

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[NRC-2016-0058]

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

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

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

SUMMARY: The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) received and is considering approval of six amendment requests. The amendment requests are for Palo Verde Nuclear Generating Station, Units 1, 2, and 3, Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 1, H. B. Robinson Steam Electric Plant, Unit No. 2, Indian Point Nuclear Generating, Unit Nos. 2 and 3, River Bend Station, Unit 1, and Prairie Island Nuclear Generating Plant, Units 1 and 2. For each amendment request, the NRC proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration. In addition, each amendment request contains sensitive unclassified non-safeguards information (SUNSI).

DATES: Comments must be filed by **[INSERT DATE 30 DAYS AFTER DATE OF PUBLICATION IN THE *FEDERAL REGISTER*]**. A request for a hearing must be filed by **[INSERT DATE 60 DAYS AFTER DATE OF PUBLICATION IN THE *FEDERAL REGISTER*]**.

Any potential party as defined in § 2.4 of title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR), who believes access to SUNSI is necessary to respond to this notice must request document access by **[INSERT DATE 10 DAYS AFTER DATE OF PUBLICATION IN THE *FEDERAL REGISTER*]**.

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

- **Federal Rulemaking Web Site:** Go to <http://www.regulations.gov> and search for Docket ID NRC-2016-0058. Address questions about NRC dockets to Carol Gallagher; telephone: 301-415-3463; 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, Office of Administration, Mail Stop: OWFN-12-H08, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001.

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

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Sandra Figueroa, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington DC 20555-0001; telephone: 301-415-1262, e-mail: Sandra.Figueroa@nrc.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Obtaining Information and Submitting Comments

A. Obtaining Information

Please refer to Docket ID NRC-2016-0058 when contacting the NRC about the availability of information for this action. You may obtain publicly-available information related to this action by any of the following methods:

- **Federal Rulemaking Web Site:** Go to <http://www.regulations.gov> and search for Docket ID NRC-2016-0058.

- **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 e-mail to pdr.resource@nrc.gov. The ADAMS accession number for each document referenced (if it is available in ADAMS) is provided the first time that it is mentioned in the SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION section.

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

B. Submitting Comments

Please include Docket ID NRC-2016-0058, facility name, unit number(s), application date, and subject in your comment submission.

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

ADAMS. The NRC does not routinely edit comment submissions to remove identifying or contact information.

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

II. Background

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

This notice includes notices of amendments containing SUNSI.

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

The Commission has made a proposed determination that the following amendment requests involve no significant hazards consideration. Under the Commission's regulations in

10 CFR 50.92, this means that operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated, or (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated, or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. The basis for this proposed determination for each amendment request is shown below.

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

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

A. Opportunity to Request a Hearing and Petition for Leave to Intervene

Within 60 days after the date of publication of this notice, any person(s) whose interest may be affected by this action may file a request for a hearing and a petition to intervene with respect to issuance of the amendment to the subject facility operating license or combined

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

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

Each contention must consist of a specific statement of the issue of law or fact to be raised or controverted. In addition, the requestor/petitioner shall provide a brief explanation of the bases for the contention and a concise statement of the alleged facts or expert opinion

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

Those permitted to intervene become parties to the proceeding, subject to any limitations in the order granting leave to intervene, and have the opportunity to participate fully in the conduct of the hearing with respect to resolution of that person's admitted contentions, including the opportunity to present evidence and to submit a cross-examination plan for cross-examination of witnesses, consistent with NRC regulations, policies and procedures.

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).

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

place after issuance of the amendment. If the final determination is that the amendment request involves a significant hazards consideration, then any hearing held would take place before the issuance of any amendment unless the Commission finds an imminent danger to the health or safety of the public, in which case it will issue an appropriate order or rule under 10 CFR part 2.

A State, local governmental body, Federally-recognized Indian Tribe, or agency thereof, may submit a petition to the Commission to participate as a party under 10 CFR 2.309(h)(1). The petition should state the nature and extent of the petitioner's interest in the proceeding. The petition should be submitted to the Commission by **[INSERT DATE 60 DAYS AFTER THE DATE OF PUBLICATION IN THE *FEDERAL REGISTER*]**. 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 for leave to intervene set forth in this section, except that under § 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. A State, local governmental body, Federally-recognized Indian Tribe, or agency thereof may also have the opportunity to participate under 10 CFR 2.315(c).

If a hearing is granted, any person who does not wish, or is not qualified, to become a party to the proceeding may, in 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 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. Persons desiring to make a limited appearance are requested to inform the Secretary of the Commission by **[INSERT DATE 60 DAYS AFTER DATE OF PUBLICATION IN THE *FEDERAL REGISTER*]**.

B. Electronic Submissions (E-Filing)

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

To comply with the procedural requirements of E-Filing, at least 10 days prior to the filing deadline, the participant should contact the Office of the Secretary by 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/getting-started.html>. System requirements for accessing the E-Submittal server are detailed in the NRC's "Guidance for Electronic Submission," which is available on the agency's public Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/e-submittals.html>. Participants may attempt to use other software not listed on the Web

site, but should note that the NRC's E-Filing system does not support unlisted software, and the NRC Meta System Help Desk will not be able to offer assistance in using unlisted software.

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

Once a participant has obtained a digital ID certificate and a docket has been created, the participant can then submit a request for hearing or petition for leave to intervene. Submissions should be in Portable Document Format (PDF) in accordance with NRC guidance available on the NRC's public Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/e-submittals.html>. A filing is considered complete at the time the documents are submitted through the NRC's E-Filing system. To be timely, an electronic filing must be submitted to the E-Filing system no later than 11:59 p.m. Eastern Time on the due date. Upon receipt of a transmission, the E-Filing system time-stamps the document and sends the submitter an 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 NRC's adjudicatory E-Filing system may seek assistance by contacting the NRC Meta System Help Desk through the "Contact Us" link located on the NRC's public Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/e-submittals.html>, by 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 the NRC's electronic hearing docket which is available to the public at <http://ehd1.nrc.gov/ehd/>, unless excluded pursuant to an order of the Commission, or the presiding officer. Participants are requested not to include personal privacy information, such as social security numbers, home addresses, or

home phone numbers in their filings, unless an NRC regulation or other law requires submission of such information. However, in some instances, a request to intervene will require including information on local residence in order to demonstrate a proximity assertion of interest in the proceeding. With respect to copyrighted works, except for limited excerpts that serve the purpose of the adjudicatory filings and would constitute a Fair Use application, participants are requested not to include copyrighted materials in their submission.

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

Arizona Public Service Company, et al., Docket Nos. STN 50-528, STN 50-529, and STN 50-530, Palo Verde Nuclear Generating Station, Units 1, 2, and 3 (PVNGS), Maricopa County, Arizona

Date of amendment request: November 25, 2015, as supplemented by letter dated January 29, 2016. Publicly-available versions are in ADAMS under Accession Nos. ML15336A087 and ML16043A361, respectively.

Description of amendment request: This amendment request contains sensitive unclassified non-safeguards information (SUNSI). The amendment would revise the Technical Specifications (TS) for PVNGS by modifying the requirements to incorporate the results of an updated criticality safety analysis for both new and spent fuel storage.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR

50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

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

Response: No.

The proposed amendment would modify the [PVNGS TS] to incorporate the results of an updated criticality safety analysis for both new fuel and spent fuel storage. The revised criticality safety analysis provides an updated methodology that allows credit for neutron absorbing NETCO-SNAP-IN[®] rack inserts and corrects non-conservative input assumptions in the previous criticality safety analysis.

The proposed amendment does not change or modify the fuel, fuel handling processes, number of fuel assemblies that may be stored in the spent fuel pool (SFP), decay heat generation rate, or the SFP cooling and cleanup system. The proposed amendment was evaluated for impact on the following previously evaluated events and accidents:

- fuel handling accident (FHA)
- fuel misload event
- SFP boron dilution event
- seismic event
- loss of SFP cooling event

Implementation of the proposed amendment will be accomplished in accordance with the Spent Fuel Pool Transition Plan and does not involve new fuel handling equipment or processes. The radiological source term of the fuel assemblies is not affected by the proposed amendment request. The FHA radiological dose consequences associated with fuel enrichment at this level are addressed in the PVNGS Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (UFSAR) Section 15.7.4 and remain unchanged. Therefore, the proposed amendments do not significantly increase the probability or consequences of a[n] FHA.

To address the proposed additional arrays, several elements of the current process were reviewed. Pool layout, region eligibility specifications and the development of fuel move sheets are separate tasks. Each of these activities is procedurally controlled and performed by trained and qualified individuals. This segregation of activities separates and insulates the complexity of [SFP] module geometry, fuel region specifications and interface considerations from the development of fuel movement sheets.

Creation of fuel move sheets in accordance with the proposed amendment will not significantly change the probability of a fuel misload event because development of fuel move sheets will continue to be controlled by approved procedures and developed by qualified personnel. A review of the additional proposed arrays and the transitional period (when both the current and new arrays would be effective in the [SFP]) was performed. The human performance shaping factors evaluated did not identify significant potential impacts due to the process changes themselves or the additional arrays. The review, therefore, confirmed that the potential for human performance errors resulting in the probability of a misload event is not significantly increased.

Operation in accordance with the proposed amendment will not significantly change the probability of a fuel misload event because fuel movement activities will continue to be controlled by approved fuel handling procedures and performed by qualified personnel. Although there will be additional allowable storage arrays defined by the amendment, the fuel handling procedures will continue to require identification of the initial and target locations for each fuel assembly that is moved.

The consequences of a fuel misload event are not changed because the reactivity analysis demonstrates that the same subcriticality criteria and requirements continue to be met for the limiting fuel misload event.

Operation in accordance with the proposed amendment will not change the probability or consequences of a boron dilution event because the systems and events that could affect SFP soluble boron concentration are unchanged. The current boron dilution analysis demonstrates that the limiting boron dilution event will reduce the boron concentration from the TS limit of 2150 [parts per million (ppm)] to 1900 ppm. This leaves sufficient margin to the 1460 ppm credited by the SFP criticality safety analysis. The analysis confirms that the time needed for dilution to reduce the soluble boron concentration is greater than the time needed for actions to be taken to prevent further dilution.

Operation in accordance with the proposed amendment will not change the probability of a seismic event since there are no elements of the updated criticality analysis that influence the occurrence of a seismic event. The consequences of a seismic event are not significantly increased because the forcing functions for seismic excitation are not increased and because the mass of storage racks with NETCO-SNAP-IN® inserts is not appreciably increased. Seismic analyses demonstrate adequate stress levels in the storage racks when inserts are installed.

Operation in accordance with the proposed amendment will not change the probability of a loss of SFP cooling event because the systems and events that could affect SFP cooling are unchanged. The consequences are not significantly increased because there are no changes in the SFP heat load or SFP cooling systems, structures, or components.

Furthermore, conservative analyses indicate that the current design requirements and criteria continue to be met with the NETCO-SNAP-IN® inserts installed.

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

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

Response: No.

The proposed amendment would modify the PVNGS TS to incorporate the results of an updated criticality safety analysis for both new fuel and spent fuel storage. The revised criticality safety analysis provides an updated methodology that allows credit for neutron absorbing NETCO-SNAP-IN® rack inserts and corrects non-conservative input assumptions in the previous criticality safety analysis.

The proposed amendment does not change or modify the fuel, fuel handling processes, number of fuel assemblies that may be stored in the pool, decay heat generation rate, or the SFP cooling and cleanup system. The effects of operating with the proposed amendment are listed below. The proposed amendment was evaluated for the potential of each effect to create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident:

- addition of inserts to the SFP storage racks,
- new storage patterns,
- additional weight from the inserts, and
- displacement of SFP water by the inserts.

Each NETCO-SNAP-IN® insert will be placed between a fuel assembly and the storage cell wall, taking up some of the space available on two sides of the fuel assembly. Analyses demonstrate that the presence of the inserts does not adversely affect spent fuel cooling, seismic capability, or subcriticality. The aluminum and boron carbide materials of construction have been shown to be compatible with nuclear fuel, storage racks, and SFP environments, and generate no adverse material interactions. Therefore, placing the inserts into the SFP storage racks cannot cause a new or different kind of accident.

Operation with the added weight of the NETCO-SNAP-IN® inserts will not create a new or different accident. The analyses of the racks with NETCO-SNAP-IN® inserts installed demonstrate that the stress levels in the rack modules continue to be considerably less than allowable stress limits. Therefore, the added weight from the inserts cannot cause a new or different kind of accident.

Operation with the proposed fuel storage patterns will not create a new or different kind of accident because fuel movement will continue to be controlled by approved fuel handling procedures. These procedures continue to require identification of the initial and target locations for each fuel assembly that is moved. There are no changes in the criteria or design requirements pertaining to fuel storage safety, including subcriticality requirements. Analyses demonstrate that the proposed storage patterns meet these requirements and criteria with adequate margins. Therefore, the proposed storage patterns cannot cause a new or different kind of accident.

The scenario involving the inadvertent removal of a SNAP-IN[®] insert was evaluated and found to not represent a “new or different kind of accident.” Rather, it represents a loss of reactivity configuration control, which is a less significant form of a fuel assembly misload event. Whenever a fuel assembly is placed in a storage configuration that is not explicitly allowed, a fuel assembly misload condition is created, whether it is the removal of a SNAP-IN[®] insert or the placement of a fuel assembly in a location that is missing a specified SNAP-IN[®] insert. An inadvertent removal of a SNAP-IN[®] insert is, therefore, not a new kind of accident but rather an alternate way of creating a previously evaluated accident. Loading a fuel assembly into a storage cell location required to be vacant and blocked (the limiting accident of this type) bounds the removal of a SNAP-IN[®] insert.

Operation with insert movement above stored fuel will not create a new or different kind of accident. The insert with its handling tool weighs less than the weight of a single fuel assembly. Single fuel assemblies are routinely moved safely over fuel assemblies and the same level of safety in design and operation will be maintained when moving the inserts.

The installed rack inserts will displace a negligible quantity of the SFP water volume and therefore, will not reduce operator response time to previously-evaluated SFP accidents.

The accidents and events previously analyzed remain bounding. Therefore, the proposed amendment does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

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

Response: No.

The proposed amendment would modify the TS to incorporate the results of an updated criticality safety analysis for both new fuel and spent fuel storage. The revised criticality safety analysis provides an updated methodology that allows credit for neutron absorbing NETCO-SNAP-IN[®] rack inserts and corrects non-conservative input assumptions in the previous criticality safety analysis. It was evaluated for its effect on current margins of safety as they relate to criticality, structural integrity,

and spent fuel heat removal capability. The margin of safety for subcriticality required by 10 CFR 50.68(b)(4) is unchanged. New criticality analyses confirm that operation in accordance with the proposed amendment continues to meet the required subcriticality margins.

The structural evaluations for the racks and [SFP] with NETCO-SNAP-IN[®] inserts installed show that the rack and SFP are unimpaired by loading combinations during seismic motion, and there is no adverse seismic-induced interaction between the rack and NETCO-SNAP-IN[®] inserts.

The proposed amendment does not affect spent fuel heat generation, heat removal from the fuel assembly, or the SFP cooling systems. The effects of the NETCO-SNAP-IN[®] inserts are negligible with regards to volume of water in the pool, flow in the SFP rack cells, and heat removal system performance.

The addition of a Spent Fuel Pool Rack Neutron Absorber Monitoring program (proposed TS 5.5.21) provides a method to identify potential degradation in the neutron absorber material prior to challenging the assumptions of the criticality safety analysis related to the material. Therefore, the addition of this monitoring program does not reduce the margin of safety; rather it ensures the margin of safety is maintained for the planned life of the spent fuel storage racks.

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

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

Attorney for licensee: Michael G. Green, Senior Regulatory Counsel, Pinnacle West Capital Corporation, P.O. Box 52034, Mail Station 8695, Phoenix, Arizona 85072-2034.

NRC Branch Chief: Robert J. Pascarelli.

Duke Energy Progress, Inc., Docket No. 50-400, Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 1 (HNP), Wake and Chatham Counties, North Carolina

Duke Energy Progress, Inc., Docket No. 50-261, H. B. Robinson Steam Electric Plant, Unit No. 2 (RNP), Darlington County, South Carolina

Date of amendment request: November 19, 2015. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML15323A351.

Description of amendment request: This amendment request contains sensitive unclassified non-safeguards information (SUNSI). The amendment requested plant-specific review and approval of a reactor core design methodology report DPC-NE-3008-P, Revision 0, "Thermal-Hydraulic Models for Transient Analysis," for adoption into the HNP and RNP Technical Specifications.

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

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

Response: No.

The proposed change requests review and approval of DPC-NE-3008-P, Revision 0, "Thermal-Hydraulic Models for Transient Analysis," to be applied to Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant (HNP) and H. B. Robinson Steam Electric Plant (RNP). The benchmark calculations performed confirm the accuracy of the codes and models. The proposed use of this methodology does not affect the performance of any equipment used to mitigate the consequences of an analyzed accident. There is no impact on the source term or pathways assumed in accidents previously assumed. No analysis assumptions are violated and there are no adverse effects on the factors that contribute to offsite or onsite dose as the result of an accident.

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

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

Response: No.

The proposed change requests review and approval of DPC-NE-3008-P, Revision 0, "Thermal-Hydraulic Models for Transient Analysis," to be applied to Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant (HNP) and H. B. Robinson Steam Electric Plant (RNP). It does not change any system functions or maintenance activities. The change does not physically alter the plant, that is, no new or different type of equipment will be installed. The software is not installed in any plant equipment, and therefore the software is incapable of initiating an equipment malfunction that would result in a new or different type of accident from any previously evaluated. The change does not alter assumptions made in the safety analyses but ensures that the core will operate within safe limits. This change does not create new failure modes or mechanisms which are not identifiable during testing, and no new accident precursors are generated.

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

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

Response: No.

Margin of safety is related to the confidence in the ability of the fission product barriers to perform their design functions during and following an accident. These barriers include the fuel cladding, the reactor coolant system, and the containment system. The proposed change requests review and approval of DPC-NE-3008-P, Revision 0, "Thermal-Hydraulic Models for Transient Analysis," to be applied to Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant (HNP) and H. B. Robinson Steam Electric Plant (RNP). DPC-NE-3008-P will be used in thermal-hydraulic transient analyses as a portion of the overall Duke Energy methodology for cycle reload safety analyses. As with the existing methodology, the Duke Energy methodology will continue to ensure (a) the acceptability of analytical limits under normal, transient, and accident conditions, and (b) that all applicable design and safety limits are satisfied such that the fission product barriers will continue to perform their design functions.

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: Lara S. Nichols, Deputy General Counsel, Duke Energy Corporation, 550 South Tyron Street, Mail Code DEC45A, Charlotte, North Carolina 28202.

NRC Branch Chief: Benjamin G. Beasley.

Duke Energy Progress, Inc., Docket No. 50-400, Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant (HNP), Unit 1, Wake and Chatham Counties, North Carolina

Date of amendment request: December 17, 2015. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML15362A169.

Description of amendment request: This amendment request contains sensitive unclassified non-safeguards information (SUNSI). The amendment would revise the as-found lift setting tolerance for main steam line code safety valves (MSSVs), revise the nominal reactor trip setpoint on pressurizer water level, and revise pressurizer water level span in the Technical Specifications (TS).

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 TS changes allow for an increase in the as-found MSSV setpoint tolerance from $\pm 1\%$ to $\pm 3\%$. In addition, the proposed amendment request includes a conservative change to the reactor trip on high pressurizer level and makes TS 3.4.3 consistent with the initial pressurizer level used in the re-analysis of the HNP Final Safety Analysis Report (FSAR), Section 15.2.3 turbine trip overpressure event. The proposed changes do not alter the MSSV nominal lift setpoints. The proposed TS changes have been evaluated on a plant specific basis. The required plant specific analyses and evaluations included transient analysis of the turbine trip event (FSAR, Section 15.2.3), evaluation of the changes on the peak clad temperature from the [Small Break] Loss of

Coolant Accident (LOCA) event, and disposition of the changes on all other FSAR events. The revised analysis evaluations were based on the existing design pressure of the reactor coolant system (RCS) and the main steam (MS) system.

These analyses and evaluations demonstrate that there is adequate margin to the specified acceptable fuel design limits (SAFDL) and the design pressures of the RCS and the MS system. The evaluations also demonstrate that the change will result in acceptable peak clad temperature (PCT) results for LOCA analyses. The change has no impact on the design pressure for the containment as peak containment pressure and temperature are obtained from postulated pipe breaks in the containment that do not challenge the MSSV lift setpoints. The MSSVs vent directly to open, ambient conditions and do not directly contribute to the temperature or pressure profile for any structure, system, or component.

There is a change in the flow rate credited for the auxiliary feedwater system (AFW) based on the higher MSSV opening tolerance. This change has been evaluated for each of the FSAR Chapter 15 events. The impact of the decrease in AFW flow is included in the PCT change for SB [small break] LOCA. The AFW flow effects for all other events have been determined to be acceptable.

As a result, the probability of a malfunction of the RCS and the main steam system are not increased and the consequences of such an accident remain acceptable. Therefore, the proposed TS changes do 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 TS changes allow for an increase in the as-found MSSV setpoint tolerance from $\pm 1\%$ to $\pm 3\%$. In addition, the proposed amendment request includes a conservative change to the reactor trip on high pressurizer level and makes TS 3.4.3 consistent with the initial pressurizer level used in the re-analysis of the FSAR, Section 15.2.3 turbine trip overpressure event.

Plant specific analyses and evaluations indicate that the plant response to any previously evaluated event will remain acceptable. All plant systems, structures, and components will continue to be capable of performing their required safety function as required by event analysis guidance.

The proposed TS changes do not alter the MSSV nominal lift setpoints. The operation and response of the affected equipment important to safety has been evaluated and found to be acceptable. All structures and

components will continue to be operated within acceptable operating and/or design parameters. No system, structure, or component will be subjected to a condition that has not been evaluated and determined to be acceptable using the guidance required for specific event analysis.

Therefore, the proposed TS changes do 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 TS changes allow for an increase in the as-found MSSV setpoint tolerance from $\pm 1\%$ to $\pm 3\%$. In addition, the proposed amendment request includes a conservative change to the reactor trip setpoint on high pressurizer level and makes TS 3.4.3 consistent with the initial pressurizer level used in the re-analysis of the FSAR Section, 15.2.3 turbine trip overpressure event.

The proposed TS changes do not alter the MSSV nominal lift setpoints. The operation and response of the affected equipment important to safety is unchanged. All systems, structures, and components will continue to be operated within acceptable operating and/or design parameters. The calculated peak reactor vessel pressure and main steam system pressure for the turbine trip overpressure event remains within the acceptance criteria. A new analysis is submitted to support the change. The model used for the re-analyzed turbine trip event (FSAR, Section 15.2.3) is based on methodologies previously approved by the NRC for other licensees.

The consequences of the turbine trip event continue to be within the regulatory limit for the event, thus the margin of safety for overpressure remains unchanged. The impact on LOCA has been evaluated and the PCT change results in a PCT that is lower than the regulatory limit. Therefore, the margin to safety for cladding performance in this event is not reduced.

The margin of safety for the containment is unaffected by the proposed change. Therefore, the proposed TS changes do not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

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

Attorney for licensee: Lara Nichols, Deputy General Counsel, Duke Energy Corporation, 550 South Tryon St., M/C DEC45A, Charlotte, North Carolina 28202.

NRC Branch Chief: Benjamin G. Beasley.

Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc., Docket Nos. 50-247 and 50-286, Indian Point Nuclear Generating, Unit Nos. 2 and 3, Westchester County, New York

Date of amendment request: December 10, 2015. A publicly available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML15350A006.

Description of amendment request: These amendment requests contain sensitive unclassified non-safeguards information (SUNSI). The amendments would revise the near end-of-life moderator temperature coefficient (MTC) surveillance requirement and technical specification (TS) for Indian Point Nuclear Generating, Unit Nos. 2 and 3, by placing a set of conditions on reactor core operation, which if met, would allow revision from the required MTC measurement.

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 safety analysis assumption of a constant moderator density coefficient and the actual value assumed are not changing. The Bases for and values of the most negative MTC Limiting Condition for Operation and for the Surveillance Requirement are not changing. Instead, a revised prediction is compared to the MTC Surveillance limit to determine if the limit is met.

The proposed changes to the TS do not affect the initiators of any analyzed accident. In addition, operation in accordance with the proposed TS changes ensures that the previously evaluated accidents will continue to be mitigated as analyzed. The proposed changes do not adversely affect the design function or operation of any structures, systems, and components important to safety.

The probability or consequences of accidents previously evaluated in the [updated final safety analysis report] UFSAR are unaffected by this proposed change because there is no change to any equipment response or accident mitigation scenario. There are no new or additional challenges to fission product barrier integrity.

Therefore, it is concluded that the proposed changes do not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

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

Response: No.

The proposed changes do not involve a physical alteration of the plant (no new or different type of equipment will be installed). The proposed changes do not create any new failure modes for existing equipment or any new limiting single failures.

Additionally the proposed changes do not involve a change in the methods governing normal plant operation and all safety functions will continue to perform as previously assumed in accident analyses. Thus, the proposed changes do not adversely affect the design function or operation of any structures, systems, and components important to safety.

No new accident scenarios, failure mechanisms, or limiting single failures are introduced as a result of the proposed changes. The proposed changes do not challenge the performance or integrity of any safety-related system.

Therefore, it is concluded that the proposed changes do 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 margin of safety associated with the acceptance criteria of any accident is unchanged. The proposed change will have no effect on the availability, operability, or performance of the safety-related systems and components. A change to a surveillance requirement is proposed based on an alternate method of confirming that the surveillance is met. The Technical Specification Limiting Condition for Operation (LCO) limits are not being changed.

The proposed change will not adversely affect the operation of plant equipment or the function of equipment assumed in the accident analysis.

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

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

Attorney for licensee: Ms. Jeanne Cho, Assistant General Counsel, Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc., 440 Hamilton Avenue, White Plains, New York 10601.

NRC Branch Chief: Travis L. Tate.

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: June 29, 2015, as revised by letter dated December 3, 2015.

Publicly-available versions are in ADAMS under Accession Nos. ML15188A369 and ML15345A389, respectively.

Description of amendment request: This amendment request contains sensitive unclassified non-safeguards information (SUNSI). This amendment request proposes to change the RBS Cyber Security Plan (CSP) Implementation Schedule Milestone 8 full implementation date and proposes a revision to the existing operating license Physical Protection license condition. The revised submittal reflects administrative changes made to remove security-related information only, and did not change the technical content of the original submittal.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), in the letter dated December 3, 2015, the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

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

Response: No.

The proposed change to the CSP Implementation Schedule is administrative in nature. This change does not alter accident analysis assumptions, add any initiators, or affect the function of plant systems or the manner in which systems are operated, maintained, modified, tested, or inspected. The proposed change does not require any plant modifications which affect the performance capability of the structures, systems, and components relied upon to mitigate the consequences of postulated accidents and has no impact on the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

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

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

Response: No.

The proposed change to the CSP Implementation Schedule is administrative in nature. This proposed change does not alter accident analysis assumptions, add any initiators, or affect the function of plant systems or the manner in which systems are operated, maintained, modified, tested, or inspected. The proposed change does not require any plant modifications which affect the performance capability of the structures, systems, and components relied upon to mitigate the consequences of postulated accidents and does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

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

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

Response: No.

Plant safety margins are established through limiting conditions for operation, limiting safety system settings, and safety limits specified in the technical specifications. The proposed change to the CSP implementation Schedule is administrative in nature. In addition, the milestone date delay for full implementation of the CSP has no substantive impact because other measures have been taken which provide adequate protection during this period of time. Because there is no change to established safety margins as a result of this change, the proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

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

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

Attorney for licensee: Joseph A. Aluise, Associate General Counsel – Nuclear Energy Services, Inc., 639 Loyola Avenue, New Orleans, Louisiana 70113.

NRC Branch Chief: Meena K. Khanna.

Northern States Power Company, Docket Nos. 50-282 and 50-306, Prairie Island Nuclear Generating Plant, Units 1 and 2, Goodhue County, Minnesota

Date of amendment request: November 17, 2015. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML15327A244.

Description of amendment request: This amendment request contains sensitive unclassified non-safeguards information (SUNSI). The amendment would revise Technical Specification (TS) 3.7.16, "Spent Fuel Storage Pool Boron Concentration," and TS 4.3.1, "Fuel Storage Criticality," to allow spent fuel pool storage of nuclear fuel containing a boron-based neutron absorber in the form of zirconium diboride (ZrB₂) Integral Fuel Burnable Absorber.

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. Do the proposed changes involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

The proposed amendments do not change or modify the fuel, fuel handling processes, fuel storage racks, number of fuel assemblies that

may be stored in the spent fuel pool (SFP), decay heat generation rate, or the SFP cooling and cleanup system. The proposed amendment was evaluated for impact on the following previously-evaluated criticality events and accidents and no impacts were identified: (1) fuel assembly misloading, (2) loss of spent fuel pool cooling, and (3) spent fuel boron dilution.

Operation in accordance with the proposed amendment will not change the probability of a fuel assembly misloading because fuel movement will continue to be controlled by approved fuel selection and fuel handling procedures. These procedures continue to require identification of the initial and target locations for each fuel assembly and fuel assembly insert that is moved. The consequences of a fuel misloading event are not changed because the reactivity analysis demonstrates that the same subcriticality criteria and requirements continue to be met for the worst-case fuel misloading event.

Operation in accordance with the proposed amendment will not change the probability of a loss of spent fuel pool cooling because the change in fuel burnup requirements and SFP boron concentration have no bearing on the systems, structures, and components involved in initiating such an event. The proposed amendment does not change the heat load imposed by spent fuel assemblies nor does it change the flow paths in the spent fuel pool. Finally, a criticality analysis of the limiting fuel loading configuration confirmed that the condition would remain subcritical at the resulting temperature value. Therefore, the accident consequences are not increased for the proposed amendment.

Operation in accordance with the proposed amendment will not change the probability of a boron dilution event because the incremental changes in TS values have no bearing on the systems, structures, and components involved in initiating or sustaining the intrusion of unborated water to the spent fuel pool. The consequences of a boron dilution event are unchanged because the proposed amendment has no bearing on the systems that operators would use to identify and terminate a dilution event. Also, implementation of the proposed amendment will not affect any of the other key parameters of the boron dilution analysis which includes SFP water inventory, volume of SFP contents, the assumed initial boron concentration of the accident, and the sources of dilution water. Finally, a criticality analysis of the limiting fuel loading configuration confirmed that the dilution event would be terminated at a soluble boron concentration value that ensured a subcritical condition.

Therefore, the proposed changes do not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of a criticality accident previously evaluated.

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

Response: No.

The proposed changes involve incremental changes to TS values, and represent minimal change to existing fuel selection and SFP loading procedures. Further, the proposed changes involve no change to plant systems, structures, components or to the processes for fuel handling. The proposed changes do not involve new SFP loading configurations and do not change or modify the fuel, fuel handling processes, fuel storage racks, number of fuel assemblies that may be stored in the pool, decay heat generation rate, or the spent fuel pool cooling and cleanup system. As such, the proposed changes introduce no new material interactions, man-machine interfaces, or processes that could create the potential for an accident of a new or different type.

3. Do the proposed changes involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety?

Response: No.

The proposed change was evaluated for its effect on current margins of safety as they relate to criticality. The margin of safety for subcriticality required by 10 CFR 50.68 (b)(4) is unchanged. The new criticality analysis confirms that operation in accordance with the proposed amendment continues to meet the required subcriticality margin. Increasing the minimum SFP soluble boron concentration ensures that subcriticality margins will be preserved, and increases the margin of safety associated with a boron dilution event.

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

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

Attorney for licensee: Peter M. Glass, Assistant General Counsel, Xcel Energy, 414 Nicollet Mall, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55401.

NRC Branch Chief: David J. Wrona.

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

**Arizona Public Service Company, et al., Docket Nos. STN 50-528, STN 50-529, and STN
50-530, Palo Verde Nuclear Generating Station, Units 1, 2, and 3, Maricopa County,
Arizona**

**Duke Energy Progress, Inc., Docket No. 50-400, Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant,
Unit 1, Wake and Chatham Counties, North Carolina**

**Duke Energy Progress, Inc., Docket No. 50-261, H. B. Robinson Steam Electric Plant,
Unit No. 2, Darlington County, South Carolina**

**Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc., Docket Nos. 50-247 and 50-286, Indian Point Nuclear
Generating, Unit Nos. 2 and 3, Westchester County, New York**

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

**Northern States Power Company, Docket Nos. 50-282 and 50-306, Prairie Island Nuclear
Generating Plant, Units 1 and 2, Goodhue County, Minnesota**

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

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

C. The requester shall submit a letter requesting permission to access SUNSI to the Office of the Secretary, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, Attention: Rulemakings and Adjudications Staff, and provide a copy to the Associate General Counsel for Hearings, Enforcement and Administration, Office of the General Counsel, Washington, DC 20555-0001. The expedited delivery or courier mail address for both offices is: U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland 20852. The 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
- (3) The identity of the individual or entity requesting access to SUNSI and the requester’s basis for the need for the information in order to meaningfully participate in this adjudicatory proceeding. In particular, the request must explain why publicly-available versions

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.

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 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. However, if more than 25 days remain between the date the petitioner is granted access to the information and the deadline for filing all other contentions (as established in the notice of hearing or opportunity for hearing), the petitioner may file its SUNSI contentions by that later deadline. This provision does not extend the time for filing a request for a hearing and petition to intervene, which must comply with the requirements of 10 CFR 2.309.

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.

G. Review of Denials of Access.

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

(2) The requester may challenge the NRC staff's adverse determination by filing a challenge within 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) officer if that officer has been designated to rule on information access issues.

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

³ Requesters 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.

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, 23rd day of March, 2016.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

/RA/

Annette L. Vietti-Cook,
Secretary of the Commission.

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

Day	Event/Activity
0	Publication of <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; and (ii) all contentions whose formulation does not require access to SUNSI (+25 Answers to petition for intervention; +7 petitioner/requestor reply).
20	U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff informs the requester of the staff's determination whether the request for access provides a reasonable basis to believe standing can be established and shows need for SUNSI. (NRC staff also informs any party to the proceeding whose interest independent of the proceeding would be harmed by the release of the information.) If NRC staff makes the finding of need for SUNSI and likelihood of standing, NRC staff begins document processing (preparation of redactions or review of redacted documents).
25	If NRC staff finds no "need" or no likelihood of standing, the deadline for petitioner/requester to file a motion seeking a ruling to reverse the NRC staff's denial of access; NRC staff files copy of access determination with the presiding officer (or Chief Administrative Judge or other designated officer, as appropriate). If NRC staff finds "need" for SUNSI, the deadline for any party to the proceeding whose interest independent of the proceeding would be harmed by the release of the information to file a motion seeking a ruling to reverse the NRC staff's grant of access.
30	Deadline for NRC staff reply to motions to reverse NRC staff determination(s).
40	(Receipt +30) If NRC staff finds standing and need for SUNSI, deadline for NRC staff to complete information processing and file motion for Protective Order and draft Non-Disclosure Affidavit. Deadline for applicant/licensee to file Non-Disclosure Agreement for SUNSI.
A	If access granted: issuance of presiding officer or other designated officer decision on motion for protective order for access to sensitive information

Day	Event/Activity
	(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.