

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Michele G. Evans,

*Director, Division of Operating Reactor
Licensing, Office of Nuclear Reactor
Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 2015-04298 Filed 3-2-15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[NRC-2015-0030]

Applications and Amendments to Facility Operating Licenses and Combined Licenses Involving Proposed No Significant Hazards Considerations and Containing Sensitive Unclassified Non-Safeguards Information and Order Imposing Procedures for Access to Sensitive Unclassified Non-Safeguards Information

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory
Commission.

ACTION: License amendment request;
opportunity to comment, request a
hearing, and petition for leave to
intervene; order.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory
Commission (NRC) received and is
considering approval of four
amendment requests. The amendment
requests are for Braidwood Station,
Units 1 and 2, and Byron Station, Units
1 and 2; Peach Bottom Atomic Power
Station, Unit 2; Diablo Canyon Nuclear
Power Plant, Units 1 and 2; and Vogtle
Electric Generating Plant, Units 1 and 2,
Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant, Units 1
and 2, and Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear
Plant, Units 1 and 2. The NRC proposes
to determine that each amendment
request involves no significant hazards
consideration. In addition, each
amendment request contains sensitive
unclassified non-safeguards information
(SUNSI).

DATES: Comments must be filed by April
2, 2015. A request for a hearing must be
filed by May 4, 2015. Any potential
party as defined in § 2.4 of Title 10 of
the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10
CFR), who believes access to SUNSI is
necessary to respond to this notice must
request document access by March 13,
2015.

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-2015-0030. Address questions about NRC dockets to Carol

Gallagher; telephone: 301-415-3463;
email: Carol.Gallagher@nrc.gov.

- *Mail comments to:* Cindy Bladey,
Office of Administration, Mail Stop:
O12-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:

Shirley Rohrer, Office of Nuclear
Reactor Regulation, U.S. Nuclear
Regulatory Commission, Washington,
DC 20555-0001; telephone: 301-415-
5411; email: Shirley.Rohrer@nrc.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Obtaining Information and Submitting Comments

A. Obtaining Information

Please refer to Docket ID NRC-2015-
0030 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-2015-0030.
- *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 email 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 the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section.

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

B. Submitting Comments

Please include Docket ID NRC-2015-
0030, 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://](http://www.regulations.gov)

www.regulations.gov as well as entering
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 submissions into
ADAMS.

II. Background

Pursuant to Section 189a.(2) of the
Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended
(the Act), the NRC is publishing this
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 notice includes notices of
amendments containing SUNSI.

III. Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendments to Facility Operating Licenses and Combined Licenses, Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity for a Hearing

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

The Commission is seeking public
comments on this proposed
determination. Any comments received
within 30 days after the date of

publication of this notice will be considered in making any final determination.

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

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.

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 email 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 email notice confirming receipt of the document. The E-Filing system also distributes an email 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 email 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 as of the time of deposit in the mail, or by courier, express mail, or expedited delivery service upon depositing the document with the provider of the service. A presiding officer, having granted an exemption request from using E-Filing, may require a participant or party to use E-Filing if the presiding officer subsequently determines that the reason for granting the exemption from use of E-Filing no longer exists.

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

participants are requested not to include copyrighted materials in their submission.

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

For further details with respect to this amendment action, see the application for amendment which is available for public inspection at the NRC's PDR, located at One White Flint North, Room O1-F21, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland 20852. Publicly available documents created or received at the NRC are accessible electronically through ADAMS in the NRC Library at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html>. If you do not have access to ADAMS or if there are problems in accessing the documents located in ADAMS, contact the PDR's Reference staff at 1-800-397-4209, 301-415-4737, or by email to pdr.resource@nrc.gov.

Exelon Generation Company, LLC, Docket Nos. STN 50-456 and STN 50-457, Braidwood Station, Units 1 and 2, Will County, Illinois; Docket Nos. STN 50-454 and STN 50-455, Byron Station, Units 1 and 2, Ogle County, Illinois

Date of amendment request: October 16, 2014. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML14289A580.

Description of amendment request: This amendment request contains sensitive unclassified non-safeguards information (SUNSI). The proposed amendment would allow utilization of WCAP-16143-P, Revision 1, "Reactor Vessel Closure Head/Vessel Flange Requirements Evaluation for Byron/Braidwood Units 1 and 2," dated October 2014, as an analytical method to determine the reactor coolant system pressure and temperature (P-T) limits.

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

EGC [Exelon Generation Company, LLC] has evaluated the proposed change for Braidwood Station and Byron Station, using the criteria in 10 CFR 50.92, and has determined that the proposed change does

not involve a significant hazards consideration. The following information is provided to support a finding of no significant hazards consideration.

Criteria

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

Response: No.

These changes to the analysis do not adversely affect accident initiators or precursors, nor alter the design assumptions or conditions of the facility previously approved by the NRC, or the manner in which the plant is operated and maintained. The revisions to the subject WCAP [WCAP-16143[-P]] do not alter or prevent the ability of structures, systems, and components (SSCs) from performing their intended function to mitigate the consequences of an initiating event within the assumed acceptance limits. The changes also do not affect the source term, containment isolation, or radiological release assumptions used in evaluating the radiological consequences of an accident previously evaluated; do not increase the types or amounts of radioactive effluent that may be released offsite; and do not significantly increase individual or cumulative occupational/public radiation exposures.

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 use of WCAP-16143[-P], Revision 1, for generation of [Reactor Pressure Vessel] RPV P-T limits, will continue to ensure that RPV integrity is maintained under all conditions. The revisions contained in WCAP-16143[-P], Revision 1, and the changes proposed to TS [Technical Specifications] Table 1.1-1 do not change the conclusions of WCAP-16143[-P], Revision 0, previously approved by the NRC; nor do they change the way the RPV is analyzed or performs its safety function. Subsequently, these changes do not result in the creation of any new accident initiators or precursors; do not result in changes to any existing accident scenarios; and do not introduce any operational changes or mechanisms that would create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident.

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

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

Response: No.

The proposed changes do not change any safety limits or reduce the margin of safety to any safety limits. The stress analysis and fracture mechanics evaluation, documented in the revision to WCAP-16143[-P], determined that for the RPV boltup condition, the RPV 54-stud case (*i.e.*, all RPV head studs in-service) was more limiting than the RPV 53-stud case (*i.e.*, one RPV head stud

out-of-service). In addition, the conclusions of the updated analysis for the RPV 54-stud case confirmed the conclusions from WCAP-16143, Revision 0. This change, subsequently, has no impact on the current RPV P-T limit curves.

Therefore, the proposed changes do not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

Based on the above, EGC concludes that the proposed changes do not involve a significant hazards consideration under the standards set forth in 10 CFR 50.92(c), and, accordingly, a finding of "no significant hazards consideration" is justified.

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 requested amendments involve no significant hazards consideration.

Attorney for licensee: Bradley J. Fewell, Associate General Counsel, Exelon Nuclear, 4300 Winfield Road, Warrenville, Illinois 60555.

NRC Branch Chief: Travis L. Tate.

Exelon Generation Company, LLC, and PSEG Nuclear LLC, Docket No. 50-277, Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station (PBAPS), Unit 2, York and Lancaster Counties, Pennsylvania

Date of application for amendment: December 5, 2014. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML14342A229.

Description of amendment request: This amendment request contains sensitive unclassified non-safeguards information (SUNSI). The proposed amendment would revise the Technical Specifications (TSs) related to the Safety Limit Minimum Critical Power Ratios (SLMCPRs). The proposed changes result from a cycle-specific analysis performed to support the operation of PBAPS, Unit 2, in the upcoming Cycle 21. The re-analysis was performed to accommodate operation in the Maximum Extended Load Line Limit Analysis Plus (MELLLA+) operating domain based on a separate license amendment request (LAR) dated September 4, 2014 (ADAMS Accession No. ML14247A503).

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

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

Response: No.

The derivation of the cycle specific Safety Limit Minimum Critical Power Ratios (SLMCPRs) for incorporation into the Technical Specifications (TS), and their use to determine cycle specific thermal limits, has been performed using the methodology discussed in NEDE-24011-P-A, "General Electric Standard Application for Reactor Fuel," Revision 20 [ADAMS Accession No. ML13352A474].

The basis of the SLMCPR calculation is to ensure that during normal operation and during anticipated operational transients, at least 99.9% of all fuel rods in the core do not experience boiling transition if the limit is not violated. The new SLMCPRs preserve the existing margin to boiling transition.

The MCPR safety limit is reevaluated for each reload using NRC-approved methodologies. The analyses for PBAPS, Unit 2 Cycle 21, with the addition of operation in the MELLLA+ operating domain, have concluded that a two recirculation loop MCPR safety limit of ≥ 1.15 , based on the application of Global Nuclear Fuel's NRC-approved MCPR safety limit methodology, will ensure that this acceptance criterion is met. For single recirculation loop operation, a MCPR safety limit of ≥ 1.15 also ensures that this acceptance criterion is met. The MCPR operating limits are presented and controlled in accordance with the PBAPS Unit 2 Core Operating Limits Report (COLR).

The requested TS changes do not involve any additional plant modifications or operational changes that could affect system reliability or performance or that could affect the probability of operator error beyond those associated with the MELLLA+ LAR [ADAMS Accession No. ML14247A503]. The requested changes do not affect any postulated accident precursors, do not affect any accident mitigating systems, and do not introduce any new accident initiation mechanisms.

Therefore, the proposed TS 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 SLMCPR is a TS numerical value, calculated to ensure that during normal operation and during anticipated operational transients, at least 99.9% of all fuel rods in the core do not experience boiling transition if the limit is not violated. The new SLMCPRs are calculated using NRC-approved methodology discussed in NEDE-24011-P-A, "General Electric Standard Application for Reactor Fuel," Revision 20 [ADAMS Accession No. ML13352A474]. The proposed changes do not involve any new modes of operation, any changes to setpoints, or any plant modifications beyond those associated with the MELLLA+ LAR [ADAMS Accession No. ML14247A503]. The proposed revised MCPR safety limits have been shown to be acceptable for Cycle 21 operation with the MELLLA+ operating domain. The core operating limits will continue to be developed using NRC-approved methods. The proposed MCPR safety limits or methods for establishing the core operating limits do

not result in the creation of any new precursors to an accident.

Therefore, this 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.

There is no significant reduction in the margin of safety previously approved by the NRC as a result of the proposed change to the SLMCPRs. The new SLMCPRs are calculated using methodology discussed in NEDE-24011-P-A, "General Electric Standard Application for Reactor Fuel," Revision 20 [ADAMS Accession No. ML13352A474]. The SLMCPRs ensure that during normal operation and during anticipated operational transients, at least 99.9% of all fuel rods in the core do not experience boiling transition if the limits are not violated, thereby preserving the fuel cladding integrity.

Therefore, the proposed TS changes do not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety previously approved by the NRC.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, and with the changes noted above in square brackets, 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: J. Bradley Fewell, Esquire, Vice President and Deputy General Counsel, Exelon Generation Company, LLC, 200 Exelon Way, Kennett Square, Pennsylvania 19348.

NRC Branch Chief: Meena K. Khanna.

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

Date of amendment request: October 2, 2014. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML14275A444.

Description of amendment request: This amendment request contains sensitive unclassified non-safeguards information (SUNSI). The proposed amendments request approval to perform the fuel assembly structural analyses based on a pipe break that considers the application of leak-before-break, which allows the exclusion of the dynamic effects of certain pipe breaks, consistent with 10 CFR part 50, Appendix A, General Design Criterion 4, "Environmental and design effects design bases," for DCPP, Units 1 and 2. The fuel assembly structural analyses are performed to satisfy NUREG-0800, "Standard Review Plan for the Review of Safety Analysis Reports for Nuclear Power Plants: LWR Edition," Section

4.2, "Fuel System Design," Appendix A, "Evaluation of Fuel Assembly Structural Response to Externally Applied Forces," Revision 3, March 2007 (ADAMS Accession No. ML070740002). Further, the licensee requests approval to use the fuel assembly structural analysis results to satisfy, in part, the emergency core cooling system performance criterion, 10 CFR 50.46(b)(4), "Coolable geometry."

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

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

Response: No.

The proposed change requests approval to perform the fuel assembly structural analyses based on a pipe break that considers the application of Leak-Before-Break (LBB). Performing the fuel assembly structural analyses based on a pipe break that considers the application of LBB will not impact any accident previously evaluated.

No physical changes are being made to the plant as a result of this change. DCPD will continue to satisfy the criteria of 10 CFR 50.46(b) with this change.

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 accident from any accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

The proposed change does not involve any physical changes to the plant. The best-estimate large break loss-of-coolant [accident] (BELOCA) analyses are not impacted by this change.

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

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

Response: No.

The revised fuel structural integrity analysis incorporates the reduced LBB loads and therefore will not decrease the margin of safety to the 10 CFR 50.46 limits. The BELOCA analyses are not impacted by this change, and the criteria of 10 CFR 50.46(b) continue to be met. The proposed change does not involve any changes to the fuel, reactor vessel, or containment fission product barriers. Therefore there will be no impact on the accident analyses that are contained in the Updated Final Safety Analysis Report.

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 requests involve no significant hazards consideration.

Attorney for licensee: Jennifer Post, Esq., Pacific Gas and Electric Company, P.O. Box 7442, San Francisco, California 94120.

Acting NRC Branch Chief: Eric R. Oesterle.

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

Date of amendment request: December 30, 2014. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML14365A352.

Description of amendment request: This amendment request contains sensitive unclassified non-safeguards information (SUNSI). The amendments would revise the Cyber Security Plan (CSP) implementation schedule.

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

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

Response: No.

The proposed license amendment request is for a change to the Milestone 8 implementation schedule for the SNC CSP, as cited by the existing FOLs [facility operating licenses] applicable to FNP, HNP and VEGP Units 1 and 2.

The CSP is designed to provide high assurance that the systems within the scope of § 73.54 are protected from cyber attacks. The CSP itself does not require any plant modifications, but the plan describes appropriate configuration management requirements to assure plant modifications involving digital computer systems are reviewed to provide adequate protection against cyber attacks, up to and including the design basis threat as defined in § 73.54.

The proposed change is a schedule change for CSP implementation only; it will modify the existing FOL for each SNC-operated facility to add citation of the license amendment establishing the new Milestone 8 completion date. This change is administrative in nature and does not alter

the plant configuration, involve the installation of new plant equipment, alter accident analysis assumptions, add any new initiators, or affect the function of plant systems or the manner in which systems are operated, maintained, modified, tested, or inspected.

Based on the above, 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 will modify the existing FOL for each SNC-operated facility to add citation of the license amendment establishing the new Milestone 8 completion date for CSP implementation. This change is administrative in nature and does not alter plant configuration, install new plant equipment, alter accident analysis assumptions, add any initiators, or affect the function of plant systems or the manner in which systems are operated, maintained, tested, or inspected.

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

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

Response: No.

The proposed SNC CSP Milestone 8 implementation date change does not alter plant configuration, install new plant equipment, alter accident analysis assumptions, add any initiators, or affect the function of plant systems or the manner in which systems are operated, maintained, tested, or inspected. Plant safety margins are established through Limiting Conditions for Operation, Limiting Safety System Settings and Safety Limits specified in the Technical Specifications. Because there is no change to these established safety margins, the proposed change does not involve a reduction in a margin of safety.

The proposed change will modify the existing FOL for each SNC-operated facility to add citation of the license amendment establishing the new Milestone 8 completion date. This change is administrative in nature and does not involve a reduction in margin of safety.

Based on the above, 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: Leigh D. Perry, SVP & General Counsel of Operations and Nuclear, Southern Nuclear Operating Company, 40 Iverness Center Parkway, Birmingham, Alabama 35201.

NRC Branch Chief: Robert J. Pascarelli.

Order Imposing Procedures for Access to Sensitive Unclassified Non-Safeguards Information for Contention Preparation.

Exelon Generation Company, LLC, Docket Nos. STN 50-456 and STN 50-457, Braidwood Station, Units 1 and 2, Will County, Illinois, Docket Nos. STN 50-454 and STN 50-455, Byron Station, Units 1 and 2, Ogle County, Illinois

Exelon Generation Company, LLC, and PSEG Nuclear LLC, Docket No. 50-277, Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station, Unit 2, York and Lancaster Counties, Pennsylvania

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

Southern Nuclear Operating Company, Inc., Docket Nos. 50-424 and 50-425, Vogtle Electric Generating Plant, Units 1 and 2, Burke County, Georgia, Docket Nos. 50-348 and 50-364, Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2, Houston County, Alabama, Docket Nos. 50-321 and 50-366, Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2, City of Dalton, Georgia

A. This Order contains instructions regarding how potential parties to this proceeding may request access to documents containing SUNSI.

B. Within 10 days after publication of this notice of hearing and opportunity to petition for leave to intervene, any potential party who believes access to SUNSI is necessary to respond to this notice may request such access. A "potential party" is any person who intends to participate as a party by demonstrating standing and filing an admissible contention under 10 CFR 2.309. Requests for access to SUNSI submitted later than 10 days after publication of this notice will not be considered absent a showing of good cause for the late filing, addressing why the request could not have been filed earlier.

C. The requester shall submit a letter requesting permission to access SUNSI to the Office of the Secretary, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, Attention: Rulemakings and Adjudications Staff, and provide a copy to the Associate General Counsel for Hearings, Enforcement and Administration, Office of the General Counsel, Washington, DC 20555-0001. The expedited delivery or courier mail address for both offices is: U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland 20852. The email address for the Office of the Secretary and the

Office of the General Counsel are *Hearing.Docket@nrc.gov* and *OGCmailcenter@nrc.gov*, respectively.¹ The request must include the following information:

(1) A description of the licensing action with a citation to this **Federal Register** notice;

(2) The name and address of the potential party and a description of the potential party's particularized interest that could be harmed by the action identified in C.(1); and

(3) The identity of the individual or entity requesting access to SUNSI and the requester's basis for the need for the information in order to meaningfully participate in this adjudicatory proceeding. In particular, the request must explain why publicly-available versions of the information requested would not be sufficient to provide the basis and specificity for a proffered contention.

D. Based on an evaluation of the information submitted under paragraph C.(3) the NRC staff will determine within 10 days of receipt of the request whether:

(1) There is a reasonable basis to believe the petitioner is likely to establish standing to participate in this NRC proceeding; and

(2) The requestor has established a legitimate need for access to SUNSI.

E. If the NRC staff determines that the requestor satisfies both D.(1) and D.(2) above, the NRC staff will notify the requestor in writing that access to SUNSI has been granted. The written notification will contain instructions on how the requestor may obtain copies of the requested documents, and any other conditions that may apply to access to those documents. These conditions may include, but are not limited to, the signing of a Non-Disclosure Agreement or Affidavit, or Protective Order² setting forth terms and conditions to prevent the unauthorized or inadvertent disclosure of SUNSI by each individual who will be granted access to SUNSI.

F. Filing of Contentions. Any contentions in these proceedings that are based upon the information received as a result of the request made for SUNSI must be filed by the requestor no later than 25 days after the requestor is

¹ While a request for hearing or petition to intervene in this proceeding must comply with the filing requirements of the NRC's "E-Filing Rule," the initial request to access SUNSI under these procedures should be submitted as described in this paragraph.

² Any motion for Protective Order or draft Non-Disclosure Affidavit or Agreement for SUNSI must be filed with the presiding officer or the Chief Administrative Judge if the presiding officer has not yet been designated, within 30 days of the deadline for the receipt of the written access request.

granted access to that information. However, if more than 25 days remain between the date the petitioner is granted access to the information and the deadline for filing all other contentions (as established in the notice of hearing or opportunity for hearing), the petitioner may file its SUNSI contentions by that later deadline. This provision does not extend the time for filing a request for a hearing and petition to intervene, which must comply with the requirements of 10 CFR 2.309.

G. Review of Denials of Access.

(1) If the request for access to SUNSI is denied by the NRC staff after a determination on standing and need for access, the NRC staff shall immediately notify the requestor in writing, briefly stating the reason or reasons for the denial.

(2) The requester may challenge the NRC staff's adverse determination by filing a challenge within 5 days of receipt of that determination with: (a) the presiding officer designated in this proceeding; (b) if no presiding officer

has been appointed, the Chief Administrative Judge, or if he or she is unavailable, another administrative judge, or an administrative law judge with jurisdiction pursuant to 10 CFR 2.318(a); or (c) officer if that officer has been designated to rule on information access issues.

H. Review of Grants of Access. A party other than the requester may challenge an NRC staff determination granting access to SUNSI whose release would harm that party's interest independent of the proceeding. Such a challenge must be filed with the Chief Administrative Judge within 5 days of the notification by the NRC staff of its grant of access.

If challenges to the NRC staff determinations are filed, these procedures give way to the normal process for litigating disputes concerning access to information. The availability of interlocutory review by the Commission of orders ruling on such NRC staff determinations (whether granting or denying access) is governed by 10 CFR 2.311.³

I. The Commission expects that the NRC staff and presiding officers (and any other reviewing officers) will consider and resolve requests for access to SUNSI, and motions for protective orders, in a timely fashion in order to minimize any unnecessary delays in identifying those petitioners who have standing and who have propounded contentions meeting the specificity and basis requirements in 10 CFR part 2. Attachment 1 to this Order summarizes the general target schedule for processing and resolving requests under these procedures.

It is so ordered.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 18th day of February, 2015.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Annette L. Vietti-Cook,

Secretary of the Commission.

Attachment 1—General Target Schedule for Processing and Resolving Requests for Access to Sensitive Unclassified Non-Safeguards Information in This Proceeding

| Day | Event/activity |
|---------------|---|
| 0 | Publication of Federal Register notice of hearing and opportunity to petition for leave to intervene, including order with instructions for access requests. |
| 10 | Deadline for submitting requests for access to Sensitive Unclassified Non-Safeguards Information (SUNSI) with information: supporting the standing of a potential party identified by name and address; describing the need for the information in order for the potential party to participate meaningfully in an adjudicatory proceeding. |
| 60 | Deadline for submitting petition for intervention containing: (i) Demonstration of standing; and (ii) all contentions whose formulation does not require access to SUNSI (+25 Answers to petition for intervention; +7 petitioner/requestor reply). |
| 20 | U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff informs the requester of the staff's determination whether the request for access provides a reasonable basis to believe standing can be established and shows need for SUNSI. (NRC staff also informs any party to the proceeding whose interest independent of the proceeding would be harmed by the release of the information.) If NRC staff makes the finding of need for SUNSI and likelihood of standing, NRC staff begins document processing (preparation of redactions or review of redacted documents). |
| 25 | If NRC staff finds no "need" or no likelihood of standing, the deadline for petitioner/requester to file a motion seeking a ruling to reverse the NRC staff's denial of access; NRC staff files copy of access determination with the presiding officer (or Chief Administrative Judge or other designated officer, as appropriate). If NRC staff finds "need" for SUNSI, the deadline for any party to the proceeding whose interest independent of the proceeding would be harmed by the release of the information to file a motion seeking a ruling to reverse the NRC staff's grant of access. |
| 30 | Deadline for NRC staff reply to motions to reverse NRC staff determination(s). |
| 40 | (Receipt +30) If NRC staff finds standing and need for SUNSI, deadline for NRC staff to complete information processing and file motion for Protective Order and draft Non-Disclosure Affidavit. Deadline for applicant/licensee to file Non-Disclosure Agreement for SUNSI. |
| A | If access granted: Issuance of presiding officer or other designated officer decision on motion for protective order for access to sensitive information (including schedule for providing access and submission of contentions) or decision reversing a final adverse determination by the NRC staff. |
| A + 3 | Deadline for filing executed Non-Disclosure Affidavits. Access provided to SUNSI consistent with decision issuing the protective order. |
| A + 28 | Deadline for submission of contentions whose development depends upon access to SUNSI. However, if more than 25 days remain between the petitioner's receipt of (or access to) the information and the deadline for filing all other contentions (as established in the notice of hearing or opportunity for hearing), the petitioner may file its SUNSI contentions by that later deadline. |
| A + 53 | (Contention receipt +25) Answers to contentions whose development depends upon access to SUNSI. |
| A + 60 | (Answer receipt +7) Petitioner/Intervenor reply to answers. |
| >A + 60 | Decision on contention admission. |

[FR Doc. 2015-03917 Filed 3-2-15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

³Requesters should note that the filing requirements of the NRC's E-Filing Rule (72 FR 49139; August 28, 2007) apply to appeals of NRC

staff determinations (because they must be served on a presiding officer or the Commission, as

applicable), but not to the initial SUNSI request submitted to the NRC staff under these procedures.