

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

BIWEEKLY NOTICE

NRC-2009-0261

APPLICATIONS AND AMENDMENTS TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSES
INVOLVING NO SIGNIFICANT HAZARDS CONSIDERATIONS

I. Background

Pursuant to section 189a. (2) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission or NRC staff) is publishing this regular biweekly notice. The Act requires the Commission publish notice of any amendments issued, or proposed to be issued and grants the Commission the authority to issue and make immediately effective any amendment to an operating license 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 4, 2009 to June 17, 2009. The last biweekly notice was published on June 16, 2009 (74 FR 28575).

NOTICE OF CONSIDERATION OF ISSUANCE OF AMENDMENTS TO
FACILITY OPERATING LICENSES, PROPOSED NO SIGNIFICANT HAZARDS
CONSIDERATION DETERMINATION, AND OPPORTUNITY FOR A HEARING

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

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

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

make a final No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, any hearing will take place after issuance. The Commission expects that the need to take this action will occur very infrequently.

Written comments may be submitted by mail to the Chief, Rulemaking and Directives Branch, TWB-05-B01M, Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, and should cite the publication date and page number of this *Federal Register* notice. Copies of written comments received may be examined at the Commission's Public Document Room (PDR), located at One White Flint North, Public File Area O1F21, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland.

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. Requests for a hearing and a petition for leave to intervene shall be filed in accordance with the Commission's "Rules of Practice for Domestic Licensing Proceedings" in 10 CFR Part 2. Interested person(s) should consult a current copy of 10 CFR 2.309, which is available at the Commission's PDR, located at One White Flint North, Public File Area O1F21, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland. Publicly available records will be accessible from the Agencywide Documents Access and Management System's (ADAMS) Public Electronic Reading Room on the Internet at the NRC Web site, <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 petitioner/requestor 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 petitioner/requestor 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 petitioner/requestor intends to rely in proving the contention at the hearing. The petitioner/requestor must also provide references to those specific sources and documents of which the petitioner is aware and on which the petitioner/requestor 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 petitioner/requestor to relief. A petitioner/requestor who fails to satisfy these requirements with respect to at least one contention will not be permitted to participate as a party.

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

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

All documents filed in NRC adjudicatory proceedings, including a request for hearing, a petition for leave to intervene, any motion or other document filed in the proceeding prior to the submission of a request for hearing or petition to intervene, and documents filed by interested governmental entities participating under 10 CFR 2.315(c), must be filed in accordance with the NRC E-Filing rule, which the NRC promulgated in August 28, 2007 (72 FR 49139). 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 a waiver in accordance with the procedures described below.

To comply with the procedural requirements of E-Filing, at least five (5) days prior to the filing deadline, the petitioner/requestor must contact the Office of the Secretary by e-mail at hearing.docket@nrc.gov, or by calling (301) 415-1677, to request (1) a digital 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/or (2) creation of an electronic docket for the proceeding (even in instances in which the petitioner/requestor (or its counsel or representative) already holds an NRC-issued digital ID certificate). Each petitioner/requestor will need to download the Workplace Forms Viewer™ to access the Electronic Information Exchange (EIE), a component of the E-Filing system. The Workplace Forms Viewer™ is free and is available at <http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/e-submittals/install-viewer.html>. Information about applying for a digital ID certificate is available on NRC's public website at <http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/e-submittals/apply-certificates.html>.

Once a petitioner/requestor has obtained a digital ID certificate, had a docket created, and downloaded the EIE viewer, it 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 public website at <http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/e-submittals.html>. A filing is considered complete at the time the filer submits its documents through EIE. To be timely, an electronic filing must be submitted to the EIE 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 EIE system also distributes an e-mail notice that provides access to the document to the NRC 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 may seek assistance through the “Contact Us” link located on the NRC website at <http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/e-submittals.html> or by calling the NRC electronic filing Help Desk, which is available between 8:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m., Eastern Time, Monday through Friday, excluding government holidays. The electronic filing Help Desk can be contacted by telephone at 1-866-672-7640 or by e-mail at MSHD.Resource@nrc.gov.

Participants who believe that they have a good cause for not submitting documents electronically must file a motion, 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.

Non-timely requests and/or petitions and contentions will not be entertained absent a determination by the Commission, the presiding officer, or the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board that the petition and/or request should be granted and/or the contentions should be admitted, based on a balancing of the factors specified in 10 CFR 2.309(c)(1)(i)-(viii).

Documents submitted in adjudicatory proceedings will appear in NRC's electronic hearing docket which is available to the public at http://ehd.nrc.gov/EHD_Proceeding/home.asp, unless excluded pursuant to an order of the

Commission, an Atomic Safety and Licensing Board, or a 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. With respect to copyrighted works, except for limited excerpts that serve the purpose of the adjudicatory filings and would constitute a Fair Use application, participants are requested not to include copyrighted materials in their submission.

For further details with respect to this amendment action, see the application for amendment which is available for public inspection at the Commission's PDR, located at One White Flint North, Public File Area 01F21, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland. Publicly available records will be accessible from the ADAMS Public Electronic Reading Room on the Internet at the NRC Web site, <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html>. If you do not have access to ADAMS or if there are problems in accessing the documents located in ADAMS, contact the PDR Reference staff at 1 (800) 397-4209, (301) 415-4737 or by email to pdr.resource@nrc.gov.

Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant, Inc., Docket Nos. 50-317 and 50-318, Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Calvert County, Maryland

Date of amendments request: May 21, 2009

Description of amendments request: The amendments would remove the Table of Contents (TOC) from the Technical Specifications (TSs) and place them under licensee control.

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

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

No.

The proposed change is administrative and affects control of a document, the TOC, listing the specifications in the plant TSs. Transferring control from the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) to CCNPP [Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant] (the licensee) does not affect the operation, physical configuration, or function of plant equipment or systems. It does not impact the initiators or assumptions of analyzed events; nor does it impact the mitigation of accidents or transient events. The change has no impact on, and hence cannot 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?

No.

The proposed change is administrative and does not alter the plant configuration, require installation of new equipment, alter assumptions about previously analyzed accidents, or impact the operation or function of plant equipment or systems. Therefore, this 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?

No.

The proposed change is administrative. The TOC is not required by regulation to be in the TS. Removal does not impact any safety assumptions or have the potential to reduce a margin of safety as described in the TS Bases. The change involves a transfer of control of the TOC from the NRC to CCNPP. No change in the technical content of the TS specifications is involved. Consequently, transfer from the NRC to CCNPP has no impact on the margin of safety, and hence cannot 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 amendments request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Attorney for licensee: Carey Fleming, Sr. Counsel - Nuclear Generation, Constellation Generation Group, LLC, 750 East Pratt Street, 17th floor, Baltimore, MD 21202

NRC Acting Branch Chief: John Boska

Entergy Nuclear Vermont Yankee, LLC and Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc.,

Docket No. 50-271, Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station, Vernon, Vermont

Date of amendment request: May 5, 2009.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would revise the Technical Specification (TS) Section 6.7.C to change requirements related to the schedule for performing the 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J, Type A test. Specifically, the proposed change would change the TS from requiring the test “no later than April 2010” to “prior to startup from the April 2010 refuel outage.”

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:

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

Response: No. The change does not impact the function of any structure, system or component that affects the probability of an accident or that supports mitigation or consequences of an accident previously evaluated. The proposed change involves testing of Primary Containment but does not impact containment design or performance requirements. The proposed change ensures that the Type A test is performed prior to establishing Primary Containment following the April 2010 Refuel[ing] Outage. The proposed change does not affect reactor operations or accident analysis and there is no change to the radiological consequences of a previously analyzed accident. The operability requirements for accident mitigation systems remain consistent with the licensing and design basis. Therefore, the proposed change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

- 2.0 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 does not involve any physical alteration of plant equipment and does not change the method by which any safety-related system performs its function. The proposed change involves the scheduling of the Type A test and does not alter the way the test is performed. Type A tests have been previously performed and are well within the design capability of station structures, systems or components. No new or different types of equipment will be permanently installed or operated. Operation of existing installed equipment is unchanged. The methods governing plant operation and testing remain consistent with current safety analysis assumptions. Therefore, the proposed change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

- 3.0 Does the proposed change involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety?

Response: No. These changes do not change any existing design or operational requirements and do not adversely affect existing plant safety margins or the reliability of the equipment assumed to operate in the safety analysis. The proposed change affects the schedule for performing the Type A test and does not affect the way the test is performed or margins for the existing Primary Containment. As such, there are no changes being made to safety analysis assumptions, safety limits or safety system settings that would adversely affect plant safety as a result of the proposed change. 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: Mr. William C. Dennis, Assistant General Counsel, Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc., 400 Hamilton Avenue, White Plains, NY 10601

NRC Acting Branch Chief: John Boska

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

Date of amendment request: May 13, 2009

Description of amendment request: The proposed change will modify the Technical Specification (TS) 2.1.1.1, "DNBR," to revise the Departure from Nucleate Boiling Ratio (DNBR) safety limit based upon the Combustion Engineering (CE) 16 x 16 Next Generation Fuel (NGF) design and the associated Departure from Nucleate Boiling (DNB) correlations.

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.

No changes to plant equipment or operating procedures are required due to the change in the safety limit for DNBR. This change does not impact any of the accident initiators. The analyses of the reload are performed using NRC [U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission] approved methodologies to ensure the Specified Acceptable Fuel Design Limits (SAFDLs), of which DNBR is one, are not violated. The current DNBR setpoint continues to ensure automatic protective action is initiated to prevent exceeding the proposed DNBR safety limit.

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 does not result in any plant modifications or change in the way the plant is designed to function. The proposed change is not associated with any accident precursor or initiator. The proposed change supports the loading and use of Next Generation

Fuel (NGF) at ANO-2 [Arkansas Nuclear One, Unit 2] as previously approved by the NRC.

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

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

Response: No.

The use the NRC-approved NGF WSSV-T correlation with the ABB-NV correlation to establish a new bounding DNBR safety limit of 1.23, preserves the DNBR margin of safety at a 95/95 level. The Core Protection Calculator (CPC) DNBR power adjustment addressable constant BERR1 is calculated based on the WSSV-T and ABB-NV CHF [critical heat flux] correlations such that a CPC trip at a DNBR of 1.25 using the CE-1 CHF correlation assures that the bounding DNBR safety limit of 1.23 for the WSSV-T and ABB-NV CHF correlations will not be violated during normal operation and AOOs [anticipated operational occurrences] to at least a 95/95 probability / confidence level.

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: Terence A. Burke, Associate General Council - Nuclear Entergy Services, Inc., 1340 Echelon Parkway, Jackson, Mississippi 39213

NRC Branch Chief: Michael T. Markley

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

Date of amendment request: May 15, 2009

Description of amendment request: The amendment would modify Technical Specification (TS) 6.6.5, "Core Operating Limits Report (COLR)," to minimize the number of U.S. Nuclear

Regulatory Commission (NRC)-approved references consistent with the guidance provided in NRC Generic Letter 88-16, "Removal of Cycle-Specific Parameter Limits from Technical Specifications," dated October 3, 1988. This request also fulfills the commitment made in the licensee's letter to the NRC dated March 11, 2008, "Response to Request for Additional Information License Amendment Request to Revise Technical Specification 6.6.5, Core Operating Limits Report."

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 to the list of NRC-approved methodologies listed in TS 6.6.5 are administrative in nature and have no impact on any plant configuration or system performance relied upon to mitigate the consequences of an accident. Changes to the calculated core operating limits may only be made using NRC-approved methodologies, must be consistent with all applicable safety analysis limits, and are controlled by the 10 CFR 50.59 [Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* Section 50.59] process.

The proposed change will minimize and clarify the listing of the NRC-approved methodologies that are currently being used in the ANO-2 [Arkansas Nuclear One, Unit 2] core designs and the determination of the operating limits for those cores. Assumptions used for accident initiators and/or safety analysis acceptance criteria are not altered by the proposed changes.

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

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

Response: No.

The proposed change to the list of topical reports used to determine the operating limits has no impact on any plant configurations or on system performance that is relied upon to mitigate the consequences of an accident. These changes are administrative in nature and do not result in a change to the physical plant or to the modes of operation defined in the facility license.

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

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

Response: No.

The proposed change does not amend the cycle specific parameter limits located in the COLR from the values presently required by the TS. The individual specifications continue to require operation of the plant within the bounds of the limits specified in COLR. The proposed change to the list of analytical methods referenced in the COLR is administrative in nature.

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: Terence A. Burke, Associate General Council – Nuclear Entergy Services, Inc., 1340 Echelon Parkway, Jackson, Mississippi 39213

NRC Branch Chief: Michael T. Markley

Entergy Operations, Inc., Docket No. 50-382, Waterford Steam Electric Station, Unit 3, St. Charles Parish, Louisiana

Date of amendment request: May 22, 2009

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment will modify the Waterford Steam Electric Station, Unit 3 (Waterford 3), Technical Specification (TS) 6.9.1.11 to minimize the number of references that reflect U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC)-approved methods used in establishing the Core Operating Limits Report (COLR) parameter limits, consistent with the guidance provided in NRC Generic Letter 88-16, "Removal of Cycle-Specific Parameter Limits from Technical Specifications," dated October 3, 1988.

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 to the list of NRC-approved methodologies listed in TS 6.9.1.11.1 are administrative in nature and have no impact on any plant configuration or system performance relied upon to mitigate the consequences of an accident. Changes to the calculated core operating limits may only be made using NRC approved methodologies, must be consistent with all applicable safety analysis limits, and are controlled by the 10 CFR 50.59 [Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* Section 50.59] process.

The proposed changes will minimize and clarify the listing of the NRC-approved methodologies that are currently being used in the Waterford 3 core designs and the determination of the operating limits for those cores.

Assumptions used for accident initiators and/or safety analysis acceptance criteria are not altered by the proposed changes.

Therefore, the proposed changes do 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 to the list of topical reports used to determine the operating limits has no impact on any plant configurations or on system performance that is relied upon to mitigate the consequences of an accident. These changes are administrative in nature and do not result in a change to the physical plant or to the modes of operation defined in the facility license.

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

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

Response: No.

The proposed changes do not amend the cycle specific parameter limits located in the COLR from the values presently required by the TS. The individual specifications continue to require operation of the plant within the bounds of the limits specified in COLR.

The proposed changes to the list of analytical methods referenced in the COLR are administrative in nature.

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: Terence A. Burke, Associate General Counsel – Nuclear Entergy Services, Inc., 1340 Echelon Parkway, Jackson, Mississippi 39213

NRC Branch Chief: Michael T. Markley

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

Docket Nos. 50-254 and 50-265, Quad Cities Nuclear Power Station (QCPS), Units 1 and 2, Rock Island County, Illinois

Date of application for amendment request: April 7, 2009

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment deletes a no longer applicable footnote from the DNPS Technical Specifications (TS), corrects administrative errors in the titles of analytical methods, and deletes historical analytical methods no longer applicable in DNPS and QCPS TS. The proposed amendment also deletes a license condition from the DNPS and QCPS Renewed Facility Operating License (FOL).

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

Response: No

DNPS TS 3.4.5, "RCS Leakage Detection Instrumentation," establishes the applicability and requirements for equipment used to quantify unidentified reactor coolant system operational leakage (i.e., the drywell floor drain sump monitoring system). The proposed change deletes a footnote that established a limited duration alternative to these requirements for DNPS Unit 3.

The deletion of the footnote restores DNPS TS 3.4.5 requirements to the requirements prior to NRC approval of an emergency license amendment, which provided an alternative means to demonstrate TS compliance. In that the condition necessitating the footnote (i.e., a failed component) has been resolved (i.e., repair of the failed component), the footnote is no longer applicable. The proposed change will have no effect on any accident initiator or precursor previously evaluated and will not change the manner in which the plant is operated. Thus, the proposed change does not have any effect on the probability of an accident previously evaluated.

DNPS and QCNPS TS 5.6.5 "Core Operating Limits Report (COLR)," lists the NRC-approved analytical methods that are used at DNPS and QCNPS to determine core operating limits. The proposed changes will correct administrative errors in the titles of several analytical methods in DNPS and QCNPS TS 5.6.5.b. The proposed changes will also delete historical analytical methods from DNPS and QCNPS TS 5.6.5.b that are no longer applicable, as well as renumber the remaining analytical methods.

The correction of administrative errors in the titles of analytical methods does not change the content or application of the methods. Similarly, the deletion of

non-applicable analytical methods does not affect the ability to accurately model core behavior, including the determination of core operating limits, for the fuel that is currently loaded in the DNPS and QCNPS reactors. Therefore, the proposed changes will have no effect on any accident initiator or precursor previously evaluated and will not change the manner in which the core is operated. Thus, the proposed changes do not have any effect on the probability of an accident previously evaluated.

Finally, the proposed changes will delete a license condition in the DNPS Units 2 and 3 and QCNPS Units 1 and 2 Facility Operating Licenses (FOLs) that limits the maximum average fuel rod burnup to 60 gigawattdays per metric ton of uranium (GWD/MTU) until a generic environmental assessment that supports an extended limit is approved.

The proposed deletion of the license condition is justified by completion of generic environmental assessments for DNPS and QCNPS (i.e. as required by the license condition). As such, these license conditions are no longer required or applicable. Therefore, the proposed change will have no effect on any accident initiator or precursor previously evaluated and will not change the manner in which the core is operated. Thus, the proposed changes do not have any effect on the probability of an accident previously evaluated.

The proposed changes to the DNPS TS 3.4.5, DNPS and QCNPS TS 5.6.5.b, and the deletion of the Renewed FOL license conditions do not affect the ability to successfully respond to previously evaluated accidents and does not affect the radiological assumptions used in the evaluations for both DNPS and QCNPS.

Thus, the proposed changes will have no effect on the type or amount of radiation released, and will have no effect on predicted offsite doses in the event of an accident.

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

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

Response: No

The proposed changes to DNPS TS Section 3.4.5, DNPS and QCNPS TS Section 5.6.5, and the proposed deletion of Renewed FOL license conditions do not affect the performance of any structure, system, or component credited with mitigating any accident previously evaluated.

The deletion of the footnote from DNPS TS 3.4.5 restores TS requirements to the requirements prior to NRC approval of an August 2008 emergency license amendment. The proposed deletion of the footnote does not affect the control parameters governing unit operation or the response of plant equipment to

transient conditions. The proposed changes do not introduce any new modes of system operation or failure mechanisms.

The NRC-approved analytical methodologies in TS 5.6.5.b are used to accurately model core behavior, including the determination of core operating limits, for the fuel that is currently loaded in the DNPS and QCNPS reactors. These methodologies do not affect the control parameters governing unit operation or the response of plant equipment to transient conditions. The proposed changes do not introduce any new modes of system operation or failure mechanisms.

The existing Renewed FOL license condition limits fuel burnup until completion of a generic environmental assessment. In June 2004, the NRC issued NUREG-1437, "Generic Environmental Impact Statement for License Renewal of Nuclear Plants," Supplement 16, "Quad Cities Nuclear Power Station, Units 1 and 2," and Supplement 17, "Dresden Nuclear Power Station, Units 2 and 3." Based on the completion and conclusions of these generic environmental assessments for DNPS and QCNPS, the license condition limiting fuel burnup for each unit has been satisfied. As such, these license conditions are no longer required or applicable.

The proposed deletion of the license condition does not affect the control parameters governing unit operation or the response of plant equipment to transient conditions. The proposed changes do not introduce any new modes of system operation or failure mechanisms.

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

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

Response: No

The proposed changes to DNPS TS 3.4.5, DNPS and QCNPS TS 5.6.5.b, and the DNPS and QCNPS Renewed FOLs (i.e., deletion of the fuel burnup license condition) will not affect the ability to quantify unidentified RCS leakage, accurately model core behavior for the currently loaded fuel, and ensure compliance with NRC-approved LTRs.

As such, the proposed changes do not modify the safety limits or setpoints at which protective actions are initiated and do not change the requirements governing operation or availability of safety equipment assumed to operate to preserve the margin of safety. Therefore, the proposed changes provide an equivalent level of protection as that currently provided.

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: Mr. Bradley J. Fewell, Associate General Counsel, Exelon Nuclear, 4300 Winfield Road, Warrenville, IL 60555.

NRC Branch Chief: Russell A. Gibbs

Florida Power and Light Company, Docket Nos. 50-250 and 50-251, Turkey Point Plant, Units 3 and 4, Miami-Dade County, Florida

Date of amendment request: April 13, 2009

Description of amendment request: The amendment would delete those portions of Technical Specifications superseded by 10 CFR Part 26, Subpart I. This change is consistent with NRC approved Revision 0 to Technical Specification Task Force (TSTF) Improved Standard Technical Specification Change Traveler, TSTF-511, Eliminate Working Hour Restrictions from TS 5.2.2 to support Compliance with 10 CFR Part 26."

The NRC staff issued a notice of availability of the model safety evaluation and model no significant hazards consideration (NSHC), using the consolidated line-item improvement process for referencing in license amendment applications in the *Federal Register* on December 30, 2008 (73 FR 79923). The licensee affirmed the applicability of the following NSHC determination in its application dated April 13, 2009.

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

Criterion 1: The Proposed Change Does Not Involve a Significant Increase in the Probability or Consequences of an Accident Previously Evaluated.

The proposed change removes Technical Specification restrictions on working hours for personnel who perform safety related functions. The Technical Specification restrictions are superseded by the worker fatigue requirements in 10 CFR Part 26.

Removal of the Technical Specification requirements will be performed concurrently with the implementation of the 10 CFR Part 26, Subpart I, requirements. The proposed change does not impact the physical configuration or function of plant structures, systems, or components (SSCs) or the manner in which SSCs are operated, maintained, modified, tested, or inspected. Worker fatigue is not an initiator of any accident previously evaluated. Worker fatigue is not an assumption in the consequence mitigation of any accident previously evaluated.

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

Criterion 2: The Proposed Change Does Not Create the Possibility of a New or Different Kind of Accident From Any Accident Previously Evaluated.

The proposed change removes Technical Specification restrictions on working hours for personnel who perform safety related functions. The Technical Specification restrictions are superseded by the worker fatigue requirements in 10 CFR Part 26. Working hours will continue to be controlled in accordance with NRC requirements. The new rule allows for deviations from controls to mitigate or prevent a condition adverse to safety or as necessary to maintain the security of the facility. This ensures that the new rule will not unnecessarily restrict working hours and thereby create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

The proposed change does not alter the plant configuration, require new plant equipment to be installed, alter accident analysis assumptions, add any initiators, or effect the function of plant systems or the manner in which systems are operated, maintained, modified, tested, or inspected. Therefore, the proposed change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated.

Criterion 3: The Proposed Change Does Not Involve a Significant Reduction in a Margin of Safety.

The proposed change removes Technical Specification restrictions on working hours for personnel who perform safety related functions. The Technical Specification restrictions are superseded by the worker fatigue requirements in 10 CFR Part 26. The proposed change does not involve any physical changes to the plant or alter the manner in which plant systems are operated, maintained, modified, tested, or inspected. The proposed change does not alter the manner in which safety limits, limiting safety system settings or limiting conditions for operation are determined. The safety analysis acceptance criteria are not affected by this change. The proposed change will not result in plant operation in a configuration outside the design basis. The proposed change does not adversely affect systems that respond to safely shutdown the plant and to maintain the plant in a safe shutdown condition. Removal of plant-specific Technical Specification administrative requirements will not reduce a margin of safety because the requirements in 10 CFR Part 26 are adequate to ensure that worker fatigue is managed.

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: M.S. Ross, Attorney, Florida Power & Light, P.O. Box 14000, Juno Beach, Florida 33408-0420.

NRC Branch Chief: Thomas H. Boyce.

FPL Energy Duane Arnold, LLC, Docket No. 50-331, Duane Arnold Energy Center (DAEC), Linn County, Iowa

Date of amendment requests: March 4, 2009.

Description of amendment requests: The proposed amendments would change the Technical Specification (TS) Section 5.5.12 (Primary Containment Leakage Rate Testing Program) and change TS Section 3.6.1.3 (Primary Containment Isolation Valves) to remove

the repair criterion for Main Steamline Isolation Valves (MSIVs) that fail their as-found leakage rate acceptance criterion found in current Surveillance Requirement 3.6.1.3.9.

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 proposed change to TS 5.5.12 does not modify existing structures, systems or components (SSCs) of the plant, and it does not introduce new SSCs. It does not change assumptions, methodology, likelihood, or results of previously evaluated accidents in the Updated Final Safety Analysis Report [UFSAR]. It does not change operating procedures or administrative controls that affect the functions of SSCs. By excluding Main Steam pathway leakage from Type A, and Type B and C test results, this change will make the Primary Containment Leakage Rate Testing Program more closely aligned with the assumptions used in associated accident dose consequence analyses.

The proposed change [to TS 3.6.1.3] to eliminate the repair criterion (i.e., as-left leakage limit) for MSIVs that fail their as-found leak test, does not change how the MSIVs function in response to any event, nor the likelihood of occurrence of any accident previously identified in the UFSAR. Repairing the MSIVs to an as-left leakage value, which can be higher than the currently specified value in TS, that reliably assures the next as-found leakage test will be within limits is sufficient to ensure that the calculated dose consequences of any event involving MSIV leakage as an effluent pathway remain within analyzed limits.

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.

No new or different accidents result from utilizing the proposed changes. The changes do 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 operation. The changes do not alter assumptions made in the safety analysis for MSIV performance.

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

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

Response: No.

Since Main Steam pathway leakage bypasses the containment and its filtration system (Standby Gas Treatment System) during a Loss-of-Coolant Accident (LOCA), the effects on release to the environment is analyzed and specifically accounted for in the DAEC dose analysis methodology approved by Amendments 237 and 241. This proposed change to exclude Main Steam pathway leakage from Type A, and Type B and C test results does not change dose analysis values, and thus, does not affect actual margin in the dose analysis.

Similarly, removing the as-left repair criterion for MSIVs from the TS has no impact on the assumptions for MSIV leakage used in the accident analysis, which are based upon the as-found MSIV leakage limit, not the as-left leakage. As long as the as-left leakage value gives high confidence that the as-found leakage will remain within limits over the next operating cycle until the next as-found leak test is conducted, the assumptions of the dose consequence analyses are not adversely impacted and the previously calculated results remain bounding.

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: Mr. R. E. Helfrich, Florida Power & Light Company, P. O. Box 14000, Juno Beach, FL 33408-0420.

NRC Branch Chief: Lois M. James.

FPL Energy Duane Arnold, LLC, Docket No. 50-331, Duane Arnold Energy Center, Linn County, Iowa

Date of amendment request: April 17, 2009.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would revise Operating License No. DPR-49 by changing "FPL Energy Duane Arnold, LLC" to "NextEra Energy Duane Arnold, LLC," where appropriate, to reflect the renaming of FPL Energy Duane Arnold, LLC to NextEra Energy Duane Arnold, LLC.

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 request is for administrative changes only. No actual facility equipment or accident analyses will be affected by the proposed changes. Therefore, this request will have no impact on 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 request is for administrative changes only. No actual facility equipment or accident analyses will be affected by the proposed changes and no failure modes not bounded by previously evaluated accidents will be created. Therefore, this request will 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.

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. This request is for administrative changes only. No actual plant equipment or accident analyses will be affected by the proposed changes. Additionally, the proposed changes will not relax any criteria used to establish safety limits, will not relax any safety system settings, and will not relax the bases for any limiting conditions of operation.

Therefore, these proposed changes will 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: Mr. R. E. Helfrich, Florida Power & Light Company, P. O. Box 14000, Juno Beach, FL 33408-0420.

NRC Branch Chief: Lois M. James.

Nebraska Public Power District, Docket No. 50-298, Cooper Nuclear Station, Nemaha County, Nebraska

Date of amendment request: June 2, 2009

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would (1) delete Technical Specification (TS) surveillance requirement (SR) 3.1.3.2 and revise SR 3.1.3.3, (2) remove reference to SR 3.1.3.2 from Required Action A.3 of TS 3.1.3, "Control Rod OPERABILITY," and (3) revise Example 1.4-3 in TS Section 1.4, "Frequency," to clarify the applicability of the 1.25 surveillance test interval extension. The changes are in accordance with U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC)-approved TS Task Force (TSTF) traveler TSTF-475, Revision 1, "Control Rod Notch Testing Frequency and SRM [Source Range Monitor] Insert Control Rod Action."

The NRC issued a "Notice of Availability of Model Application Concerning Technical Specification Improvement To Revise Control Rod Notch Surveillance Frequency, Clarify SRM Insert Control Rod Action, and Clarify Frequency Example" in the *Federal Register* on

November 13, 2007 (72 FR 63935). In its application dated June 2, 2009, the licensee affirmed the applicability of the model no significant hazards consideration (NSHC).

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), an analysis of the issue of NSHC adopted by the licensee is presented below:

Criterion 1--The Proposed Change Does Not Involve a Significant Increase in the Probability or Consequences of an Accident Previously Evaluated

The proposed change generically implements TSTF-475, Revision 1, "Control Rod Notch Testing Frequency and SRM Insert Control Rod Action." TSTF-475, Revision 1 modifies NUREG-1433 (BWR/4) and NUREG-1434 (BWR/6) STS. The changes: (1) revise TS testing frequency for surveillance requirement (SR) 3.1.3.2 in TS 3.1.3, "Control Rod OPERABILITY", (2) clarify the requirement to fully insert all insertable control rods for the limiting condition for operation (LCO) in TS 3.3.1.2, Required Action E.2, "Source Range Monitoring Instrumentation" (NUREG-1434 only), and (3) revise Example 1.4-3 in Section 1.4 "Frequency" to clarify the applicability of the 1.25 surveillance test interval extension. The consequences of an accident after adopting TSTF-475, Revision 1 are no different than the consequences of an accident prior to adoption. Therefore, this change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

Criterion 2--The Proposed Change Does Not Create the Possibility of a New or Different Kind of Accident from any Accident Previously Evaluated

The proposed change does not involve a physical alteration of the plant (no new or different type of equipment will be installed) or a change in the methods governing normal plant operation. The proposed change will not introduce new failure modes or effects and will not, in the absence of other unrelated failures, lead to an accident whose consequences exceed the consequences of accidents previously analyzed. Thus, this change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

Criterion 3--The Proposed Change Does Not Involve a Significant Reduction in the Margin of Safety

TSTF-475, Revision 1 will: (1) [revise the TS SR 3.1.3.2 frequency in TS 3.1.3, "Control Rod OPERABILITY", (2) clarify the requirement to fully insert all insertable control rods for the limiting condition for operation (LCO) in TS 3.3.1.2, "Source Range Monitoring Instrumentation," and (3)] revise Example 1.4-3 in Section 1.4 "Frequency" to clarify the applicability of the 1.25

surveillance test interval extension. [The GE Nuclear Energy Report, “CRD Notching Surveillance Testing for Limerick Generating Station,” dated November 2006, concludes that extending the control rod notch test interval from weekly to monthly is not expected to impact the reliability of the scram system and that the analysis supports the decision to change the surveillance frequency.] Therefore, the proposed changes in TSTF-475, Revision 1 are acceptable and do not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the analysis adopted by the licensee and, based upon this review, it appears that the standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the request for amendment involves NSHC.

Attorney for licensee: Mr. John C. McClure, Nebraska Public Power District, Post Office Box 499, Columbus, NE 68602-0499

NRC Branch Chief: Michael T. Markley

Southern Nuclear Operating Company, Inc. (SNC), Docket Nos. 50-321, 50-366, 50-348, 50-364, 50-424, 50-425, Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant, Unit Nos. 1 and 2 (FNP), Houston County, Alabama, Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear Plant, Unit Nos. 1 and 2 (HNP), Appling County, Georgia, Vogtle Electric Generating Plant, Units Nos. 1 and 2 (VEGP), Burke County, Georgia

Date of amendment request: May 19, 2009.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would delete those portions of technical specifications (TS) superseded by Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR) Part 26, Subpart I. This change is consistent with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC)-approved Revision 0 to Technical Specification Task Force (TSTF) Traveler, TSTF-511, “Eliminate Working Hour Restrictions from TS 5.2.2 to Support Compliance with 10 CFR Part 26.” The availability of this TS improvement was announced in the *Federal Register* on December 30, 2008, (73 FR 79923) as part of the consolidated line item improvement process.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: SNC has reviewed the no significant hazards determination published on December 30, 2008, (73 FR 79925), as part of the CLIIP Notice of Availability. SNC has concluded that the determination presented in the notice is applicable to FNP, HNP, and VEGP. SNC has evaluated the proposed changes to the TS using the criteria in 10 CFR 50.92 and has determined that the proposed changes do not involve a significant hazards consideration. An analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration is presented below:

Criterion 1: The Proposed Change Does Not Involve a Significant Increase in the Probability or Consequences of an Accident Previously Evaluated

The proposed change removes Technical Specification restrictions on working hours for personnel who perform safety related functions. The Technical Specification restrictions are superseded by the worker fatigue requirements in 10 CFR Part 26. Removal of the Technical Specification requirements will be performed concurrently with the implementation of the 10 CFR Part 26, Subpart I, requirements. The proposed change does not impact the physical configuration or function of plant structures, systems, or components (SSCs) or the manner in which SSCs are operated, maintained, modified, tested, or inspected. Worker fatigue is not an initiator of any accident previously evaluated. Worker fatigue is not an assumption in the consequence mitigation of any accident previously evaluated.

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

Criterion 2: The Proposed Change Does Not Create the Possibility of a New or Different Kind of Accident From Any Accident Previously Evaluated

The proposed change removes Technical Specification restrictions on working hours for personnel who perform safety related functions. The Technical Specification restrictions are superseded by the worker fatigue requirements in 10 CFR Part 26. Working hours will continue to be controlled in accordance with NRC requirements. The new rule allows for deviations from controls to mitigate or prevent a condition adverse to safety or as necessary to maintain the security of the facility. This ensures that the new rule will not unnecessarily restrict working hours and thereby create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

The proposed change does not alter the plant configuration, require new plant equipment to be installed, alter accident analysis assumptions, add any initiators, or affect the function of plant systems or the manner in which systems are operated, maintained, modified, tested, or inspected.

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

Criterion 3: The Proposed Change Does Not Involve a Significant Reduction in a Margin of Safety

The proposed change removes Technical Specification restrictions on working hours for personnel who perform safety related functions. The Technical Specification restrictions are superseded by the worker fatigue requirements in 10 CFR Part 26. The proposed change does not involve any physical changes to the plant or alter the manner in which plant systems are operated, maintained, modified, tested, or inspected. The proposed change does not alter the manner in which safety limits, limiting safety system settings or limiting conditions for operation are determined. The safety analysis acceptance criteria are not affected by this change. The proposed change will not result in plant operation in a configuration outside the design basis. The proposed change does not adversely affect systems that respond to safely shutdown the plant and to maintain the plant in a safe shutdown condition.

Removal of plant-specific Technical Specification administrative requirements will not reduce a margin of safety because the requirements in 10 CFR Part 26 are adequate to ensure that worker fatigue is managed.

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: FNP: M. Stanford Blanton, Esq., Balch and Bingham, Post Office Box 306, 1710 Sixth Avenue North, Birmingham, Alabama 35201, HNP: Ernest L. Blake, Jr., Esquire, Shaw, Pittman, Potts and Trowbridge, 2300 N Street, NW., Washington, DC 20037,

VEGP: Mr. Arthur H. Domby, Troutman Sanders, NationsBank Plaza, Suite 5200, 600

Peachtree Street, NE., Atlanta, Georgia 30308-2216

NRC Branch Chief: Melanie C. Wong.

Tennessee Valley Authority, Docket No. 50 390, Watts Bar Nuclear Plant, Unit 1, Rhea

County, Tennessee

Date of amendment request: June 5, 2009.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would correct an error by changing a logic connector from “OR” to “AND” between Technical Specification (TS) 3.3.2, “ESFAS [Engineered Safety Feature Actuation System] Instrumentation,” Condition I, Actions I.2.1 and I.2.2.

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.

This proposed amendment corrects an identified error by only changing a logic connector between two TS actions. The change only restores the sequential nature of these required actions consistent with other similar TS actions where, if conditions warrant, the movement of the plant to lower modes is required (i.e., to Mode 3, to Mode 4, etc.). In addition, this change does not alter the completion times for these actions. 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.

By correcting the logic connector between these two TS actions, this change only restores consistency with other similar TS actions where movement of the plant to lower modes is required. The change does not alter the expected outcome of the required actions nor does it change the completion times for these actions. Therefore, the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from those previously analyzed has not been created.

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

Response: No.

By only correcting the logic connector between the required actions, the proposed change does not alter the expected outcome of the required actions nor does it change the completion times for these actions. 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: General Counsel, Tennessee Valley Authority, 400 West Summit Hill Drive, ET 11A, Knoxville, Tennessee 37902.

NRC Branch Chief: L. Raghavan.

Tennessee Valley Authority, Docket No. 50 390, Watts Bar Nuclear Plant, Unit 1, Rhea County, Tennessee

Date of amendment request: June 5, 2009.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would change the technical specifications to revise the completion time (CT) from 1 hour to 24 hours for Condition B of TS 3.5.1, "Accumulators," and its associated Bases. Condition B of TS 3.5.1 currently specifies a CT of one hour to restore a reactor coolant system (RCS) accumulator

to operable status when declared inoperable due to any reason except not being within the required boron concentration range.

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

Criterion 1—The Proposed Change Does Not Involve a Significant Increase in the Probability or Consequences of an Accident Previously Evaluated

The basis for the accumulator limiting condition for operation (LCO), as discussed in Bases Section 3.5.1, is to ensure that a sufficient volume of borated water will be immediately forced into the core through each of the cold legs in the event the RCS pressure falls below the pressure of the accumulators, thereby providing the initial cooling mechanism during large RCS pipe ruptures. As described in Section 9.2 of the WCAP-15049, "Risk-Informed Evaluation of an Extension to Accumulator Completion Times," evaluation, the proposed change will allow plant operation in a configuration outside the design basis for up to 24 hours, instead of 1 hour, before being required to begin shutdown. The impact of the increase in the accumulator CT on core damage frequency for all the cases evaluated in WCAP-15049 is within the acceptance limit of $1.0\text{E-}06/\text{yr}$ for a total plant core damage frequency (CDF) less than $1.0\text{E-}03/\text{yr}$. The incremental conditional core damage probabilities calculated in WCAP-15049 for the accumulator CT increase meet the criterion of $5\text{E-}07$ in Regulatory Guides (RG) 1.174 and 1.177 for all cases except those that are based on design basis success criteria. As indicated in WCAP-15049, design basis accumulator success criteria are not considered necessary to mitigate large break loss-of-coolant accident (LOCA) events, and were only included in the WCAP-15049 evaluation as a worst case data point. In addition, WCAP-15049 states that the NRC has indicated that an

incremental conditional core damage frequency (ICCDP) greater than 5E-07 does not necessarily mean the change is unacceptable.

The proposed technical specification change does not involve any hardware changes nor does it affect the probability of any event initiators. There will be no change to normal plant operating parameters, engineered safety feature (ESF) actuation setpoints, accident mitigation capabilities, accident analysis assumptions or inputs.

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

Criterion 2—The Proposed Change Does Not Create the Possibility of a New or Different Kind of Accident from Any Previously Evaluated

No new accident scenarios, transient precursors, failure mechanisms, or limiting single failures are introduced as a result of the proposed change. As described in Section 9.1 of the WCAP-15049 evaluation, the plant design will not be changed with this proposed technical specification CT increase. All safety systems still function in the same manner and there is no additional reliance on additional systems or procedures. The proposed accumulator CT increase has a very small impact on core damage frequency. The WCAP-15049 evaluation demonstrates that the small increase in risk due to increasing the accumulator allowed outage time (AOT) is within the acceptance criteria provided in RGs 1.174 and 1.177. No new accidents or transients can be introduced with the requested change and the likelihood of an accident or transient is not impacted.

The malfunction of safety related equipment, assumed to be operable in the accident analyses, would not be caused as a result of the proposed technical specification change. No new failure mode has been created and no new equipment performance burdens are imposed.

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

Criterion 3—The Proposed Change Does Not Involve a Significant Reduction in the Margin of Safety

The proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. There will be no change to the departure from nucleate boiling ratio (DNBR) correlation limit, the design DNBR limits, or the safety analysis DNBR limits.

The basis for the accumulator LCO, as discussed in Bases Section 3.5.1, is to ensure that a sufficient volume of borated water will be immediately forced into the core through each of the cold legs in the event the RCS pressure falls below the pressure of the accumulators, thereby providing the initial cooling mechanism during large RCS pipe ruptures. As described in Section 9.2 of the WCAP-15049 evaluation, the proposed change will allow plant operation in a configuration outside the design basis for up to 24 hours, instead of 1 hour, before being required to begin shutdown. The impact of this on plant risk was evaluated and found to be very small. That is, increasing the time the accumulators will be unavailable to respond to a large LOCA event, assuming accumulators are needed to mitigate the design basis event, has a very small impact on plant risk. Since the frequency of a design basis large LOCA (a large LOCA with loss of offsite power) would be significantly lower than the large LOCA frequency of the WCAP-15049 evaluation, the impact of increasing the accumulator CT from 1 hour to 24 hours on plant risk due to a design basis large LOCA would be significantly less than the plant risk increase presented in the WCAP-15049 evaluation.

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

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff

proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Attorney for licensee: General Counsel, Tennessee Valley Authority, 400 West Summit Hill Drive, ET 11A, Knoxville, Tennessee 37902.

NRC Branch Chief: L. Raghavan.

Tennessee Valley Authority, Docket No. 50 390, Watts Bar Nuclear Plant, Unit 1, Rhea County, Tennessee

Date of amendment request: June 5, 2009.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would provide alternatives for valve position verification in various Required Actions and Surveillance Requirements in Technical Specification 3.6.3, "Containment Isolation Valves."

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

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

Response: No.

The proposed amendment will revise the position verification requirements for manual containment isolation devices that are locked, sealed, or otherwise secured in the closed position. Revising the verification requirements will not introduce any physical changes or result in the equipment being operated in a new or different manner. All systems, structures, and components previously required for mitigation of a transient remain capable of performing their designed functions. Furthermore, although the proposed change would revise the position verification requirements, no physical change is being made to the assumed position of the valves for accident analysis. 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.

No new accident scenarios or failure mechanisms are introduced as a result of this proposed change. The proposed amendment would revise the position verification requirements but not alter any valve positions. With no changes to the plant lineup, no new or different accidents are possible. 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.

Changes to the position verification requirements of normally closed manual containment isolation valves that are locked, sealed, or otherwise secured do not change the position/status of these valves. The proposed amendment does not impact the ability of these valves to perform their design function of controlling containment leakage rates during design basis radiological accidents. 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: General Counsel, Tennessee Valley Authority, 400 West Summit Hill Drive, ET 11A, Knoxville, Tennessee 37902.

NRC Branch Chief: L. Raghavan

NOTICE OF ISSUANCE OF AMENDMENTS TO
FACILITY OPERATING 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.

Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating License, 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 are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room (PDR), located at One White Flint North, Public File Area 01F21, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland. Publicly available records will be accessible from the Agencywide Documents Access and

Management Systems (ADAMS) Public Electronic Reading Room on the internet at the NRC web site, <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html>. If you do not have access to ADAMS or if there are problems in accessing the documents located in ADAMS, contact the PDR Reference staff at 1 (800) 397-4209, (301) 415-4737 or by email to pdr.resource@nrc.gov.

Entergy Nuclear Vermont Yankee, LLC and Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc., Docket No. 50-271, Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station, Vernon, Vermont

Date of application for amendment: February 12, 2008, as supplemented by letters dated August 28, 2008, September 15, 2008, October 17, 2008, December 15, 2008, December 18, 2008 (two letters), April 9, 2009, and May 20, 2009.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revised the Technical Specification (TS) Sections 2.1, "Limiting Safety System Setting," 3.1, "Reactor Protection System," 3.2, "Protective Instrument Systems," associated Surveillance Requirements, and other TS with similar requirements as these instrumentation TS sections.

Date of Issuance: June 12, 2009.

Effective date: As of the date of issuance, and shall be implemented within 180 days.

Amendment No.: 236.

Facility Operating License No. DPR-28: Amendment revised the License and Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in FEDERAL REGISTER: April 22, 2008 (73 FR 21659).

The supplemental letters dated August 28, 2008, September 15, 2008, October 17, 2008, December 15, 2008, December 18, 2008 (two letters), April 9, 2009, and May 20, 2009,

the application as originally noticed, and did not change the staff's original proposed no significant hazards consideration determination. The Commission's related evaluation of this amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated June 12, 2009.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Entergy Nuclear Vermont Yankee, LLC and Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc., Docket No. 50-271, Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station, Vernon, Vermont

Date of application for amendment: September 22, 2008.

Brief description of amendment: The proposed amendment would revise the Technical Specification (TS) to remove the requirement to perform quarterly closure time testing of the Main Steam Isolation Valves (MSIVs) by deleting TS Surveillance Requirement 4.7.D.1.c. Operability testing of the MSIVs will continue to be required by the Vermont Yankee Inservice Test Program and the safety functions of the MSIVs will continue to be contained in the Vermont Yankee Updated Final Safety Analysis Report and Vermont Yankee Technical Requirements Manual.

Date of Issuance: June 17, 2009

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

Amendment No.: 237

Facility Operating License No. DPR-28: Amendment revised the License and Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in FEDERAL REGISTER: November 4, 2008 (73 FR 65692).

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

South Carolina Electric & Gas Company, South Carolina Public Service Authority, Docket No. 50-395, Virgil C. Summer Nuclear Station, Unit No. 1, Fairfield County, South Carolina

Date of application for amendment: March 2, 2009

Brief description of amendment: The amendment deletes those portions of Technical Specifications superseded by 10 CFR Part 26, Subpart I. This change is consistent with NRC-approved Revision 0 to Technical Specification Task Force Traveler, TSTF-511, "Eliminate Working Hour Restrictions from TS 5.2.2 to Support Compliance with 10 CFR Part 26," as announced in the **Federal Register** on December 30, 2008 (73 FR 79923) as part of the consolidated line item improvement process.

Date of issuance: June 9, 2009

Effective date: As of the date of issuance and shall be implemented by October 1, 2009.

Amendment No.: 181

Renewed Facility Operating License No. NPF-12: Amendment revises the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in *FEDERAL REGISTER*: March 24, 2009 (74 FR 12395).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated June 9, 2009.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

Tennessee Valley Authority, Docket Nos. 50-327 and 50-328, Sequoyah Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2, Hamilton County, Tennessee

Date of application for amendments: October 23, 2008.

Brief description of amendments: The amendments revised the Sequoyah Nuclear Plant (SQN), Units 1 and 2 Technical Specifications (TSs) by a partial adoption of Technical Specifications Task Force (TSTF) Traveler, TSTF-491, Revision 2, "Removal of Main Steam and Feedwater Valve Isolation Times." The amendments only revised TS 3.7.1.5, "Main Steam Line Isolation Valves," by relocating the main steam isolation valve closure time from Surveillance Requirement 4.7.1.5.1 to the Bases. The amendments deviated from TSTF-491 in that the current SQN TS 3.7.1.6 "Main Feedwater Isolation, Regulating, and Bypass Valves," and associated surveillance requirements do not include the main feedwater valve closure times, and thus, TSTF-491 changes to TS 3.7.1.6 were not applied to the SQN TSs.

Date of issuance: June 12, 2009.

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

Amendment Nos.: 324 and 316.

Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-77 and DPR-79: Amendments revised the technical specifications.

Date of initial notice in *Federal Register*: January 13, 2009 (74 FR 1716).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated June 12, 2009.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

NOTICE OF ISSUANCE OF AMENDMENTS TO FACILITY OPERATING 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, and (3) the Commission's related letter, Safety Evaluation and/or Environmental Assessment, as indicated. All of these items are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room (PDR), located at One White Flint North, Public File Area 01F21, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland. Publicly available records will be accessible from the Agencywide Documents Access and Management System's (ADAMS) Public Electronic Reading Room on the Internet at the NRC web site, <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html>. If you do not have access to ADAMS or if there are problems in accessing the documents located in ADAMS, contact the PDR Reference staff at 1 (800) 397-4209, (301) 415-4737 or by email to pdr.resource@nrc.gov.

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 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. Requests for a hearing and a petition for leave to intervene shall be filed in accordance with the Commission's "Rules of Practice for Domestic Licensing Proceedings" in 10 CFR Part 2. Interested person(s) should consult a current copy of 10 CFR 2.309, which is available at the Commission's PDR, located at One White Flint North, Public File Area 01F21, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland, and electronically on the Internet at the NRC web site, <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/doc-collections/cfr/>. If there are problems in accessing the document, contact the PDR Reference staff at 1 (800) 397-4209, (301) 415-4737, or by e-mail to pdr.resource@nrc.gov. If a request for a hearing or petition for leave to intervene is filed by the above date, 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 identify the specific contentions which the petitioner/requestor 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 petitioner/requestor 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 petitioner intends to rely in proving the contention at the hearing. The petitioner must also provide references to those specific sources and documents of which the petitioner is aware and on which the 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.¹ 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 petitioner to relief. A petitioner/requestor who fails to satisfy these requirements with respect to at least one contention will not be permitted to participate as a party.

Each contention shall be given a separate numeric or alpha designation within one of the following groups:

1. Technical - - primarily concerns/issues relating to technical and/or health and safety matters discussed or referenced in the applications.

2. Environmental - - primarily concerns/issues relating to matters discussed or referenced in the environmental analysis for the applications.

3. Miscellaneous - - does not fall into one of the categories outlined above.

As specified in 10 CFR 2.309, if two or more petitioners/requestors seek to co-sponsor a contention, the petitioners/requestors shall jointly designate a representative who shall have the authority to act for the petitioners/requestors with respect to that contention. If a petitioner/requestor seeks to adopt the contention of another sponsoring petitioner/requestor, the petitioner/requestor who seeks to adopt the contention must either agree that the sponsoring petitioner/requestor shall act as the representative with respect to that contention, or jointly designate with the sponsoring petitioner/requestor a representative who shall have the authority to act for the petitioners/requestors with respect to that contention.

¹To the extent that the applications contain attachments and supporting documents that are not publicly available because they are asserted to contain safeguards or proprietary information, petitioners desiring access to this information should contact the applicant or applicant's counsel and discuss the need for a protective order.

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. Since the Commission has made a final determination that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration, if a hearing is requested, it will not stay the effectiveness of the amendment. Any hearing held would take place while the amendment is in effect.

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 E-Filing rule, which the NRC promulgated in August 28, 2007, (72 FR 49139). 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 a waiver in accordance with the procedures described below.

To comply with the procedural requirements of E-Filing, at least five (5) days prior to the filing deadline, the petitioner/requestor must contact the Office of the Secretary by e-mail at hearing.docket@nrc.gov, or by calling (301) 415-1677, to request (1) a digital 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/or (2) creation of an electronic docket for the proceeding (even in instances in which the petitioner/requestor (or its counsel or representative) already holds an NRC-issued digital ID certificate). Each petitioner/ requestor will need to download the Workplace Forms Viewer™ to access the Electronic Information Exchange (EIE), a component of the E-Filing system.

The Workplace Forms Viewer™ is free and is available at <http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/e-submittals/install-viewer.html>. Information about applying for a digital ID certificate is available on NRC's public website at <http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/e-submittals/apply-certificates.html>.

Once a petitioner/requestor has obtained a digital ID certificate, had a docket created, and downloaded the EIE viewer, it 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 public website at <http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/e-submittals.html>. A filing is considered complete at the time the filer submits its documents through EIE. To be timely, an electronic filing must be submitted to the EIE 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 EIE system also distributes an e-mail notice that provides access to the document to the NRC 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 may seek assistance through the "Contact Us" link located on the NRC website at <http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/e-submittals.html> or by calling the NRC electronic filing Help Desk, which is available between 8:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m., Eastern Time, Monday through Friday, excluding government holidays. The electronic filing

Help Desk can be contacted by telephone at 1-866-672-7640 or by e-mail at

MSHD.Resource@nrc.gov.

Participants who believe that they have a good cause for not submitting documents electronically must file a motion, 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.

Non-timely requests and/or petitions and contentions will not be entertained absent a determination by the Commission, the presiding officer, or the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board that the petition and/or request should be granted and/or the contentions should be admitted, based on a balancing of the factors specified in 10 CFR 2.309(c)(1)(i)-(viii).

Documents submitted in adjudicatory proceedings will appear in NRC's electronic hearing docket which is available to the public at http://ehd.nrc.gov/EHD_Proceeding/home.asp, unless excluded pursuant to an order of the Commission, an Atomic Safety and Licensing Board, or a 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. 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.

Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc., Docket No. 50-333, James A. FitzPatrick Nuclear Power Plant, Oswego County, New York

Date of application for amendment: June 4, 2009, as supplemented by letter dated June 6, 2009.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment authorizes a temporary one-time change to Technical Specification (TS) 3.8.1 Required Action B.4 Completion Time. The amendment would add a note allowing a Completion Time of "17 days", on a temporary one-time basis. This one-time allowance will expire at 10:15 a.m. on June 12, 2009.

Date of issuance: June 8, 2009

Effective date: As of the date of issuance, and shall be implemented immediately.

Amendment No.: 294

Facility Operating License No. DPR-59: The amendment revised the License and the Technical Specifications.

Public comments requested as to the 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 June 8, 2009.

Attorney for licensee: Mr. William C. Dennis, Assistant General Counsel, Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc., 440 Hamilton Avenue, White Plains, NY 10601.

NRC Acting Branch Chief: John P. Boska

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 19th day of June 2009.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

/RA/

Joseph G. Giitter, Director
Division of Operating Reactor Licensing
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation