities as safe shutdown functions are not affected.

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

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

Response: No.

The changes to COL Appendix C (and plant-specific Tier 1) Table 3.3-3 and UFSAR Appendix 9A design information, including fire areas 1201 AF 02, 1201 AF 03, 1202 AF 03, and 1202 AF 04, do not adversely affect the safety-related functions of the safe shutdown Class 1E divisions or any function associated with safe shutdown.

Interdivisional fiber-optic cabling is not adversely affected and plant control functions are not changed as PMS is designed to operate with a loss of a single division. This activity does not reduce the margin of safety regarding fire protection within the plant. The changes do not affect any other safety-related equipment or fission product barriers. The requested changes will not affect any design code, function, design analysis, safety analysis input or result, or design/safety margin. No safety analysis or design basis acceptance limit/criterion is challenged or exceeded by the requested changes. Redundant cables are terminated in other fire areas. Voting logic for actuation of PMS control functions is not changed and plant responses to potential spurious actuation are not adversely affected by these activities.

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

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

*Attorney for licensee:* M. Stanford Blanton, Balch & Bingham LLP, 1710 Sixth Avenue North, Birmingham, AL 35203-2015.

*NRC Branch Chief:* Jennifer Dixon-Herrity.

*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:* March 22, 2017. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML17081A484.

*Description of amendment request:* The proposed amendments would revise Technical Specification (TS) 3.7.1, "Main Steam Safety Valves (MSSVs)," to resolve a non-conservative moderator temperature coefficient value.

*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 TS for the purpose of correcting a non-conservative value. The proposed TS change does not introduce new equipment or new equipment operating modes, nor does the proposed change alter existing system relationships. The proposed change does not affect normal plant operation. Further, the proposed change does not increase the likelihood of the malfunction of any system, structure, or component, or negatively impact any analyzed accident. This change corrects the TS to ensure all associated accident analyses are adequately considered. The probability of an accident previously evaluated is not affected and there is no significant increase in 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 TS for the purpose of correcting a non-conservative value. 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 proposed change does not alter assumptions made in the safety analysis. Further, the proposed change does not introduce new accident initiators.

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 the TS for the purpose of correcting a non-conservative value. The proposed change does not alter the manner in which safety limits, limiting safety system settings, or limiting conditions for operation are determined. The safety analysis assumptions and acceptance criteria are not affected by this 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, Inc., 40 Inverness Center Parkway, Birmingham, AL 35242.

*NRC Branch Chief:* Michael T. Markley.

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

*Date of amendment request:* March 24, 2017. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML17083B097.

*Description of amendment request:* The amendments would revise Technical Specification 3.7.9, "Ultimate Heat Sink (UHS)," to extend the Completion Time to restore one inoperable nuclear service cooling water (NSCW) basin transfer pump from 31 days to 46 days. In addition, a new Condition is added to address two inoperable NSCW basin transfer pumps.

*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 amendment does not affect accident initiators or precursors nor adversely alter the design assumptions, conditions, and configuration of the facility. The proposed amendment does not alter any plant equipment or operating practices with respect to such initiators or precursors in a manner that the probability of an accident is increased.

The proposed amendment extends the time one NSCW basin transfer pump is allowed to be inoperable and provides remedial action requirements when two NSCW basin transfer pumps are inoperable. The proposed amendment does not involve a physical change to the NSCW system, nor does it change the safety function of the NSCW system or the equipment supported by the NSCW system. The UHS will remain capable of responding to a design basis event during the period of time both NSCW basin transfer pumps are unavailable. Additionally, an alternate method of NSCW cooling tower basin transfer will be implemented prior to the need for the transfer function during an

accident when one or both NSCW basin transfer pumps are inoperable. As a result, the proposed amendment does not alter assumptions relative to the mitigation of an accident or transient event.

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 accident from any accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

With respect to a new or different kind of accident, there are no [no] proposed design changes to the NSCW system, cooling tower basin transfer system, or UHS; nor are there any changes in the method by which safety related plant structures, systems, and components perform their specified safety functions. The proposed amendment will not affect the normal method of plant operation or revise any operating parameters. No new accident scenarios, transient precursor, failure mechanisms, or limiting single failures will be introduced as a result of this proposed change.

The proposed amendment does not alter the design or performance of the NSCW system, cooling towers, basin transfer system, or UHS. The proposed amendment extends the time one NSCW basin transfer pump is allowed to be inoperable and provides remedial actions when two NSCW basin transfer pumps are inoperable. The compensatory measures when two NSCW basin transfer pumps are inoperable are consistent with the compensatory measures allowed when one NSCW basin transfer pump is inoperable.

No changes are being proposed to the procedures that operate the plant equipment and the change does not have a detrimental impact on the manner in which plant equipment operates or response to an actuation signal.

Therefore, the proposed change will not create the possibility of a new or different accident previously evaluated.

3. Does the proposed change involve a significant reduction in the 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. These barriers include the fuel cladding, the reactor coolant system, and the containment. The performance of these fission product barriers will not be affected by the proposed change.

The proposed amendment extends the time one NSCW basin transfer pump is allowed to be inoperable and provides remedial action requirements when two NSCW basin transfer pumps are inoperable. The UHS will remain capable of responding to a design basis event during the extended time one inoperable NSCW basin transfer pump is unavailable and the brief period of time the NSCW basin transfer function is unavailable. An alternate method of NSCW cooling tower basin transfer will be implemented prior to the need for the transfer function during an accident. For these reasons, the NSCW system and the UHS will continue to be capable of transferring the combined heat

load of structures, systems, and components important to safety under normal and accident conditions.

Therefore, the margin to the onsite and offsite radiological dose limits are not impacted by the proposed amendment and, thus 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 35242.

*NRC Branch Chief:* Michael T. Markley.

### III. Notice of Issuance of Amendments to Facility Operating Licenses and Combined Licenses

During the period since publication of the last biweekly notice, the Commission has issued the following amendments. The Commission has determined for each of these amendments that the application complies with the standards and requirements of the 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.

*DTE Electric Company, Docket No. 50-341, Fermi 2, Monroe County, Michigan*

*Date of amendment request:* February 23, 2017, as supplemented by letter dated March 30, 2017.

*Brief description of amendment:* The amendment revised the Technical Specification requirements for the high pressure coolant injection system and reactor core isolation cooling system actuation instrumentation.

*Date of issuance:* April 14, 2017.

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

*Amendment No.:* 206. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML17076A027; documents related to this amendment are listed in the Safety Evaluation enclosed with the amendment.

*Renewed Facility Operating License No. NPF-43:* The amendment revised the Renewed Facility Operating License and Technical Specifications.

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* March 13, 2017 (82 FR 13512). The supplemental letter dated March 30, 2017, provided additional information that clarified the application, did not expand the scope of the application as originally noted, 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 and final no significant hazards determination is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated April 14, 2017.

*No significant hazards consideration comments received:* No.

*Duke Energy Progress, LLC, Docket Nos. 50-325 and 50-324, Brunswick Steam Electric Plant, Units 1 and 2, Brunswick County, North Carolina*

*Date of amendment request:* April 13, 2016, as supplemented by letter dated March 1, 2017.

*Brief description of amendments:* The amendments revised the Allowable Values (AVs) of Surveillance Requirements (SRs) contained in Technical Specification 3.3.8.2, "RPS Electric Power Monitoring," by amending the Reactor Protection System electric power monitoring assembly AVs for overvoltage and undervoltage contained within SRs 3.3.8.2.2 and 3.3.8.2.3

*Date of issuance:* April 11, 2017.

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

*Amendment Nos.:* 273 and 301. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML16343A246; documents related to these amendments are listed in the Safety Evaluation enclosed with the amendments.

*Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-71 and DPR-62:* Amendments revised the Facility Operating Licenses and Technical Specifications.

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* June 7, 2016 (81 FR 36613). The supplemental letter dated March 1, 2017, 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 April 11, 2017.

*No significant hazards consideration comments received:* No.

*South Carolina Electric & Gas Company and South Carolina Public Service Authority, Docket Nos. 52-027 and 52-028, Virgil C. Summer Nuclear Station, Units 2 and 3, Fairfield, South Carolina*

*Date of amendment request:* September 15, 2016.

*Brief description of amendments:* The amendments changed Combined License Nos. NPF-93 and NPF-94 for the Virgil C. Summer Nuclear Station, Units 2 and 3. The amendments changed the Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (UFSAR) in the form of departures from the incorporated plant-specific Design Control Document (DCD) Tier 2\* information. Specifically, the changes revised the combined operating licenses and clarify information in WCAP-17179, "AP1000® Component Interface Module Technical Report," which demonstrates design compliance with licensing bases requirements. The WCAP-17179 is incorporated by reference into the UFSAR to provide additional details regarding the component interface module (CIM) system design. The amendments also proposed a change to the CIM internal power supply that will enable proper functioning of the field programmable gate arrays.

*Date of issuance:* April 12, 2017.

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

*Amendment No.:* 71. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML17040A184;

documents related to these amendments are listed in the Safety Evaluation enclosed with the amendments.

*Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-93 and NPF-94:* Amendments revised the UFSAR in the form of departures from the incorporated plant-specific DCD Tier 2\* information.

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* October 25, 2016 (81 FR 73437).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated April 12, 2017.

*No significant hazards consideration comments received:* No.

*TEX Operations Company LLC, Docket Nos. 50-445 and 50-446, Comanche Peak Nuclear Power Plant, Unit Nos. 1 and 2 (CPNPP), Somervell County, Texas*

*Date of amendment request:* April 27, 2016, as supplemented by letter dated June 30, 2016.

*Brief description of amendments:* The amendments revised the technical specifications (TSs) for CPNPP consistent with Technical Specifications Task Force (TSTF) Standard Technical Specifications Change Traveler TSTF-545, Revision 3, "TS Inservice Testing Program Removal & Clarify SR [Surveillance Requirement] Usage Rule Application to Section 5.5 Testing," dated October 21, 2015. The changes include deleting the current TS requirements for the Inservice Testing Program, adding a new defined term, "INSERVICE TESTING PROGRAM," to the TSs, and revising other TSs to reference this new defined term instead of the deleted program.

*Date of issuance:* April 13, 2017.

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

*Amendment Nos.:* Unit 1—168; Unit 2—168. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML17074A494; documents related to these amendments are listed in the Safety Evaluation enclosed with the amendments.

*Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-87 and NPF-89:* The amendments revised the Facility Operating Licenses and Technical Specifications.

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* July 19, 2016 (81 FR 46963). The supplemental letter dated June 30, 2016, 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 April 13, 2017.

*No significant hazards consideration comments received:* No.

#### **IV. Notice of Issuance of Amendments to Facility Operating Licenses and Combined Licenses and Final Determination of No Significant Hazards Consideration and Opportunity for a Hearing (Exigent Public Announcement or Emergency Circumstances)**

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 for the amendment complies with the standards and requirements of 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.

Because of exigent or emergency circumstances associated with the date the amendment was needed, there was not time for the Commission to publish, for public comment before issuance, its usual notice of consideration of issuance of amendment, proposed no significant hazards consideration determination, and opportunity for a hearing.

For exigent circumstances, the Commission has either issued a **Federal Register** notice providing opportunity for public comment or has used local media to provide notice to the public in the area surrounding a licensee's facility of the licensee's application and of the Commission's proposed determination of no significant hazards consideration. The Commission has provided a reasonable opportunity for the public to comment, using its best efforts to make available to the public means of communication for the public to respond quickly, and in the case of telephone comments, the comments have been recorded or transcribed as appropriate and the licensee has been informed of the public comments.

In circumstances where failure to act in a timely way would have resulted, for example, in derating or shutdown of a nuclear power plant or in prevention of either resumption of operation or of increase in power output up to the plant's licensed power level, the Commission may not have had an opportunity to provide for public comment on its no significant hazards

consideration determination. In such case, the license amendment has been issued without opportunity for comment. If there has been some time for public comment but less than 30 days, the Commission may provide an opportunity for public comment. If comments have been requested, it is so stated. In either event, the State has been consulted by telephone whenever possible.

Under its regulations, the Commission may issue and make an amendment immediately effective, notwithstanding the pendency before it of a request for a hearing from any person, in advance of the holding and completion of any required hearing, where it has determined that no significant hazards consideration is involved.

The Commission has applied the standards of 10 CFR 50.92 and has made a final determination that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration. The basis for this determination is contained in the documents related to this action. Accordingly, the amendments have been issued and made effective 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 51.12(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 application for amendment, (2) the amendment to Facility Operating License or Combined License, as applicable, 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.

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

Within 60 days after the date of publication of this notice, any persons (petitioner) whose interest may be affected by this action may file a request for a hearing and petition for leave to intervene (petition) with respect to the action. Petitions shall be filed in accordance with the Commission's "Agency Rules of Practice and Procedure" in 10 CFR part 2. Interested

persons should consult a current copy of 10 CFR 2.309. 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/>. Alternatively, a copy of the regulations is available at the NRC's Public Document Room, located at One White Flint North, Room O1-F21, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland 20852. If a petition is filed, the Commission or a presiding officer will rule on the petition and, if appropriate, a notice of a hearing will be issued.

As required by 10 CFR 2.309(d) the petition should specifically explain the reasons why intervention should be permitted with particular reference to the following general requirements for standing: (1) The name, address, and telephone number of the petitioner; (2) the nature of the petitioner's right under the Act to be made a party to the proceeding; (3) the nature and extent of the 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 petitioner's interest.

In accordance with 10 CFR 2.309(f), the petition must also set forth the specific contentions which the petitioner seeks to have litigated in 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 petitioner must 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 petitioner intends to rely in proving the contention at the hearing. The petitioner must also provide references to the specific sources and documents on which the petitioner intends to rely to support its position on the issue. The petition must include sufficient information to show that a genuine dispute exists with the applicant or licensee on a material issue of law or fact. Contentions must be limited to matters within the scope of the proceeding. The contention must be one which, if proven, would entitle the petitioner to relief. A petitioner who fails to satisfy the requirements at 10 CFR 2.309(f) 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. Parties have the opportunity to participate fully in the conduct of the hearing with respect to resolution of that party's admitted contentions, including the opportunity to present

evidence, consistent with the NRC's regulations, policies, and procedures.

Petitions must be filed no later than 60 days from the date of publication of this notice. Petitions and motions for leave to file new or amended contentions that are filed after the 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) through (iii). The petition must be filed in accordance with the filing instructions in the "Electronic Submissions (E-Filing)" section of this document.

If a hearing is requested, and the Commission has not made a final determination on the issue of no significant hazards consideration, the Commission will make a final determination on the issue of no significant hazards consideration. The final determination will serve to establish 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 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 the 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.

A State, local governmental body, Federally-recognized Indian Tribe, or agency thereof, may submit a petition to the Commission to participate as a party under 10 CFR 2.309(h)(1). The petition should state the nature and extent of the petitioner's interest in the proceeding. The petition should be submitted to the Commission by July 10, 2017. The petition must be filed in accordance with the filing instructions in the "Electronic Submissions (E-Filing)" section of this document, and should meet the requirements for petitions set forth in this section, except that under 10 CFR 2.309(h)(2) a State, local governmental body, or federally recognized Indian Tribe, or agency thereof does not need to address the standing requirements in 10 CFR 2.309(d) if the facility is located within its boundaries. Alternatively, a State, local governmental body, Federally-recognized Indian Tribe, or agency thereof may participate as a non-party under 10 CFR 2.315(c).

If a hearing is granted, any person who is not a party to the proceeding and is not affiliated with or represented by a party may, at the discretion of the presiding officer, be permitted to make a limited appearance pursuant to the provisions of 10 CFR 2.315(a). A person making a limited appearance may make an oral or written statement of his or her position on the issues but may not otherwise participate in the proceeding. A limited appearance may be made at any session of the hearing or at any prehearing conference, subject to the limits and conditions as may be imposed by the presiding officer. Details regarding the opportunity to make a limited appearance will be provided by the presiding officer if such sessions are scheduled.

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

All documents filed in NRC adjudicatory proceedings, including a request for hearing and petition for leave to intervene (petition), 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 that request to participate under 10 CFR 2.315(c), must be filed in accordance with the NRC's E-Filing rule (72 FR 49139; August 28, 2007, as amended at 77 FR 46562, August 3, 2012). 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. Detailed guidance on making electronic submissions may be found in the Guidance for Electronic Submissions to the NRC and on the NRC Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/e-submittals.html>. Participants may not submit paper copies of their filings unless they seek an exemption in accordance with the procedures described below.

To comply with the procedural requirements of E-Filing, at least 10 days prior to the filing deadline, the participant should contact the Office of the Secretary by email at [hearing.docket@nrc.gov](mailto:hearing.docket@nrc.gov), or by telephone at 301-415-1677, to (1) request a digital identification (ID) certificate, which allows the participant (or its counsel or representative) to digitally sign submissions and access the E-Filing system for any proceeding in which it is participating; and (2) advise the Secretary that the participant will be submitting a petition or other adjudicatory document (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>. Once a participant has obtained a digital ID certificate and a docket has been created, the participant can then submit adjudicatory documents. Submissions must be in Portable Document Format (PDF). Additional guidance on PDF submissions is available on the NRC's public Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/electronic-sub-ref-mat.html>. A filing is considered complete at the time the document is 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 document on those participants separately. Therefore, applicants and other participants (or their counsel or representative) must apply for and receive a digital ID certificate before adjudicatory documents are filed so that they can obtain access to the documents via the E-Filing system.

A person filing electronically using the NRC's adjudicatory E-Filing system may seek assistance by contacting the NRC's Electronic Filing 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 Electronic Filing Help Desk is available between 9 a.m. and 6 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 stating why there is good cause for not filing electronically and 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, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland, 20852, Attention: Rulemaking and Adjudications Staff. Participants filing adjudicatory documents 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 <https://adams.nrc.gov/ehd>, unless excluded pursuant to an order of the Commission or the presiding officer. If you do not have an NRC-issued digital ID certificate as described above, click cancel when the link requests certificates and you will be automatically directed to the NRC's electronic hearing dockets where you will be able to access any publicly available documents in a particular hearing docket. Participants are requested not to include personal privacy information, such as social security numbers, home addresses, or personal phone numbers in their filings, unless an NRC regulation or other law requires submission of such information. For example, in some instances, individuals provide home addresses in order to demonstrate proximity to a facility or site. 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.

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

*Date of amendment request:* April 4, 2017, as supplemented by letter dated April 8, 2017.

*Description of amendment request:* The amendment is a one-time change to the licensing basis for the service water cooling tower, which provides the

standby seismically qualified ultimate heat sink for Seabrook Station, Unit No. 1, to be removed from service for maintenance on the cooling tower basin with the reactor plant in operational Modes 5 or 6, cold shutdown or refueling, respectively, during the April 2017 refueling outage. During the maintenance period, the normal heat sink provided by the non-seismic tunnel access to the Atlantic Ocean would remain in service.

*Date of issuance:* April 13, 2017.

*Effective date:* This license amendment is effective as of its date of issuance and shall be implemented immediately for the period that Seabrook Station, Unit No. 1, is in Modes 5 and 6 during the April 2017 refueling outage.

*Amendment No.:* 155. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML17102A889; documents related to this amendment are listed in the Safety Evaluation enclosed with the amendment.

*Facility Operating License No. NPF-86:* Amendment revised the Facility Operating License licensing basis.

*Public comments requested as to proposed no significant hazards consideration (NSHC):* Yes. The *Portsmouth Herald* and *The Boston Globe* on April 10, 2017, and April 11, 2017. The notice provided an opportunity to submit comments on the Commission's proposed NSHC determination. A public comment was received and addressed in the Safety Evaluation.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment, finding of exigent circumstances, state consultation, and final NSHC determination are contained in a Safety Evaluation dated April 13, 2017.

*Attorney for licensee:* William Blair, Managing Attorney—Nuclear Florida Power & Light Company, P.O. Box 14000, Juno Beach, FL 33408-0420.

*NRC Branch Chief:* James G. Danna.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 28th day of April 2017.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Kathryn M. Brock,**

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

[FR Doc. 2017-09345 Filed 5-8-17; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7590-01-P**

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[NRC-2017-0104]

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

**AGENCY:** Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**ACTION:** Biweekly notice; correction.

**SUMMARY:** The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is correcting a notice that was published in the **Federal Register** (FR) on April 25, 2017, regarding notice of issuance of amendments to facility operating licenses and combined licenses. This action is necessary to correct an administrative error.

**DATES:** The correction is effective May 9, 2017.

**ADDRESSES:** Please refer to Docket ID NRC-2017-0104 when contacting the NRC about the availability of information regarding this document. You may obtain publicly-available information related to this document using any of the following methods:

- *Federal Rulemaking Web site:* Go to <http://www.regulations.gov> and search for Docket ID NRC-2017-0104. 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.

- *NRC's Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS):* You may obtain publicly available documents online in the ADAMS Public Documents collection at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html>. To begin the search, select "ADAMS Public Documents" and then select "Begin Web-based ADAMS Search." For problems with ADAMS, please contact the NRC's Public Document Room (PDR) reference staff at 1-800-397-4209, 301-415-4737, or by email to [pdr.resource@nrc.gov](mailto:pdr.resource@nrc.gov).

- *NRC's PDR:* You may examine and purchase copies of public documents at the NRC's PDR, Room O1-F21, One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland 20852.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** V. Sreenivas, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001; telephone: 301-415-2597, email: [V.Sreenivas@nrc.gov](mailto:V.Sreenivas@nrc.gov).