

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[NRC-2017-0002]

Biweekly Notice

**Applications and Amendments to Facility Operating Licenses and Combined Licenses
Involving No Significant Hazards Considerations**

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Biweekly notice.

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

This biweekly notice includes all notices of amendments issued, or proposed to be issued, from December 20, 2016 to December 30, 2016. The last biweekly notice was published on January 3, 2016.

DATES: Comments must be filed by February 16, 2017. A request for a hearing must be filed by March 20, 2017.

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

- **Federal Rulemaking Web Site:** Go to <http://www.regulations.gov> and search for Docket ID **NRC-2017-0002**. 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: Kay Goldstein, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington DC 20555-0001; telephone: 301-415-1506, e-mail: Kay.Goldstein@nrc.gov.

I. Obtaining Information and Submitting Comments

A. Obtaining Information

Please refer to Docket ID **NRC-2017-0002** when contacting the NRC about the availability of information for this action. You may obtain publicly-available information related to this action by any of the following methods:

- **Federal rulemaking Web Site:** Go to <http://www.regulations.gov> and search for Docket ID **NRC-2017-0002**.

- **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 this document"

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

B. Submitting Comments

Please include Docket ID **NRC-2017-0002**, facility name, unit number(s), plant docket number, application date, and subject in your comment submission.

The NRC cautions you not to include identifying or contact information that you do not want to be publicly disclosed in your comment submission. The NRC 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 persons (petitioner) whose interest may be affected by this action may file a request for a hearing and petition for leave to intervene (petition) with respect to the action. Petitions shall be filed in accordance with the Commission's "Agency Rules of Practice and Procedure" in 10 CFR part 2. Interested persons should consult a current copy of 10 CFR 2.309. The NRC's regulations are accessible electronically from the NRC Library on the NRC's Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/doc-collections/cfr/>. Alternatively, a copy of the regulations is available at the NRC's Public

Document Room, located at One White Flint North, Room O1-F21, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland 20852. If a petition is filed, the Commission or a presiding officer will rule on the petition and, if appropriate, a notice of a hearing will be issued.

As required by 10 CFR 2.309(d) the petition should specifically explain the reasons why intervention should be permitted with particular reference to the following general requirements for standing: (1) the name, address, and telephone number of the petitioner; (2) the nature of the petitioner's right under the Act to be made a party to the proceeding; (3) the nature and extent of the petitioner's property, financial, or other interest in the proceeding; and (4) the possible effect of any decision or order which may be entered in the proceeding on the petitioner's interest.

In accordance with 10 CFR 2.309(f), the petition must also set forth the specific contentions which the petitioner seeks to have litigated in the proceeding. Each contention must consist of a specific statement of the issue of law or fact to be raised or controverted. In addition, the petitioner must provide a brief explanation of the bases for the contention and a concise statement of the alleged facts or expert opinion which support the contention and on which the petitioner intends to rely in proving the contention at the hearing. The petitioner must also provide references to the specific sources and documents on which the petitioner intends to rely to support its position on the issue. The petition must include sufficient information to show that a genuine dispute exists with the applicant or licensee on a material issue of law or fact. Contentions must be limited to matters within the scope of the proceeding. The contention must be one which, if proven, would entitle the petitioner to relief. A petitioner who fails to satisfy the requirements at 10 CFR 2.309(f) with respect to at least one contention will not be permitted to participate as a party.

Those permitted to intervene become parties to the proceeding, subject to any limitations in the order granting leave to intervene. Parties have the opportunity to participate fully in the conduct of the hearing with respect to resolution of that party's admitted contentions, including the opportunity to present evidence, consistent with the NRC's regulations, policies, and procedures.

Petitions must be filed no later than 60 days from the date of publication of this notice. Petitions and motions for leave to file new or amended contentions that are filed after the deadline will not be entertained absent a determination by the presiding officer that the filing demonstrates good cause by satisfying the three factors in 10 CFR 2.309(c)(1)(i) through (iii). The petition must be filed in accordance with the filing instructions in the "Electronic Submissions (E-Filing)" section of this document.

If a hearing is requested, and the Commission has not made a final determination on the issue of no significant hazards consideration, the Commission will make a final determination on the issue of no significant hazards consideration. The final determination will serve to establish when the hearing is held. If the final determination is that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration, the Commission may issue the amendment and make it immediately effective, notwithstanding the request for a hearing. Any hearing would take place after issuance of the amendment. If the final determination is that the amendment request involves a significant hazards consideration, then any hearing held would take place before the issuance of the amendment unless the Commission finds an imminent danger to the health or safety of the public, in which case it will issue an appropriate order or rule under 10 CFR part 2.

A State, local governmental body, Federally-recognized Indian Tribe, or agency thereof, may submit a petition to the Commission to participate as a party under 10 CFR 2.309(h)(1). The petition should state the nature and extent of the petitioner's interest in the proceeding.

The petition should be submitted to the Commission by March 20, 2017. The petition must be filed in accordance with the filing instructions in the “Electronic Submissions (E-Filing)” section of this document, and should meet the requirements for petitions set forth in this section. Alternatively, a State, local governmental body, Federally-recognized Indian Tribe, or agency thereof may participate as a non-party under 10 CFR 2.315(c).

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

B. Electronic Submissions (E-Filing).

All documents filed in NRC adjudicatory proceedings, including a request for hearing and petition for leave to intervene (petition), any motion or other document filed in the proceeding prior to the submission of a request for hearing or petition to intervene, and documents filed by interested governmental entities that request to participate under 10 CFR 2.315(c), must be filed in accordance with the NRC’s E-Filing rule (72 FR 49139; August 28, 2007, as amended at 77 FR 46562, August 3, 2012). The E-Filing process requires participants to submit and serve all adjudicatory documents over the internet, or in some cases to mail copies on electronic storage

media. Detailed guidance on making electronic submissions may be found in the Guidance for Electronic Submissions to the NRC and on the NRC Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/e-submittals.html>. Participants may not submit paper copies of their filings unless they seek an exemption in accordance with the procedures described below.

To comply with the procedural requirements of E-Filing, at least 10 days prior to the filing deadline, the participant should contact the Office of the Secretary by e-mail at hearing.docket@nrc.gov, or by telephone at 301-415-1677, to (1) request a digital identification (ID) certificate, which allows the participant (or its counsel or representative) to digitally sign submissions and access the E-Filing system for any proceeding in which it is participating; and (2) advise the Secretary that the participant will be submitting a petition or other adjudicatory document (even in instances in which the participant, or its counsel or representative, already holds an NRC-issued digital ID certificate). Based upon this information, the Secretary will establish an electronic docket for the hearing in this proceeding if the Secretary has not already established an electronic docket.

Information about applying for a digital ID certificate is available on the NRC's public Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/e-submittals/getting-started.html>. Once a participant has obtained a digital ID certificate and a docket has been created, the participant can then submit adjudicatory documents. Submissions should be in Portable Document Format (PDF). Additional guidance on PDF submissions is available on the NRC's public Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/electronic-sub-ref-mat.html>. A filing is considered complete at the time the document is submitted through the NRC's E-Filing system. To be timely, an electronic filing must be submitted to the E-Filing system no later than 11:59 p.m. Eastern Time on the due date. Upon receipt of a transmission, the E-Filing system time-stamps the document and sends the submitter an 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 document on those participants separately. Therefore, applicants and other participants (or their counsel or representative) must apply for and receive a digital ID certificate before adjudicatory documents are filed so that they can obtain access to the documents via the E-Filing system.

A person filing electronically using the NRC's adjudicatory E-Filing system may seek assistance by contacting the NRC's Electronic Filing Help Desk through the "Contact Us" link located on the NRC's public Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/e-submittals.html>, by e-mail to MSHD.Resource@nrc.gov, or by a toll-free call at 1-866-672-7640. The NRC Electronic Filing Help Desk is available between 9 a.m. and 6 p.m., Eastern Time, Monday through Friday, excluding government holidays.

Participants who believe that they have a good cause for not submitting documents electronically must file an exemption request, in accordance with 10 CFR 2.302(g), with their initial paper filing stating why there is good cause for not filing electronically and requesting authorization to continue to submit documents in paper format. Such filings must be submitted by: (1) first class mail addressed to the Office of the Secretary of the Commission, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, Attention: Rulemaking and Adjudications Staff; or (2) courier, express mail, or expedited delivery service to the Office of the Secretary, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland, 20852, Attention: Rulemaking and Adjudications Staff. Participants filing adjudicatory documents in this manner are responsible for serving the document on all other participants. Filing is considered complete by first-class mail as of the time of deposit in the mail, or by courier, express mail, or expedited delivery service upon depositing the document with the provider of the service. A presiding officer,

having granted an exemption request from using E-Filing, may require a participant or party to use E-Filing if the presiding officer subsequently determines that the reason for granting the exemption from use of E-Filing no longer exists.

Documents submitted in adjudicatory proceedings will appear in the NRC's electronic hearing docket which is available to the public at <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 personal phone numbers in their filings, unless an NRC regulation or other law requires submission of such information. For example, in some instances, individuals provide home addresses in order to demonstrate proximity to a facility or site. With respect to copyrighted works, except for limited excerpts that serve the purpose of the adjudicatory filings and would constitute a Fair Use application, participants are requested not to include copyrighted materials in their submission.

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

Duke Energy Progress, LLC, 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 (CNS), York County, South Carolina

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

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

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

Date of amendment request: September 27, 2016, as supplemented by letter dated November 22, 2016. Publicly-available versions are in ADAMS under Accession Nos. ML16273A042 and ML16327A325, respectively.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendments would revise the Technical Specification (TS) Surveillance Requirements (SRs), which currently require operating ventilation systems with charcoal filters for a 10-hour period every 31 days. The SRs would be revised to require operation of the systems for 15 continuous minutes every 31 days. The proposed amendments are consistent with NRC-approved Technical Specifications Task Force (TSTF) Traveler TSTF-522, Revision 0, "Revise Ventilation System Surveillance Requirements to Operate for 10 hours per Month," as published in the *Federal Register* on September 20, 2012 (77 FR 58428), with variations due to plant-specific nomenclature.

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. The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis against the standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c). The NRC staff's analysis 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 affects various BSEP, CNS, MNS, HNP, and RNP SRs that currently require ventilation systems to be periodically operated for 10

continuous hours. These SRs would be modified to require operation for 15 continuous minutes.

These systems are not accident initiators and therefore, these changes do not involve a significant increase in the probability of an accident. The proposed system and filter testing changes are consistent with current regulatory guidance for these systems and will continue to assure that these systems perform their design function, which may include mitigating accidents. Thus, the change does not involve a significant increase in the consequences of an accident.

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 change affects various BSEP, CNS, MNS, HNP, and RNP SRs that currently require ventilation systems to be periodically operated for 10 continuous hours. These SRs would be modified to require operation for 15 continuous minutes.

The change proposed for these ventilation systems does not change any system operations or maintenance activities. Testing requirements will be revised and will continue to demonstrate that the Limiting Conditions for Operation are met and the system components are capable of performing their intended safety functions. The change does not create new failure modes or mechanisms and no new accident precursors are generated.

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 change affects various BSEP, CNS, MNS, HNP, and RNP SRs that currently require ventilation systems to be periodically operated for 10 continuous hours. These SRs would be modified to require operation for 15 continuous minutes.

The design basis for the BSEP, HNP, and RNP ventilation systems' heaters is to heat the incoming air, thereby reducing the relative humidity. The proposed

change will continue to demonstrate that the heaters are capable of heating the air and will perform their design function.

The CNS and MNS ventilation systems are tested at 95 percent relative humidity, and, therefore, do not require heaters to heat the incoming air and reduce the relative humidity.

These proposed changes are consistent with regulatory guidance, and do not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

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: Kathryn B. Nolan, Deputy General Counsel, Duke Energy Corporation, 550 South Tyron Street, Mail Code DEC45A, Charlotte NC 28202.

NRC Acting Branch Chief: Jeanne D. Johnston.

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

Date of amendment request: November 18, 2016. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. [ML16343A521](#).

Description of amendment request: The amendment would modify the Technical Specification (TS) definition of Shutdown Margin (SDM) to require calculation of the SDM at a reactor moderator temperature of 68 degrees Fahrenheit (°F), or a higher temperature that represents the most reactive state throughout the operating cycle. This change is needed to address new boiling water reactor (BWR) fuel designs, which may be more reactive at shutdown temperatures above 68 °F. This proposed change is in accordance with the industry Technical

Specifications Task Force (TSTF) initiative identified as Change Traveler TSTF-535, Revision 0, “Revise Shutdown Margin Definition to Address Advanced Fuel Designs.” The availability of this TS improvement was announced in the *Federal Register* published on February 26, 2013 (78 FR 13100), as part of NRC’s Consolidated Line Item Improvement Process.

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

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

Response: No.

The proposed change revises the definition of SDM. SDM is not an initiator to any accident previously evaluated. Accordingly, the proposed change to the definition of SDM has no effect on the probability of any accident previously evaluated. SDM is an assumption in the analysis of some previously evaluated accidents, and inadequate SDM could lead to an increase in consequences for those accidents. However, the proposed change revises the SDM definition to ensure that the correct SDM is determined for all fuel types at all times during the fuel cycle. As a result, the proposed change does not adversely affect the consequences of any accident previously evaluated.

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

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

Response: No.

The proposed change revises the definition of SDM. The change does not involve a physical alteration of the plant (i.e., no new or different type of equipment will be installed) or a change in the methods governing normal plant operations. The change does not alter assumptions made in the safety analysis regarding SDM.

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

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

Response: No.

The proposed change revises the definition of SDM. The proposed change does not alter the manner in which safety limits, limiting safety system settings or limiting conditions for operation are determined. The proposed change ensures that the SDM assumed in determining safety limits, limiting safety system settings or limiting conditions for operation is correct for all BWR fuel types at all times during the fuel cycle.

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

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

Attorney for licensee: Kathryn B. Nolan, Deputy General Counsel, 550 South Tryon Street, M/C DEC45A, Charlotte NC 28202.

NRC Acting Branch Chief: Jeanne D. Johnston.

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

Date of amendment request: October 25, 2016. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML16299A275.

Description of amendment request: This licensee proposes to revise the FCS Updated Safety Analysis Report (USAR) to change the structural design methodology for the Auxiliary Building at FCS. Specifically, the licensee proposes the following changes: (1) use the ultimate strength design (USD) method from the industry standard American Concrete Institute (ACI) 318-63, "Publication SP-10, Commentary on Building Code Requirements for Reinforced Concrete," for

normal operating/service conditions for future designs and evaluations; (2) use higher concrete compressive strength values for Class B concrete, based on original strength test data; (3) use higher reinforcing steel yield strength values, based on original strength test data; and (4) make minor clarifications, including adding a definition of control fluids to the dead load section of the USAR.

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] revises the methodology used to re-evaluate or design new modifications to the existing Auxiliary Building. All other structures will continue to utilize the current license basis and thus are not affected by this change. The proposed change allows evaluations of the Auxiliary Building to apply the ultimate strength design (USD) method from the ACI 318-63 Code for normal operating/service load combinations.

The ACI USD method is an accepted industry standard used for the design and analysis of reinforced concrete. A change in the methodology that an analysis uses to verify structure qualifications does not have any impact on the probability of accidents previously evaluated. Designs performed with the ACI USD method will continue to demonstrate that the Auxiliary Building meets industry accepted ACI Code requirements. This LAR does not propose changes to the no loss-of-function loads, loading combinations, or required USD capacity.

The use of increased concrete strength based on original test data for the areas identified in Section 2.3 of this document and the use of higher steel yield strength maintain adequate structural capacity. As such, these proposed changes do not pose a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated because the revised strength values are determined based on actual original test data using a high level of confidence.

The controlled hydrostatic load is changed from live load to dead load for USD in the definition. This is consistent with ACI-349-97 [American

Concrete Institute Code Requirements for Nuclear Safety Related Concrete Structures] and therefore does not pose a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

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.

This LAR proposes no physical change to any plant system, structure, or component. Similarly, no changes to plant operating practices, operating procedures, computer firmware, or computer software are proposed. This LAR does not propose changes to the design loads used to design Class I structures. Application of the new methodology to the design or evaluation of the Auxiliary Building will continue to ensure the Auxiliary Building will adequately house and protect equipment important to safety.

Calculations that use the ACI USD method for normal operating/service load combinations will continue to demonstrate that the concrete structures meet required design criteria. Use of the increased compressive strength of concrete based on 28-day test data (not age hardening) is permitted by the ACI 318-63 Code and ensures that the concrete structure is capable of performing its design function without alteration or compensatory actions of any kind. A higher steel yield has minimal reduction on design margin. The controlled hydrostatic load is changed from live load to dead load for USD in the definition which is consistent with ACI-349-97.

The use of these alternative methodologies for qualifying the Auxiliary Building does not have a negative impact on the ability of the structure or its components to house and protect equipment important to safety and thus, does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated.

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

Response: No.

The proposed change is for the design of new modifications or re-analysis of the Auxiliary Building.

Utilization of the ACI 318-63 Code USD method applies only to the normal operating/service load cases and is already part of the current license basis (CLB) for no loss-of-function load cases. No changes to

design basis loads are proposed; therefore, new designs or re-evaluations of the Auxiliary Building shall still prove capable of coping with design basis loads.

Use of the increased compressive strength of concrete based on 28-day test data is justified and further constrained by limiting its application to areas where the concrete is not exposed to excessive moisture (i.e. exterior walls below 1007' [foot] elevation). The use of a higher steel yield is conservatively derived from original test data and has minimal reduction on design margin. The controlled hydrostatic load is changed from live load to dead load for USD in the definition which is consistent with ACI-349-97.

Therefore, the proposed 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: David A. Repka, Esq., Winston & Strawn, 1700 K Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20006-3817.

NRC Branch Chief: Douglas A. Broaddus.

Omaha Public Power District, Docket No. 50-285, Fort Calhoun Station, Unit No. 1 (FCS),

Washington County, Nebraska

Date of amendment request: November 18, 2016. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML16323A228.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would delete License Condition 3.D., "Fire Protection Program," which requires that FCS implement and maintain a fire protection program that complies with the requirements of 10 CFR 50.48(a) and 10 CFR

50.48(c). Since power operations are terminated at FCS and the reactor is permanently defueled, FCS will maintain a fire protection program in accordance with 10 CFR 50.48(f).

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

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

Response: No.

The proposed change removes the Fire Protection License Condition which is applicable to an operating reactor. Because FCS is permanently defueled, the proposed change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated because: (1) the proposed amendment does not alter, degrade, or prevent action described or assumed in any accident in the USAR [Updated Safety Analysis Report] from being performed, (2) the proposed amendment does not alter any assumptions previously made in evaluating radiological consequences, and (3) the proposed amendment does not affect the integrity of any fission product barrier.

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

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

Response: No.

The proposed change does not alter any, safety limits, or safety analysis assumptions associated with the operation of the plant. The proposed change does not introduce any new accident initiators, nor does the change reduce or adversely affect the capabilities of any plant structure or system in the performance of its safety function.

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

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

Response: No.

The proposed change does not alter the manner in which safety limits or limiting safety system settings are determined. The safety analysis acceptance criteria are not affected by the proposed change. The proposed change does not change the design function of any equipment assumed to operate in the event of an accident.

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: David A. Repka, Esq., Winston & Strawn, 1700 K Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20006-3817.

NRC Branch Chief: Douglas A. Broaddus.

PSEG Nuclear LLC, and Exelon Generation Company, LLC, Docket Nos. 50-272 and 50-311, Salem Nuclear Generating Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Salem County, New Jersey

Date of amendment request: November 17, 2016. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML16323A279.

Description of amendment request: The amendments would revise the Salem Nuclear Generating Station (Salem), Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Accident Monitoring Instrumentation Technical Specifications (TSs) and Surveillance Requirements by modifying the list of instruments to be operable based on implementation of Regulatory Guide 1.97, Revision 2, "Instrumentation for Light-Water-Cooled Nuclear Power Plants to Assess Plant and Environs Conditions During and Following an Accident." In addition, the amendments would revise the allowed outage times and required actions for inoperable channels to be consistent with NUREG-1431, Revision 4,

“Standard Technical Specifications - Westinghouse Plants.” TS 6.9.4, “Special Reports,” would also be revised to reflect these changes.

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

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

Response: No

The proposed changes to the TS modify Accident Monitoring Instrumentation TS Tables 3.3-11 and 4.3-11 of Salem Units 1 and 2 by removing or adding instruments as listed [in the amendment request], and updating the AOT [allowed outage time] and required actions to better align with the Westinghouse STS [Standard Technical Specifications], NUREG-1431. The instruments listed [in the amendment request] are not assumed to be initiators of any analyzed event of Chapter 15 in the Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (UFSAR). Therefore the probability of an accident previously evaluated is not significantly increased.

The proposed changes do not alter the design of any system, structure, or component (SSC). The proposed changes conform to NRC regulatory guidance regarding the content of plant TS, as identified in 10 CFR 50.36, NUREG-1431, and the NRC Final Policy Statement in 58 FR 39132.

TS Operability requirements are retained for Type A and Category 1 variables. Operability of these instruments ensures sufficient information is available to monitor and assess plant status during and following an accident. Alternate means for diagnosing and responding to instrument malfunctions are unaffected by the proposed change. Therefore, the consequences of an accident previously evaluated are not significantly increased.

Therefore, these proposed changes do not represent 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 to the TS would modify the TS Tables 3.3-11 and 4.3-11 of Salem Units 1 and 2, by removing or adding instruments as listed [in the amendment request], and updating the AOT and required actions to better align with the Westinghouse STS. The proposed changes do not involve a modification to the physical configuration of the plant or changes in the methods governing normal plant operation. The proposed changes will not impose any new or different requirement or introduce a new accident initiator, accident precursor, or malfunction mechanism.

Additionally, there is no change in the types or increases in the amounts of any effluent that may be released off-site and there is no increase in individual or cumulative occupational exposure.

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

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

Response: No

The proposed changes to the TS would modify the TS Tables 3.3-11 and 4.3-11 of Salem Units 1 and 2, by removing or adding instruments as listed [in the amendment request], and updating the AOT and required actions to better align with the Westinghouse STS. The instruments removed from Tables 3.3-11 and 4.3-11 are not needed for manual operator action necessary for safety systems to accomplish their safety function for the design basis events. The instruments listed for removal are indication-only with the exception of containment pressure narrow range instruments; thus, they do not provide an input to any automatic trip functions. In the case where similar or related instruments (e.g., containment pressure-narrow range) are associated with important trips (i.e., RPS or ESF trips), such instruments are governed by separate existing TS sections which are not altered by this request.

Therefore, since the proposed changes do not impact the response of the plant to a design basis accident, the proposed 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: Jeffrie J. Keenan, PSEG Nuclear LLC - N21, P.O. Box 236, Hancocks Bridge, NJ 08038.

NRC Acting Branch Chief: Stephen S. Koenick.

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

Date of amendment request: May 11, 2016, as supplemented by letter dated December 13, 2016. Publicly-available versions are in ADAMS under Accession Nos. ML16132A374 and ML16348A017, respectively.

Description of amendment request: The amendment would revise the Hope Creek Generating Station Technical Specification (TS) requirements by deleting TS Action Statement 3.4.2.1.b concerning stuck open safety/relief valves. In addition, TS 3.6.2.1 Action Statements regarding suppression chamber water temperature would be revised to align with NUREG-1433, Revision 4, "Standard Technical Specifications – General Electric Plants (BWR/4)."

The license amendment request was original noticed in the *Federal Register* on July 19, 2016 (81 FR 46965). The notice is being reissued in its entirety to include the revised scope, description of the amendment request, and proposed no significant hazards consideration determination.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided, in its December 13, 2016, letter, 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 change deletes Action Statement 3.4.2.1.b concerning safety/relief valves and revises TS Action Statement 3.6.2.1.b to be consistent with the BWR Standard Technical Specifications (NUREG-1433, "Standard Technical Specifications General Electric Plants, BWR/4," Revision 4, dated April 2012). The two (2) minute action represents detailed methods of responding to an event, and therefore, if eliminated, would not result in increasing the probability of the event, nor act as an initiator of an event. Limiting condition for operation 3.6.2.1, "Depressurization Systems - Suppression Chamber," and plant procedures provide operators with appropriate direction for response to a suppression pool high temperature (which could be caused by a stuck open relief valve). Providing specific direction to close the valve within two (2) minutes does not provide additional plant protection beyond what is provided for in plant procedures and TS 3.6.2.1.

Therefore, this action can be eliminated, and will 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 TS change deletes Action Statement 3.4.2.1.b concerning safety/relief valves and revises TS Action Statement 3.6.2.1.b to be consistent with the BWR Standard Technical Specifications (NUREG-1433, "Standard Technical Specifications General Electric Plants, BWR/4," Revision 4, dated April 2012). This change does not change the design or configuration of the plant. No new operation or failure modes are created, nor is a system-level failure mode created that is different than those that already exist.

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

Response: No

The proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety, nor does it affect any analytical limits. There are no changes to accident or transient core thermal hydraulic conditions, or fuel or reactor coolant boundary design limits, as a result of the proposed change. The

proposed change will not alter the assumptions or results of the analysis contained in the Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (UFSAR).

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

NRC Acting Branch Chief: Stephen S. Koenick.

Tennessee Valley Authority, Docket No. 50-391, Watts Bar Nuclear Plant (WBN), Unit 2, Rhea County, Tennessee

Date of amendment request: November 23, 2016. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML16333A250.

Description of amendment request: The amendment would revise Technical Specification (TS) Surveillance Requirement (SR) 3.0.2 to extend, on a one-time basis, certain SRs that are normally performed on an 18-month frequency in conjunction with a refueling outage. The proposed change extends the due date for these SRs to October 31, 2017, which allows these SRs to be performed during the first refueling outage for WBN Unit 2.

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

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

Response: No.

The requested action is a one-time extension to the performance interval of a limited number of TS surveillance requirements. The performance of these surveillances, or the extension of these surveillances, is not a precursor to an accident. Performing these surveillances or failing to perform these surveillances does not affect the probability of an accident. Therefore, the proposed delay in performance of the SRs in this amendment request does not increase the probability of an accident previously evaluated.

A delay in performing these surveillances does not result in a system being unable to perform its required function. In the case of this one-time extension request, the short period of additional time that the systems and components will be in service before the next performance of the surveillance will not affect the ability of those systems to operate as designed. Therefore, the systems required to mitigate accidents will remain capable of performing their required function. No new failure modes have been introduced because of this action and the consequences remain consistent with previously evaluated accidents. On this basis, the proposed delay in performance of the SRs in this amendment request does not involve a significant increase in the consequences 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 amendment create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated?

Response: No.

The proposed amendment does not involve a physical alteration of any system, structure, or component (SSC) or a change in the way any SSC is operated. The proposed amendment does not involve operation of any SSCs in a manner or configuration different from those previously recognized or evaluated. No new failure mechanisms will be introduced by the one-time SR extensions being requested.

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

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

Response: No.

The proposed amendment is a one-time extension of the performance interval of a limited number of TS surveillance requirements. Extending these surveillance requirements does not involve a modification of any TS limiting conditions for operation. Extending these SRs does not involve a change to any limit on accident consequences specified in the license or regulations. Extending these SRs does not involve a change in how accidents are mitigated or a significant increase in the consequences of an accident. Extending these SRs does not involve a change in a methodology used to evaluate consequences of an accident. Extending these SRs does not involve a change in any operating procedure or process.

The instrumentation and components involved in this request have exhibited reliable operation based on current test results. The current testing includes power ascension testing and surveillance testing that either partially or fully exercised the components. Some components have been evaluated for extended testing intervals greater than 18 months but are set at WBN to an 18-month frequency.

Based on the limited additional period of time that the systems and components will be in service before the surveillances are next performed, as well as the operating experience that these surveillances are typically successful when performed, it is reasonable to conclude that the margins of safety associated with these SRs will not be affected by the requested extension.

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 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Attorney for licensee: Sherry A. Quirk, Executive Vice President and General Counsel,

Tennessee Valley Authority, 400 West Summit Hill Dr., 6A West Tower, Knoxville, TN 37902.

NRC Acting Branch Chief: Jeanne D. Johnston

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

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

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

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

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

Dominion Nuclear Connecticut, Inc., Docket No. 50-336, Millstone Power Station, Unit No. 2 (MPS2), New London County, Connecticut

Date of amendment request: January 25, 2016, as supplemented by letters dated June 27 and October 12, 2016.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revised the MPS2 technical specifications (TSs) to remove the requirement for the charging pumps to be operable in TS 3.5.2, “Emergency Core Cooling Systems, ECCS Subsystems - $T_{avg} \geq 300$ °F,” by eliminating surveillance requirement 4.5.2.e from the TSs. The proposed change also revises the MPS2 final safety analysis report relative to the long-term analysis of the inadvertent opening of a pressurized water reactor pressurizer pressure relief valve event and clarifies the existing discussion regarding the application of single failure criteria.

Date of issuance: December 22, 2016.

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

Amendment No.: 331. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML16308A485; documents related to this amendment are listed in the Safety Evaluation enclosed with the amendment.

Renewed Facility Operating License No. DPR-65: Amendment revised the Renewed Facility Operating License.

Date of initial notice in *Federal Register*: May 24, 2016 (81 FR 32804). The supplemental letters dated June 27 and October 12, 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 amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated December 22, 2016.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Entergy Operations, Inc., Docket No. 50-368, Arkansas Nuclear One, Unit No. 2, Pope County, Arkansas

Date of application for amendment: December 22, 2015.

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

Date of issuance: December 29, 2016.

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

Amendment No.: 304. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML16267A139; documents related to this amendment are listed in the Safety Evaluation enclosed with the amendment.

Renewed Facility Operating License No. NPF-6: The amendment revised the Renewed Facility Operating License and Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in *Federal Register*: February 16, 2016 (81 FR 7838).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated December 29, 2016.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

Date of amendment request: March 29, 2016, as supplemented by letter dated September 6, 2016.

Brief description of amendments: The amendments revised the technical specification (TS) requirements for snubbers.

Date of issuance: December 29, 2016.

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

Amendment Nos.: 223 and 184. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML16335A038; documents related to these amendments are listed in the Safety Evaluation enclosed with the amendments.

Renewed Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-39 and NPF-85: Amendments revised the Renewed Facility Operating Licenses and TSs.

Date of initial notice in *Federal Register*: May 24, 2016 (81 FR 32807). The supplemental letter dated September 6, 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 December 29, 2016.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Docket Nos. 50-275 and 50-323, Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant (DCPP), Units 1 and 2, San Luis Obispo County, California

Date of application for amendments: October 26, 2011, as supplemented by letters dated December 20, 2011; April 2, April 30, June 6, August 2, September 11, November 27, and December 5, 2012; March 7, March 25, April 30, May 9, May 30, and September 17, 2013; April 24 and April 30, 2014; February 2 and June 22, 2015; and January 25, February 11, and August 17, 2016.

Brief description of amendments: The amendments revised the facility operating licenses to allow the permanent replacement of the current DCPP Eagle 21 digital process protection system (PPS) with a new digital PPS that is based on the Invensys Operations Management Tricon Programmable Logic Controller (PLC), Version 10, and the CS Innovations, LLC (a Westinghouse Electric Company), Advanced Logic System. The amendments also incorporate a revised definition of Channel Operational Test in Technical Specification (TS) 1.1, "Definitions."

Date of issuance: December 21, 2016.

Effective date: This license amendment is effective as of its date of issuance and shall be implemented within 120 days from the date of issuance.

Amendment Nos.: Unit 1 - 227; Unit 2 - 229. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML16139A008; documents related to these amendments are listed in the Safety Evaluation enclosed with the amendments.

Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-80 and DPR-82: The amendments revised the Facility Operating Licenses and Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in *Federal Register*: June 7, 2016 (81 FR 36606). The supplemental letter dated August 17, 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 December 21, 2016.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

STP Nuclear Operating Company, Docket No. 50-498, South Texas Project, Unit 1, Matagorda County, Texas

Date of amendment request: April 7, 2016, as supplemented by letters dated May 25 and September 28, 2016.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revised Technical Specification 5.3.2, "Control Rod Assemblies," to allow permanent operation with 56 full-length control rods with no control rod assembly in core location D-6.

Date of issuance: December 21, 2016.

Effective date: As of the date of issuance and shall be implemented prior to entering Mode 5 from Mode 6 during startup from refueling outage 1RE20.

Amendment No.: Unit 1 - 211. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML16319A010; documents related to this amendment are listed in the Safety Evaluation enclosed with the amendment.

Facility Operating License No. NPF-76: The amendment revised the Facility Operating License and Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in *Federal Register*: July 19, 2016 (81 FR 46967). The supplemental letter dated September 28, 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 amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated December 21, 2016.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

ZionSolutions, LLC, Docket Nos. 50-295 and 50-304, Zion Nuclear Power Station, Units 1 and 2, Lake County, Illinois

Date of application for amendment: January 7, 2016, as supplemented by letter dated June 22, 2016, and December 1, 2016.

Brief description of amendment: This amendment revises the Zion Nuclear Power Station Licenses to approve the Independent Spent Fuel Installation (ISFSI) only Emergency Plan.

Date of issuance: December 20, 2016.

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

Amendment Nos.: 190 and 177. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML16211A074; documents related to these amendments are listed in the Safety Evaluation enclosed with the amendments.

Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-39 and NPF-48: These amendments revise the Licenses.

Date of initial notice in FEDERAL REGISTER: March 1, 2016, (81 FR 10683). The supplemental letters dated June 22, 2016, and December 1, 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 amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated December 20, 2016.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

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

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

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

In circumstances where failure to act in a timely way would have resulted, for example, in derating or shutdown of a nuclear power plant or in prevention of either resumption of operation or of increase in power output up to the plant's licensed power level, the Commission may not have had an opportunity to provide for public comment on its no significant hazards consideration determination. In such case, the license amendment has been issued without opportunity for comment. If there has been some time for public comment but less than 30 days, the Commission may provide an opportunity for public comment. If comments have been requested, it is so stated. In either event, the State has been consulted by telephone whenever possible.

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

The Commission has applied the standards of 10 CFR 50.92 and has made a final determination that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration. The basis for this determination is contained in the documents related to this action. Accordingly, the amendments have been issued and made effective as indicated.

Unless otherwise indicated, the Commission has determined that these amendments satisfy the criteria for categorical exclusion in accordance with 10 CFR 51.22. Therefore, pursuant to 10 CFR 51.22(b), no environmental impact statement or environmental assessment need be prepared for these amendments. If the Commission has prepared an environmental assessment under the special circumstances provision in 10 CFR 51.12(b) and has made a determination based on that assessment, it is so indicated.

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

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

The Commission is also offering an opportunity for a hearing with respect to the issuance of the amendment.

Within 60 days after the date of publication of this notice, any persons (petitioner) whose interest may be affected by this action may file a request for a hearing and petition for leave to intervene (petition) with respect to the action. Petitions shall be filed in accordance with the Commission's "Agency Rules of Practice and Procedure" in 10 CFR part 2. Interested persons should consult a current copy of 10 CFR 2.309. The NRC's regulations are accessible electronically from the NRC Library on the NRC's Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/doc-collections/cfr/>. Alternatively, a copy of the regulations is available at the NRC's Public Document Room, located at One White Flint North, Room O1-F21, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland 20852. If a petition is filed, the Commission or a presiding officer will rule on the petition and, if appropriate, a notice of a hearing will be issued.

As required by 10 CFR 2.309(d) the petition should specifically explain the reasons why intervention should be permitted with particular reference to the following general requirements for standing: (1) the name, address, and telephone number of the petitioner; (2) the nature of the petitioner's right under the Act to be made a party to the proceeding; (3) the nature and extent of the petitioner's property, financial, or other interest in the proceeding; and (4) the

possible effect of any decision or order which may be entered in the proceeding on the petitioner's interest.

In accordance with 10 CFR 2.309(f), the petition must also set forth the specific contentions which the petitioner seeks to have litigated in the proceeding. Each contention must consist of a specific statement of the issue of law or fact to be raised or controverted. In addition, the petitioner must provide a brief explanation of the bases for the contention and a concise statement of the alleged facts or expert opinion which support the contention and on which the petitioner intends to rely in proving the contention at the hearing. The petitioner must also provide references to the specific sources and documents on which the petitioner intends to rely to support its position on the issue. The petition must include sufficient information to show that a genuine dispute exists with the applicant or licensee on a material issue of law or fact. Contentions must be limited to matters within the scope of the proceeding. The contention must be one which, if proven, would entitle the petitioner to relief. A petitioner who fails to satisfy the requirements at 10 CFR 2.309(f) with respect to at least one contention will not be permitted to participate as a party.

Those permitted to intervene become parties to the proceeding, subject to any limitations in the order granting leave to intervene. Parties have the opportunity to participate fully in the conduct of the hearing with respect to resolution of that party's admitted contentions, including the opportunity to present evidence, consistent with the NRC's regulations, policies, and procedures.

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

The petition must be filed in accordance with the filing instructions in the “Electronic Submissions (E-Filing)” section of this document.

If a hearing is requested, and the Commission has not made a final determination on the issue of no significant hazards consideration, the Commission will make a final determination on the issue of no significant hazards consideration. The final determination will serve to establish when the hearing is held. If the final determination is that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration, the Commission may issue the amendment and make it immediately effective, notwithstanding the request for a hearing. Any hearing would take place after issuance of the amendment. If the final determination is that the amendment request involves a significant hazards consideration, then any hearing held would take place before the issuance of the amendment unless the Commission finds an imminent danger to the health or safety of the public, in which case it will issue an appropriate order or rule under 10 CFR part 2.

A State, local governmental body, Federally-recognized Indian Tribe, or agency thereof, may submit a petition to the Commission to participate as a party under 10 CFR 2.309(h)(1). The petition should state the nature and extent of the petitioner’s interest in the proceeding. The petition should be submitted to the Commission by March 20, 2017. The petition must be filed in accordance with the filing instructions in the “Electronic Submissions (E-Filing)” section of this document, and should meet the requirements for petitions set forth in this section, except that under 10 CFR 2.309(h)(2) a State, local governmental body, or federally recognized Indian Tribe, or agency thereof does not need to address the standing requirements in 10 CFR 2.309(d) if the facility is located within its boundaries. Alternatively, a State, local governmental body, Federally-recognized Indian Tribe, or agency thereof may participate as a non-party under 10 CFR 2.315(c).

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

B. Electronic Submissions (E-Filing).

All documents filed in NRC adjudicatory proceedings, including a request for hearing and petition for leave to intervene (petition), any motion or other document filed in the proceeding prior to the submission of a request for hearing or petition to intervene, and documents filed by interested governmental entities that request to participate under 10 CFR 2.315(c), must be filed in accordance with the NRC's E-Filing rule (72 FR 49139; August 28, 2007, as amended at 77 FR 46562, August 3, 2012). The E-Filing process requires participants to submit and serve all adjudicatory documents over the internet, or in some cases to mail copies on electronic storage media. Detailed guidance on making electronic submissions may be found in the Guidance for Electronic Submissions to the NRC and on the NRC Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/e-submittals.html>. Participants may not submit paper copies of their filings unless they seek an exemption in accordance with the procedures described below.

To comply with the procedural requirements of E-Filing, at least 10 days prior to the filing deadline, the participant should contact the Office of the Secretary by e-mail at hearing.docket@nrc.gov, or by telephone at 301-415-1677, to (1) request a digital identification (ID) certificate, which allows the participant (or its counsel or representative) to digitally sign submissions and access the E-Filing system for any proceeding in which it is participating; and (2) advise the Secretary that the participant will be submitting a petition or other adjudicatory document (even in instances in which the participant, or its counsel or representative, already holds an NRC-issued digital ID certificate). Based upon this information, the Secretary will establish an electronic docket for the hearing in this proceeding if the Secretary has not already established an electronic docket.

Information about applying for a digital ID certificate is available on the NRC's public Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/e-submittals/getting-started.html>. Once a participant has obtained a digital ID certificate and a docket has been created, the participant can then submit adjudicatory documents. Submissions should be in Portable Document Format (PDF). Additional guidance on PDF submissions is available on the NRC's public Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/electronic-sub-ref-mat.html>. A filing is considered complete at the time the document is submitted through the NRC's E-Filing system. To be timely, an electronic filing must be submitted to the E-Filing system no later than 11:59 p.m. Eastern Time on the due date. Upon receipt of a transmission, the E-Filing system time-stamps the document and sends the submitter an 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 document on those participants separately. Therefore, applicants and other participants (or their counsel or representative)

must apply for and receive a digital ID certificate before adjudicatory documents are filed so that they can obtain access to the documents via the E-Filing system.

A person filing electronically using the NRC's adjudicatory E-Filing system may seek assistance by contacting the NRC's Electronic Filing Help Desk through the "Contact Us" link located on the NRC's public Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/e-submittals.html>, by e-mail to MSHD.Resource@nrc.gov, or by a toll-free call at 1-866-672-7640. The NRC Electronic Filing Help Desk is available between 9 a.m. and 6 p.m., Eastern Time, Monday through Friday, excluding government holidays.

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

Documents submitted in adjudicatory proceedings will appear in the NRC's electronic hearing docket which is available to the public at <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 personal phone numbers in their filings, unless an NRC regulation or other law requires submission of such information. For example, in some instances, individuals provide home addresses in order to demonstrate proximity to a facility or site. With respect to copyrighted works, except for limited excerpts that serve the purpose of the adjudicatory filings and would constitute a Fair Use application, participants are requested not to include copyrighted materials in their submission.

The Commission will issue a notice or order granting or denying a hearing request or intervention petition, designating the issues for any hearing that will be held and designating the Presiding Officer. A notice granting a hearing will be published in the Federal Register and served on the parties to the hearing.

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.

Arizona Public Service Company, et al., Docket No. STN 50-530, Palo Verde Nuclear
Generating Station, Unit No. 3, Maricopa County, Arizona

Date of application for amendment: December 21, 2016, as supplemented by letter dated
December 23, 2016.

Brief description of amendment: The emergency amendment revised the Technical Specifications (TSs) for a one-time extension of the emergency diesel generator (DG) completion time described in TS 3.8.1.B.4. Specifically, the emergency amendment extended the TS required action 3.8.1.B.4 completion time from 10 days to 21 days for the purpose of collecting and analyzing data associated with the failure of train B DG and continuing with the repair of the DG. During surveillance testing on December 15, 2016, the DG suffered a failure of the number nine right cylinder connecting rod and piston. Current plans to collect and analyze data associated with the engine failure and continue with the repair will exceed the TS required action completion time of 10 days. As a result, the licensee evaluated the defense-in-depth and compensatory measures and is requesting a one-time deterministic license amendment to extend the completion time based upon the guidance of Standard Review Plan Branch Technical Position 8-8, "Onsite (Emergency Diesel Generators) and Offsite Power Sources Allowed Outage Time Extensions."

Date of issuance: December 23, 2016.

Effective date: As of the date of issuance and shall be implemented prior to the expiration of the 10-days completion time, or December 25, 2016, at 3:56 AM PST.

Amendment No.: Unit 3 - 199. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML16358A676; documents related to this amendment are listed in the Safety Evaluation enclosed with the amendment.

Renewed Facility Operating License No. NPF-74: The amendment revised the Operating License and TSs.

Public comments requested as to Proposed no significant hazards consideration (NSHC): No.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment, finding of emergency circumstances, state consultation, and final NSHC determination are contained in a safety evaluation dated December 23, 2016.

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.

Southern Nuclear Operating Company, Inc., Docket No. 50-425, Vogtle Electric Generating Plant, Unit 2, Burke County, Georgia

Date of amendment request: December 13, 2016.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment modifies the Unit 2 Technical Specifications (TS) Limiting Condition for Operation (LCO) 3.7.9, "Ultimate Heat Sink (UHS)," to add a Note to extend the completion time of Condition D.2.2 of LCO 3.7.9 to 77 days to allow for refurbishing the 2A nuclear service cooling water transfer pump. This TS change would be only for the 2A NSCW transfer pump during operating Cycle 19.

Date of issuance: December 21, 2016.

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

Amendment No.: 165. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No.

ML16354A133; documents related to this amendment are listed in the Safety Evaluation enclosed with the amendment.

Renewed Facility Operating License No. NPF-81: Amendment revised the Renewed Facility Operating License and TSs.

Public comments requested as to proposed no significant hazards consideration (NSHC): Yes.

Public notice of the proposed amendment was published in *The Augusta Chronicle*, located in Augusta, Georgia, on December 17 and December 18, 2016. The notice provided an opportunity to submit comments on the Commission's proposed NSHC determination. No Comments were received.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment, finding of exigent circumstances, state consultation, public comments, and final NSHC determination are contained in a safety evaluation dated December 21, 2016.

Attorney for licensee: Jennifer M. Buettner, Associate General Counsel, Southern Nuclear Operating Company, Inc., 40 Inverness Center Parkway, Birmingham, AL 35242.

NRC Branch Chief: Michael T. Markley.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 6th day of January 2017.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

/RA/

George A. Wilson, Deputy Director,
Division of Operating Reactor Licensing,
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.