

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.
Margaret W. O'Banion,
*Project Manager, Plant Licensing Branch IV,
Division of Operating Reactor Licensing,
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*
[FR Doc. 2018-01799 Filed 1-29-18; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[NRC-2018-0012]

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 December 30, 2017, to January 12, 2018. The last biweekly notice was published on January 16, 2018.

DATES: Comments must be filed by March 1, 2018. A request for a hearing must be filed by April 2, 2018.

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

- *Federal Rulemaking website:* Go to <http://www.regulations.gov> and search for Docket ID NRC-2018-0012. Address questions about NRC dockets to Carol Gallagher; telephone: 301-415-3463; email: Carol.Gallagher@nrc.gov. For technical questions, contact the individual listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section of this document.

- *Mail comments to:* May Ma, Office of Administration, Mail Stop: OWFN-2-A13, 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:

Lynn Ronewicz, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington DC 20555-0001; telephone: 301-415-1927, email: Lynn.Ronewicz@nrc.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Obtaining Information and Submitting Comments

A. Obtaining Information

Please refer to Docket ID NRC-2018-0012, 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 website:* Go to <http://www.regulations.gov> and search for Docket ID NRC-2018-0012.
- *NRC's Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS):* You may obtain publicly-available documents online in the ADAMS Public Documents collection at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html>. To begin the search, select "ADAMS Public Documents" and then select "Begin Web-based ADAMS Search." For problems with ADAMS, please contact the NRC's Public Document Room (PDR) reference staff at 1-800-397-4209, 301-415-4737, or by email to pdr.resource@nrc.gov. The ADAMS accession number for each document referenced (if it is available in ADAMS) is provided the first time that it is mentioned in 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-2018-0012, 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's Library on the NRC's website 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 no later than 60 days from the date of publication of this notice. 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 website 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, 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 website 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 website 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 website at <http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/e-submittals.html>, by email to MSHD.Resource@nrc.gov, or by a toll-free call at 1-866-672-7640. The NRC 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 accessing information related to this document, see the "Obtaining Information and Submitting Comments" section of this document.

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

Date of amendment request: September 8, 2017. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML17255A463.

Description of amendment request: The amendment would revise the RBS Technical Specifications (TSs) by adding a new specification related to "Control Building Air Conditioning (AC) System," TS Limiting Condition for Operation 3.7.7. This new TS specifically would address the AC function for switchgear and other electrical equipment located in the RBS control building. A TS Surveillance Requirement 3.7.7.1 would be added to verify that the control building AC (CBAC) system has the capability to remove the assumed heat load. The proposed amendment also requests a correction to the RBS license antitrust conditions, Appendix C, due to an administrative error.

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 addition of Technical Specification (TS) 3.7.7 creates a Limiting Condition for Operation (LCO) for the CBAC system required to support TS equipment. The Completion Time presented in the proposed TS is consistent with other [engineered safety feature (ESF)] mechanical system Completion Times and is supported by the inputs used in the current analysis.

The CBAC systems, including the Control Building Heating, Ventilation, and Air Conditioning (HVAC) and the Control Building Chilled Water systems, are designed for the mitigation of design basis accidents or transients, such as a Loss of Coolant Accident (LOCA). They are not designed, nor do they serve, for the prevention of those events. Consequently, the proposed amendment does not increase the probability of a previously evaluated accident occurring.

Should an accident occur during the period of time that one subsystem of the CBAC system is out of service, the other subsystem components would serve to provide the minimum required air conditioning and chilled water assumed in the accident analysis. Therefore, the radiological consequences of associated accidents assuming no additional failures are not impacted by the proposed amendment.

Therefore, it is concluded that this change does not significantly increase 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 previously evaluated?

Response: No.

The proposed change provides a new technical specification providing a new completion time [(CT)] for one CBAC subsystem out of service CT. The change does not involve any unanalyzed modifications to the design or operational limits. The new CT does not introduce any new or unanalyzed modes of operation. No new accident scenarios, failure mechanisms or limiting single failures are introduced as result of the proposed change. The change has no adverse effects on any safety related system. Therefore, no new failure modes or accident precursors are created.

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 change involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety?

Response: No.

The proposed change does not change any accident analyses. The proposed change does not exceed or alter a design basis or safety limit, including limits on Control Building temperatures; therefore it does not significantly reduce the margin of safety. The proposed change establishes TS Allowed Outage Times for CBAC which are longer than the current governing LCO's. The risk implications of this amendment request were evaluated and found to be acceptable.

During the proposed Completion Time, the supported systems will remain capable of providing adequate airflow and chilled water to maintain the supported systems capable of mitigating the consequences of a design basis event such as LOCA with no additional single failure.

The proposed change does not impact accident offsite dose, containment pressure or temperature, emergency core cooling system (ECCS) or reactor protection system (RPS) settings or other parameter that could affect a margin of safety.

Therefore, it is concluded that this change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

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

Attorney for licensee: William B. Glew, Jr., Associate General Counsel—Entergy Services, Inc., 440 Hamilton Avenue, White Plains, NY 10601.

NRC Branch Chief: Robert J. Pascarelli.

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

Date of amendment request: November 15, 2017. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML17319A898.

Description of amendment request: The amendment would revise the RBS Technical Specifications (TSs) by replacing the existing specifications related to "operation with a potential for draining the reactor vessels" (OPDRVs) with revised requirements for reactor pressure vessel (RPV) water inventory control (WIC) to protect Safety Limit 2.1.1.3. Safety Limit 2.1.1.3 requires reactor vessel water level to be greater than the top of active irradiated fuel. The proposed amendment would adopt changes, with variations as noted in the license amendment request, and is based on the NRC-approved safety evaluation for Technical Specifications Task Force (TSTF) Traveler TSTF-542, Revision 2, "Reactor Pressure Vessel Water Inventory Control," dated December 20, 2016 (ADAMS Accession No. ML16343B065).

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 replaces existing TS requirements related to OPDRVs with new requirements on RPV WIC that will protect Safety Limit 2.1.1.3. Draining of RPV water inventory in Mode 4 (*i.e.*, cold shutdown) and Mode 5 (*i.e.*, refueling) is not an accident previously evaluated and, therefore, replacing the existing TS controls to prevent or mitigate such an event with a new set of controls has no effect on any accident previously evaluated. RPV water inventory control in Mode 4 or Mode 5 is not an initiator of any accident previously

evaluated. The existing OPDRV controls or the proposed RPV WIC controls are not mitigating actions assumed in any accident previously evaluated.

The proposed change reduces the probability of an unexpected draining event (which is not a previously evaluated accident) by imposing new requirements on the limiting time in which an unexpected draining event could result in the reactor vessel water level dropping to the top of the active fuel (TAF). These controls require cognizance of the plant configuration and control of configurations with unacceptably short drain times. These requirements reduce the probability of an unexpected draining event. The current TS requirements are only mitigating actions and impose no requirements that reduce the probability of an unexpected draining event.

The proposed change reduces the consequences of an unexpected draining event (which is not a previously evaluated accident) by requiring an Emergency Core Cooling System (ECCS) subsystem to be operable at all times in Modes 4 and 5. The current TS requirements do not require any water injection systems, ECCS or otherwise, to be Operable in certain conditions in Mode 5. The change in requirement from two ECCS subsystems to one ECCS subsystem in Modes 4 and 5 does not significantly affect the consequences of an unexpected draining event because the proposed Actions ensure equipment is available within the limiting drain time that is as capable of mitigating the event as the current requirements.

The proposed controls provide escalating compensatory measures to be established as calculated drain times decrease, such as verification of a second method of water injection and additional confirmations that containment and/or filtration would be available if needed.

The proposed change reduces or eliminates some requirements that were determined to be unnecessary to manage the consequences of an unexpected draining event, such as automatic initiation of an ECCS subsystem and control room ventilation. These changes do not affect the consequences of any accident previously evaluated since a draining event in Modes 4 and 5 is not a previously evaluated accident and the requirements are not needed to adequately respond to a draining 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 amendment create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated?

Response: No.

The proposed change replaces existing TS requirements related to OPDRVs with new requirements on RPV WIC that will protect Safety Limit 2.1.1.3. The proposed change will not alter the design function of the equipment involved. Under the proposed change, some systems that are currently required to be operable during OPDRVs would be required to be available within the limiting drain time or to be in service depending on the limiting drain time. Should those systems be unable to be placed into

service, the consequences are no different than if those systems were unable to perform their function under the current TS requirements.

The event of concern under the current requirements and the proposed change is an unexpected draining event. The proposed change does not create new failure mechanisms, malfunctions, or accident initiators that would cause a draining event or a new or different kind of accident not previously evaluated or included in the design and licensing bases.

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 a margin of safety?

Response: No.

The proposed change replaces existing TS requirements related to OPDRVs with new requirements on RPV WIC. The current requirements do not have a stated safety basis and no margin of safety is established in the licensing basis. The safety basis for the new requirements is to protect Safety Limit 2.1.1.3. New requirements are added to determine the limiting time in which the RPV water inventory could drain to the top of the fuel in the reactor vessel should an unexpected draining event occur. Plant configurations that could result in lowering the RPV water level to the TAF within one hour are now prohibited. New escalating compensatory measures based on the limiting drain time replace the current controls. The proposed TS establish a safety margin by providing defense-in-depth to ensure that the Safety Limit is protected and to protect the public health and safety. While some less restrictive requirements are proposed for plant configurations with long calculated drain times, the overall effect of the change is to improve plant safety and to add safety margin.

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

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

Attorney for licensee: William B. Glew, Jr., Associate General Counsel—Entergy Services, Inc., 440 Hamilton Avenue, White Plains, NY 10601.

NRC Branch Chief: Robert J. Pascarelli.

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

Date of amendment request: December 6, 2017. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML17347A788.

Description of amendment request: The amendment would add, replace,

and modify numerous technical specification (TS) requirements related to operations that have the potential for draining the reactor vessel (OPDRVs) with new requirements on reactor pressure vessel water inventory control (RPV WIC) to protect TS Safety Limit 2.1.1.3. The proposed changes are based on Technical Specifications Task Force (TSTF) Traveler TSTF-542, "Reactor Pressure Vessel Water Inventory Control."

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 replaces existing TS requirements related to OPDRVs with new requirements on RPV WIC that will protect Safety Limit 2.1.1.3. Draining of RPV water inventory in Mode 4, (*i.e.*, cold shutdown) and Mode 5 (*i.e.*, refueling) is not an accident previously evaluated and, therefore, replacing the existing TS controls to prevent or mitigate such an event with a new set of controls has no effect on any accident previously evaluated. RPV water inventory control in Mode 4 or Mode 5 is not an initiator of any accident previously evaluated. The existing OPDRV controls or the proposed RPV WIC controls are not mitigating actions assumed in any accident previously evaluated.

The proposed change reduces the probability of an unexpected draining event (which is not a previously evaluated accident) by imposing new requirements on the limiting time in which an unexpected draining event could result in the reactor vessel water level dropping to the top of active fuel (TAF). These controls require cognizance of the plant configuration and control of configurations with unacceptably short drain times. These requirements reduce the probability of an unexpected draining event. The current TS requirements are only mitigating actions and impose no requirements that reduce the probability of an unexpected draining event.

The proposed change reduces the consequences of an unexpected draining event (which is not a previously evaluated accident) by requiring an Emergency Core Cooling System (ECCS) subsystem to be operable at all times in Modes 4 and 5. The current TS requirements do not require any water injection systems, ECCS or otherwise, to be Operable in certain conditions in Mode 5. The change in requirement from two ECCS subsystems to one ECCS subsystem in Modes 4 and 5 does not significantly affect the consequences of an unexpected draining event because the proposed Actions ensure equipment is available within the limiting drain time that is capable of mitigating the event as the current requirements. The

proposed controls provide escalating compensatory measures to be established as calculated drain times decrease, such as verification of a second method of water injection and additional confirmations that containment and/or filtration would be available if needed.

The proposed change reduces or eliminates some requirements that were determined to be unnecessary to manage the consequences of an unexpected draining event, such as automatic initiation of an ECCS subsystem and control room ventilation. These changes do not affect the consequences of any accident previously evaluated since a draining event in Modes 4 and 5 is not a previously evaluated accident and the requirements are not needed to adequately respond to a draining 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 amendment create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

The proposed change replaces existing TS requirements related to OPDRVs with new requirements on RPV WIC that will protect Safety Limit 2.1.1.3. The proposed change will not alter the design function of the equipment involved. Under the proposed change, some systems that are currently required to be operable during OPDRVs would be required to be available within the limiting drain time or to be in service depending on the limiting drain time. Should those systems be unable to be placed into service, the consequences are no different than if those systems were unable to perform their function under the current TS requirements.

The event of concern under the current requirements and the proposed change is an unexpected draining event. The proposed change does not create new failure mechanisms, malfunctions, or accident initiators that would cause a draining event or a new or different kind of accident not previously evaluated or included in the design and license bases.

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 amendment involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety?

Response: No.

The proposed change replaces existing TS requirements related to OPDRVs with new requirements on RPV WIC. The current requirements do not have a stated safety basis and no margin of safety is established in the license basis. The safety basis for the new requirements is to protect Safety Limit 2.1.1.3. New requirements are added to determine the limiting time in which the RPV water inventory could drain to the top of the fuel in the reactor vessel should an unexpected draining event occur. Plant configurations that could result in lowering the RPV water level to the TAF within one hour are now prohibited. New escalating compensatory measures based on the limiting

drain time replace the current controls. The proposed TS establish a safety margin by providing defense-in-depth to ensure that the Safety Limit is protected and to protect the public health and safety. While some less restrictive requirements are proposed for plant configurations with long calculated drain times, the overall effect of the change is to improve plant safety and to add safety margin.

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: David W. Jenkins, FirstEnergy Corporation, Mail Stop A-GO-15, 76 South Main Street, Akron, OH 44308.

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: September 21, 2017. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML17265A847.

Description of amendment request: The amendment would revise the Hope Creek Generating Station Technical Specifications (TSs) by replacing the existing specifications related to "operation with a potential for draining the reactor vessel" (OPDRV) with revised requirements for reactor pressure vessel (RPV) water inventory control (WIC) to protect Safety Limit 2.1.4. Safety Limit 2.1.4 requires reactor vessel water level to be greater than the top of active irradiated fuel. The amendment would adopt changes with variations as noted in the license amendment request and is based on the NRC-approved safety evaluation for Technical Specifications Task Force (TSTF) Traveler TSTF-542, Revision 2, "Reactor Pressure Vessel Water Inventory Control," dated December 20, 2016.

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 replaces existing TS requirements related to OPDRVs with new

requirements on RPV WIC that will protect Safety Limit 2.1.4. Draining of RPV water inventory in OPCON [Operational Condition] 4 (*i.e.*, cold shutdown) and OPCON 5 (*i.e.*, refueling) is not an accident previously evaluated and, therefore, replacing the existing TS controls to prevent or mitigate such an event with a new set of controls has no effect on any accident previously evaluated. RPV water inventory control in OPCON 4 or OPCON 5 is not an initiator of any accident previously evaluated. The existing OPDRV controls or the proposed RPV WIC controls are not mitigating actions assumed in any accident previously evaluated.

The proposed change reduces the probability of an unexpected draining event (which is not a previously evaluated accident) by imposing new requirements on the limiting time in which an unexpected draining event could result in the reactor vessel water level dropping to the top of the active fuel (TAF). These controls require cognizance of the plant configuration and control of configurations with unacceptably short drain times. These requirements reduce the probability of an unexpected draining event. The current TS requirements are only mitigating actions and impose no requirements that reduce the probability of an unexpected draining event.

The proposed change reduces the consequences of an unexpected draining event (which is not a previously evaluated accident) by requiring an Emergency Core Cooling System (ECCS) subsystem to be operable at all times in OPCONs 4 and 5. The current TS requirements do not require any water injection systems, ECCS or otherwise, to be Operable in certain conditions in OPCON 5. The change in requirement from two ECCS subsystems to one ECCS subsystem in OPCONs 4 and 5 does not significantly affect the consequences of an unexpected draining event because the proposed Actions ensure equipment is available within the limiting drain time that is as capable of mitigating the event as the current requirements. The proposed controls provide escalating compensatory measures to be established as calculated drain times decrease, such as verification of a second method of water injection and additional confirmations that containment and/or filtration would be available if needed.

The proposed change reduces or eliminates some requirements that were determined to be unnecessary to manage the consequences of an unexpected draining event, such as automatic initiation of an ECCS subsystem and control room ventilation. These changes do not affect the consequences of any accident previously evaluated since a draining event in Modes 4 and 5 is not a previously evaluated accident and the requirements are not needed to adequately respond to a draining 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 amendment create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated?

Response: No.

The proposed change replaces existing TS requirements related to OPDRVs with new requirements on RPV WIC that will protect Safety Limit 2.1.4. The proposed change will not alter the design function of the equipment involved. Under the proposed change, some systems that are currently required to be operable during OPDRVs would be required to be available within the limiting drain time or to be in service depending on the limiting drain time. Should those systems be unable to be placed into service, the consequences are no different than if those systems were unable to perform their function under the current TS requirements.

The event of concern under the current requirements and the proposed change is an unexpected draining event. The proposed change does not create new failure mechanisms, malfunctions, or accident initiators that would cause a draining event or a new or different kind of accident not previously evaluated or included in the design and licensing bases.

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 a margin of safety?

Response: No.

The proposed change replaces existing TS requirements related to OPDRVs with new requirements on RPV WIC. The current requirements do not have a stated safety basis and no margin of safety is established in the licensing basis. The safety basis for the new requirements is to protect Safety Limit 2.1.4. New requirements are added to determine the limiting time in which the RPV water inventory could drain to the top of the fuel in the reactor vessel should an unexpected draining event occur. Plant configurations that could result in lowering the RPV water level to the TAF within one hour are now prohibited. New escalating compensatory measures based on the limiting drain time replace the current controls. The proposed TS establish a safety margin by providing defense-in-depth to ensure that the Safety Limit is protected and to protect the public health and safety. While some less restrictive requirements are proposed for plant configurations with long calculated drain times, the overall effect of the change is to improve plant safety and to add safety margin.

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.

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

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

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

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

For further details with respect to the action see (1) the applications for amendment, (2) the amendment, and (3) the Commission's related letter, Safety Evaluation and/or Environmental Assessment as indicated. All of these items can be accessed as described in the "Obtaining Information and Submitting Comments" section of this document.

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

Date of amendment request: December 15, 2016, as supplemented by letters dated June 8, 2017, and July 17, 2017.

Brief description of amendments: The amendments modified Technical Specification (TS) 3.9.4, "Residual Heat Removal (RHR) and Coolant Circulation—High Water Level," and TS 3.9.5, "Residual Heat Removal (RHR) and Coolant Circulation—Low Water Level." Condition A of TS 3.9.4 applies

when RHR requirements are not met and includes four required actions. Required Action A.4 requires, within 4 hours, the closure of all containment penetrations providing direct access from containment atmosphere to outside atmosphere. The proposed changes revise Required Action A.4 and add new Required Actions A.5, A.6.1, and A.6.2 to clarify that the intent of the required actions is to establish containment closure. Each of these required actions will have a completion time of 4 hours. Condition B of TS 3.9.5 applies when no RHR loop is in operation and includes three required actions. Required Action B.3 requires the closure of all containment penetrations providing direct access from containment atmosphere to outside atmosphere. The proposed changes are the same as the proposed changes to TS 3.9.4, consisting of a revision to Required Action B.3 and the addition of new Required Actions B.4, B.5.1, and B.5.2. These proposed changes are consistent with Technical Specifications Task Force (TSTF) Traveler TSTF-197-A, Revision 2, "Require Containment Closure When Shutdown Cooling Requirements Are Not Met."

Date of issuance: January 4, 2018.

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

Amendment Nos.: 297 (Unit 1) and 293 (Unit 2). A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML17296A208; documents related to these amendments are listed in the Safety Evaluation enclosed with the amendments.

Renewed Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-35 and NPF-52: Amendments revised the Renewed Licenses and TSs.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: May 23, 2017 (82 FR 23618).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated January 4, 2018.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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: January 11, 2017, as supplemented by letter dated June 8, 2017.

Brief description of amendments: The amendments modified Technical Specification (TS) 3.9.4, "Residual Heat Removal (RHR) and Coolant Circulation—High Water Level," and TS 3.9.5, "Residual Heat Removal (RHR) and Coolant Circulation—Low Water Level." Condition A of TS 3.9.4 applies when RHR requirements are not met

and includes four required actions. Required Action A.4 requires, within 4 hours, the closure of all containment penetrations providing direct access from containment atmosphere to outside atmosphere. The proposed changes revise Required Action A.4 and add new Required Actions A.5, A.6.1, and A.6.2 to clarify that the intent of the required actions is to establish containment closure. Each of these required actions will have a completion time of 4 hours. Condition B of TS 3.9.5 applies when no RHR loop is in operation and includes three required actions. Required Action B.3 requires the closure of all containment penetrations providing direct access from containment atmosphere to outside atmosphere. The proposed changes are the same as the proposed changes to TS 3.9.4, consisting of a revision to Required Action B.3 and the addition of new Required Actions B.4, B.5.1, and B.5.2. These proposed changes are consistent with Technical Specifications Task Force (TSTF) Traveler TSTF-197-A, Revision 2, "Require Containment Closure When Shutdown Cooling Requirements Are Not Met."

Date of issuance: January 5, 2018.

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

Amendment Nos.: 305 (Unit 1) and 284 (Unit 2). A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML17297A917; documents related to these amendments are listed in the Safety Evaluation enclosed with the amendments.

Renewed Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-9 and NPF-17: Amendments revised the Renewed Licenses and TSs.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: May 23, 2017 (82 FR 23619).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated January 5, 2018.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: Yes. One comment from a member of the public was received; however, it was not related to the proposed no significant hazards consideration determination or to the proposed license amendment request.

Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc., Docket No. 50-247, Indian Point Nuclear Generating Unit No. 2, Westchester County, New York

Date of amendment request: April 7, 2017, as supplemented by letter dated August 17, 2017.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revised Technical Specification Section 3.5.4, "Refueling Water Storage Tank (RWST)," to allow for the temporary connection between

the non-seismically qualified piping of the boric acid recovery system to the seismically qualified piping of the RWST for the purpose of purifying the contents of the RWST in advance of the Indian Point Nuclear Generating Unit No. 2 spring 2018 refueling outage. Operation in this mode will be under administrative controls and will only be applicable through the end of the spring 2018 refueling outage.

Date of issuance: January 11, 2018.

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

Amendment No.: 288. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML17348A695; documents related to this amendment are listed in the Safety Evaluation enclosed with the amendment.

Facility Operating License No. DPR-26: The amendment revised the Facility Operating License and Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: July 18, 2017 (82 FR 32881). The supplemental letter dated August 17, 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 amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated January 11, 2018.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Entergy Operations, Inc.; System Energy Resources, Inc.; Cooperative Energy, A Mississippi Electric Cooperative; and Entergy Mississippi, Inc., Docket No. 50-416, Grand Gulf Nuclear Station, Unit 1 (GGNS), Claiborne County, Mississippi

Date of amendment request: December 29, 2016, as supplemented by letter dated August 25, 2017.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment modified GGNS Technical Specification (TS) 5.5.12, "10 CFR Appendix J, Testing Program," and TS Surveillance Requirement 3.6.5.1.1 to allow for a one cycle extension to the 10-year frequency of the GGNS containment leakage rate test (*i.e.*, Integrated Leakage Rate Test or Type A test) and the drywell bypass leakage rate test, respectively.

Date of issuance: December 29, 2017.

Effective date: As of the date of issuance and shall be implemented by February 18, 2018.

Amendment No.: 214. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under

Accession No. ML17334A739; documents related to this amendment are listed in the Safety Evaluation enclosed with the amendment.

Renewed Facility Operating License No. NPF-29: The amendment revised the Renewed Facility Operating License and TSs.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: May 23, 2017 (82 FR 23625). The supplemental letter dated August 25, 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 amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated December 29, 2017.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

Date of amendment request: February 10, 2017, as supplemented by letters dated July 13, December 20, and December 21, 2017.

Brief description of amendments: The amendments revised the DNPS, Unit Nos. 2 and 3, Technical Specifications (TSs) by replacing the existing specifications related to "operations with a potential for draining the reactor vessel" with revised requirements for reactor pressure vessel water inventory control to protect Safety Limit 2.1.1.3. Safety Limit 2.1.1.3 requires reactor vessel water level to be greater than the top of active irradiated fuel. The amendments adopt changes, with variations, as noted in the license amendment request, and are based on the NRC-approved safety evaluation for Technical Specifications Task Force (TSTF) Traveler TSTF-542, Revision 2, "Reactor Pressure Vessel Water Inventory Control," dated December 20, 2016.

Date of issuance: January 8, 2018.

Effective date: As of the date of issuance and shall be implemented prior to the beginning of the DNPS, Unit No. 3, refueling outage currently planned for fall of 2018.

Amendment Nos.: 256 (Unit No. 2) and 249 (Unit No. 3). A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML17272A783; documents related to these amendments are listed in the Safety Evaluation enclosed with the amendments.

Renewed Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-19 and DPR-25: Amendments revised the Renewed Facility Operating Licenses and TSs.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: April 11, 2017 (82 FR 17457).

The supplemental letters dated July 13, December 20, and December 21, 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 January 8, 2018.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, on January 23, 2018.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Greg A. Casto,

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

[FR Doc. 2018-01469 Filed 1-29-18; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

POSTAL SERVICE

Temporary Emergency Committee of the Board of Governors; Sunshine Act Meeting

DATE AND TIME: Thursday, February 8, 2018, at 9:00 a.m.; and Friday, February 9, at 8:30 a.m.

PLACE: Washington, DC, at U.S. Postal Service Headquarters, 475 L'Enfant Plaza, SW, in the Benjamin Franklin Room.

STATUS: Thursday, February 8, 2018, at 9:00 a.m.—Closed; Friday, February 9, at 8:30 a.m.—Open.

MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED:

Thursday, February 8, 2018, at 9:00 a.m. (Closed)

1. Financial Matters.
2. Strategic Issues.
3. Executive Session—Discussion of prior agenda items and Board governance.

Friday, February 9, at 8:30 a.m. (Open)

1. Remarks of the Postmaster General and CEO and Chairman of the Temporary Emergency Committee of the Board.
2. Approval of Minutes of Previous Meetings.
3. Postal Quarter 1 Financial Report.
4. Postal Quarter 1 Service Performance Report.
5. Draft Agenda for the April 10, 2018 meetings.