

**NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

**[NRC-2016-0127]**

**Biweekly Notice**

**Applications and Amendments to Facility Operating Licenses and Combined Licenses**

**Involving No Significant Hazards Considerations**

**AGENCY:** Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**ACTION:** Biweekly notice.

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

This biweekly notice includes all notices of amendments issued, or proposed to be issued from June 7, 2016, to June 20, 2016. The last biweekly notice was published on June 21, 2016.

**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*]**.

**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-2016-0127. Address questions about NRC dockets to Carol Gallagher; telephone: 301-415-3463; e-mail: [Carol.Gallagher@nrc.gov](mailto:Carol.Gallagher@nrc.gov). For technical questions, contact the individual listed in the FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT section of this document.

- **Mail comments to:** Cindy Bladey, Office of Administration, Mail Stop: OWFN-12-H08, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001.

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

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Lynn Ronewicz, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington DC 20555-0001; telephone: 301-415-1927, e-mail: [lynn.ronewicz@nrc.gov](mailto:lynn.ronewicz@nrc.gov).

## I. Obtaining Information and Submitting Comments

### A. Obtaining Information

Please refer to Docket ID NRC-2016-0127 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-2016-0127.

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

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

## B. Submitting Comments

Please include Docket ID NRC-2016-0127, facility name, unit number(s), application date, and subject in your comment submission.

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

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

before making the comment submissions available to the public or entering the comment into ADAMS.

**II. Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendments to Facility  
Operating Licenses and Combined Licenses and Proposed No Significant  
Hazards Consideration Determination**

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

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

Normally, the Commission will not issue the amendment until the expiration of 60 days after the date of publication of this notice. The Commission may issue the license amendment before expiration of the 60-day period provided that its final determination is that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration. In addition, the Commission may issue the amendment prior to the expiration of the 30-day comment period if circumstances change during the 30-day comment period such that failure to act in a timely way would result, for example in derating or shutdown of the facility. If the Commission takes action prior to the expiration of either the comment period or the notice period, it will publish in the *Federal*

*Register* a notice of issuance. If the Commission makes a final no significant hazards consideration determination, any hearing will take place after issuance. The Commission expects that the need to take this action will occur very infrequently.

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

Within 60 days after the date of publication of this notice, any 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 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 ten 10 days prior to the filing deadline, the participant should contact the Office of the Secretary by e-mail at [hearing.docket@nrc.gov](mailto:hearing.docket@nrc.gov), or by telephone at 301-415-1677, to request (1) a digital identification (ID) certificate, which allows the participant (or its counsel or representative) to digitally sign documents and access the E-Submittal server for any proceeding in which it is participating; and (2) advise the Secretary that the participant will be submitting a request or petition for hearing (even in instances in which the participant, or its counsel or representative, already holds an NRC-issued digital ID certificate). Based upon this information, the Secretary will establish an



electronic docket for the hearing in this proceeding if the Secretary has not already established an electronic docket.

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

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

Once a participant has obtained a digital ID certificate and a docket has been created, the participant can then submit a request for hearing or petition for leave to intervene. Submissions should be in Portable Document Format (PDF) in accordance with NRC guidance available on the NRC's public Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/e-submittals.html>. A filing is considered complete at the time the documents are submitted through the NRC's E-Filing system. To be timely, an electronic filing must be submitted to the E-Filing system no later than 11:59 p.m. Eastern Time on the due date. Upon receipt of a transmission, the E-Filing system time-stamps the document and sends the submitter an 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](mailto:MSHD.Resource@nrc.gov), or by a toll-free call at 1-866-672-7640. The NRC Meta System Help Desk is available between 8 a.m. and 8 p.m., Eastern Time, Monday through Friday, excluding government holidays.

Participants who believe that they have a good cause for not submitting documents electronically must file an exemption request, in accordance with 10 CFR 2.302(g), with their initial paper filing requesting authorization to continue to submit documents in paper format. Such filings must be submitted by: (1) first class mail addressed to the Office of the Secretary of the Commission, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, Attention: Rulemaking and Adjudications Staff; or (2) courier, express mail, or expedited delivery service to the Office of the Secretary, Sixteenth Floor, One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland, 20852, Attention: Rulemaking and Adjudications Staff. Participants filing a document in this manner are responsible for serving the document on all other participants. Filing is considered complete by first-class mail as of the time of deposit in the mail, or by courier, express mail, or expedited delivery service upon depositing the document with the provider of the service. A presiding officer, having granted an exemption request from using E-Filing, may require a participant or party to use E-Filing if the presiding officer subsequently determines that the reason for granting the exemption from use of E-Filing no longer exists.

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

Petitions for leave to intervene must be filed no later than 60 days from the date of publication of this notice. Requests for hearing, petitions for leave to intervene, and motions for leave to file new or amended contentions that are filed after the 60-day deadline will not be entertained absent a determination by the presiding officer that the filing demonstrates good cause by satisfying the three factors in 10 CFR 2.309(c)(1)(i)-(iii).

For further details with respect to these license amendment applications, see the application for amendment, which is available for public inspection in ADAMS and at the NRC's PDR. For additional direction on accessing information related to this document, see the "Obtaining Information and Submitting Comments" section of this document.

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

Date of amendment request: May 5, 2016. A publicly available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML16134A068.

Description of amendment request: The amendments would modify Technical Specifications (TSs) by the removal of Note (c), which is no longer applicable from TS Table 3.3.2-1,

“Engineered Safety Feature Actuation System Instrumentation,” Function 6.f, “Auxiliary Feedwater Pump Suction Transfer on Suction Pressure - Low,” and the removal of an expired one-time Note for Required Action to restore Diesel Generator to OPERABLE status for TS 3.8.1, “AC Sources–Operating.”

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.

This LAR [license amendment request] proposes administrative non-technical changes only. These proposed changes do not adversely affect accident initiators or precursors nor alter the design assumptions, conditions, or configurations of the facility. The proposed changes do not alter or prevent the ability of structures, systems and components (SSCs) to perform their intended function to mitigate the consequences of an initiating event within the assumed acceptance limits.

Given the above discussion, it is concluded the proposed amendment does not significantly increase the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

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

Response: No.

This LAR proposes administrative non-technical changes only. The proposed changes will not alter the design requirements of any Structure, System or Component (SSC) or its function during accident conditions. No new or different accidents result from the proposed changes. The changes do not involve a physical alteration of the plant or any changes in methods governing normal plant operation. The changes do not alter assumptions made in the safety analysis.

Given the above discussion, it is concluded 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.

This LAR proposes administrative non-technical changes only. The proposed changes do 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 these changes. The proposed changes will not result in plant operation in a configuration outside the design basis. The proposed changes do not adversely affect systems that respond to safely shutdown the plant and to maintain the plant in a safe shutdown condition.

Given the above discussion, it is concluded the proposed amendment does not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety.

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

Attorney for licensee: Lara S. Nichols, Deputy General Counsel, Duke Energy Corporation, 526 South Church Street - EC07H, Charlotte, NC 28202.

NRC Branch Chief: Michael T. Markley.

Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC, Docket Nos. 50-269, 50-270, and 50-287, Oconee Nuclear Station, Units 1, 2, and 3, Oconee County, South Carolina

Date of amendment request: February 26, 2016. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML16064A020.

Description of amendment request: The amendments would revise Technical Specifications (TSs) for the Oconee Nuclear Station, Units 1, 2, and 3 (Oconee). Specifically, the license amendment request (LAR) would revise TS 3.8.1, "AC [Alternating Current] Sources – Operating," Required Action C.2.2.5, to allow each Keowee Hydroelectric Unit to be taken out of service for up to 55 days on a one-time basis for the purpose of generator stator replacement, subject to the implementation of specified contingency measures outlined in the LAR.

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, with NRC edits in square brackets:

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

Response: No.

This change involves the temporary addition of a 55-day Completion Time for Technical Specification (TS) 3.8.1 Required Action C.2.2.5 associated with restoring compliance with TS Limiting Condition for Operation (LCO) 3.8.1.C. During the time that one Keowee Hydroelectric Unit (KHU) is inoperable for [greater than] 72 hours, a Lee Combustion Turbine (LCT) will be energizing both standby buses, two offsite power sources will be maintained available, and maintenance on electrical distribution systems will not be performed unless necessary. In addition, risk significant systems (Emergency Feedwater System, Protected Service Water System, and Standby Shutdown Facility) will be verified operable (meeting LCO requirements) within 72 hours of entering TS 3.8.1 Condition C (i.e., prior to use of the 55-day Completion Time of Required Action C.2.2.5). The temporary 55-day Completion Time will decrease the likelihood of an unplanned forced shutdown of all three Oconee Units and the potential safety consequences and operational risks associated with that action. Avoiding this risk offsets the risks associated with having a design basis event during the temporary 55-day completion time for having one KHU inoperable.

The temporary addition of the 55-day Completion Time does not involve: 1) a physical alteration to the Oconee Units; 2) the installation of new or different equipment; 3) operating any installed equipment in a new or different manner; or 4) a change to any set points for parameters which initiate protective or mitigation action.

There is no adverse impact on containment integrity, radiological release pathways, fuel design, filtration systems, main steam relief valve set points, or radwaste systems. No new radiological release pathways are created.

The consequences of an event occurring during the temporary 55-day Completion Time are the same as those that would occur during the existing Completion Time. Duke Energy reviewed the Probabilistic Risk Assessment (PRA) to gain additional insights concerning the configuration of [Oconee] with one KHU. The results of the risk analysis show a risk improvement if no maintenance is performed on the SSF, EFW System and AC Power System. The results of the risk analysis show a small risk increase using the average nominal maintenance unavailability values for the SSF, EFW System and AC Power System.

By limiting maintenance, the risk results are expected to be between these two extremes (i.e., small risk impact).

Therefore, the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated is not significantly increased.

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

Response: No.

This change involves the temporary addition of a 55-day Completion Time for TS 3.8.1 Required Action C.2.2.5 associated with restoring compliance with TS LCO 3.8.1. During the time period that one KHU is inoperable, the redundancy requirement for the emergency power source will be fulfilled by an LCT. Compensatory measures previously specified will be in place to minimize electrical power system vulnerabilities.

The temporary 55-day Completion Time does not involve a physical effect on the Oconee Units, nor is there any increased risk of an Oconee Unit trip or reactivity excursion. No new failure modes or credible accident scenarios are postulated from this activity.

Therefore, the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any kind of accident previously evaluated is not created.

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

Response: No.

This change involves the temporary addition of a 55-day Completion Time for TS 3.8.1 Required Action C.2.2.5 associated with restoring compliance with TS LCO 3.8.1. During the time period that one KHU is inoperable, the redundancy requirement for the emergency power source will be fulfilled by an LCT. Compensatory measures previously specified will be in place to minimize electrical power system vulnerabilities.

The proposed TS change does not involve: 1) a physical alteration of the Oconee Units; 2) the installation of new or different equipment; 3) operating any installed equipment in a new or different manner; 4) a change to any set points for parameters which initiate protective or mitigation action; or 5) any impact on the fission product barriers or safety limits.

Therefore, this request 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, 526 S. Church St. - EC07H, Charlotte, NC 28202.

NRC Branch Chief: Michael T. Markley.

Duke Energy Progress, Inc., Docket Nos. 50-325 and 50-324, Brunswick Steam Electric Plant, Units 1 and 2 (BSEP), Brunswick County, North Carolina

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

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

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

Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC, Docket Nos. 50-269, 50-270, and 50-287, Oconee Nuclear Station, Units 1, 2, and 3, Oconee County, South 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: April 29, 2016. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML16120A076.

Description of amendment request: The amendments would (1) consolidate the Emergency Operations Facilities (EOFs) for BSEP, HNP, and RNP with the Duke Energy Progress, Inc. (Duke Energy) corporate EOF in Charlotte, North Carolina; (2) change the BSEP, HNP, and RNP augmentation times to be consistent with those of the sites currently supported by the Duke Energy corporate EOF; and (3) decrease the frequency of the unannounced augmentation drill at BSEP from twice per year to once per year.



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 changes relocate the BSEP, HNP, and RNP EOFs from their present onsite or near-site locations to the established corporate EOF in Charlotte, North Carolina, changes the required response times for supplementing onsite personnel in response to a radiological emergency, and decreases the frequency of augmentation drills at BSEP. The functions and capabilities of the relocated EOFs will continue to meet the applicable regulatory requirements. It has been evaluated and determined that the change in response time does not significantly affect the ability to supplement the onsite staff. In addition, analysis shows that the onsite staff can acceptably respond to an event for longer than the requested time for augmented staff to arrive. The proposed changes have no effect on normal plant operation or on any accident initiator or precursors, and do not impact the function of plant structures, systems, or components (SSCs). The proposed changes do not alter or prevent the ability of the emergency response organization to perform its intended functions to mitigate the consequences of an accident or event. Therefore, the proposed change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

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

Response: No.

The proposed changes only impact the implementation of the affected stations' emergency plans by relocating their onsite or near-site EOFs to the established corporate EOF in Charlotte, North Carolina, changing the required response time of responders who supplement the onsite staff, and decreasing the frequency of augmentation drills at BSEP. The functions and capabilities of the relocated EOFs will continue to meet the applicable regulatory requirements. It has been evaluated and determined that the change in response time does not significantly affect the ability to supplement the onsite staff. In addition, analysis shows that the onsite staff can acceptably respond to an event for longer than the requested time for augmented staff to arrive. The proposed changes will not change the design function or operation of SSCs. The changes do not impact the accident analysis. The changes do not involve a physical alteration of the plant, a change in the method of plant operation, or new operator actions. The proposed changes do not introduce failure modes

that could result in a new accident, and the changes do not alter assumptions made in the safety analysis.

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

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

Response: No.

The proposed changes only impacts the implementation of the affected stations' emergency plans by relocating their onsite or near-site EOFs to the established corporate EOF in Charlotte, North Carolina, changing the required response time of responders who supplement the onsite staff, and decreasing the frequency of augmentation drills at BSEP. The functions and capabilities of the relocated EOFs will continue to meet the applicable regulatory requirements. It has been evaluated and determined that the change in response time does not significantly affect the ability to supplement the onsite staff. In addition, analysis shows that the onsite staff can acceptably respond to an event for longer than the requested time for augmented staff to arrive. Margin of safety is associated with confidence in the ability of the fission product barriers (i.e., fuel cladding, reactor coolant system pressure boundary, and containment structure) to limit the level of radiation dose to the public. The proposed changes are associated with the emergency plans and do not impact operation of the plant or its response to transients or accidents. The changes do not affect the Technical Specifications. The changes do not involve a change in the method of plant operation, and no accident analyses will be affected by the proposed changes. Safety analysis acceptance criteria are not affected. The emergency plans will continue to provide the necessary response staff for emergencies as demonstrated by staffing and functional analyses including the necessary timeliness of performing major tasks for the functional areas of the emergency plans.

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, NC 28202.

NRC Acting Branch Chief: Tracy J. Orf.

Duke Energy Progress, Inc., Docket No. 50-261, H. B. Robinson Steam Electric Plant, Unit No. 2 (HBRSEP2), Darlington County, South Carolina

Date of amendment request: April 24, 2016. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML16116A033.

Description of amendment request: The amendment would adopt Technical Specifications Task Force (TSTF) Traveler TSTF-339, Revision 2, "Relocated TS Parameters to COLR." Based on TSTF-339, the proposed amendment would relocate reactor coolant system (RCS)-related cycle-specific parameters and core safety limits from the technical specifications (TSs) to the Core Operating Limits Report (COLR).

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 relocation of RCS-related cycle-specific parameter limits from the TS to the COLR proposed by this amendment request does not result in the alteration of the design, material, or construction standards that were applicable prior to the change. The proposed change will not result in the modification of any system interface that would increase the likelihood of an accident since these events are independent of the proposed change. The proposed amendment will not change, degrade, or prevent actions, or alter any assumptions previously made in evaluating the radiological consequences of an accident described in the Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (UFSAR). Therefore, the proposed amendment does not result in an 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.

There are no new accident causal mechanisms created as a result of NRC approval of this amendment request. No changes are being made to the facility which would introduce any new accident causal mechanisms. This amendment request does not impact any plant systems that are accident initiators. Therefore, the proposed change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

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

Response: No.

Implementation of this amendment would not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety. Previously approved methodologies will continue to be used in the determination of cycle-specific core operating limits that are present in the COLR. Additionally, previously approved RCS minimum total flow rates for HBRSEP2 are retained in the TS to assure that lower flow rates will not be used without prior NRC approval. Based on the above, it is concluded that the proposed license amendment request does not impact any safety margins and will not result in a reduction in margin with respect to plant 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, NC 28202.

NRC Acting Branch Chief: Robert G. Schaaf.

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

Date of amendment request: April 4, 2016. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under  
Accession No. ML16110A266.

Description of amendment request: The amendments would revise the Technical Specifications  
(TS) requirements for snubbers. The licensee proposed to revise the TSs to conform to the  
licensee's Snubber Testing Program. The proposed changes include additions to, deletions  
from, and conforming administrative changes to the TSs.

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 changes would revise TS SR [Surveillance Requirement]  
4.7.6 to conform the TS to the revised surveillance program for snubbers.  
Snubber examination, testing and service life monitoring will continue to  
meet the requirements of 10 CFR 50.55a(g).

Snubber examination, testing and service life monitoring is not an initiator  
of any accident previously evaluated. Therefore, the probability of an  
accident previously evaluated is not significantly increased.

Snubbers will continue to be demonstrated OPERABLE by performance  
of a program for examination, testing and service life monitoring in  
compliance with 10 CFR 50.55a or authorized alternatives. The proposed  
change to the TS 3.7.6 Action for inoperable snubbers is administrative in  
nature and is required for consistency with the proposed change to TS  
SR 4.7.6. The proposed change does not adversely affect plant  
operations, design functions or analyses that verify the capability of  
systems, structures, and components to perform their design functions  
therefore, the consequences of accidents previously evaluated are not  
significantly increased.

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

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

Response: No.

The proposed changes do not involve any physical alteration of plant equipment. The proposed changes do not alter the method by which any safety-related system performs its function. As such, no new or different types of equipment will be installed, and the basic operation of installed equipment is unchanged. The methods governing plant operation and testing remain consistent with current safety analysis assumptions.

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

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

Response: No.

The proposed changes ensure snubber examination, testing and service life monitoring will continue to meet the requirements of 10 CFR 50.55a(g). Snubbers will continue to be demonstrated OPERABLE by performance of a program for examination, testing and service life monitoring in compliance with 10 CFR 50.55a or authorized alternatives.

The proposed change to the TS 3.7.6 Action for inoperable snubbers is administrative in nature and is required for consistency with the proposed change to TS SR 4.7.6.

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: William S. Blair, Managing Attorney - Nuclear, Florida Power & Light Company, 700 Universe Blvd., MS LAW/JB, Juno Beach, FL 33408-0420.

NRC Branch Chief: Benjamin G. Beasley.

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

Date of amendment request: May 16, 2016. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML16137A171.

Description of amendment request: The proposed changes, if approved for the VCSNS, involve departures from incorporated plant-specific Tier 2 Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (UFSAR) information and conforming changes to the combined license Appendix C, as well as conforming changes to the plant-specific Tier 1 information, to ensure that the design bases Tier 2 information conforms with the originally certified design. The licensee stated in its application that the changes are editorial, and with one exception, bring the plant-specific Tier 1 and Combined License (COL) Appendix C into alignment with the information contained in plant-specific Tier 2. In addition, the licensee requested a change to COL License Condition 2.D(12)(f)1 to correct a reference to a seismic interaction review discussed in the AP1000 design certification document, Revision 19, Section 3.7.5.3.

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 consistency and editorial COL Appendix C (and plant-specific Tier 1) and involved Tier 2 changes, along with one COL paragraph 2.D change, do not involve a technical change, (e.g., there is no design parameter or requirement, calculation, analysis, function or qualification change). No structure, system, component design or function would be affected. No design or safety analysis would be affected. The proposed changes do not affect any accident initiating event or component failure, thus the probabilities of the accidents previously evaluated are not affected. No function used to mitigate a

radioactive material release and no radioactive material release source term is involved, thus the radiological releases in the accident analyses are not affected.

Therefore, 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 consistency and editorial COL Appendix C (and plant-specific Tier 1) and involved Tier 2 changes, along with one COL paragraph 2.D change, would not affect the design or function of any structure, system, component (SSC), but will instead provide consistency between the SSC designs and functions currently presented in the UFSAR and the Tier 1 information. The proposed changes would not introduce a new failure mode, fault or sequence of events that could result in a radioactive material release. Therefore, the proposed changes do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

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

Response: No.

The proposed consistency and editorial COL Appendix C (and plant-specific Tier 1) and involved Tier 2 update, along with one COL paragraph 2.D change, is non-technical, thus would not affect any design parameter, function or analysis. There would be no change to an existing design basis, design function, regulatory criterion, or analysis. No safety analysis or design basis acceptance limit/criterion is involved. Therefore, the proposed amendment does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

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

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

NRC Acting Branch Chief: Jennifer Dixon-Herrity.



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

Date of amendment request: May 12, 2016. A publicly-available version is available in ADAMS under Accession No. ML16133A382.

Description of amendment request: The proposed changes, if approved for the VCSNS, involve departures from incorporated plant-specific Tier 2 Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (UFSAR) information and changes to the combined license Appendix A Technical Specifications to ensure that the listed minimum volume of the passive core cooling system core makeup tanks are aligned with the current inspections tests analyses and acceptance criteria and the relevant safety analysis.

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 activity would revise the minimum CMT [Core Makeup Tank] volume in the COL [combined operating license] Appendix A (Technical Specifications) and UFSAR information to be consistent with the plant-specific Tier 1 and COL Appendix C requirements. Because the new minimum volume is bounded by the current analyses, the proposed activity does not alter the design of an accident initiating component or system. Thus, the probabilities of an accident previously evaluated are not affected. The proposed activity does not involve other safety-related equipment or radioactive material barriers. Thus, the proposed activity does not affect an accident mitigation function.

Therefore, 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 activity would revise the minimum CMT volume in the COL Appendix A (Technical Specifications) and UFSAR information to be consistent with the plant-specific Tier 1 and COL Appendix C requirements. No results or conclusions of any design or safety analyses are affected. No system or design function or equipment qualification is affected by the changes. The changes do not result in a new failure mode, malfunction or sequence of events that could affect safety or safety-related equipment. This activity does not allow for a new fission product release path, result in a new fission product barrier failure mode, or create a new sequence of events that results in significant fuel cladding failures.

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

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

Response: No.

The proposed activity would revise the minimum CMT volume in the COL Appendix A (Technical Specifications) and UFSAR information to be consistent with the plant-specific Tier 1 and COL Appendix C requirements. No results or conclusions of any design or safety analyses are affected. No system design function or equipment is altered by this activity, and the proposed changes do not alter any design code, safety classification, or design margin. No safety analysis or design basis limit is involved with the requested change, and consequently, no margin of safety is reduced.

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

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

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

NRC Acting Branch Chief: Jennifer Dixon-Herrity.

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

Date of amendment request: May 18, 2016. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML16139A796.

Description of amendment request: The amendment request proposes changes to the technical specifications (TS) and Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (UFSAR) in the form of departures from the incorporated plant-specific Design Control Document Tier 2 information. Specifically, the proposed departures consist of changes to the TS and UFSAR to revise the minimum volume of the passive core cooling system core makeup tanks.

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 activity would revise the minimum CMT [core makeup tank] volume in the COL [combined operating license] Appendix A (Technical Specifications) and UFSAR information to be consistent with the plant-specific Tier 1 and COL Appendix C requirements. Because the new minimum volume is bounded by the current analyses, the proposed activity does not alter the design of an accident initiating component or system. Thus, the probabilities of an accident previously evaluated are not affected. The proposed activity does not involve other safety-related equipment or radioactive material barriers. Thus, the proposed activity does not affect an accident mitigation function.

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 activity would revise the minimum CMT volume in the COL Appendix A (Technical Specifications) and UFSAR information to be consistent with the plant-specific Tier 1 and COL Appendix C requirements. No results or conclusions of any design or safety analyses are affected. No system or design function or equipment qualification is affected by the changes. The changes do not result in a new failure mode, malfunction or sequence of events that could affect safety or safety-related equipment. This activity does not allow for a new fission product release path, result in a new fission product barrier failure mode, or create a new sequence of events that results in significant fuel cladding failures.

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 activity would revise the minimum CMT volume in the COL Appendix A (Technical Specifications) and UFSAR information to be consistent with the plant-specific Tier 1 and COL Appendix C requirements. No results or conclusions of any design or safety analyses are affected. No system design function or equipment is altered by this activity, and the proposed changes do not alter any design code, safety classification, or design margin. No safety analysis or design basis limit is involved with the requested change, and consequently, no margin of safety is reduced. Therefore, the proposed amendment does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

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

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

NRC Acting Branch Chief: Jennifer Dixon-Herrity.

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

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

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

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

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

Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC, Docket Nos. 50-269, 50-270, and 50-287, Oconee Nuclear Station, Units 1, 2, and 3, Oconee County, South Carolina

Date of amendment request: July 17, 2015.

Brief description of amendments: The amendments correct a usage problem with recently issued Amendment Nos. 382, 384, and 383 (ADAMS Accession No. ML13231A013), which precludes Oconee Nuclear Station Technical Specification (TS) 3.8.1, "AC [Alternating Current] Sources - Operating," Condition H, from being used as planned. The change revises the note to TS 3.8.1, Required Actions L.1, L.2, and L.3 to delete the 12-hour time limitation when the second Keowee Hydroelectric Unit (KHU) is made inoperable for the purpose of restoring the KHU undergoing maintenance to OPERABLE status. Deletion of the 12-hour time limitation allows the use of the full 60-hour Completion Time of Required Action H.2 when the unit(s) have been in Condition C for greater than 72 hours, and both units are made inoperable for the purpose of restoring the KHU undergoing maintenance to OPERABLE status.

Date of issuance: June 6, 2016.

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

Amendment Nos.: 400 (Unit 1), 402 (Unit 2), and 401 (Unit 3). A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML16138A332; documents related to these amendments are listed in the Safety Evaluation enclosed with the amendments.

Renewed Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-38, DPR-47, and DPR-55: The amendments revised the Renewed Facility Operating Licenses and TSs.

Date of initial notice in *Federal Register*: November 10, 2015 (80 FR 69710).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated June 6, 2016.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc., Docket No. 50-293, Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station (PNPS),  
Plymouth County, Massachusetts

Date of amendment request: July 15, 2015.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment approved the revised schedule for full implementation of the Cyber Security Plan (CSP) for Milestone 8 by extending the date from June 30, 2016, to December 15, 2017, and revised paragraphs 3.B and 3.G of Facility Operating License No. DPR-35 for PNPS to incorporate the revised CSP implementation schedule.

Date of issuance: June 6, 2016.

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

Amendment No.: 244. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML16082A460; documents related to this amendment are listed in the Safety Evaluation enclosed with the amendment.

Facility Operating License No. DPR-35: The amendment revised the Renewed Facility Operating License.

Date of initial notice in *Federal Register*: October 27, 2015 (80 FR 65812).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated June 6, 2016.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

FirstEnergy Nuclear Operating Company, Docket Nos. 50-334 and 50-412, Beaver Valley  
Power Station (BVPS), Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Beaver County, Pennsylvania Docket No. 50-346,  
Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station (DBNPS), Unit No. 1, Ottawa County, Ohio

Date of application for amendments: November 19, 2015, as supplemented by letter dated March 22, 2016.

Brief description of amendments: The amendments changed the BVPS and DBNPS Technical Specifications (TSs). Specifically, the license amendments revised TS 5.3.1, "Unit Staff Qualifications," by incorporating an exception to American National Standards Institute (ANSI) Standard N18.1-1971, "Selection and Training of Nuclear Power Plant Personnel," such that licensed operators are only required to comply with the requirements of 10 CFR part 55, "Operators' Licenses."

Date of issuance: June 7, 2016.

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

Amendment Nos.: 297 and 185 for BVPS, Units 1 and 2, and 292 for DBNPS, Unit 1. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML16040A084. Documents related to these amendments are listed in the Safety Evaluation (SE) enclosed with the amendments.

Renewed Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-66, NPF-73, and NPF-3: The amendments revised the TSs and Renewed Facility Operating Licenses.

Date of initial notice in *Federal Register*: January 19, 2016 (81 FR 2918). The supplemental letter dated March 22, 2016, contained clarifying information and did not change the NRC staff's initial proposed finding of no significant hazards consideration.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in an SE dated June 7, 2016.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

Date of amendment request: June 30, 2015, as supplemented by letters dated January 27, 2016, and March 3, 2016.



Brief description of amendments: The amendments revised the current emergency action level scheme for CPNPP to a scheme based on Nuclear Energy Institute (NEI) 99-01, Revision 6, "Development of Emergency Action Levels for Non-Passive Reactors," November 2012.

Date of issuance: June 14, 2016.

Effective date: As of the date of issuance and shall be implemented within 270 days from the date of issuance.

Amendment Nos.: 166 (Unit 1) and 166 (Unit 2). A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML16137A056; documents related to these amendments are listed in the Safety Evaluation enclosed with the amendments.

Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-87 and NPF-89: The amendments revised the Facility Operating Licenses to authorize revision to the CPNPP Emergency Plan.

Date of initial notice in *Federal Register*: August 14, 2015 (80 FR 48923), and corrected on August 20, 2015 (80 FR 50663). The supplemental letters dated January 27, 2016, and March 3, 2016, provided additional information that clarified the application, did not expand the scope of the application as originally noticed, and did not change the staff's original proposed no significant hazards consideration determination as published in the *Federal Register*.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated June 14, 2016.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

Date of amendment request: June 29, 2015, as supplemented by letters dated December 30, 2015; January 25, 2016; March 31, 2016; and April 14, 2016.

Brief description of amendments: The amendments revised surveillance requirements (SRs) related to gas accumulation for the emergency core cooling system and added new SRs related

to gas accumulation for the residual heat removal and containment spray systems, consistent with NRC-approved Technical Specifications Task Force (TSTF) Standard Technical Specifications Change Traveler TSTF-523, Revision 2, "Generic Letter 2008-01, Managing Gas Accumulation."

Date of issuance: June 16, 2016.

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

Amendment Nos.: 217 (Unit 1) and 205 (Unit 2). A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML16133A406; documents related to these amendments are listed in the Safety Evaluation enclosed with the amendments.

Renewed Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-42 and DPR-60: The amendments revised the Renewed Facility Operating Licenses and Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in *Federal Register*: October 13, 2015 (80 FR 61484). The supplemental letters dated December 30, 2015; January 25, 2016; March 31, 2016; and April 14, 2016, provided additional information that clarified the application, did not expand the scope of the application as originally noticed, and did not change the staff's original proposed no significant hazards consideration determination as published in the *Federal Register*.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated June 16, 2016.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Omaha Public Power District, Docket No. 50-285, Fort Calhoun Station, Unit No. 1, Washington County, Nebraska

Date of amendment request: September 11, 2015.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revised the Technical Specifications (TSs) to provide a short Completion Time to restore an inoperable system for conditions under which the existing TSs require a plant shutdown. The amendment is consistent with NRC-approved

Technical Specifications Task Force (TSTF) Traveler TSTF-426, Revision 5, "Revise or Add Actions to Preclude Entry into LCO [Limiting Condition for Operation] 3.0.3 - RITSTF [Risk-Informed TSTF] Initiatives 6b & 6c," with certain plant-specific administrative variations.

Date of issuance: June 8, 2016.

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

Amendment No.: 288. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML16139A804; documents related to this amendment are listed in the Safety Evaluation enclosed with the amendment.

Renewed Facility Operating License No. DPR-40: The amendment revised the Renewed Facility Operating License and TSs.

Date of initial notice in *Federal Register*: November 24, 2015 (80 FR 73239).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated June 8, 2016.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

Date of amendment request: July 18, 2014, as supplemented by letters dated February 27, 2015, and May 2, 2016.

Brief description of amendments: The amendments revised 22 Technical Specifications (TSs) by adopting multiple previously NRC-approved Technical Specifications Task Force (TSTF) Travelers. One proposed change is not included in this license amendment and will be addressed by further correspondence. Southern Nuclear Operating Company, Inc. (SNC) stated that these TSTF Travelers are generic changes chosen to increase the consistency between the Vogtle Electric Generating Plant TSs, the Improved Standard Technical

Specifications for Westinghouse plants (NUREG-1431), and the TSs of the other plants in the SNC fleet.

Date of issuance: June 9, 2016.

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

Amendment Nos.: 180 (Unit 1) and 161 (Unit 2). A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML15132A569; documents related to these amendments are listed in the Safety Evaluation enclosed with the amendments.

Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-68 and NPF-81: Amendments revised the Facility Operating Licenses and TSs.

Date of initial notice in *Federal Register*: March 3, 2015 (80 FR 11480). The supplemental letters dated February 27, 2015, and May 2, 2016, provided additional information that clarified the application, did not expand the scope of the application as originally noticed, and did not change the staff's original proposal no significant hazards consideration determination as published in the *Federal Register*.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated June 9, 2016.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

Date of amendment request: April 13, 2015, as supplemented by letters dated September 17, 2015, and April 13, 2016.

Brief description of amendments: The amendments consist of changes to the Technical Specifications consistent with the NRC-approved Technical Specification Task Force Improved

Standard Technical Specifications Change Traveler-432, Revision 1, "Change in Technical Specifications End States (WCAP-16294)," dated November 29, 2010.

Date of issuance: June 10, 2016.

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

Amendment Nos.: 202 (Unit 1) and 198 (Unit 2). A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML15289A227; documents related to these amendments are listed in the Safety Evaluation enclosed with the amendments.

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

Date of initial notice in *Federal Register*: May 26, 2015 (80 FR 30102). The supplemental letters dated September 17, 2015, and April 13, 2016, provided additional information that

clarified the application, did not expand the scope of the application as originally noticed, and did not change the staff's original proposed no significant hazards consideration determination as published in the *Federal Register*.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated June 10, 2016.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 22<sup>nd</sup> day of June 2016.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

*/RA/*

Anne T. Boland, Director,  
Division of Operating Reactor Licensing,  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.