

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[NRC-2013-0171]

**Applications and Amendments to Facility Operating Licenses and Combined Licenses
Involving Proposed No Significant Hazards Considerations and Containing Sensitive
Unclassified Non-Safeguards Information and Order Imposing Procedures for Access to
Sensitive Unclassified Non-Safeguards Information**

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: License amendment request; opportunity to comment, opportunity to request a hearing and petition for leave to intervene; order.

DATES: Comments must be filed by **[INSERT DATE 30 DAYS FROM DATE OF PUBLICATION]**. A request for a hearing or petition for leave to intervene must be filed by **[INSERT DATE 60 DAYS FROM DATE OF PUBLICATION]**. Any potential party as defined in Section 2.4 of Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR), who believes access to SUNSI is necessary to respond to this notice must request document access by **[INSERT DATE 10 DAYS FROM DATE OF PUBLICATION]**.

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

- **Federal Rulemaking Web site:** Go to <http://www.regulations.gov> and search for Docket ID **NRC-2013-0171**. Address questions about NRC dockets to Carol Gallagher;

telephone: 301-287-3422; e-mail: 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, Chief, Rules, Announcements, and Directives Branch (RADB), Office of Administration, Mail Stop: 3WFN, 06A44M, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Accessing Information and Submitting Comments

A. Accessing Information

Please refer to Docket ID **NRC-2013-0171** when contacting the NRC about the availability of information regarding this document. You may access publicly-available information related to this action by the following methods:

- **Federal Rulemaking Web site:** Go to <http://www.regulations.gov> and search for Docket ID **NRC-2013-0171**.

- **NRC’s Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS):** You may access publicly-available documents online in the NRC Library 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 e-mail to pdr.resource@nrc.gov. The ADAMS accession number for each

document referenced in this notice (if that document is available in ADAMS) is provided the first time that a document is referenced.

- **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-2013-0171** in the subject line of your comment submission, in order to ensure that the NRC is able to make your comment submission available to the public in this docket.

The NRC cautions you not to include identifying or contact information that you do not want to be publicly disclosed in your comment submission. The NRC posts all comment submissions at <http://www.regulations.gov> as well as entering the comment submissions into ADAMS. The NRC does not routinely edit comment submissions to remove identifying or contact information.

If you are requesting or aggregating comments from other persons for submission to the NRC, then you should inform those persons not to include identifying or contact information that they do not want to be publicly disclosed in their comment submission. Your request should state that the NRC does not routinely edit comment submissions to remove such information before making the comment submissions available to the public or entering the comment submissions into ADAMS.

II. Background

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

This notice includes notices of amendments containing SUNSI.

Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendments to Facility Operating Licenses and Combined Licenses, Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity for a Hearing

The Commission has made a proposed determination that the following amendment requests involve no significant hazards consideration. Under the Commission's regulations in 10 CFR 50.92, this means that operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; or (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. The basis for this proposed determination for each amendment request is shown below.

The Commission is seeking public comments on this proposed determination. Any comments received within 30 days after the date of publication of this notice will be considered in making any final determination.

Normally, the Commission will not issue the amendment until the expiration of 60 days after the date of publication of this notice. The Commission may issue the license amendment before expiration of the 60-day period provided that its final determination is that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration. In addition, the Commission may issue the amendment prior to the expiration of the 30-day comment period should circumstances change during the 30-day comment period such that failure to act in a timely way would result, for example in derating or shutdown of the facility. Should the Commission take action prior to the expiration of either the comment period or the notice period, it will publish in the *Federal Register* a notice of issuance. Should the Commission make a final No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, any hearing will take place after issuance. The Commission expects that the need to take this action will occur very infrequently.

Within 60 days after the date of publication of this notice, any person(s) whose interest may be affected by this action may file a request for a hearing and a petition to intervene with respect to issuance of the amendment to the subject facility operating license or combined license. Requests for a hearing and a petition for leave to intervene shall be filed in accordance with the Commission's "Agency Rules of Practice and Procedure" in 10 CFR Part 2. Interested person(s) should consult a current copy of 10 CFR 2.309, which is available at the NRC's PDR, located at One White Flint North, Room O1-F21, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland 20852. The NRC regulations are accessible electronically from the NRC Library on the NRC's Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/doc-collections/cfr/>. If a request for a hearing or petition for leave to intervene is filed within 60 days, the Commission or a presiding officer designated by the Commission or by the Chief Administrative Judge of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, will rule on the request and/or petition; and the Secretary or the

Chief Administrative Judge of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board will issue a notice of a hearing or an appropriate order.

As required by 10 CFR 2.309, a petition for leave to intervene shall set forth with particularity the interest of the petitioner in the proceeding, and how that interest may be affected by the results of the proceeding. The petition should specifically explain the reasons why intervention should be permitted with particular reference to the following general requirements: 1) the name, address, and telephone number of the requestor or petitioner; 2) the nature of the requestor's/petitioner's right under the Act to be made a party to the proceeding; 3) the nature and extent of the requestor's/petitioner's property, financial, or other interest in the proceeding; and 4) the possible effect of any decision or order which may be entered in the proceeding on the requestor's/petitioner's interest. The petition must also set forth the specific contentions which the requestor/petitioner seeks to have litigated at the proceeding.

Each contention must consist of a specific statement of the issue of law or fact to be raised or controverted. In addition, the requestor/petitioner shall provide a brief explanation of the bases for the contention and a concise statement of the alleged facts or expert opinion which support the contention and on which the requestor/petitioner intends to rely in proving the contention at the hearing. The requestor/petitioner must also provide references to those specific sources and documents of which the petitioner is aware and on which the requestor/petitioner intends to rely to establish those facts or expert opinion. The petition must include sufficient information to show that a genuine dispute exists with the applicant on a material issue of law or fact. Contentions shall be limited to matters within the scope of the amendment under consideration. The contention must be one which, if proven, would entitle

the requestor/petitioner to relief. A requestor/petitioner who fails to satisfy these requirements with respect to at least one contention will not be permitted to participate as a party.

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

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

All documents filed in NRC adjudicatory proceedings, including a request for hearing, a petition for leave to intervene, any motion or other document filed in the proceeding prior to the submission of a request for hearing or petition to intervene, and documents filed by interested governmental entities participating under 10 CFR 2.315(c), must be filed in accordance with the NRC's E-Filing rule (72 FR 49139; August 28, 2007). The E-Filing process requires participants to submit and serve all adjudicatory documents over the internet, or in some cases to mail copies on electronic storage media. Participants may not submit paper copies of their filings unless they seek an exemption in accordance with the procedures described below.

To comply with the procedural requirements of E-Filing, at least 10 days prior to the filing deadline, the participant should contact the Office of the Secretary by e-mail at

hearing.docket@nrc.gov, or by telephone at 301-415-1677, to request (1) a digital identification (ID) certificate, which allows the participant (or its counsel or representative) to digitally sign documents and access the E-Submittal server for any proceeding in which it is participating; and (2) advise the Secretary that the participant will be submitting a request or petition for hearing (even in instances in which the participant, or its counsel or representative, already holds an NRC-issued digital ID certificate). Based upon this information, the Secretary will establish an electronic docket for the hearing in this proceeding if the Secretary has not already established an electronic docket.

Information about applying for a digital ID certificate is available on the NRC's public Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/e-submittals/apply-certificates.html>. System requirements for accessing the E-Submittal server are detailed in the NRC's "Guidance for Electronic Submission," which is available on the agency's public Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/e-submittals.html>. Participants may attempt to use other software not listed on the Web site, but should note that the NRC's E-Filing system does not support unlisted software, and the NRC Meta System Help Desk will not be able to offer assistance in using unlisted software.

If a participant is electronically submitting a document to the NRC in accordance with the E-Filing rule, the participant must file the document using the NRC's online, Web-based submission form. In order to serve documents through the Electronic Information Exchange System, users will be required to install a Web browser plug-in from the NRC's Web site. Further information on the Web-based submission form, including the installation of the Web browser plug-in, is available on the NRC's public Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/e-submittals.html>.

Once a participant has obtained a digital ID certificate and a docket has been created, the participant can then submit a request for hearing or petition for leave to intervene. Submissions should be in Portable Document Format (PDF) in accordance with the NRC's guidance available on the NRC's public Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/e-submittals.html>. A filing is considered complete at the time the documents are submitted through the NRC's E-Filing system. To be timely, an electronic filing must be submitted to the E-Filing system no later than 11:59 p.m. Eastern Time on the due date. Upon receipt of a transmission, the E-Filing system time-stamps the document and sends the submitter an e-mail notice confirming receipt of the document. The E-Filing system also distributes an e-mail notice that provides access to the document to the NRC's Office of the General Counsel and any others who have advised the Office of the Secretary that they wish to participate in the proceeding, so that the filer need not serve the documents on those participants separately. Therefore, applicants and other participants (or their counsel or representative) must apply for and receive a digital ID certificate before a hearing request/petition to intervene is filed so that they can obtain access to the document via the E-Filing system.

A person filing electronically using the agency's adjudicatory E-Filing system may seek assistance by contacting the NRC Meta System Help Desk through the "Contact Us" link located on the NRC's Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/e-submittals.html>, by e-mail to MSHD.Resource@nrc.gov, or by a toll-free call at 1-866-672-7640. The NRC Meta System Help Desk is available between 8 a.m. and 8 p.m., Eastern Time, Monday through Friday, excluding government holidays.

Participants who believe that they have a good cause for not submitting documents electronically must file an exemption request, in accordance with 10 CFR 2.302(g), with their initial paper filing requesting authorization to continue to submit documents in paper format.

Such filings must be submitted by: (1) first class mail addressed to the Office of the Secretary of the Commission, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, Attention: Rulemaking and Adjudications Staff; or (2) courier, express mail, or expedited delivery service to the Office of the Secretary, Sixteenth Floor, One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland, 20852, Attention: Rulemaking and Adjudications Staff. Participants filing a document in this manner are responsible for serving the document on all other participants. Filing is considered complete by first-class mail as of the time of deposit in the mail, or by courier, express mail, or expedited delivery service upon depositing the document with the provider of the service. A presiding officer, having granted an exemption request from using E-Filing, may require a participant or party to use E-Filing if the presiding officer subsequently determines that the reason for granting the exemption from use of E-Filing no longer exists.

Documents submitted in adjudicatory proceedings will appear in NRC's electronic hearing docket which is available to the public at <http://ehd1.nrc.gov/ehd/>, unless excluded pursuant to an order of the Commission, or the presiding officer. Participants are requested not to include personal privacy information, such as social security numbers, home addresses, or home phone numbers in their filings, unless an NRC regulation or other law requires submission of such information. However, a request to intervene will require including information on local residence in order to demonstrate a proximity assertion of interest in the proceeding. With respect to copyrighted works, except for limited excerpts that serve the purpose of the adjudicatory filings and would constitute a Fair Use application, participants are requested not to include copyrighted materials in their submission.

Petitions for leave to intervene must be filed no later than 60 days from the date of publication of this notice. Requests for hearing, petitions for leave to intervene, and motions for

leave to file new or amended contentions that are filed after the 60-day deadline will not be entertained absent a determination by the presiding officer that the filing demonstrates good cause by satisfying the three factors in 10 CFR 2.309(c)(1)(i)-(iii).

For further details with respect to this amendment action, see the application for amendment which is available for public inspection at the NRC's PDR, located at One White Flint North, Room O1-F21, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland 20852. Publicly available documents created or received at the NRC are accessible electronically through ADAMS in the NRC's Library at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html>. If you do not have access to ADAMS or if there are problems in accessing the documents located in ADAMS, contact the PDR's Reference staff at 1-800-397-4209, 301-415-4737, or by e-mail to pdr.resource@nrc.gov.

Carolina Power and Light Company, Docket Nos. 50-325 and 50-324, Brunswick Steam Electric Plant, Units 1 and 2, Brunswick County, North Carolina

Date of amendment request: September 25, 2012, as supplemented by letter dated December 17, 2012. A publicly available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML12285A428.

Description of amendment request: **This license amendment request (LAR) contains sensitive unclassified non-safeguards information (SUNSI).** The LAR requests NRC review and approval for adoption of a new risk-informed, performance-based (RI-PB) fire protection licensing basis for Brunswick Steam Electric Plant, Units 1 and 2. The request is submitted in accordance with the requirements in 10 CFR 50.48(a) and (c), and the guidance in NRC Regulatory Guide (RG) 1.205, "Risk-Informed Performance-Based Fire Protection for Existing Light-Water Nuclear Power Plants," National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) 805,

“Performance-Based Standard for Fire Protection for Light Water Reactor Electric Generating Plants (2001),” and Nuclear Energy Institute (NEI) 04-02, “Guidance for Implementing a Risk-Informed, Performance-Based Fire Protection Program under 10 CFR 50.48(c).”

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:

Criterion 1: Does the proposed change involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

Operation of the Brunswick Steam Electric Plant (BSEP), Units 1 and 2 in accordance with the proposed amendment does not result in a significant increase in the probability or consequences of accidents previously evaluated. The proposed amendment does not affect accident initiators or precursors as described in the BSEP Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (UFSAR), nor does it adversely alter design assumptions, conditions, or configurations of the facility, and it does not adversely impact the ability of structures, systems, or components (SSCs) to perform their intended function to mitigate the consequences of an initiating event within the assumed acceptance limits. The proposed changes do not affect the way in which safety-related systems perform their functions as required by the accident analysis. The SSCs required to safely shut down the reactor and to maintain it in a safe shutdown condition will remain capable of performing their design functions.

The purpose of this amendment is to permit BSEP, Units 1 and 2 to adopt a new risk-informed, performance-based fire protection licensing basis that complies with the requirements in 10 CFR 50.48(a) and 10 CFR 50.48(c), as well as the guidance contained in Regulatory Guide (RG) 1.205. The NRC considers that NFPA 805 provides an acceptable methodology and performance criteria for licensees to identify fire protection requirements that are an acceptable alternative to the 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix R, fire protection features (69 FR 33536; June 16, 2004). Engineering analyses, which may include engineering evaluations, probabilistic risk assessments, and fire modeling calculations, have been performed to demonstrate that the performance-based requirements of NFPA 805 have been met.

NFPA 805, taken as a whole, provides an acceptable alternative for satisfying General Design Criterion 3 (GDC 3) of Appendix A to 10 CFR Part 50, meets the underlying intent of the NRC's existing fire protection regulations and guidance, and achieves defense-in-depth along with the goals, performance objectives, and performance criteria specified in NFPA 805, Chapter 1. In addition, if there are

any increases in core damage frequency (CDF) or risk as a result of the transition to NFPA 805, the increase will be small, governed by the delta risk requirements of NFPA 805, and consistent with the intent of the Commission's Safety Goal Policy.

Based on the above, the implementation of this amendment to transition the Fire Protection Plan at BSEP, Units 1 and 2 to one based on NFPA 805, in accordance with 10 CFR 50.48(c), does not result in a significant increase in the probability of any accident previously evaluated.

In addition, all equipment required to mitigate an accident remains capable of performing the assumed function.

Therefore, the consequences of any accident previously evaluated are not significantly increased with the implementation of this amendment.

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

Response: No.

Operation of BSEP, Units 1 and 2 in accordance with the proposed amendment does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated. Any scenario or previously analyzed accident with offsite dose consequences was included in the evaluation of design basis accidents (DBA) documented in the UFSAR as a part of the transition to NFPA 805. The proposed amendment does not impact these accident analyses. The proposed change does not alter the requirements or functions for systems required during accident conditions, nor does it alter the required mitigation capability of the fire protection program, or its functioning during accident conditions as assumed in the licensing basis analyses and/or DBA radiological consequences evaluations.

The proposed amendment does not adversely affect accident initiators nor alter design assumptions, or conditions of the facility. The proposed amendment does not adversely affect the ability of SSCs to perform their design function. SSCs required to maintain the unit in a safe and stable condition remains capable of performing their design functions. The purpose of the proposed amendment is to permit BSEP, Units 1 and 2 to adopt a new fire protection licensing basis which complies with the requirements in 10 CFR 50.48(a) and (c) and the guidance in Revision 1 of RG 1.205. As indicated in the Statements of Consideration, the NRC considers that NFPA 805 provides an acceptable methodology and performance criteria for licensees to identify fire protection systems and features that are an acceptable alternative to the 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix R fire protection features.

The requirements in NFPA 805 address only fire protection and the impacts of fire effects on the plant have been evaluated. The proposed fire protection

program changes do not involve new failure mechanisms or malfunctions that could initiate a new or different kind of accident beyond those already analyzed in the UFSAR. Based on this, as well as the discussion above, the implementation of this amendment to transition the Fire Protection Plan at BSEP, Units 1 and 2 to one based on NFPA 805, in accordance with 10 CFR 50.48(c), does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

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

Response: No.

Operation of BSEP, Units 1 and 2 in accordance with the proposed amendment does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. The transition to a new risk-informed, performance-based fire protection licensing basis that complies with the requirements in 10 CFR 50.48(a) and 10 CFR 50.48(c) does not alter the manner in which safety limits, limiting safety system settings, or limiting conditions for operation are determined. The safety analysis acceptance criteria are not affected by this change. The proposed amendment does not adversely affect existing plant safety margins or the reliability of equipment assumed in the UFSAR to mitigate accidents.

The proposed change does not adversely impact systems that respond to safely shut down the plant and maintain the plant in a safe shutdown condition. In addition, the proposed amendment will not result in plant operation in a configuration outside the design basis for an unacceptable period of time without implementation of appropriate compensatory measures. The purpose of the proposed amendment is to permit BSEP, Units 1 and 2 to adopt a new fire protection licensing basis which complies with the requirements in 10 CFR 50.48(a) and (c) and the guidance in Regulatory Guide 1.205. The NRC considers that NFPA 805 provides an acceptable methodology and performance criteria for licensees to identify fire protection systems and features that are an acceptable alternative to the 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix R required fire protection features (69 FR 33536, June 16, 2004).

The risk evaluations for plant changes, in part as they relate to the potential for reducing a safety margin, were measured quantitatively for acceptability using the delta risk guidance contained in RG 1.205. Engineering analyses, which may include engineering evaluations, probabilistic safety assessments, and fire modeling calculations, have been performed to demonstrate that the performance-based methods of NFPA 805 do not result in a significant reduction in the margin of safety.

As such, the proposed changes are evaluated to ensure that risk and safety margins are kept within acceptable limits. Based on the above, the implementation of this amendment to transition the Fire Protection Plan at BSEP,

Units 1 and 2 to one based on NFPA 805, in accordance with 10 CFR 50.48(c), will not significantly reduce 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: Ms. Lara S. Nichols, 550 South Tryon Street, M/C DEC45A, Charlotte NC 28202.

NRC Branch Chief: Jessie Quichocho.

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

Date of amendment request: February 28, 2013. A publicly available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML13070A307.

Description of amendment request: **This amendment request contains sensitive unclassified non-safeguards information (SUNSI).** The proposed license amendment would add three AREVA NP analysis methodologies to the list of approved methods to be used in determining core operating limits in Technical Specification (TS) 5.6.5, Core Operating Limits Report (COLR). This proposed change would support a planned transition to AREVA ATRIUM-10XM (XM) fuel design. In addition, the amendment would also revise TS 2.1.1.2 to change the safety limit minimum critical power ratio value for BFN Unit 2.

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 Technical Specification change involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

Changing the fuel design, adding the additional approved methodologies to the Technical Specifications, and revising the unit 2 SLMCPR [Safety Limit Minimum Critical Power Ratio] value in the Technical Specifications will not increase the probability of a LOCA [Loss-of-Coolant Accident]. The fuel cannot increase the probability of a primary coolant system breach or rupture, as there is no interaction between the fuel and the system piping. The fuel will continue to meet the 10 CFR 50.46 limits for peak clad temperature, oxidation fraction, and hydrogen generation. Therefore, the consequences of a LOCA will not be increased.

Similarly, changing fuel type and revising the Technical Specifications as proposed cannot increase the probability of an abnormal operating occurrence (AOO). As a passive component, the fuel does not interact with plant operating or control systems. Therefore, the fuel change cannot affect the initiators of the previously evaluated AOO transient events. Thermal limits for the new fuel will be determined on a reload specific basis, ensuring the specified acceptable fuel design limits continue to be met. Therefore, the consequences of a previously evaluated AOO will not increase.

The refueling accident is potentially affected by a change in fuel design, due to the mechanical interaction between the fuel and the refueling equipment. However, the probability of the refueling accident with XM fuel is not increased because the upper bail handle is designed to be mechanically compatible with existing fuel handling equipment. The design weight of the XM design is similar to other designs in use at BFN, and is well within the design capability of the refueling equipment. The consequences of the refueling accident are similar to the current ATRIUM-10 fuel, remaining well within the design basis (7x7 fuel) evaluation in the UFSAR [Updated Final Safety Analysis Report].

The probability of a control rod drop accident does not increase because the XM fuel channel is mechanically compatible with the co-resident ATRIUM-10 fuel, and the existing control blade designs. The mechanical interaction and friction forces between the XM fuel channel, and control blades, would not be higher than previous designs. In addition, routine plant testing includes confirmation of adequate control blade to control rod drive coupling. The probability of a rod drop accident is not increased with the use of XM fuel. Control rod drop accident consequences are evaluated on a cycle specific basis, confirming the number of calculated fuel rod failures remains with the UFSAR design basis.

The dose consequences of all the previously evaluated UFSAR accidents remain with the limits of 10 CFR 50.67.

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

Response: No.

The XM fuel product has been designed to maintain neutronic, thermal-hydraulic, and mechanical compatibility with the NSSS [nuclear steam supply system] vendor fuel designs. The XM fuel has been designed to meet fuel licensing criteria specified in NUREG-0800, "Standard Review Plan for Review of Safety Analysis Reports for Nuclear Power Plants." Compliance with these criteria ensures the fuel will not fail in an unexpected manner.

A change in fuel design and revising the Technical Specifications as proposed cannot create any new accident initiators because the fuel is a passive component, having no direct influence on the performance of operating plant systems and equipment. Hence, a fuel design change cannot create a new type of malfunction leading to a new or different kind of transient or accident.

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

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

Response: No.

The XM fuel is designed to comply with the fuel licensing criteria specified in NUREG-0800. Reload specific and cycle independent safety analyses are performed ensuring no fuel failures will occur as the result of abnormal operational transients, and dose consequences for accidents remain with the bounds of 10 CFR 50.67. All regulatory margins and requirements are maintained.

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

Based on the above, TVA concludes the proposed amendment does not involve a significant hazards consideration under the standards set forth in 10 CFR 50.92 (c), and, accordingly, a finding of "no significant hazards consideration" is justified.

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

Attorney for licensee: General Counsel, Tennessee Valley Authority, 400 West Summit Hill Drive, 6A West Tower, Knoxville, Tennessee 37902.

NRC Branch Chief: Jessie F. Quichocho.

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

Date of amendment request: March 27, 2013 (publicly available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML13092A392), as supplemented by letter dated May 16, 2013 (ADAMS Accession No. ML13141A291).

Description of amendment request: **This amendment request contains sensitive unclassified non-safeguards information (SUNSI).** The proposed license amendment requests NRC approval to adopt a new fire protection licensing basis that complies with the requirements in 10 CFR 50.48(a), 10 CFR 50.48(c), and the guidance in Regulatory Guide 1.205, Revision 1, "Risk-Informed, Performance Based Fire Protection for Existing Light-Water Nuclear Power Plants." This license amendment request also follows the guidance in Nuclear Energy Institute 04-02, Revision 2, "Guidance for Implementing a Risk-Informed, Performance-Based Fire Protection Program Under 10 CFR 50.48(c)." If approved, the BFN fire protection program would transition to a new risk-informed, performance-based alternative in accordance with 10 CFR 50.48(c), which incorporates by reference National Fire Protection Association Standard 805.

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 Technical Specification change involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

Operation of Browns Ferry Nuclear Plant (BFN) in accordance with the proposed amendment does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of accidents previously evaluated. The Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (UFSAR) documents the analyses of design basis accidents (DBAs) at BFN. The proposed amendment does not adversely affect accident initiators nor alter design assumptions, conditions, or configurations of the facility and does not adversely affect the ability of structures, systems, and components (SSCs) to perform their design function. SSCs required to safely shut down the reactor and to maintain it in a safe shutdown (SSD) condition will remain capable of performing their design functions.

The purpose of this amendment is to permit BFN to adopt a new fire protection licensing basis which complies with the requirements in 10 CFR 50.48(a) and (c) and the guidance in Revision 1 of Regulatory Guide (RG) 1.205. The NRC considers that National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) 805 provides an acceptable methodology and performance criteria for licensees to identify fire protection systems and features that are an acceptable alternative to the 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix R fire protection features. Engineering analyses, in accordance with NFPA 805, have been performed to demonstrate that the risk-informed, performance-based (RI-PB) requirements per NFPA 805 have been met.

NFPA 805, taken as a whole, provides an acceptable alternative to 10 CFR 50.48(b) and satisfies 10 CFR 50.48(a) and General Design Criterion 3 of Appendix A to 10 CFR Part 50 and meets the underlying intent of the NRC's existing fire protection regulations and guidance, achieves defense-in-depth (DID) and the goals, performance objectives, and performance criteria specified in Chapter 1 of NFPA 805. Additionally, 10 CFR 50.48(c) allows self approval of fire protection program changes post-transition. If there are any increases post-transition in core damage frequency or risk, the increase will be small and consistent with the intent of the Commission's Safety Goal Policy.

The improved modeling associated with the elimination of Containment Accident Pressure credit does not change the design functions of the systems. By maintaining these functions, the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated is not significantly increased.

Based on this, the implementation of this amendment does not involve a significant increase in the probability of any accident previously evaluated. Equipment required to mitigate an accident remains capable of performing the assumed function. Therefore, the implementation of this amendment does not involve a significant increase in the consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

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

Response: No.

Operation of BFN in accordance with the proposed amendment does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated. The proposed change does not alter the requirements or function for systems required during accident conditions. Implementation of the new fire protection licensing basis which complies with the requirements in 10 CFR 50.48(a) and (c) and the guidance in Revision 1 of RG 1.205 will not result in new or different accidents. The proposed amendment does not adversely affect accident initiators nor alter design assumptions, conditions, or configurations of the facility.

The proposed amendment does not adversely affect the ability of SSCs to perform their design function. SSCs required to safely shut down the reactor and maintain it in a safe shutdown condition remain capable of performing their design functions.

The purpose of this amendment is to permit BFN to adopt a new fire protection licensing basis which complies with the requirements in 10 CFR 50.48(a) and (c) and the guidance in Revision 1 of RG 1.205. The NRC considers that NFPA 805 provides an acceptable methodology and performance criteria for licensees to identify fire protection systems and features that are an acceptable alternative to the 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix R fire protection features.

The requirements in NFPA 805 address only fire protection and the impacts of fire on the plant that have already been evaluated. Based on this, the implementation of this amendment does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any kind of accident previously evaluated. The proposed changes do not involve new failure mechanisms or malfunctions that can initiate a new accident.

The improved modeling associated with the elimination of Containment Accident Pressure credit does not change the design functions of the systems. The systems are not accident initiators and by maintaining their current functions, they do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident.

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

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

Response: No.

Operation of BFN in accordance with the proposed amendment does not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety. The proposed amendment does not alter the manner in which safety limits, limiting safety system settings, or limiting conditions for operation are determined. The safety analysis acceptance criteria are not affected by this change. The proposed amendment does not adversely affect existing plant safety margins or the reliability of equipment assumed to mitigate accidents in the UFSAR. The proposed amendment does not adversely affect the ability of SSCs to perform their design function. SSCs required to safely shut down the reactor and to maintain it in a safe shutdown condition remain capable of performing their design function.

The purpose of this amendment is to permit BFN to adopt a new fire protection licensing basis which complies with the requirements in 10 CFR 50.48(a) and (c) and the guidance in Revision 1 of RG 1.205. The NRC considers that NFPA 805 provides an acceptable methodology and performance criteria for licensees to identify fire protection systems and features that are an acceptable alternative to the 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix R fire protection features. Engineering analyses, which may include engineering evaluations, probabilistic safety assessments, and fire modeling calculations, have been performed to demonstrate that the performance-based methods do not result in a significant reduction in the margin of safety.

The improved modeling associated with the elimination of Containment Accident Pressure credit does not change the design functions within the applicable limits.

Based on this, the implementation of this amendment does not significantly reduce the margin of safety. The proposed changes are evaluated to ensure that the risk and safety margins are kept within acceptable limits. Therefore, the transition does not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety. The requirements of NFPA 805 are

structured to implement the NRC's mission to protect public health and safety, promote the common defense and security, and protect the environment. NFPA 805 is also consistent with the key principles for evaluating license basis changes, as described in RG 1.174, is consistent with the DID philosophy, and maintains sufficient safety margins.

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

Attorney for licensee: General Counsel, Tennessee Valley Authority, 400 West Summit Hill Drive, 6A West Tower, Knoxville, Tennessee 37902.

NRC Branch Chief: Jessie F. Quichocho.

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

**Carolina Power and Light Company, Docket Nos. 50-325 and 50-324,
Brunswick Steam Electric Plant, Units 1 and 2,
Brunswick County, North Carolina**

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

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

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

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

C. The requestor shall submit a letter requesting permission to access SUNSI to the Office of the Secretary, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, Attention: Rulemakings and Adjudications Staff, and provide a copy to the Associate General Counsel for Hearings, Enforcement and Administration, Office of the General Counsel, Washington, DC 20555-0001. The expedited delivery or courier mail address for both offices is: U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland 20852. The e-mail address for the Office of the Secretary and the Office of the General Counsel are Hearing.Docket@nrc.gov and OGCmailcenter@nrc.gov, respectively.¹ The request must include the following information:

- (1) A description of the licensing action with a citation to this *Federal Register* notice;
- (2) The name and address of the potential party and a description of the potential party’s particularized interest that could be harmed by the action identified in C.(1); and

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

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

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

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

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

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

F. Filing of Contentions. Any contentions in these proceedings that are based upon the information received as a result of the request made for SUNSI must be filed by the requestor no later than 25 days after the requestor is granted access to that information.

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

However, if more than 25 days remain between the date the petitioner is granted access to the information and the deadline for filing all other contentions (as established in the notice of hearing or opportunity for hearing), the petitioner may file its SUNSI contentions by that later deadline.

G. Review of Denials of Access.

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

(2) The requestor may challenge the NRC staff's adverse determination by filing a challenge within 5 days of receipt of that determination with: (a) the presiding officer designated in this proceeding; (b) if no presiding officer has been appointed, the Chief Administrative Judge, or if he or she is unavailable, another administrative judge, or an administrative law judge with jurisdiction pursuant to 10 CFR 2.318(a); or (c) if another officer has been designated to rule on information access issues, with that officer.

H. Review of Grants of Access. A party other than the requestor may challenge an NRC staff determination granting access to SUNSI whose release would harm that party's interest independent of the proceeding. Such a challenge must be filed with the Chief Administrative Judge within 5 days of the notification by the NRC staff of its grant of access.

If challenges to the NRC staff determinations are filed, these procedures give way to the normal process for litigating disputes concerning access to information. The availability of

interlocutory review by the Commission of orders ruling on such NRC staff determinations (whether granting or denying access) is governed by 10 CFR 2.311.³

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

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 5th day of August 2013.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

/RA/

Rochelle C. Baval,
Acting Secretary of the Commission.

³ Requestors should note that the filing requirements of the NRC's E-Filing Rule (72 FR 49139; August 28, 2007) apply to appeals of NRC staff determinations (because they must be served on a presiding officer or the Commission, as applicable), but not to the initial SUNSI request submitted to the NRC staff under these procedures.

ATTACHMENT 1--General Target Schedule for Processing and Resolving Requests for Access to Sensitive Unclassified Non-Safeguards Information in this Proceeding

Day	Event/Activity
0	Publication of <i>Federal Register</i> notice of hearing and opportunity to petition for leave to intervene, including order with instructions for access requests.
10	Deadline for submitting requests for access to Sensitive Unclassified Non-Safeguards Information (SUNSI) with information: supporting the standing of a potential party identified by name and address; describing the need for the information in order for the potential party to participate meaningfully in an adjudicatory proceeding.
60	Deadline for submitting petition for intervention containing: (i) demonstration of standing; (ii) all contentions whose formulation does not require access to SUNSI (+25 Answers to petition for intervention; +7 petitioner/requestor reply).
20	Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff informs the requestor of the staff's determination whether the request for access provides a reasonable basis to believe standing can be established and shows need for SUNSI. (NRC staff also informs any party to the proceeding whose interest independent of the proceeding would be harmed by the release of the information.) If NRC staff makes the finding of need for SUNSI and likelihood of standing, NRC staff begins document processing (preparation of redactions or review of redacted documents).
25	If NRC staff finds no "need" or no likelihood of standing, the deadline for requestor/petitioner to file a motion seeking a ruling to reverse the NRC staff's denial of access; NRC staff files copy of access determination with the presiding officer (or Chief Administrative Judge or other designated officer, as appropriate). If NRC staff finds "need" for SUNSI, the deadline for any party to the proceeding whose interest independent of the proceeding would be harmed by the release of the information to file a motion seeking a ruling to reverse the NRC staff's grant of access.
30	Deadline for NRC staff reply to motions to reverse NRC staff determination(s).
40	(Receipt +30) If NRC staff finds standing and need for SUNSI, deadline for NRC staff to complete information processing and file motion for Protective Order and draft Non-Disclosure Affidavit. Deadline for applicant/licensee to file Non-Disclosure Agreement for SUNSI.

Day	Event/Activity
A	If access granted: Issuance of presiding officer or other designated officer decision on motion for protective order for access to sensitive information (including schedule for providing access and submission of contentions) or decision reversing a final adverse determination by the NRC staff.
A + 3	Deadline for filing executed Non-Disclosure Affidavits. Access provided to SUNSI consistent with decision issuing the protective order.
A + 28	Deadline for submission of contentions whose development depends upon access to SUNSI. However, if more than 25 days remain between the petitioner's receipt of (or access to) the information and the deadline for filing all other contentions (as established in the notice of hearing or opportunity for hearing), the petitioner may file its SUNSI contentions by that later deadline.
A + 53	(Contention receipt +25) Answers to contentions whose development depends upon access to SUNSI.
A + 60	(Answer receipt +7) Petitioner/Intervenor reply to answers.
>A + 60	Decision on contention admission.

