



This document is scheduled to be published in the Federal Register on 10/14/2014 and available online at <http://federalregister.gov/a/2014-24355>, and on FDsys.gov

[7590-01-P]

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[NRC-2014-0224]

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 September 18, 2014 to October 1, 2014. The last biweekly notice was published on September 30, 2014.

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

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

- **Federal Rulemaking Web Site:** Go to <http://www.regulations.gov> and search for Docket ID **NRC-2014-0224**. Address questions about NRC dockets to Carol Gallagher; telephone: 301-287-3422; e-mail: Carol.Gallagher@nrc.gov.

- **Mail comments to:** Cindy Bladey, Office of Administration, Mail Stop: 3WFN-06-A44M, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001.

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Obtaining Information and Submitting Comments.

A. Obtaining Information.

Please refer to Docket ID **NRC-2014-0224** 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-2014-0224**.

- **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 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-2014-0224** in the subject line of your comment submission, in order to ensure that the NRC is able to make your comment submission available to the public in this docket.

The NRC cautions you not to include identifying or contact information that you do not want to be publicly disclosed in your comment submission. The NRC posts all comment submissions at <http://www.regulations.gov> as well as 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. 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 should circumstances change during the 30-day comment period such that failure to act in a timely way would result, for example in derating or shutdown of the facility. Should the Commission take action prior to the expiration of either the comment period or the notice period, it will publish in the *Federal Register* a notice of issuance. Should the Commission make a final No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, any hearing will take place after issuance. The Commission expects that the need to take this action will occur very infrequently.

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

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

presiding officer designated by the Commission or by the Chief Administrative Judge of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, will rule on the request and/or petition; and the Secretary or the Chief Administrative Judge of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board will issue a notice of a hearing or an appropriate order.

As required by 10 CFR 2.309, a petition for leave to intervene shall set forth with particularity the interest of the petitioner in the proceeding, and how that interest may be affected by the results of the proceeding. The petition should specifically explain the reasons why intervention should be permitted with particular reference to the following general requirements: 1) the name, address, and telephone number of the requestor or petitioner; 2) the nature of the requestor's/petitioner's right under the Act to be made a party to the proceeding; 3) the nature and extent of the requestor's/petitioner's property, financial, or other interest in the proceeding; and 4) the possible effect of any decision or order which may be entered in the proceeding on the requestor's/petitioner's interest. The petition must also identify the specific contentions which the 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, 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 e-mail at hearing.docket@nrc.gov, or by telephone at 301-415-1677, to request (1) a digital identification (ID) certificate, which allows the participant (or its counsel or representative) to digitally sign documents and access the E-Submittal server for any proceeding in which it is participating; and (2) advise the Secretary that the participant will be submitting a request or petition for hearing (even in instances in which the participant, or its counsel or representative, already holds an NRC-issued digital ID certificate). Based upon this information, the Secretary will establish an electronic docket for the hearing in this proceeding if the Secretary has not already established an electronic docket.

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

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

browser plug-in, is available on the NRC's public Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/e-submittals.html>.

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

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

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

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

Date of amendment request: July 8, 2014. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML14205A278.

Description of amendment request: The amendments would modify the Technical Specifications by revising or adding surveillance requirements (SRs) to verify that the system locations susceptible to gas accumulation are sufficiently filled with water and to provide allowances that permit performance of the verification. The licensee proposed the changes to address NRC 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 Revision 2 of Technical Specification Task Force-523, "Generic Letter 2008-01, Managing Gas Accumulation" (ADAMS Accession No. ML13053A075).

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

1. Does the Proposed Change Involve a Significant Increase in the Probability or Consequences of an Accident Previously Evaluated?

Response: No.

The proposed change revises or adds SRs that require verification that the Emergency Core Cooling Systems (ECCS), the Residual Heat Removal (RHR) System, and the Containment Spray (CS) System are not rendered inoperable due to accumulated gas and to provide allowances which permit performance of the revised verification. Gas accumulation in the subject systems is not an initiator of any accident previously evaluated. As a result, the probability of any accident previously evaluated is not significantly increased. The proposed SRs ensure that the subject systems continue to be capable to perform their assumed safety function and are not rendered inoperable due to gas accumulation. Thus, the consequences of any accident previously evaluated are not significantly increased.

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

2. Does the Proposed Change Create the Possibility of a New or Different Kind of Accident from any Accident Previously Evaluated?

Response: No.

The proposed change revises or adds SRs that require verification that the ECCS, the RHR System, and the CS System are not rendered inoperable due to accumulated gas and to provide allowances which permit performance of the revised verification. The proposed change does not involve a physical alteration of the plant (i.e., no new or different type of equipment will be installed) or a change in the methods governing normal plant operation. In addition, the proposed change does not impose any new or different requirements that could initiate an accident. The proposed change does not alter assumptions made in the safety analysis and is consistent with the safety analysis assumptions.

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

3. Does the Proposed Change Involve a Significant Reduction in the Margin of Safety?

Response: No.

The proposed change revises or adds SRs that require verification that the ECCS, RHR System, and CS System are not rendered inoperable due to accumulated gas and to provide allowances which permit performance of the revised verification. The proposed change adds new requirements to manage gas accumulation in order to ensure that the subject systems are capable of performing their assumed safety functions. The proposed SRs are more comprehensive than the current SRs and will ensure that the assumptions of the safety analysis are protected. The proposed change does not adversely affect any current plant safety margins or the reliability of the equipment assumed in the safety analysis. Therefore, there are no changes being made to any safety analysis assumptions, safety limits, or limiting safety system settings that would adversely affect plant safety as a result of the proposed change.

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

The NRC staff 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 S. Blair, Managing Attorney - Nuclear, Florida Power & Light Company, 700 Universe Blvd. MS LAW/JB, Juno Beach, Florida 33408-0420.

Acting NRC Branch Chief: Lisa M. Regner.

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

Date of amendment request: August 27, 2014. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML14245A408.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment requests approval for a change to the VCSNS licensing basis to incorporate a supplemental analysis to the steam generator tube rupture (SGTR) accident.

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 adopt a new analytical method to evaluate the effects of a SGTR, does not affect any accident initiators or precursors since there is no physical change to plant systems, structures and components [SSCs] or manner in which they are operated during normal operation. As such, the proposed change does not increase the probability of an accident.

The ability of operators to mitigate the consequences of an accident is also not diminished as there is no impact on the design of mitigating plant systems that would reduce their design capability or increase their failure probability during normal operation or accident conditions.

The present methodology for calculating mass transfer (i.e., from the reactor coolant system to the secondary side via the failed SG [steam generator] tube) for input to the radiological consequences of a postulated SGTR is conservative when compared with results from the new methodology. As such, the existing licensing basis methodology for calculating mass transfer will be retained. The calculated doses for the SGTR event for use in the FSAR [final safety analysis report] will be updated to reflect the results of the updated calculations with the reported doses to include 5 percent margin. Although slightly higher than the current analyses of record, the updated doses are well within regulatory limits and the increases are not more than minimal. Consistent with VCSNS's current licensing basis, the dose calculations conform to the guidance presented in 10 CFR 50.67, RG 1.183, and Standard Review Plan [(SRP)] Section 15.0.1.

The use of this previously approved methodology (WCAP-10698-P-A) more accurately calculates the plant response to an SGTR event. The improved accuracy of the new methodology provides valuable information related to operator actions and associated timing. Such accurate

transient response information enables enhancements to be made to the emergency operating procedures (EOPs) and allows future changes to be more effectively assessed for impact.

Therefore, the proposed change does not involve a significant increase in the consequences or probability of occurrence 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 impact the design of affected plant systems, involve a physical alteration to the systems, or change to the way in which systems are currently operated, such that previously unanalyzed SGTRs would now occur. Since the design function and mode of operation of SSCs in the facility prior to a postulated accident are unchanged, the change to adopt a new analytical method to evaluate the effects of a tube rupture does not introduce any new malfunctions. Its use is beneficial in that it allows for a more accurate prediction of the plant response following a postulated SGTR to determine the time available for operator actions to prevent overfilling the affected SG. Thus, the proposed change does not affect or create new accident initiators or precursors or create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident.

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

Response: No.

The approval of the proposed change will not result in any modifications to affected plant systems that would reduce their design capabilities during normal operating and accident conditions. By using the WCAP-10698-P-A methodology, a more accurate SGTR response is calculated. The improved understanding of the transient response enables enhancements to the EOPs, which provide further assurance the SSCs required for accident mitigation are available and that required actions can be accomplished in a time frame to prevent overfill of a ruptured SG.

The SGTR dose consequences to be reported in the FSAR are well within the acceptance criteria presented in 10 CFR 50.67, RG 1.183, and SRP 15.0.1. Given this, there is no 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: J. Hagood Hamilton, Jr., South Carolina Electric & Gas Company, Post Office Box 764, Columbia, South Carolina 29218.

NRC Branch Chief: Robert J. Pascarelli.

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

Date of amendment request: August 22, 2014, and revised by the letter dated September 23, 2014. Publicly-available versions are available in ADAMS under Accession Nos. ML14234A423 and ML14266A656, respectively.

Description of amendment request: The license amendment request consists of changes to the Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (UFSAR) in the form of departures from the incorporated plant-specific Design Control Document (DCD) Tier 2 information and involves changes to Tier 2* and Tier 1 information, with corresponding changes associated with combined license (COL) Appendix C information.

The proposed changes include:

- (a) Installation of an additional non-safety-related battery;
- (b) Revision to the annex building internal configuration by converting a shift turnover room to a battery room, adding an additional battery equipment room, and moving a fire area wall;
- (c) Increase in the height of a room in the annex building; and
- (d) Increase in thicknesses of certain floor of the annex building.

In addition, the proposed changes also include reconfiguring existing rooms and related room, wall, and access path changes.

Because this proposed change requires a departure from Tier 1 information in the Westinghouse Advanced Passive 1000 DCD, the licensee also requested an exemption from the requirements of the Generic DCD Tier 1 in accordance with 10 CFR 52.63(b)(1).

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

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

Response: No.

The proposed additions of a new nonsafety-related battery, battery room and battery equipment room, the room height increase, the floor thickness changes, the relocation of a non-structural internal wall, and the associated wall, room and corridor changes within the annex building do not adversely affect the fire loading analysis durations of the affected fire zones and areas (i.e., the calculated fire durations remain less than their design values). Thus, the fire loads analysis is not adversely affected (i.e., analysis results remain acceptable). The safe shutdown fire analysis is not affected. The proposed changes to the structural configuration, including anticipated equipment loading, room height, and floor thickness are accounted for in the updated structural configuration model that was used to analyze the Annex Building for safe shutdown earthquake (SSE) and other design loads and load combinations, thus the structural analysis is not adversely affected. The structural analysis description and results in the UFSAR are unchanged. The relocated internal Annex Building wall is non-structural, thus this change does not affect the structural analyses for the Annex Building. The proposed changes do not involve any accident initiating event or component failure, thus the probabilities of the accidents previously evaluated are not affected. The rooms affected by the proposed changes do not contain or interface with safety-related equipment, thus the proposed changes would not affect any safety-related equipment or accident mitigating function. The radioactive material source terms and release paths used in the safety analyses are unchanged, thus the radiological releases in the accident analyses are not affected.

With the conversion of an annex building room to a battery room, the building volume serviced by nuclear island nonradioactive ventilation system decreases by approximate five percent. This reduced volume is used in the post-accident main control room dose portion of the UFSAR LOCA [loss-of-coolant accident] radiological analysis. However, the volume decrease is not sufficient to change the calculated main control room dose reported in the UFSAR, and control room habitability is not affected.

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

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

Response: No.

The proposed additions of a new nonsafety-related battery, battery room and battery equipment room, the room height increase, the floor thickness changes, the relocation of a non-structural internal wall, and their associated wall, room and corridor changes do not change fire barrier performance, and the fire loading analyses results remain acceptable. The room height and floor thickness changes are consistent with the annex building configuration used in the building's structural analysis. The relocated internal wall is non-structural, thus the structural analyses for the annex building are not affected. The affected rooms and associated equipment do not interface with components that contain radioactive material. The affected rooms do not contain equipment whose failure could initiate an accident. The proposed changes do not create a new fault or sequence of events that could result in a radioactive material release.

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

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

Response: No.

The proposed additions of a new nonsafety-related battery, battery room and battery equipment room, the room height increase, the floor thickness changes, the relocation of a non-structural internal wall, and their associated wall, room and corridor changes do not change the fire barrier performance of the affected fire areas. The affected rooms do not contain safety-related equipment, and the safe shutdown fire analysis is not affected. Because the proposed change does not alter compliance with

the construction codes to which the annex building is designed and constructed, the proposed changes to the structural configuration, including anticipated equipment loading, room height, and floor thickness do not adversely affect the safety margins associated with the seismic Category II structural capability of the annex building.

The floor areas and amounts of combustible material loads in affected fire zones and areas do not significantly change, such that their fire duration times remain within their two-hour design value, thus the safety margins associated with the fire loads analysis are not affected.

No safety analysis or design basis acceptance limit/criterion is challenged or exceeded by the proposed changes, thus no margin of safety is reduced.

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

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

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

NRC Branch Chief: Lawrence Burkhart.

Virginia Electric and Power Company, Docket Nos. 50-338 and 50-339, North Anna Power Station, Units 1 and 2, Louisa County, Virginia

Date of amendment request: August 27, 2014. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML14246A190.

Description of amendment request: The proposed license amendment requests changes to the Technical Specification (TS) to revise TS Figures 3.4.3-1 and 3.4.3-2, for the North Anna Units 1 and 2 Reactor Coolant System (RCS) Heatup Limitations and RCS Cooldown Limitations,

respectively, for clarification and to be fully representative of the allowable operating conditions during RCS startup and cooldown evolutions.

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 clarification of TS Figures 3.4.3-1 and 3.4.3-2 does not involve a physical change to the plant and does not change the manner in which plant systems or components are operated or controlled. The proposed change does not alter or prevent the ability of structures, system, and components (SSCs) to perform their intended function to mitigate the consequences of an initiating event within the assumed acceptance limits. The P/T [pressure/temperature] curves on TS Figures 3.4.3-1 and 3.4.3-2 are not being modified and remain valid.

Therefore, the probability of occurrence of an accident previously evaluated is not significantly increased by the proposed amendment.

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 clarification of TS Figures 3.4.3-1 and 3.4.3-2 does not involve any physical alteration of plant equipment; consequently, no new or different types of equipment will be installed. The proposed change does not adversely affect accident initiators or precursors nor alter the design assumptions, conditions, or configuration of the facility. The P/T curves on TS Figures 3.4.3-1 and 3.4.3-2 are not being modified, and the basic operation of installed plant systems and components is unchanged.

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

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

Response: No.

The existing RCS P/T curves on TS Figures 3.4.3-1 and 3.4.3-2 are not being modified. The proposed clarification of TS Figures 3.4.3-1 and 3.4.3-2 does not alter any plant equipment, does not change the manner in which the plant is operated or controlled, and has no impact on any safety analysis assumptions. The proposed change does not alter the manner in which safety limits, limiting safety system settings, or limiting conditions for operation are determined. The proposed change does not result in plant operation in a configuration outside the analyses or design basis and does not adversely affect systems that respond to safely shut down the plant and to maintain the plant in a safe shutdown condition.

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: Lillian M. Cuoco, Senior Counsel, Dominion Resources Services, Inc.,
120 Tredegar Street, RS-2, Richmond, VA 23219.

NRC Branch Chief: Robert J. Pascarelli.

**III. Previously Published Notices 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 following notices were previously published as separate individual notices. The notice content was the same as above. They were published as individual notices either because time did not allow the Commission to wait for this biweekly notice or because the action involved exigent circumstances. They are repeated here because the biweekly notice

lists all amendments issued or proposed to be issued involving no significant hazards consideration.

For details, see the individual notice in the *Federal Register* on the day and page cited.

This notice does not extend the notice period of the original notice.

Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc., Docket No. 50-293, Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station, Plymouth County, Massachusetts

Date of amendment request: September 11, 2014. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML14258A179.

Description of amendment request: The amendment would revise Technical Specification 4.3.4.b to reflect the removal of the energy absorbing pad from the spent fuel pool and the installation of a leveling platform.

Date of publication of individual notice in *Federal Register*: September 22, 2014 (79 FR 56608).

Expiration date of individual notice: October 26, 2014 (public comments); November 22, 2014 (hearing requests).

IV. 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.

Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC, Docket Nos. 50-269, 50-270 and 50-287, Oconee Nuclear Station (ONS), Units 1, 2 and 3, Oconee County, South Carolina

Date of application for amendments: October 24, 2013, as supplemented by letter dated June 30, 2014.

Brief description of amendments: The amendments revised the ONS Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (UFSAR) to clarify the Quality Assurance (QA) requirements for Standby Shutdown Facility (SSF) equipment. The proposed change revises ONS UFSAR Section

3.1.1.1 to clarify that the QA requirements applied to certain equipment relied upon to perform the SSF function that existed prior to the construction of the SSF, will be consistent with the original QA requirements for that equipment.

Date of Issuance: September 25, 2014.

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

Amendment Nos.: 387, 389, and 388. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML14254A246. Documents related to these amendments are listed in the Safety Evaluation enclosed with the amendments.

Renewed Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-38, DPR-47, and DPR-55: Amendments revised the licenses.

Date of initial notice in *Federal Register*: February 19, 2014 (79 FR 9493). The supplemental letter dated June 30, 2014, provided additional information that clarified the application, did not expand the scope of the application as noticed, and did not change the staff's 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 September 25, 2014.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

Date of amendment request: May 1, 2014, as supplemented by letter dated August 21, 2014.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revised Technical Specification 2.0, "Safety Limits (SLs)," by changing the safety limit minimum critical power ratio for both single and dual recirculation loop operation.

Date of issuance: September 30, 2014.

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

Amendment No.: 307. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML14258B189; documents related to this amendment are listed in the Safety Evaluation enclosed with the amendment.

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

Date of initial notice in *Federal Register*: August 5, 2014 (79 FR 45487). The supplemental letter dated August 21, 2014, provided additional information that clarified the application, did not expand the scope of the application as originally noticed, and did not change the NRC staff's original proposed no significant hazards consideration determination (NSHC) as published in the *Federal Register*.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment and final NSHC determination is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated September 30, 2014.

No significant hazards consideration comments received. No.

Entergy Operations, Inc., System Energy Resources, Inc., South Mississippi Electric Power Association, and Entergy Mississippi, Inc., Docket No. 50-416, Grand Gulf Nuclear Station, Unit 1, Claiborne County, Mississippi

Date of application for amendment: October 26, 2012, as supplemented by letters dated May 28 and August 28, 2013.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment deleted Paragraph 2.C.(32) of the Grand Gulf Nuclear Station, Unit 1, Facility Operating License, which currently prohibits operating with partial feedwater heating for the purpose of extending the fuel cycle at rated power conditions.

Date of issuance: September 25, 2014.

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

Amendment No: 199. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No.

ML14162A378; documents related to this amendment are listed in the Safety Evaluation enclosed with the amendment.

Facility Operating License No. NPF-29: The amendment revised the Facility Operating License.

Date of initial notice in *Federal Register*: February 12, 2013 (78 FR 9948). The supplemental letters dated May 28 and August 28, 2013, 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 September 25, 2014.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

FirstEnergy Nuclear Operating Company, et al., Docket Nos. 50-334 and 50-412, Beaver Valley Power Station, Units 1 and 2, Beaver County, Pennsylvania

Date of amendment requests: July 25, 2012, as supplemented by letters dated June 1, October 21, and November 14, 2013.

Brief description of amendments: The amendments modified Technical Specification 3.1.3 to allow the normally required near end-of-life Moderator Temperature Coefficient (MTC)

measurement to not be performed under certain conditions. If these conditions are met, the MTC measurement would be replaced by a calculated value.

Date of issuance: September 17, 2014.

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

Amendment Nos.: 291 and 178. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML14245A151; documents related to these amendments are listed in the Safety Evaluation enclosed with the amendments.

Renewed Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-66 and NPF-73: Amendments revised the Facility Operating License and Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in *Federal Register*: September 4, 2012 (77 FR 53929). The supplements dated June 1, October 21, and November 14, 2013, provided additional information that clarified the application, did not expand the scope of the application as originally noticed, and did not change the NRC 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 September 17, 2014.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

NextEra Energy Duane Arnold, LLC, Docket No. 50-331, Duane Arnold Energy Center,

Linn County, Iowa

Date of amendment request: August 29, 2013, as supplemented by letters dated May 28, 2014, July 24, 2014, and August 21, 2014.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revised the Duane Arnold Energy Center Technical Specifications Surveillance Requirements (SRs) 3.8.4.1 and 3.8.4.6 by changing the

battery terminal voltage, the battery charger voltage, and amperage provided in these SRs to account for the replacement of the existing 58-cell 125 volts direct current (VDC) batteries with new 60-cell 125 VDC batteries.

Date of issuance: September 26, 2014.

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

Amendment No.: 289. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML14259A292; documents related to this amendment are listed in the Safety Evaluation enclosed with the amendment.

Renewed Facility Operating License No. DPR-49: The amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in *Federal Register*: December 24, 2013 (78 FR 77732). The supplemental letters dated May 28, 2014, July 24, 2014, and August 21, 2014, 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 September 26, 2014.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Southern California Edison Company, et al., Docket Nos. 50-361 and 50-362, San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station (SONGS), Units 2 and 3, San Diego County, California

Date of amendment request: October 21, 2013, as supplemented by letters dated June 5, 2014, August 11, 2014, and September 15, 2014.

Brief description of amendments: The amendments revised and removed certain requirements from the Section 5, "Administrative Controls," portions of the SONGS Units 2 and 3 Technical Specifications (TSs) that are no longer applicable to the units in a permanently defueled condition. Specifically, the amendments revised TS Sections 5.1, "Responsibility," 5.2, "Organization," and 5.3, "Facility Staff Qualifications," to reflect new staffing and training requirements for operating staff.

Date of issuance: September 30, 2014.

Effective date: Upon issuance, to be implemented within 60 days of issuance.

Amendment Nos.: Unit 2 - 227; Unit 3 - 220. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML14183B240; documents related to these amendments are listed in the Safety Evaluation enclosed with the amendments.

Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-10 and NPF-15: The amendments revised the Facility Operating Licenses and TSs.

Date of initial notice in *Federal Register*: December 24, 2013 (78 FR 77733). The supplemental letters dated June 5, 2014, August 11, 2014, and September 15, 2014, 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 September 30, 2014.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

Date of application for amendments: August 20, 2013, as supplemented by letters dated February 24 and June 12, 2014.

Brief description of amendments: The amendments revised the Vogtle Electric Generating Plant Emergency Plan by revising certain Emergency Action Level thresholds by removing Main Steam Line radiation monitors RE-13119, RE-13120, RE-13121, and RE-13122 to address limitations of these monitors.

Date of issuance: September 30, 2014.

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

Amendment Nos.: 172 and 154. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML14170A911; documents related to these amendments are listed in the Safety Evaluation enclosed with the amendments.

Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-68 and NPF-81: Amendments revised the Emergency Plan.

Date of initial notice in *Federal Register*: September 17, 2013 (78 FR 57184). The supplemental letters dated on February 24, and June 12, 2014, provided additional information clarifying the LAR, did not expand the scope of the application as originally noticed, and did not change the NRC staff's original proposed no significant hazards consideration as published in the *Federal Register*.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated September 30, 2014.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

**V. 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 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, and electronically on the Internet at the NRC's Web site, <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/doc-collections/cfr/>. If there are problems in accessing the document, contact the PDR's Reference staff at 1-800-397-4209, 301-415-4737, or by e-mail to pdr.resource@nrc.gov. If a request for a hearing or petition for leave to intervene is filed by the above date, the Commission or a presiding officer designated by the Commission or by the Chief Administrative Judge of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, will rule on the

request and/or petition; and the Secretary or the Chief Administrative Judge of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board will issue a notice of a hearing or an appropriate order.

As required by 10 CFR 2.309, a petition for leave to intervene shall set forth with particularity the interest of the petitioner in the proceeding, and how that interest may be affected by the results of the proceeding. The petition should specifically explain the reasons why intervention should be permitted with particular reference to the following general requirements: 1) the name, address, and telephone number of the requestor or petitioner; 2) the nature of the requestor's/petitioner's right under the Act to be made a party to the proceeding; 3) the nature and extent of the requestor's/petitioner's property, financial, or other interest in the proceeding; and 4) the possible effect of any decision or order which may be entered in the proceeding on the requestor's/petitioner's interest. The petition must also identify the specific contentions which the 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 petitioner intends to rely in proving the contention at the hearing. The petitioner must also provide references to those specific sources and documents of which the petitioner is aware and on which the petitioner intends to rely to establish those facts or expert opinion. The petition must include sufficient information to show that a genuine dispute exists with the applicant on a material issue of law or fact. Contentions shall be limited to matters within the scope of the amendment under consideration. The contention must be one which, if proven, would entitle the petitioner to relief. A

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

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 ten 10 days prior to the filing deadline, the participant should contact the Office of the Secretary by e-mail at hearing.docket@nrc.gov, or by telephone at 301-415-1677, to request (1) a digital identification (ID) certificate, which allows the participant (or its counsel or representative) to digitally sign

documents and access the E-Submittal server for any proceeding in which it is participating; and (2) advise the Secretary that the participant will be submitting a request or petition for hearing (even in instances in which the participant, or its counsel or representative, already holds an NRC-issued digital ID certificate). Based upon this information, the Secretary will establish an electronic docket for the hearing in this proceeding if the Secretary has not already established an electronic docket.

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

If a participant is electronically submitting a document to the NRC in accordance with the E-Filing rule, the participant must file the document using the NRC's online, Web-based submission form. In order to serve documents through the Electronic Information Exchange System, users will be required to install a Web browser plug-in from the NRC's Web site. Further information on the Web-based submission form, including the installation of the Web browser plug-in, is available on the NRC's public Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/e-submittals.html>.

Once a participant has obtained a digital ID certificate and a docket has been created, the participant can then submit a request for hearing or petition for leave to intervene. Submissions should be in Portable Document Format (PDF) in accordance with NRC guidance available on the NRC's public Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/e-submittals.html>. A

filing is considered complete at the time the documents are submitted through the NRC's E-Filing system. To be timely, an electronic filing must be submitted to the E-Filing system no later than 11:59 p.m. Eastern Time on the due date. Upon receipt of a transmission, the E-Filing system time-stamps the document and sends the submitter an e-mail notice confirming receipt of the document. The E-Filing system also distributes an e-mail notice that provides access to the document to the NRC's Office of the General Counsel and any others who have advised the Office of the Secretary that they wish to participate in the proceeding, so that the filer need not serve the documents on those participants separately. Therefore, applicants and other participants (or their counsel or representative) must apply for and receive a digital ID certificate before a hearing request/petition to intervene is filed so that they can obtain access to the document via the E-Filing system.

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

Participants who believe that they have a good cause for not submitting documents electronically must file an exemption request, in accordance with 10 CFR 2.302(g), with their initial paper filing requesting authorization to continue to submit documents in paper format. Such filings must be submitted by: (1) first class mail addressed to the Office of the Secretary of the Commission, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, Attention: Rulemaking and Adjudications Staff; or (2) courier, express mail, or expedited delivery service to the Office of the Secretary, Sixteenth Floor, One White Flint North, 11555

Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland, 20852, Attention: Rulemaking and Adjudications Staff. Participants filing a document in this manner are responsible for serving the document on all other participants. Filing is considered complete by first-class mail 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.

Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc., Docket No. 50-247, Indian Point Nuclear Generating Unit 2, Westchester County, New York

Date of amendment request: September 15, 2014, as supplemented by letter dated September 18, 2014.

Description of amendment request: The amendment inserts a temporary change to Surveillance Requirement 3.8.6.6 by reducing the required Battery 22 capacity from 85 percent to 80 percent through March 6, 2015. The change is necessary because questions have been raised about the continued operability of the battery until the next scheduled surveillance test that is due by March 7, 2015. The questions are based on a concern that the Battery 22 will degrade and no longer meet Surveillance Requirement 3.8.6.6 before the next scheduled test and therefore must be demonstrated to meet the criteria to ensure strict technical specification compliance.

Date of issuance: September 24, 2014.

Effective date: As of its issuance date and shall be implemented upon approval.

Amendment No.: 278. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML14265A329; documents related to this amendment are listed in the Safety Evaluation enclosed with the amendment.

Facility Operating License No. DPR-26: The Amendment revised the technical specifications and the license.

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

A notice was published in the *Journal News* located in White Plains, New York, on September 19, 20, and 21, 2014. The notice provided an opportunity to submit comments on the Commission's proposed NSHC determination. No comments have been received.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment, finding of exigent circumstances, state consultation, and final NSHC determination are contained in a safety evaluation dated September 24, 2014.

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

NRC Branch Chief: Benjamin G. Beasley.

Wolf Creek Nuclear Operating Corporation, Docket No. 50-482, Wolf Creek Generating Station, Coffey County, Kansas

Date of amendment request: September 10, 2014.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revised the Technical Specifications (TSs) to incorporate a one-time Completion Time extension in TS 3.4.15, "RCS [reactor coolant system] Leakage Detection Instrumentation." The amendment added a Note to the 30-day Completion Time of Required Action A.2 to extend the Completion Time to allow the continued operation for Cycle 20 with the containment sump level and flow monitoring system inoperable until startup from a plant shutdown or startup from Refueling Outage 20 (spring 2015).

Date of issuance: September 29, 2014.

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

Amendment No.: 211. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML14259A339; documents related to this amendment are listed in the Safety Evaluation enclosed with the amendment.

Renewed Facility Operating License No. NPF-42. The amendment revised the Operating License and Technical Specifications.

Public comments requested as to proposed no significant hazards consideration (NSHC): Yes. The *Topeka Capital-Journal* newspaper on September 18-20, 2014, and the *Wichita Eagle* newspaper on September 22-24, 2014. The notice provided an opportunity to submit comments on the Commission's proposed NSHC determination. No comments have been received.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment, finding of exigent circumstances, state consultation, and final NSHC determination are contained in a safety evaluation dated September 29, 2014.

Attorney for licensee: Jay Silberg, Esq., Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw Pittman LLP, 2300 N Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20037.

NRC Acting Branch Chief: Eric R. Oesterle.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 3rd day of October 2014.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

A. Louise Lund, Acting Director,
Division of Operating Reactor Licensing,
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 2014-24355 Filed 10/10/2014 at 8:45 am;
Publication Date: 10/14/2014]