

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[NRC-2016-0083]

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

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Biweekly notice.

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

This biweekly notice includes all notices of amendments issued, or proposed to be issued, from March 29 to April 11, 2016. The last biweekly notice was published on April 12, 2016.

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

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

- **Federal Rulemaking Web Site:** Go to <http://www.regulations.gov> and search for Docket ID NRC-2016-0083. Address questions about NRC dockets to Carol Gallagher; telephone: 301-415-3463; e-mail: Carol.Gallagher@nrc.gov. For technical questions, contact the individual listed in the FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT section of this document.

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

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

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Janet Burkhardt, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington DC 20555-0001; telephone: 301-415-1384, e-mail: Janet.Burkhardt@nrc.gov.

I. Obtaining Information and Submitting Comments

A. Obtaining Information

Please refer to Docket ID NRC-2016-0083 when contacting the NRC about the availability of information for this action. You may obtain publicly-available information related to this action by any of the following methods:

- **Federal rulemaking Web Site:** Go to <http://www.regulations.gov> and search for Docket ID **NRC-2016-0083**.

- **NRC's Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS):**

You may obtain publicly-available documents online in the ADAMS Public Documents collection at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html>. To begin the search, select "[ADAMS Public Documents](#)" and then select "[Begin Web-based ADAMS Search](#)." For problems with ADAMS, please contact the NRC's Public Document Room (PDR) reference staff at 1-800-397-4209, 301-415-4737, or by e-mail to pdf.resource@nrc.gov. The ADAMS accession number for each document referenced (if it is available in ADAMS) is provided the first time that it is mentioned in the SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION section of this document.

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

B. Submitting Comments

Please include Docket ID [NRC-2016-0083](#), facility name, unit number(s), application date, and subject in your comment submission.

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

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

before making the comment submissions To remove such information before making the comment submissions available to the public or entering the comment submissions into ADAMS.

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

The Commission has made a proposed determination that the following amendment requests involve no significant hazards consideration. Under the Commission's regulations in § 50.92 of title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR), this means that operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; (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.

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

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

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

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

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

Petitions for leave to intervene must be filed no later than 60 days from the date of publication of this notice. Requests for hearing, petitions for leave to intervene, and motions for leave to file new or amended contentions that are filed after the 60-day deadline will not be entertained absent a determination by the presiding officer that the filing demonstrates good cause by satisfying the three factors in 10 CFR 2.309(c)(1)(i)-(iii). If a hearing is requested, and the Commission has not made a final determination on the issue of no significant hazards consideration, the Commission will make a final determination on the issue of no significant hazards consideration. The final determination will serve to decide when the hearing is held. If the final determination is that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration, the Commission may issue the amendment and make it immediately effective, notwithstanding the request for a hearing. Any hearing held would take place after issuance of the amendment. If the final determination is that the amendment request involves a significant hazards consideration, then any hearing held would take place before the issuance of any amendment unless the Commission finds an imminent danger to the health or safety of the public, in which case it will issue an appropriate order or rule under 10 CFR Part 2.

A State, local governmental body, federally-recognized Indian Tribe, or agency thereof, may submit a petition to the Commission to participate as a party under 10 CFR 2.309(h)(1). The petition should state the nature and extent of the petitioner's interest in the proceeding. The petition should be submitted to the Commission by **[INSERT DATE 60 DAYS FROM THE**

DATE OF PUBLICATION IN THE *FEDERAL REGISTER*]. The petition must be filed in accordance with the filing instructions in the “Electronic Submissions (E-Filing)” section of this document, and should meet the requirements for petitions for leave to intervene set forth in this section, except that under § 2.309(h)(2) a State, local governmental body, or Federally-recognized Indian Tribe, or agency thereof does not need to address the standing requirements in 10 CFR 2.309(d) if the facility is located within its boundaries. A State, local governmental body, Federally-recognized Indian Tribe, or agency thereof may also have the opportunity to participate under 10 CFR 2.315(c).

If a hearing is granted, any person who does not wish, or is not qualified, to become a party to the proceeding may, in the discretion of the presiding officer, be permitted to make a limited appearance pursuant to the provisions of 10 CFR 2.315(a). A person making a limited appearance may make an oral or written statement of position on the issues, but may not otherwise participate in the proceeding. A limited appearance may be made at any session of the hearing or at any prehearing conference, subject to the limits and conditions as may be imposed by the presiding officer. Persons desiring to make a limited appearance are requested to inform the Secretary of the Commission by **[INSERT DATE 60 DAYS FROM DATE OF PUBLICATION IN THE *FEDERAL REGISTER*]**.

B. Electronic Submissions (E-Filing).

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

to submit and serve all adjudicatory documents over the internet, or in some cases to mail copies on electronic storage media. Participants may not submit paper copies of their filings unless they seek an exemption in accordance with the procedures described below.

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

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

If a participant is electronically submitting a document to the NRC in accordance with the E-Filing rule, the participant must file the document using the NRC's online, Web-based submission form. In order to serve documents through the Electronic Information Exchange System, users will be required to install a Web browser plug-in from the NRC's Web site.

Further information on the Web-based submission form, including the installation of the Web browser plug-in, is available on the NRC's public Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/e-submittals.html>.

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

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

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

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

purpose of the adjudicatory filings and would constitute a Fair Use application, participants are requested not to include copyrighted materials in their submission.

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

NextEra Energy, Point Beach, LLC, Docket Nos. 50-266 and 50-301, Point Beach Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2, Town of Two Creeks, Manitowoc County, Wisconsin

Date of amendment request: January 15, 2016. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML16015A112.

Description of amendment request: The amendments would revise the technical specifications (TSs) for Point Beach Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2. The proposed change eliminates TS 3.7.14, "Primary Auxiliary Building Ventilation (VNPAB)," in its entirety on the basis that the VNPAB is not credited for accident mitigation and meets none of the criteria of 10 CFR 50.36 for inclusion in the TS.

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

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

Response: No.

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. No actual facility equipment or accident analyses are affected by the proposed changes.

The control room dose analysis for a loss of coolant accident using alternate source term (AST) initially credited operation of the VNPAB exhaust system. However, the analysis was subsequently revised to remove credit for the VNPAB prior to NRC final approval of implementation of AST. As a result, NextEra is proposing to remove the VNPAB system from the TS. The VNPAB system is not an initiator of accidents and does not function to mitigate the consequences of DBAs [design-basis accidents].

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

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

Response: No.

The proposed change does not involve a physical alteration of the plant (no new or different type of equipment will be installed). The proposed change does not create any new failure modes for existing equipment or any new limiting single failures. Additionally, the proposed change does not involve a change in the methods governing normal plant operation, and all safety functions will continue to perform as previously assumed in the accident analyses. Thus, the proposed change does not adversely affect the design function or operation of any structures, systems, and components important to safety.

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

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

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

Response: No.

The margin of safety associated with the acceptance criteria of any accident is unchanged. The proposed change will have no [effect] on the availability, operability, or performance of safety-related systems and components. The proposed change will not adversely affect the

operation of plant equipment or the function of equipment assumed in the accident analysis.

The proposed amendment does not involve changes to any safety analyses assumptions, safety limits, or limiting safety system settings. The changes do not adversely impact plant operating margins or the reliability of equipment credited in the safety analyses.

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: William Blair, Managing Attorney – Nuclear, Florida Power & Light Company, P. O. Box 14000, 700 Universe Boulevard, Juno Beach, FL 33408-0420.

NRC Branch Chief: David J. Wrona.

NextEra Energy, Point Beach, LLC, Docket Nos. 50-266 and 50-301, Point Beach Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2, Town of Two Creeks, Manitowoc County, Wisconsin

Date of amendment request: February 12, 2016. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML16043A217.

Description of amendment request: The amendments would revise the facility operating licenses and the technical specifications (TSs) for Point Beach Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2. The proposed changes to the operating licenses, which are administrative in nature, remove license conditions that have been completed and are no longer in effect. The proposed change to the TSs revise the ventilation filter testing program by changing the value for methyl iodide penetration for the control room emergency filtration system.

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 includes a change to delete license conditions that are complete or otherwise obsolete. This change is strictly administrative in nature. The proposed amendment also revises the charcoal testing criteria in TS 5.5.10, Ventilation Filter Testing Program. The proposed changes do 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. No actual facility equipment or accident analyses are affected 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 amendment create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

The proposed changes do not involve a physical alteration of the plant (no new or different type of equipment will be installed). The proposed changes do not create any new failure modes for existing equipment or any new limiting single failures. Additionally, the proposed changes do not involve a change in the methods governing normal plant operation, and all safety functions will continue to perform as previously assumed in the accident analyses. Thus, the proposed change does not adversely affect the design function or operation of any structures, systems, and components important to safety.

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

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

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

Response: No.

The margin of safety associated with the acceptance criteria of any accident is unchanged. The proposed changes will have no effect on the availability, operability, or performance of safety-related systems and components. The proposed change will not adversely affect the operation of plant equipment or the function of equipment assumed in the accident analysis.

The proposed amendment does not involve changes to any safety analyses assumptions, safety limits, or limiting safety system settings. The changes do not adversely impact plant operating margins or the reliability of equipment credited in the safety analyses.

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: William Blair, Managing Attorney – Nuclear, Florida Power & Light Company, P. O. Box 14000, 700 Universe Boulevard, Juno Beach, FL 33408-0420.

NRC Branch Chief: David J. Wrona.

Northern States Power Company - Minnesota (NSPM), Docket No. 50-263, Monticello Nuclear Generating Plant (MNGP), Wright County, Minnesota

Date of amendment request: February 10, 2016. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML16047A336.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would revise Technical Specification (TS) 5.5.11, "Primary Containment Leakage Rate Testing Program," to increase the containment integrated leakage rate test program Test A interval from 10 to 15 years.

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 amendment involves a permanent change to extend the Type A containment integrated leak rate test (ILRT) interval from 10 to 15 years. The proposed extension does not involve either a physical change to the plant or a change in the manner in which the plant is operated or maintained. The containment is designed to provide an essentially leak tight barrier against the uncontrolled release of radioactivity to the environment for postulated accidents. As such, the containment and the testing requirements invoked to periodically demonstrate the integrity of the containment exist to ensure the plant's ability to mitigate the consequences of an accident, and do not involve the prevention or identification of any precursors of an accident.

The effect of changing the Type A test frequency to once every 15 years, measured as an increase to the total integrated plant risk (for accident sequences influenced by Type A testing), is less than or equal to the criteria established in [Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI)] Report No. 1009325, Revision 2-A. Moreover, the risk impact for the ILRT extension when compared to other severe accident risks is negligible. In addition, as documented in NUREG-1493, Type B and C tests have identified a very large percentage of containment leakage paths, and the percentage of containment leakage paths that are detected only by Type A testing is very small. The MNGP Type A test history supports this conclusion.

The integrity of the containment is subject to two types of failure mechanisms that can be categorized as: (1) activity based, and, (2) time based. Activity based failure mechanisms are defined as those which involve degradation due to system and/or component modifications or maintenance. Local leak rate test requirements and administrative controls such as configuration management and procedural requirements

for system restoration ensure that containment integrity is not degraded by plant modifications or maintenance activities. The design and construction requirements of the containment combined with the containment inspections performed in accordance with American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME) [Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code,] Section XI, and TS requirements provide a high degree of assurance that the containment would not degrade in a manner that is detectable only by a Type A test.

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 TS change involves a permanent extension of the Type A containment test interval from 10 to 15 years. The containment testing requirements which periodically demonstrate the integrity of the containment exist to ensure the plant's ability to mitigate the consequences of an accident. The proposed change does not involve a physical change to the plant (i.e., no new or different type of equipment will be installed) nor does the proposed change alter the design, configuration, or the manner in which the plant is operated or controlled beyond the standard functional capabilities of the equipment.

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 TS change involves a permanent extension of the Type A containment test interval from 10 to 15 years. The specific requirements and conditions of the Primary Containment Leak Rate Testing Program exist to ensure that the required degree of containment structural integrity and leak-tightness considered in the plant safety analysis is maintained. The overall containment leak rate limit specified by TS is maintained.

The proposed change involves only an extension of the interval between Type A test performances for MNGP. Extension of the proposed surveillance interval is in accordance with the 15-year ILRT Interval determined acceptable by the NRC utilizing the guidance of [Nuclear Energy Institute (NEI)] 94-01, Revision 2-A. Industry experience supports the conclusion that Type B and C testing detects a large percentage of

containment leakage paths and that the percentage of containment leakage paths that are detected only by Type A testing is small. The containment inspections performed in accordance with ASME Section XI, and the TS serve to provide a high degree of assurance that the containment would not degrade in a manner that is detectable only by Type A testing. The combination of these factors ensures that the margin of safety in the plant safety analysis is maintained. The design, operation, testing methods and acceptance criteria for Type A, B, and C containment leakage tests specified in applicable codes and standards continue to be met with the acceptance of this proposed change because these criteria are not affected by the proposed change to the Type A test interval.

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: Peter M. Glass, Assistant General Counsel, Xcel Energy Services, Inc.,
414 Nicollet Mall, Minneapolis, MN 55401.

NRC Branch Chief: David J. Wrona.

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

Date of amendment request: November 24, 2015. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS
under Accession No. ML15328A515.

Description of amendment request: The amendment request proposes to rename, relocate, and
add radiation detectors to provide monitoring of the radiologically controlled area ventilation
system (VAS) exhaust from the radiologically controlled areas of the auxiliary building and

annex building. The amendment proposes changes in the VEGP Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (UFSAR) Tier 2 information, and departure from certified AP1000 Design Control Document (DCD) Tier 1 information. It also requires conforming changes to Combined License Appendix C, "Inspections, Tests, Analyses, and Acceptance Criteria." Because this proposed change requires a departure from Tier 1 information in the Westinghouse Advanced Passive 1000 DCD, the licensee also requested an exemption from the requirements of the Generic DCD Tier 1 in accordance with 52.63(b)(1).

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 design functions of the VAS include prevention of the unmonitored release of airborne radioactivity to the atmosphere or adjacent plant areas by providing monitoring of the VAS exhaust from radiologically controlled areas of the auxiliary building and annex building, and to automatically isolate the selected building areas and start the containment air filtration system (VFS) upon detection of high radioactivity. The proposed changes to the VAS to relocate and add radiation detectors are acceptable as they maintain these design functions.

These proposed changes to the VAS design as described in the current licensing basis do not have an adverse effect on any of the design functions of the systems. The proposed changes do not affect the support, design, or operation of mechanical and fluid systems required to mitigate the consequences of an accident. There is no change to plant systems or the response of systems to postulated accident conditions. There is no change to the predicted radioactive releases due to postulated accident conditions. The plant response to previously evaluated accidents or external events is not adversely affected, nor do the proposed changes described create any new accident precursors.

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

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

Response: No.

The proposed changes revise the VAS design as described in the current licensing basis to enable the system to perform required design functions, and are consistent with other UFSAR information. The proposed changes do not change the design requirements for the system. The relocated and new VAS radiation detectors are designed to the same equipment specifications, including required sensitivity and range, as the existing radiation detectors. The relocated and new VAS radiation detectors monitor the same parameters, as well as perform the same design functions, as the existing radiation detectors. The proposed changes to the system do not result in a new failure mechanism or introduce any new accident precursors. No design function described in the UFSAR is adversely affected by the proposed changes. The proposed changes do not result in a new failure mode, malfunction or sequence of events that could affect safety or safety-related equipment. The proposed changes do not allow for a new fission product release path, result in a new fission product barrier failure mode, or create a new sequence of events that would result in significant fuel cladding failures.

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

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

Response: No.

The proposed changes do not change the codes or standards for the radiation detectors, or functionality of the ductwork in the auxiliary building and annex building. The proposed changes have no adverse effect on the nonsafety-related system design functions of the VAS for the prevention of the unmonitored release of airborne radioactivity to the atmosphere or adjacent plant areas by providing monitoring of the VAS exhaust from radiologically controlled areas of the auxiliary building and annex building, and to automatically isolate the selected building areas and start the VFS upon detection of high radioactivity. The proposed changes do not affect safety-related equipment or equipment whose failure could initiate an accident. The proposed changes to relocate and add radiation detectors do not adversely interface with safety-related equipment or fission product barriers. Therefore, the proposed changes

do not affect any safety-related equipment, design code, function, design analysis, safety analysis input or result, or design/safety margin. No safety analysis or design basis acceptance limit/criterion is challenged or exceeded by the requested changes, thus, no margin of safety is reduced.

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

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

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

Acting NRC Branch Chief: John McKirgan.

Southern Nuclear Operating Company, Inc., Docket Nos. 50-424, 50-425, 52-025, 52-026, Vogtle Electric Generating Plant (VEGP), Units 1, 2, 3, and 4, Burke County, Georgia and Southern Nuclear Operating Company, Inc. (SNC), Docket Nos. 50-348 and 50-364, Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant (FNP), Units 1 and 2, Houston County, Alabama, Docket Nos. 50-321 and 50-366, Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear Plant (HNP), Units 1 and 2, City of Dalton, GA

Date of amendment request: March 3, 2016. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML16071A110.

Description of amendment request: The amendment requests NRC approval for the adoption of Nuclear Energy Institute (NEI) 99-01, Revision 6, "Development of Emergency Action Levels for Non-Passive Reactors," to replace the Emergency Action Level (EAL) schemes for VEGP, FNP, and HNP that are currently based on Revision 4 of NEI 99-01. Additionally, SNC proposes changes to the radiation monitors at FNP.

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.

Adoption of NEI 99-01, Revision 6 EAL Schemes

The proposed changes to SNC's EAL schemes to adopt the NRC-endorsed guidance in NEI 99-01, Revision 6, "Development of Emergency Action Levels for Non-Passive Reactors," do not reduce the capability to meet the emergency planning requirements established in 10 CFR 50.47 and 10 CFR 50, Appendix E. The proposed changes do not reduce the functionality, performance, or capability of SNC's [emergency response organization (ERO)] to respond in mitigating the consequences of any design basis accident.

The probability of a reactor accident requiring implementation of Emergency Plan EALs has no relevance in determining whether the proposed changes to the EALs reduce the effectiveness of the Emergency Plans. As discussed in Section D, "Planning Basis," of NUREG-0654, Revision 1, "Criteria for Preparation and Evaluation of Radiological Emergency Response Plans and Preparedness in Support of Nuclear Power Plants:"

"...The overall objective of emergency response plans is to provide dose savings (and in some cases immediate life saving) for a spectrum of accidents... No single specific accident sequence should be isolated as the one for which to plan because each accident could have different consequences, both in nature and degree. Further, the range of possible selection for a planning basis is very large, starting with a zero point of requiring no planning at all because significant offsite radiological accident consequences are unlikely to occur, to planning for the worst possible accident, regardless of its extremely low likelihood...."

Therefore, SNC did not consider the risk insights regarding any specific accident initiation or progression in evaluating the proposed changes.

The proposed changes do not involve any physical changes to plant equipment or systems, nor do they alter the assumptions of any accident analyses. The proposed changes do not adversely affect accident

initiators or precursors nor do they alter the design assumptions, conditions, and configuration or the manner in which the plants are operated and maintained. The proposed changes do not adversely affect the ability of Structures, Systems, or Components (SSCs) to perform their intended safety functions in mitigating the consequences of an initiating event within the assumed acceptance limits.

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

[FNP] RE-60 Radiation Monitors

The proposed changes to the [FNP] EALs resulting from the proposed modification of the RE-60 radiation monitors do not impact the physical function of SSCs or the manner in which SSCs perform their design function. The proposed change does not adversely affect accident initiators or precursors, nor alter design assumptions.

While the proposed change will alter the design configuration of the plant by replacing and relocating radiation monitors RE-60-A, B and C and by abandoning RE-60D, the proposed change does not alter or prevent the ability of operable SSCs to perform their intended function to mitigate the consequences of an initiating event within assumed acceptance limits. Similarly, while these instruments monitor and provide information on the consequences of an accident, the radiation monitors perform no safety function that directly mitigates the consequences of an accident. Further, no operating procedures or administrative controls that function to prevent or mitigate accidents are affected by the proposed change.

Therefore, the proposed change to the [FNP] EALs resulting from the proposed modification of the RE-60 radiation monitors 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.

Adoption of NEI 99-01, Revision 6 EAL Schemes

The proposed changes to SNC's EAL schemes to adopt the NRC-endorsed guidance in NEI 99-01, Revision 6, do not involve any physical changes to plant systems or equipment. The proposed changes do not involve the addition of any new plant equipment. The proposed changes will not alter the design configuration, or method of operation of plant equipment beyond its normal functional capabilities. All SNC ERO functions will continue to be performed as required. The proposed

changes do not create any new credible failure mechanisms, malfunctions, or accident initiators.

Therefore, the proposed changes to the EAL schemes do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from those that have been previously evaluated.

[FNP] RE-60 Radiation Monitors

The proposed change to the [FNP] EALs resulting from the proposed modification of the RE-60 radiation monitors does not impact the [FNP] accident analysis. The change does not involve a physical alteration of safety-related SSCs (i.e., no new or different type of safety-related SSC will be installed), a change in the method of plant operation, or new operator actions. The proposed change will not introduce failure modes that could result in a new accident, and the change does not alter assumptions made in the safety analysis. The proposed change revises EALs, which establish the thresholds for placing the plant in an emergency classification. EALs are not initiators of any accidents.

Therefore, the proposed change to the [FNP] EALs resulting from the proposed modification of the RE-60 radiation monitors does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

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

Response: No.

Adoption of NEI 99-01, Revision 6 EAL Schemes

The proposed changes to SNC's EAL schemes to adopt the NRC-endorsed guidance in NEI 99-01, Revision 6, do not alter or exceed a design basis or safety limit. There is no change being made to safety analysis assumptions, safety limits, or limiting safety system settings that would adversely affect plant safety as a result of the proposed changes. There are no changes to setpoints or environmental conditions of any SSC or the manner in which any SSC is operated. Margins of safety are unaffected by the proposed changes to adopt the NEI 99-01, Revision 6 EAL scheme guidance. The applicable requirements of 10 CFR 50.47 and 10 CFR 50, Appendix E will continue to be met.

Therefore, the proposed changes to SNC's EAL schemes do not involve any reduction in a margin of safety.

[FNP] RE-60 Radiation Monitors

Margin of safety is associated with confidence in the ability of the fission product barriers (i.e., fuel cladding, reactor coolant system pressure boundary, and containment structure) to limit the level of radiation dose to

the public. The proposed change to the [FNP] EALs resulting from the proposed modification of the RE-60 radiation monitors does not impact operation of the plant or its response to transients or accidents. The change does not affect the Technical Specifications or the Operating License. The proposed change does not involve a change in the method of plant operation, and no accident analyses will be affected by the proposed change.

Additionally, the proposed change will not relax any criteria used to establish safety limits and will not relax any safety system settings. 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.

Therefore, the proposed change to the Farley EALs resulting from the proposed modification of the RE-60 radiation monitors 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: Leigh D. Perry, SVP & General Counsel of Operations and Nuclear, Southern Nuclear Operating Company, 40 Iverness Center Parkway, Birmingham, AL 35201.
NRC Branch Chief: Michael T. Markley.

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

During the period since publication of the last biweekly notice, the Commission has issued the following amendments. The Commission has determined for each of these

amendments that the application complies with the standards and requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), and the Commission's rules and regulations. The Commission has made appropriate findings as required by the Act and the Commission's rules and regulations in 10 CFR Chapter I, which are set forth in the license amendment.

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

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

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

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

Date of amendment request: March 2, 2015, as supplemented by letter dated August 31, 2015.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revised the technical specifications (TSs) by (1) aligning the peak calculated primary containment internal pressure (P_a) for the design basis

loss of coolant accident in TS 6.19 to be consistent with the 10 CFR 50 Appendix, J, Option B definition of P_a , and (2) revising the acceptable methods of surveillance for leakage rate testing of the containment air lock door seals.

Date of issuance: March 31, 2016.

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

Amendment No.: 326. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML16068A312; documents related to this amendment are listed in the Safety Evaluation enclosed with the amendment.

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

Date of initial notice in *Federal Register*: July 21, 2015 (80 FR 43126). The supplemental letter dated August 31, 2015, provided additional information that expanded the scope of the application as originally noticed. A notice published in the *Federal Register* on February 22, 2016 (81 FR 8752), superseded the original notice in its entirety to reflect the expanded scope of the proposed amendment and include the staff's proposed no significant hazards consideration determination.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated March 31, 2016.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

DTE Electric Company, Docket No. 50-341, Fermi 2, Monroe County, Michigan

Date of amendment request: September 24, 2015.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment deleted the note associated with Surveillance Requirement (SR) 3.5.1.4 to reflect the Residual Heat Removal (RHR) system design and ensure the RHR system operation is consistent with TS 3.5.1 Limiting Condition for Operation requirements.

Date of issuance: April 5, 2016.

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

Amendment No.: 203. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML16054A637; documents related to this amendment are listed in the Safety Evaluation enclosed with the amendment.

Facility Operating License No. NPF-43: This amendment revises the Facility Operating License and Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in *Federal Register*: November 24, 2015 (80 FR 73235).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated April 5, 2016.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

Date of amendment request: June 22, 2015.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revised the James A. FitzPatrick Nuclear Power Plant Cyber Security Plan Implementation Schedule Milestone 8 full implementation date from June 30, 2016, to December 15, 2017.

Date of issuance: April 6, 2016.

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

Amendment No.: 311. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML16062A388; documents related to this amendment are listed in the Safety Evaluation enclosed with the amendment.

Renewed Facility Operating License No. DPR-59: The amendment revised the Renewed Facility Operating License.

Date of initial notice in *Federal Register*: August 4, 2015 (80 FR 46349).

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

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

Date of amendment request: July 2, 2015, as supplemented by letter dated November 17, 2015.

Brief description of amendments: The amendments revised the Technical Specifications (TSs) by removing TS 3/4.9.5, "Communications," and TS 3/4.9.6, "Manipulator Crane." The amendments require the licensee to relocate the requirements to the Updated Final Safety Analysis Report and related procedures to be controlled in accordance with 10 CFR 50.59, "Changes, tests, and experiments."

Date of issuance: March 29, 2016.

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

Amendment Nos: 269 (Unit No. 3) and 264 (Unit No. 4). A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML16040A373; documents related to these amendments are listed in the Safety Evaluation enclosed with the amendments.

Renewed Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-31 and DPR-41: Amendments revised the Renewed Facility Operating Licenses and TSs.

Date of initial notice in *Federal Register*: October 27, 2015 (80 FR 65813). The supplemental letter dated November 17, 2015, provided additional information that clarified the application, did not expand the scope of the application as originally noticed, and did not change the staff's original proposed no significant hazards consideration determination as published in the *Federal Register*.

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

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Florida Power & Light Company, Docket Nos. 50-335 and 50-389, St. Lucie Plant Unit Nos. 1 and 2, St. Lucie County, Florida

Date of amendment requests: March 22, 2013, as supplemented by letters dated June 14, 2013; February 24, March 25, April 25, July 14, August 27, September 10, and October 10, 2014; and March 10, April 1, April 20, May 12, August 21, and October 22, 2015.

Brief description of amendments: The amendments transition the fire protection program to a new risk-informed, performance-based alternative in accordance with 10 CFR 50.48(c), which incorporates by reference the National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) Standard 805 (NFPA 805), "Performance-Based Standard for Fire Protection for Light Water Reactor Electric

Generating Plants,” 2001 Edition. Copies of NFPA 805 may be purchased from the NFPA Customer Service Department, 1 Batterymarch Park, P.O. Box 9101, Quincy, Massachusetts 02269–9101 and in PDF format through the NFPA Online Catalog (<http://www.nfpa.org>) or by calling 1-800-344-3555 or 617-770-3000. Copies are also available for inspection at the NRC Library, Two White Flint North, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland 20852-2738, and at the NRC PDR, One White Flint North, Room O1–F15, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland 20852–2738.

Date of issuance: March 31, 2016.

Effective date: As of the date of issuance and shall be implemented as described in the transition license conditions.

Amendment Nos.: 231 and 181. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML15344A346; documents related to these amendments are listed in the Safety Evaluation enclosed with the amendments.

Renewed Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-67 and NPF-16: Amendments revised the Renewed Facility Operating Licenses and Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in *Federal Register*: December 26, 2013 (78 FR 78407). The supplemental letters dated February 24, March 25, April 25, July 14, August 27, September 10, and October 10, 2014; and March 10, April 1, April 20, May 12, August 21, and October 22, 2015, provided additional information that clarified the application, did not expand the scope of the application as originally noticed, and did not change the staff’s original proposed no significant hazards consideration determination as published in the *Federal Register*.

The Commission’s related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated March 31, 2016.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

Date of amendment request: July 24, 2015.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revised the Technical Specification (TS) Surveillance Requirements (SRs), which currently require operation of ventilation systems with charcoal filters for a 10-hour period at a monthly frequency. The SRs are revised to require operation of the systems for 15 continuous minutes at a monthly frequency.

Date of issuance: April 5, 2016.

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

Amendment No.: 287. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML16084A755; documents related to this amendment are listed in the Safety Evaluation enclosed with the amendment.

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

Date of initial notice in *Federal Register*: October 13, 2015 (80 FR 61485).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated April 5, 2016.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

Date of amendment request: March 27, 2015, as supplemented by letter dated February 3, 2016.

Brief description of amendments: The amendments revised certain Technical Specification (TS) 3/4.3.1, "Reactor Trip System Instrumentation," actions. Specifically, TS Table 3.3-1, Action 2, is revised to allow one power range (PR) channel to be bypassed for up to 4 hours for surveillance testing, and two new action notes are established for the PR nuclear instrumentation in TS Table 4.3-1. The changes support the installation and use of bypass test capability for the PR nuclear instrumentation.

Date of issuance: March 28, 2016.

Effective date: As of the date of issuance and shall be implemented at Salem, Unit No. 1, prior to returning to the MODE of applicability following refueling outage 1R24, and at Salem, Unit No. 2, prior to returning to the MODE of applicability following refueling outage 2R22.

Amendment Nos.: 312 (Unit No. 1) and 293 (Unit No. 2). A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML16054A068; documents related to these amendments are listed in the Safety Evaluation enclosed with the amendments.

Renewed Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-70 and DPR-75: Amendments revised the Renewed Facility Operating Licenses and TSs.

Date of initial notice in *Federal Register*: July 7, 2015 (80 FR 38776). The supplemental letter dated February 3, 2016, provided additional information that clarified the application, did not expand the scope of the application as originally noticed, and did not change the staff's original proposed no significant hazards consideration determination as published in the *Federal Register*.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated March 28, 2016.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 15th day of April 2016.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

/RA/

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