

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[NRC-2017-0009]

Biweekly Notice

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

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Biweekly notice.

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

This biweekly notice includes all notices of amendments issued, or proposed to be issued, from December 31, 2016, to January 17, 2017. The last biweekly notice was published on January 17, 2017.

DATES: Comments must be filed by March 2, 2017. A request for a hearing must be filed by April 3, 2017.

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

- **Federal Rulemaking Web Site:** Go to <http://www.regulations.gov> and search for Docket ID NRC-2017-0009. 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: Lynn Ronewicz, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington DC 20555-0001; telephone: 301-415-1927, e-mail: Lynn.Ronewicz@nrc.gov.

I. Obtaining Information and Submitting Comments

A. Obtaining Information

Please refer to Docket ID NRC-2017-0009, facility name, unit number(s), plant docket number, application date, and subject, when contacting the NRC about the availability of information for this action. You may obtain publicly-available information related to this action by any of the following methods:

- **Federal Rulemaking Web Site:** Go to <http://www.regulations.gov> and search for Docket ID NRC-2017-0009.

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

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

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

B. Submitting Comments

Please include Docket ID NRC-2017-0009, facility name, unit number(s), plant docket number, application date, and subject in your comment submission.

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

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

ADAMS.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

In accordance with 10 CFR 2.309(f), the petition must also set forth the specific contentions which the petitioner seeks to have litigated in the proceeding. Each contention must consist of a specific statement of the issue of law or fact to be raised or controverted. In

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

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

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

If a hearing is requested, and the Commission has not made a final determination on the issue of no significant hazards consideration, the Commission will make a final determination on the issue of no significant hazards consideration. The final determination will serve to establish when the hearing is held. If the final determination is that the amendment request involves no

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

A State, local governmental body, Federally-recognized Indian Tribe, or agency thereof, may submit a petition to the Commission to participate as a party under 10 CFR 2.309(h)(1). The petition should state the nature and extent of the petitioner's interest in the proceeding. The petition should be submitted to the Commission by April 3, 2017. The petition must be filed in accordance with the filing instructions in the "Electronic Submissions (E-Filing)" section of this document, and should meet the requirements for petitions set forth in this section, except that under 10 CFR 2.309(h)(2) a State, local governmental body, or Federally-recognized Indian Tribe, or agency thereof does not need to address the standing requirements in 10 CFR 2.309(d) if the facility is located within its boundaries. Alternatively, a State, local governmental body, Federally-recognized Indian Tribe, or agency thereof may participate as a non-party under 10 CFR 2.315(c).

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

regarding the opportunity to make a limited appearance will be provided by the presiding officer if such sessions are scheduled.

B. Electronic Submissions (E-Filing).

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

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

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

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

Participants who believe that they have a good cause for not submitting documents electronically must file an exemption request, in accordance with 10 CFR 2.302(g), with their initial paper filing stating why there is good cause for not filing electronically and requesting

authorization to continue to submit documents in paper format. Such filings must be submitted by: (1) first class mail addressed to the Office of the Secretary of the Commission, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, Attention: Rulemaking and Adjudications Staff; or (2) courier, express mail, or expedited delivery service to the Office of the Secretary, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland, 20852, Attention: Rulemaking and Adjudications Staff. Participants filing adjudicatory documents in this manner are responsible for serving the document on all other participants. Filing is considered complete by first-class mail as of the time of deposit in the mail, or by courier, express mail, or expedited delivery service upon depositing the document with the provider of the service. A presiding officer, having granted an exemption request from using E-Filing, may require a participant or party to use E-Filing if the presiding officer subsequently determines that the reason for granting the exemption from use of E-Filing no longer exists.

Documents submitted in adjudicatory proceedings will appear in the NRC's electronic hearing docket which is available to the public at <https://adams.nrc.gov/ehd>, unless excluded pursuant to an order of the Commission or the presiding officer. If you do not have an NRC-issued digital ID certificate as described above, click cancel when the link requests certificates and you will be automatically directed to the NRC's electronic hearing dockets where you will be able to access any publicly available documents in a particular hearing docket. Participants are requested not to include personal privacy information, such as social security numbers, home addresses, or personal phone numbers in their filings, unless an NRC regulation or other law requires submission of such information. For example, in some instances, individuals provide home addresses in order to demonstrate proximity to a facility or site. With respect to copyrighted works, except for limited excerpts that serve the purpose of the adjudicatory filings and would constitute a Fair Use application, participants are requested not to include copyrighted materials in their submission.

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

Duke Energy Florida, Inc., et al., Docket No. 50-302, Crystal River Unit 3 Nuclear Generating Plant, Citrus County, Florida

Date of amendment request: March 31, 2016. A publicly available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML16091A308.

Description of amendment request: The amendment would revise the Physical Protection license condition for the facility operating license to reflect a change to the Cyber Security Plan implementation schedule. Specifically, the completion date for Milestone 8 is proposed to be changed from December 31, 2017, to December 31, 2018.

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 one year extension to the Cyber Security Plan implementation schedule for Milestone 8 does not alter the Fuel Handling Accident analysis, add any initiators, or affect the function of plant systems or the manner in which systems are operated, maintained, modified, tested, or inspected. The proposed change does not require any plant modifications that affect the performance capability of the structures, systems, and components relied upon to mitigate the consequences of postulated accidents and have no impact on the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

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

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

Response: No.

The proposed change to the Cyber Security Plan implementation schedule for Milestone 8 does not alter accident analysis assumptions, add any initiators, or affect the function of plant systems or the manner in which systems are operated, maintained, modified, tested, or inspected. The proposed change does not require any plant modifications that affect the performance capability of the structures, systems, and components relied upon to mitigate the consequences of postulated accidents and does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

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

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

Response: No.

Plant safety margins are established through limiting conditions for operation and safety analysis described in the FSAR [final safety analysis report]. The proposed change revises the Cyber Security Plan implementation schedule. The proposed Cyber Milestone 8 schedule change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety because the proposed change does not involve changes to the initial conditions contributing to accident severity or consequences, or reduce response or mitigation capabilities. Because there is no change to these established safety margins as result of this change, the proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

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

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

Attorney for licensee: Lara S. Nichols, 550 South Tryon Street, Charlotte, NC 28202.

NRC Branch Chief: Bruce A. Watson. CHP.

Duke Energy Florida, Inc., et al., Docket No. 50-302, Crystal River Unit 3 Nuclear Generating Plant, Citrus County, Florida

Date of amendment request: December 9, 2016. A publicly available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML16348A187.

Description of amendment request: The amendment would revise the Physical Protection license condition for the facility operating license by removing the existing cyber security license condition from the facility operating license.

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 removal of the Cyber Security Plan does not alter the Fuel Handling Accident analysis, add any initiators, or affect the function of plant systems or the manner in which systems are operated, maintained, modified, tested, or inspected. The proposed change does not require any plant modifications that affect the performance capability of the structures, systems, and components relied upon to mitigate the consequences of postulated accidents and have no impact on the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

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

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

Response: No.

The proposed removal of the Cyber Security Plan does not alter accident analysis assumptions, add any initiators, or affect the function of plant systems or the manner in which systems are operated, maintained,

modified, tested, or inspected. The proposed change does not require any plant modifications that affect the performance capability of the structures, systems, and components relied upon to mitigate the consequences of postulated accidents and does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

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

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

Response: No.

Plant safety margins are established through limiting conditions for operation and safety analysis described in the FSAR [final safety analysis report]. The proposed removal of the Cyber Security Plan does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety because the proposed change does not involve changes to the initial conditions contributing to accident severity or consequences, or reduce response or mitigation capabilities. Because there is no change to these established safety margins as result of this change, the proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

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

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

Attorney for licensee: Lara S. Nichols, 550 South Tryon Street, Charlotte, NC 28202.

NRC Branch Chief: Bruce A. Watson, CHP.

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

Date of amendment request: December 8, 2016. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML16343A947.

Description of amendment request: The amendment would revise the Cyber Security Plan (CSP) Milestone 8 full implementation date as set forth in the CSP Implementation Schedule as previously approved.

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

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

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

Response: No.

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

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

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

Response: No.

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

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

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

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

NRC Acting Branch Chief: Stephen S. Koenick.

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

Date of amendment request: October 27, 2016, as supplemented by letter dated December 2, 2016. Publicly-available versions are in ADAMS under Accession Nos. ML16302A227 and ML16340A018, respectively.

Description of amendment request: The amendment would revise the ANO-2 Renewed Facility Operating License NPF-6 specific to license conditions and requirements related to the adoption of National Fire Protection Association Standard 805 (NFPA 805), based on updated information associated with the modifications that were described and committed to in the ANO-2 license amendment request that was previously approved by the NRC to adopt a new risk-informed, performance-based fire protection licensing basis that complies with the requirements in 10 CFR 50.48(a) and 10 CFR 50.48(c). The amendment would also provide updated information related to ignition frequencies, recovery actions, use of an NRC-approved fire modeling tool not previously recognized as being used by ANO, and dual unit control room abandonment.

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 purpose of this amendment is to provide updated information associated with the modifications that were described and committed to the ANO-2 license amendment request that was submitted and subsequently approved by the NRC to adopt a new risk-informed, performance-based fire protection licensing basis that complies with the requirements in 10 CFR 50.48(a) and 10 CFR 50.48(c), as well as the guidance contained in Regulatory Guide (RG) 1.205. The amendment also provides updated information related to ignition frequencies, recovery actions, use of an NRC-approved fire modeling tool not previously recognized as being used by ANO, and dual unit control room abandonment. The NRC considers that NFPA 805 provides an acceptable methodology and performance criteria for licensees to identify fire protection requirements that are an acceptable alternative to the 10 CFR part 50, Appendix R, fire protection features (69 FR 33536; June 16, 2004).

Operation of ANO-2 in accordance with the proposed amendment does not result in a significant increase in the probability or consequences of

accidents previously evaluated. The proposed amendment does not affect accident initiators or precursors as described in the ANO-2 Safety Analysis Report (SAR), nor does it adversely alter design assumptions, conditions, or configurations of the facility, and it does not adversely impact the ability of structures, systems, or components (SSCs) to perform their intended function to mitigate the consequences of accidents described and evaluated in the SAR. The proposed amendment does not adversely alter safety-related systems nor affect the way in which safety-related systems perform their functions as required by the accident analysis. The SSCs required to safely shut down the reactor and to maintain it in a safe shutdown condition will remain capable of performing the associated design functions.

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

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

Response: No.

Implementation of the new risk-informed, performance-based fire protection licensing basis, with the revised modifications, recovery actions, application of an NRC-approved fire modeling method for ANO, and ignition frequencies, along with the demonstration of the risk impact of dual unit abandonment, complies with the requirements in 10 CFR 50.48(a) and 10 CFR 50.48(c), as well as the guidance contained in RG 1.205, and will not result in new or different kinds of accidents. The requirements in NFPA 805 address only fire protection. The impacts of fire effects on the plant have been evaluated. The proposed amendment does not involve new failure mechanisms or malfunctions that could initiate a new or different kind of accident beyond those already analyzed in the SAR.

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

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

Response: No.

The proposed amendment has been evaluated to ensure that risk and safety margins are maintained within acceptable limits. The risk evaluations for plant changes in relation to the potential for reducing a safety margin, were measured quantitatively for acceptability using the delta risk (i.e., change in core damage frequency and change in large early release frequency) criteria from Section 5.3.5, "Acceptance Criteria," of NEI [Nuclear Energy Institute] 04-02, "Guidance for Implementing a

Risk-Informed, Performance-based Fire Protection Program under 10 CFR 50.48(c),” as well as the guidance contained in RG 1.205. Engineering analyses, which may include engineering evaluations, probabilistic safety assessments, and fire modeling calculations, have been performed to demonstrate that the performance-based methods of NFPA-805 do not result in a significant reduction in the margin of safety.

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: William Glew, Associate General Counsel - Nuclear Legal, Nuclear and Environmental Entergy Services, Inc., 440 Hamilton Avenue, White Plains, NY 10601.

NRC Branch Chief: Robert J. Pascarelli.

Exelon Generation Company, LLC, Docket Nos. 50-317 and 50-318, Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2, Calvert County, Maryland

Date of amendment request: September 22, 2016, as supplemented by letter dated November 10, 2016. Publicly available versions are in ADAMS under Accession Nos. ML16266A086 and ML16315A112, respectively.

Description of amendment request: The amendments would revise the Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2, Technical Specification (TS) 3.3.8, “Control Room Recirculation Signal (CRRS),” and TS 3.7.8, “Control Room Emergency Ventilation System (CREVS),” to remove certain CREV system components and their associated testing, which no longer serve the purpose of establishing and isolating the control room boundary.

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 any accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

The proposed amendment eliminates certain CREV system components from the Technical Specifications that no longer serve the purpose of establishing and isolating the Control Room (CR) boundary. The testing related to those components would be eliminated as well.

The CREV system and its components are not an accident initiator. The CREV system and its components required to be operable and capable of performing any mitigation function assumed in the accident analysis continue to be operated and tested in accordance with the applicable TS requirements.

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

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

Response: No.

The proposed amendment eliminates certain CREV system components that no longer serve the purpose of establishing and isolating the Control Room boundary.

The proposed amendment does not impose any new or different requirements. The change does not alter assumptions made in the safety analysis. The proposed change is consistent with the safety analysis assumptions and current plant operating practice.

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

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

Response: No.

The proposed amendment eliminates certain CREV system components that no longer serve the purpose of establishing and isolating the CR boundary. The testing related to those components would be eliminated as well.

The proposed amendment does not affect the design, operation, testing methods, and acceptance criteria for systems, structures, and components (SSCs), specified in applicable codes and standards (or alternatives approved for use by the NRC). The elimination of components that no longer serve the original purpose of establishing the CR envelope and isolating the control room from the outside atmosphere by placing the CREV system in full recirculation mode improves the overall mitigating capabilities of the system by eliminating the consequences of any potential failure of a component to realign. The CREV system will continue to meet all of its requirements as described in the plant licensing basis (including the Final Safety Analysis Report and TS Bases). Similarly, there is no impact to safety analysis acceptance criteria as described in the plant licensing basis.

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: Tamra Domeyer, Associate General Counsel, Exelon Generation, 4300 Winfield Road, Warrenville, IL 60555.

NRC Acting Branch Chief: Stephen S. Koenick.

Exelon Generation Company, LLC, Docket No. 50-353, Limerick Generating Station, Unit 2, Montgomery County, Pennsylvania

Date of amendment request: December 20, 2016. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML16355A263.

Description of amendment request: The amendment would allow the use of the release fractions listed in Tables 1 and 3 of NRC Regulatory Guide (RG) 1.183, "Alternative Radiological Source Terms for Evaluating Design Basis Accidents at Nuclear Power Reactors," for partial length rods that are currently in the Limerick Generating Station (LGS) Unit 2 Cycle 14 reactor core for the remainder of the current operating cycle. These partial length rods are expected to exceed 62,000 megawatt days per metric ton of uranium (MWD/MTU), which is the current rod average burnup limit specified in Footnotes 10 and 11 of NRC RG 1.183, prior to the end of the operating cycle. In addition, the change will revise the LGS licensing basis to allow movement of irradiated fuel bundles containing partial length rods that have been in operation above the 62,000 MWD/MTU limit.

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 would allow the use of the release fractions listed in Tables 1 and 3 of NRC Regulatory Guide 1.183 for partial length rods which are currently in the LGS Unit 2 Cycle 14 reactor core that are expected to exceed the 62,000 MWD/MTU rod peak burnup limit specified in Footnotes 10 and 11 of NRC Regulatory Guide 1.183 prior to the end of the operating cycle. In addition, the proposed change would revise the LGS licensing basis to allow movement of irradiated fuel bundles containing partial length rods that have been in operation above the 62,000 MWD/MTU limit. The proposed change does not involve any physical changes to the plant design and is not an initiator of an accident. The proposed change does not adversely affect accident initiators or precursors, and does not alter the design assumptions, conditions, or configuration of the plant or the manner in which the plant is operated or maintained. Therefore, the proposed change does not affect the probability of a loss-of-coolant accident. In addition, the proposed change does not affect the probability of a fuel handling accident or control rod drop accident because the method and frequency of initiating activities

are not changing.

Analyses have been performed that demonstrate that the power and burnup for a partial length rod is within 2.4% of the power and burnup in the same axial portion of neighboring full length rods, which is minor. Therefore, since the power and burnup of the full length rods comply with the limits specified in Footnotes 10 and 11 of NRC Regulatory Guide 1.183, the partial length rods may operate beyond the 62,000 MWD/MTU burnup limit and meet the intent of NRC Regulatory Guide 1.183. There are no changes in the dose consequences of the analyses of record for the fuel handling accident, control rod drop accident, and loss-of-coolant accident.

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

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

Response: No.

The proposed change would allow the use of the release fractions listed in Tables 1 and 3 of NRC Regulatory Guide 1.183 for partial length rods which are currently in the LGS Unit 2 Cycle 14 reactor core that are expected to exceed the 62,000 MWD/MTU rod peak burnup limit specified in Footnotes 10 and 11 of NRC Regulatory Guide 1.183 prior to the end of the operating cycle. In addition, the proposed change would revise the LGS licensing basis to allow movement of irradiated fuel bundles containing partial length rods that have been in operation above the 62,000 MWD/MTU limit. The proposed change does not introduce any changes or mechanisms that create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident. The proposed change does not install any new or different type of equipment, and installed equipment is not being operated in a new or different manner. No new effects on existing equipment are created nor are any new malfunctions introduced.

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

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

Response: No.

The proposed change would allow the use of the release fractions listed in Tables 1 and 3 of NRC Regulatory Guide 1.183 for partial length rods which are currently in the LGS Unit 2 Cycle 14 reactor core that are expected to exceed the 62,000 MWD/MTU rod peak burnup limit specified in Footnotes 10 and 11 of NRC Regulatory Guide 1.183 prior to

the end of the operating cycle. In addition, the proposed change would revise the LGS licensing basis to allow movement of irradiated fuel bundles containing partial length rods that have been in operation above the 62,000 MWD/MTU limit. Analyses have been performed that demonstrate that the power and burnup for a partial length rod is within 2.4% of the power and burnup in the same axial portion of neighboring full length rods, which is minor. There is no change in the dose consequences of the fuel handling accident, control rod drop accident, or loss-of-coolant accident analyses of record. The margin of safety, as defined by 10 CFR 50.67 and NRC Regulatory Guide 1.183, has been maintained.

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: Tamra Domeyer, Associate General Counsel, Exelon Generation Company, LLC, 4300 Winfield Road, Warrenville, IL 60555.

NRC Acting Branch Chief: Stephen S. Koenick.

Exelon Generation Company, LLC, Docket No. 50-220, Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station, Unit 1 (NMP1), Oswego, New York

Date of amendment request: January 3, 2017. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML17003A065.

Description of amendment request: The amendment would revise the NMP1 licensing basis related to alternate source term analysis in the updated final safety analysis report to allow the use of the release fractions listed in Tables 1 and 3 of NRC Regulatory Guide (RG) 1.183, "Alternative Radiological Source Terms for Evaluating Design Basis Accidents at Nuclear Power

Reactors,” July 2000 (ADAMS Accession No. ML003716792), for partial length fuel rods (PLRs) that are operating above the peak burnup limit for the remainder of the current operating cycle. In addition, the proposed change would revise the NMP1 licensing basis to allow movement of irradiated fuel bundles containing PLRs that have been in operation above 62,000 megawatt-days per metric tons of uranium (MWD/MTU).

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 would allow the use of the release fractions listed in Tables 1 and 3 of NRC RG 1.183 for PLRs which are currently in the NMP1 Cycle 22 reactor core that are expected to exceed the 62,000 MWD/MTU rod peak burnup limit specified in Footnotes 10 and 11 of NRC RG 1.183 prior to the end of the operating cycle. In addition, the proposed change would revise the NMP1 licensing basis to allow movement of irradiated fuel bundles containing PLRs that have been in operation above the 62,000 MWD/MTU limit. The proposed change does not involve any physical changes to the plant design and is not an initiator of an accident. The proposed change does not adversely affect accident initiators or precursors, and does not alter the design assumptions, conditions, or configuration of the plant or the manner in which the plant is operated or maintained. Therefore, the proposed change does not affect the probability of a loss-of-coolant accident or control rod drop accident. In addition, the proposed change does not affect the probability of a fuel handling accident because the method and frequency of fuel movement activities are not changing.

Analyses have been performed that demonstrate that the power and burnup for a PLR is bounded by the power and burnup in the same axial portion of neighboring [full length fuel rods] FLRs. Therefore, since the FLR operating characteristics bound the PLR, and since the power and burnup of the FLRs comply with the limits specified in Footnotes 10 and 11 of NRC RG 1.183, the PLRs may operate beyond the 62,000 MWD/MTU burnup limit and meet the intent of NRC RG 1.183. There are no changes in the dose consequences of the analyses of record for the fuel handling accident, control rod drop accident and loss-of-coolant accident.

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

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

Response: No.

The proposed change would allow the use of the release fractions listed in Tables 1 and 3 of NRC RG 1.183 for PLRs which are currently in the NMP1 Cycle 22 reactor core that are expected to exceed the 62,000 MWD/MTU rod peak burnup limit specified in Footnotes 10 and 11 of NRC RG 1.183 prior to the end of the operating cycle. In addition, the proposed change would revise the NMP1 licensing basis to allow movement of irradiated fuel bundles containing PLRs that have been in operation above the 62,000 MWD/MTU limit. The proposed change does not introduce any changes or mechanisms that create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident. The proposed change does not install any new or different type of equipment, and installed equipment is not being operated in a new or different manner. No new effects on existing equipment are created nor are any new malfunctions introduced.

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

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

Response: No.

The proposed change would allow the use of the release fractions listed in Tables 1 and 3 of NRC RG 1.183 for PLRs which are currently in the NMP1 Cycle 22 reactor core that are expected to exceed the 62,000 MWD/MTU rod peak burnup limit specified in Footnotes 10 and 11 of NRC RG 1.183 prior to the end of the operating cycle. In addition, the proposed change would revise the NMP1 licensing basis to allow movement of irradiated fuel bundles containing PLRs that have been in operation above the 62,000 MWD/MTU limit. Analyses have been performed that demonstrate that the power and burnup for a PLR is bounded by the power and burnup in the same axial portion of neighboring FLRs. There is no change in the dose consequences of the fuel handling accident, control rod drop accident or loss-of-coolant accident analyses of record. The margin of safety, as defined by 10 CFR 50.67 and NRC RG 1.183, has been maintained.

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: Tamra Domeyer, Associate General Counsel, Exelon Generation Company, LLC, 4300 Winfield Road, Warrenville, IL 60555.

NRC Acting Branch Chief: Stephen S. Koenick.

Southern Nuclear Operating Company, Inc., Docket Nos. 50-348 and 50-364, Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2, Houston County, Alabama, Docket Nos. 50-424, 50-425, Vogtle Electric Generating Plant, Units 1 and 2, Burke County, Georgia

Date of amendment request: November 21, 2016. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML16326A256.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendments would revise the requirements on control and shutdown rods, and rod and bank position indication in Technical Specification (TS) 3.1.4, "Rod Group Alignment Limits"; TS 3.1.5, "Shutdown Bank Insertion Limits"; TS 3.1.6, "Control Bank Insertion Limits"; and TS 3.1.7, "Rod Position Indication," consistent with NRC-approved Technical Specifications Task Force Traveler (TSTF)-547, Revision 1, "Clarification of Rod Position Requirements," dated March 4, 2016 (ADAMS Accession Package No. ML16012A126).

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.

Control and shutdown rods are assumed to insert into the core to shut down the reactor in evaluated accidents. Rod insertion limits ensure that adequate negative reactivity is available to provide the assumed shutdown margin (SDM). Rod alignment and overlap limits maintain an appropriate power distribution and reactivity insertion profile.

Control and shutdown rods are initiators to several accidents previously evaluated, such as rod ejection. The proposed change does not change the limiting conditions for operation for the rods or make any technical changes to the Surveillance Requirements (SRs) governing the rods. Therefore, the proposed change has no significant effect on the probability of any accident previously evaluated.

Revising the TS Actions to provide a limited time to repair rod movement control has no effect on the SDM assumed in the accident analysis as the proposed Action require verification that SDM is maintained. The effects on power distribution will not cause a significant increase in the consequences of any accident previously evaluated as all TS requirements on power distribution continue to be applicable.

Revising the TS Actions to provide an alternative to frequent use of the moveable incore detector system to verify the position of rods with inoperable rod position indicator does not change the requirement for the rods to be aligned and within the insertion limits.

Therefore, the assumptions used in any accidents previously evaluated are unchanged and there is no significant increase in the consequences.

The proposed change to resolve the conflicts in the TS ensure that the intended Actions are followed when equipment is inoperable. Actions taken with inoperable equipment are not assumptions in the accidents previously evaluated and have no significant effect on the consequences.

The proposed change to eliminate an unnecessary action has no effect on the consequences of accidents previously evaluated as the analysis of those accidents did not consider the use of the action.

The proposed change to increase consistency within the TS has no effect on the consequences of accidents previously evaluated as the proposed change clarifies the application of the existing requirements and does not change the intent.

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 involve a physical alteration of the plant (i.e., no new or different type of equipment will be installed). The change does not alter assumptions made in the safety analyses. The proposed change does not alter the limiting conditions for operation for the rods or make any technical changes to the SRs governing the rods. The proposed change to actions maintains or improves safety when equipment is inoperable and does not introduce new failure modes.

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 to allow time for rod position indication to stabilize after rod movement and to allow an alternative method of verifying rod position has no effect on the safety margin as actual rod position is not affected. The proposed change to provide time to repair rods that are Operable but immovable does not result in a significant reduction in the margin of safety because all rods must be verified to be Operable, and all other banks must be within the insertion limits. The remaining proposed changes to make the requirements internally consistent and to eliminate unnecessary actions do not affect the margin of safety as the changes do not affect the ability of the rods to perform their specified safety function.

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

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.

FirstEnergy Nuclear Operating Company, et al., Docket No. 50-346, Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station, Unit No. 1, Ottawa County, Ohio

Date of amendment request: February 9, 2016.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revised the technical specification requirements for limitations on the radioactive material released in liquid and gaseous effluents and the references for the radioactive material effluent requirements.

Date of issuance: January 11, 2017.

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

Amendment No.: 293. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML16298A349; documents related to this amendment are listed in the Safety Evaluation enclosed with the amendment.

Renewed Facility Operating License No. NPF-3: The amendment revised the Facility Operating License and Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in *Federal Register*: March 29, 2016 (81 FR 17506).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated January 11, 2017.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

Date of amendment request: January 21, 2016, as supplemented by letter dated December 27, 2016.

Brief description of amendments: The amendments revised Technical Specification (TS) 3.4.6, "RCS [Reactor Coolant System] Loops - MODE 4"; TS 3.4.7, "RCS Loops - MODE 5, Loops Filled"; TS 3.4.8, "RCS Loops - MODE 5, Loops Not Filled"; TS 3.5.2, "ECCS [Emergency Core Cooling System] - Operating"; TS 3.6.6, "Containment Spray and Cooling Systems"; TS 3.9.5, "Residual Heat Removal (RHR) and Coolant Circulation - High Water Level"; and TS 3.9.6, "Residual Heat Removal (RHR) and Coolant Circulation - Low Water Level." The amendments modified the TS requirements to address Generic Letter 2008-01, "Managing Gas Accumulation in Emergency Core Cooling, Decay Heat Removal, and Containment Spray Systems" (ADAMS Accession No. ML072910759), as described in Technical Specifications Task Force Traveler (TSTF)-523, Revision 2, "Generic Letter 2008-01, Managing Gas Accumulation" (ADAMS Accession No. ML13053A075).

Date of issuance: January 5, 2017.

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

Amendment Nos.: 228 (Unit 1); 230 (Unit 2). A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML16330A672; documents related to these amendments are listed in the Safety Evaluation enclosed with the amendments.

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

Date of initial notice in *Federal Register*: March 15, 2016 (81 FR 13844). The supplemental letter dated December 27, 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 January 5, 2017.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

Date of amendment request: May 12, 2016.

Description of amendment: The amendment authorized changes to the VCSNS, Units 2 and 3, changing the listed minimum volume of the passive core cooling system core makeup tanks (CMT) as reflected in the Combined License (COL) Appendix A, Technical Specifications (TSs), and Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (UFSAR) for VCSNS, Units 2 and 3. Specifically, this amendment is a departure from the generic AP1000 Design Control Document Tier 2 information as implemented in the plant-specific UFSAR, changing the minimum CMT volume from 2,500 ft³ to 2,487 ft³. The amendment resolves an inconsistency in the licensing documents by aligning the listed minimum CMT volume with that provided in the VCSNS COL Tier 1 information. The amendment also includes an addition to the TS Bases stating that the volume of one CMT is adequate for safety injection in the case of small-break loss-of-coolant accident. No changes were proposed to COL Tier 1 information.

Date of issuance: January 10, 2017.

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

Amendment No.: 57. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML16327A646; documents related to this amendment are listed in the Safety Evaluation enclosed with the amendment.

Facility Combined Licenses Nos. NPF-93 and NPF-94: Amendment revised the Facility Combined Licenses.

Date of initial notice in *Federal Register*: July 5, 2016 (81 FR 43646).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in the Safety Evaluation dated January 10, 2017.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Southern Nuclear Operating Company, Inc., Georgia Power Company, Oglethorpe Power Corporation, Municipal Electric Authority of Georgia, City of Dalton, Georgia, Docket No. 50-366, Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear Plant, Unit No. 2, Appling County, Georgia

Date of amendment request: August 29, 2016, as supplemented by letter dated November 18, 2016.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revised the values for the Safety Limit Minimum Critical Power Ratios for both single and dual recirculation loop operation.

Date of issuance: January 6, 2017.

Effective date: As of the date of issuance and shall be implemented prior to reactor startup from the spring 2017 refueling outage.

Amendment No.: 226. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML16344A126; documents related to this amendment are listed in the Safety Evaluation enclosed with the amendment.

Renewed Facility Operating License No. NPF-5: Amendment revised the Renewed Facility Operating License and Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in *Federal Register*: October 11, 2016 (81 FR 70184). The supplemental letter dated November 18, 2016, provided additional information that clarified the application, did not expand the scope of the application as originally noticed, and did not change the staff's original proposed no significant hazards consideration determination as published in the *Federal Register*.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated January 6, 2017.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

Date of amendment request: September 30, 2016.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revised Technical Specification 3.0.2 to allow for a one-time extension of the intervals for Surveillance Requirements 3.6.11.2 and 3.6.11.3.

Date of issuance: January 5, 2017.

Effective date: As of the date of issuance and shall be implemented within 7 days of issuance.

Amendment No.: 3. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No.

ML16343A814; documents related to this amendment are listed in the Safety Evaluation enclosed with the amendment.

Facility Operating License No. NPF-96: Amendment revised the Facility Operating License and Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in *Federal Register*: October 25, 2016 (81 FR 73442).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated January 5, 2017.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Tennessee Valley Authority, Docket Nos. 50-390 and 50-391, Watts Bar Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2, Rhea County, Tennessee

Date of amendment request: September 23, 2016.

Brief description of amendments: The amendments revised the completion date for License Condition 2.C.(9)b for Watts Bar Nuclear Plant, Unit 1, and License Condition 2.C.(3) for Watts Bar Nuclear Plant, Unit 2, regarding the completion of permanent modifications to the Fort Loudoun Dam from February 1, 2017, to June 30, 2018.

Date of issuance: January 11, 2017.

Effective date: As of the date of issuance and shall be implemented within 15 days of issuance.

Amendment Nos.: 109 (Unit 1); 4 (Unit 2). A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML16354A024; documents related to these amendments are listed in the Safety Evaluation enclosed with the amendments.

Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-90 and NPF-96: Amendments revised the Facility Operating Licenses.

Date of initial notice in *Federal Register*: November 8, 2016 (81 FR 78653).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated January 11, 2017.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

For further details with respect to the action see (1) the application for amendment, (2) the amendment to Facility Operating License or Combined License, as applicable, and (3) the

Commission's related letter, Safety Evaluation and/or Environmental Assessment, as indicated. All of these items can be accessed as described in the "Obtaining Information and Submitting Comments" section of this document.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

A State, local governmental body, Federally-recognized Indian Tribe, or agency thereof, may submit a petition to the Commission to participate as a party under 10 CFR 2.309(h)(1). The petition should state the nature and extent of the petitioner's interest in the proceeding. The petition should be submitted to the Commission by April 3, 2017. The petition must be filed in accordance with the filing instructions in the "Electronic Submissions (E-Filing)" section of this document, and should meet the requirements for petitions set forth in this section, except that under 10 CFR 2.309(h)(2) a State, local governmental body, or federally recognized Indian Tribe, or agency thereof does not need to address the standing requirements in 10 CFR 2.309(d) if the facility is located within its boundaries. Alternatively, a State, local governmental body, Federally-recognized Indian Tribe, or agency thereof may participate as a non-party under 10 CFR 2.315(c).

If a hearing is granted, any person who is not a party to the proceeding and is not affiliated with or represented by a party may, at the discretion of the presiding officer, be permitted to make a limited appearance pursuant to the provisions of 10 CFR 2.315(a). A person making a limited appearance may make an oral or written statement of his or her

position on the issues but may not otherwise participate in the proceeding. A limited appearance may be made at any session of the hearing or at any prehearing conference, subject to the limits and conditions as may be imposed by the presiding officer. Details regarding the opportunity to make a limited appearance will be provided by the presiding officer if such sessions are scheduled.

B. Electronic Submissions (E-Filing).

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

To comply with the procedural requirements of E-Filing, at least 10 days prior to the filing deadline, the participant should contact the Office of the Secretary by e-mail at hearing.docket@nrc.gov, or by telephone at 301-415-1677, to (1) request a digital identification (ID) certificate, which allows the participant (or its counsel or representative) to digitally sign submissions and access the E-Filing system for any proceeding in which it is participating; and (2) advise the Secretary that the participant will be submitting a petition or other adjudicatory

document (even in instances in which the participant, or its counsel or representative, already holds an NRC-issued digital ID certificate). Based upon this information, the Secretary will establish an electronic docket for the hearing in this proceeding if the Secretary has not already established an electronic docket.

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

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

Filing Help Desk is available between 9 a.m. and 6 p.m., Eastern Time, Monday through Friday, excluding government holidays.

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

Documents submitted in adjudicatory proceedings will appear in the NRC's electronic hearing docket which is available to the public at <https://adams.nrc.gov/ehd>, unless excluded pursuant to an order of the Commission or the presiding officer. If you do not have an NRC-issued digital ID certificate as described above, click cancel when the link requests certificates and you will be automatically directed to the NRC's electronic hearing dockets where you will be able to access any publicly available documents in a particular hearing docket. Participants are requested not to include personal privacy information, such as social security numbers, home addresses, or personal phone numbers in their filings, unless an NRC regulation or other law

requires submission of such information. For example, in some instances, individuals provide home addresses in order to demonstrate proximity to a facility or site. With respect to copyrighted works, except for limited excerpts that serve the purpose of the adjudicatory filings and would constitute a Fair Use application, participants are requested not to include copyrighted materials in their submission.

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

Date of amendment request: December 30, 2016, as supplemented by letters dated January 2, 2017, and January 4, 2017.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revised the Technical Specifications (TSs) for a one-time extension of the Unit 3 emergency diesel generator (3B DG) completion time described in TS 3.8.1.B.4. Specifically, the emergency risk-informed amendment extended, on a one-time basis, the TS required action 3.8.1.B.4 completion time from 21 days to 62 days for the purpose of completing repairs and testing to reestablish operability of the 3B DG.

During surveillance testing on December 15, 2016, the DG suffered a failure of the number nine right cylinder connecting rod and piston. Disassembly and inspection of the damaged 3B DG has been aggressively and continuously pursued since initial failure on December 15, 2016. APS established an Outage Control Center to schedule, manage, and oversee the work activities needed for the repairs. Multi-discipline teams were formed to assess the extent of damage, inspect and recover parts, and determine the cause of failure. APS has determined that the cause of failure of the 3B DG is attributed to high-cycle fatigue and that the mode of failure is not common to the “A” train DG or the DGs in Units 1 and 2.

Date of issuance: January 4, 2017.

Effective date: As of the date of issuance and shall be implemented prior to the expiration of the 21-day completion time, or January 5, 2017, at 3:56 AM Mountain Time.

Amendment No.: 200. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML17004A020; documents related to this amendment are listed in the Safety Evaluation enclosed with the amendment.

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

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

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment, finding of emergency circumstances, state consultation, and final NSHC determination are contained in a Safety Evaluation dated January 4, 2017.

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

NRC Branch Chief: Robert J. Pascarelli.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 23rd day of January 2017.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

/RA/

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