

**NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

[NRC–2015–0154]

**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 eight amendment requests. The amendment requests are for Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station, Unit 3; Beaver Valley Power Station, Units Nos. 1 and 2; Monticello Nuclear Generating Plant; Fort Calhoun Station, Unit No. 1; Salem Nuclear Generating Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2; Susquehanna Steam Electric Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2; Browns Ferry Nuclear Plant, Unit 3; and Callaway Plant, Unit 1. For each amendment request, the NRC proposes to determine that they involve no significant hazards consideration. In addition, each amendment request contains sensitive unclassified non-safeguards information (SUNSI).

**DATES:** Comments must be filed by August 6, 2015. A request for a hearing must be filed by September 8, 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 July 17, 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–2015–0154. Address questions about NRC dockets to Carol Gallagher; telephone: 301–415–3463; email: [Carol.Gallagher@nrc.gov](mailto:Carol.Gallagher@nrc.gov). For technical questions, contact the individual listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section of this document.

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

OWFN–12–H08, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001.

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

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Janet Burkhardt, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001; telephone: 301–415–1384, email: [Janet.Burkhardt@nrc.gov](mailto:Janet.Burkhardt@nrc.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:****I. Obtaining Information and Submitting Comments***A. Obtaining Information*

Please refer to Docket ID NRC–2015–0154 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–2015–0154.
- *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](mailto: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–2015–0154, facility name, unit number(s), application date, and subject in your comment submission.

The NRC cautions you not to include identifying or contact information that you do not want to be publicly disclosed in your comment submission. The NRC posts all comment submissions at <http://www.regulations.gov> as well as 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](mailto: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](mailto: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, in some instances, a request to intervene will require including information on local residence in order to demonstrate a proximity assertion of interest in the proceeding. With respect to copyrighted works, except for limited excerpts that serve the purpose of the adjudicatory filings and would constitute a Fair Use application, participants are requested not to include copyrighted materials in their submission.

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](mailto:pdr.resource@nrc.gov).

*Exelon Generation Company, LLC, and PSEG Nuclear LLC, Docket No. 50-278, Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station (PBAPS), Unit 3, York and Lancaster Counties, Pennsylvania*  
Date of amendment request: April 30, 2015. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML15120A290.

*Description of amendment request:*  
This amendment request contains sensitive unclassified non-safeguards information (SUNSI). The proposed amendment would revise the Technical Specifications related to the Safety Limit Minimum Critical Power Ratios. The proposed changes result from a cycle-specific analysis performed to support the operation of PBAPS Unit 3, 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, redacted to remove proprietary information).

*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 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 reasonably assure 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 [minimum critical power ratio] safety limit is reevaluated for each reload using NRC-approved methodologies. The analyses for Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station (PBAPS) Unit 3 Cycle 21, with the addition of operation in the MELLLA+ operating domain, have concluded that a two recirculation loop MCPR safety limit of  $\geq 1.15$ , based on the application of Global Nuclear Fuel's NRC-approved MCPR safety limit methodology, will reasonably assure that this acceptance criterion is met. For single recirculation loop operation, a MCPR safety limit of  $\geq 1.15$  also reasonably assures that this acceptance criterion is met. The MCPR operating limits are presented and controlled in accordance with the PBAPS Unit 3 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 reasonably assure 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 reasonably assure 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, 4300 Winfield Road, Warrenville, Illinois 60555.

*NRC Branch Chief:* Douglas A. Broadus.

*FirstEnergy Nuclear Operating Company, et al., Docket Nos. 50-334 and 50-412, Beaver Valley Power Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2 (BVPS-1 and BVPS-2), Beaver County, Pennsylvania*

*Date of amendment request:* March 19, 2015, as supplemented by letter dated May 6, 2015. Publicly-available versions are in ADAMS under Accession Nos. ML15084A346 and ML15127A202, respectively.

*Description of amendment request:* This amendment request contains sensitive unclassified non-safeguards information (SUNSI). The amendment would change the BVPS-1 and BVPS-2 Operating License. Specifically, the proposed license amendment would revise the Cyber Security Plan, Milestone 8, full implementation date as set forth in the cyber security plan 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:

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

*Response:* No.

The proposed amendment extends the completion date for milestone 8 of the Cyber Security Plan (CSP) implementation schedule. Revising the full implementation date for the CSP does not involve modifications to any safety-related structures, systems, or components (SSCs). The implementation schedule provides a timeline for fully implementing the CSP. The CSP describes how the requirements of 10 CFR 73.54 are to be implemented to identify, evaluate, and mitigate cyber-attacks up to and including the design basis cyber-attack threat; thereby achieving high assurance that the facility's digital computer and communications systems and networks are protected from cyber-attacks. The revision of the CSP Implementation Schedule will not alter previously evaluated design basis accident analysis assumptions, add any accident initiators, modify the function of the plant safety-related SSCs, or affect how any plant safety-related SSCs are operated, maintained, tested, or inspected.

As the proposed change does not directly impact SSCs, and milestones 1 through 7 provide significant protection against cyber-attacks, the proposed change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

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

*Response:* No.

The proposed change does not introduce a new mode of plant operation or involve a physical modification to the plant. New equipment is not installed with the proposed amendment, nor does the proposed amendment cause existing equipment to be operated in a new or different manner. The change to cyber security implementation plan milestone 8 is administrative in nature and relies on the significant protection against cyber-attacks that has been gained through the implementation of CSP milestones 1 through 7. Since the proposed amendment does not involve a change to the plan design or operation, no new system interactions are created by this change. The proposed changes do not result in any new failure modes, and thus cannot initiate an accident different from those previously evaluated.

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

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

*Response:* No.

The proposed amendment does not affect the performance of any structures, systems or components as described in the design basis analyses. The change to milestone 8 of the cyber security implementation plan is administrative in nature.

The proposed change does not introduce a new mode of plant operation or involve a physical modification to the plant. The proposed amendment does not introduce changes to limits established in the accident analysis. Since there is no impact to any SSCs, or any maintenance or operational practice, there is also no reduction in any margin of safety.

As the proposed change does not directly impact SSCs, and milestones 1 through 7 provide significant protection against cyber-attacks, the proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety.

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

*Attorney for licensee:* David W. Jenkins, FirstEnergy Nuclear Operating Company, FirstEnergy Corporation, 76 South Main Street, Akron, Ohio 44308.  
*NRC Branch Chief:* Douglas A. Broadus.

*Northern States Power Company—Minnesota, Docket No. 50-263, Monticello Nuclear Generating Plant (MNGP), Wright County, Minnesota*  
*Date of amendment request:* October 3, 2014. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Package Accession No. ML14283A125.

*Description of amendment request:* This amendment request contains sensitive unclassified non-safeguards information (SUNSI). The proposed amendment would revise the MNGP Technical Specifications and approve certain analytical methods to support operation in the expanded power-flow operating domain described as the Extended Flow Window (EFW).

*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 probability (frequency of occurrence) of Design Basis Accidents occurring is not affected by the EFW operating domain because MNGP will continue to comply with the regulatory and design basis criteria established for plant equipment. Based on

the EFW domain representing the same region as the Maximum Extended Load Line Limit Analysis Plus (MELLLA+), there is no change in consequences of postulated accidents when operating in the EFW operating domain compared to the operating domain previously evaluated. The results of accident evaluations remain within the NRC approved acceptance limits.

The spectrum of postulated transients has been investigated and is shown to meet the plant's currently licensed regulatory criteria. In the area of fuel and core design, the Safety Limit Minimum Critical Power Ratio (SLMCPR) is still met. Continued compliance with the SLMCPR will be confirmed on a cycle specific basis consistent with the criteria accepted by the NRC. Challenges to the Reactor Coolant Pressure Boundary were evaluated for the extended operating domain conditions (pressure, temperature, flow, and radiation) and were found to meet their acceptance criteria for allowable stresses and overpressure margin.

Evaluations have also show that the consequences of the Loss of Coolant Accident (LOCA) are not exacerbated by operation in the EFW domain.

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

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

*Response:* No.

Equipment that could be affected by the EFW operating domain has been evaluated. Aside from small changes to plant setpoints, the only physical change that is proposed involves installation of an electrical jumper that had been previously approved and installed for several operating cycles. No new operating mode, safety-related equipment lineup, accident scenario, or equipment failure mode was identified. The full spectrum of accident considerations has been evaluated and no new or different kind of accident has been identified. The EFW operating domain uses developed technology and applies it within the capabilities of existing plant safety-related equipment in accordance with the regulatory criteria. No new accident or event precursor has been identified.

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

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

*Response:* No.

The EFW operating domain affects only design and operational margins. Challenges to the fuel, reactor coolant pressure boundary, and containment were evaluated for the EFW operating domain conditions. Fuel integrity is maintained by meeting existing design and regulatory limits. The calculated loads on affected structures, systems and components (including the reactor coolant pressure boundary) will remain within their design basis event categories. No NRC acceptance criterion is exceeded.

Because the MNGP configuration and responses to transients and postulated accidents do not result in exceeding the presently-approved NRC acceptance limits, the proposed changes do not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

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

*Attorney for licensee:* Peter M. Glass, Assistant General Counsel, Xcel Energy Services, Inc., 414 Nicollet Mall, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55401.

*NRC Branch Chief:* David L. Pelton.  
*Omaha Public Power District, Docket No. 50-285, Fort Calhoun Station, Unit No. 1, Washington County, Nebraska*

*Date of amendment request:* November 25, 2014, as supplemented by letter dated April 20, 2015. Publicly-available versions are in ADAMS under Accession Nos. ML15070A007 and ML15110A420, respectively.

*Description of amendment request:* This amendment request contains sensitive unclassified non-safeguards information (SUNSI). The amendment would revise the Cyber Security Plan, Milestone 8, full implementation date as set forth in the Fort Calhoun Station cyber security plan 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:

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

*Response:* No.

This amendment proposes a change to the Fort Calhoun Station (FCS)/Omaha Public Power District (OPPD) Cyber Security Program (CSP) Milestone 8 (MS8) full implementation date as set forth in the CSP Implementation Schedule and associated regulatory commitment. The revision of the MS8 implementation date for the CSP does not involve modifications to any safety-related structures, systems, or components (SSCs). The revision of the CSP Implementation Schedule will not alter previously evaluated design basis accident analysis assumptions, add any accident initiators, modify the function of the plant safety-related SSCs, or affect how any plant safety-related SSCs are operated, maintained, modified, tested, or inspected.

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

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

*Response:* No.

This amendment proposes a change to the CSP MS8 full implementation date as set forth in the CSP Implementation Schedule and associated regulatory commitment. The revision of the MS8 full implementation date for the CSP does not involve modifications to any safety-related SSCs. No new accident scenarios, failure mechanisms, or limiting single failures are introduced as a result of this proposed amendment.

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

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

*Response:* No.

The amendment proposes a change to the CSP MS8 full implementation date as set forth in the CSP Implementation Schedule and associated regulatory commitment. The revision of the MS8 full implementation date for the CSP does not involve modifications to any safety-related SSCs. The proposed amendment has no effect on the structural integrity of the fuel cladding, reactor coolant pressure boundary, or containment structure.

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:* David A. Repka, Esq., Winston & Strawn, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, DC 20006-3817.

*NRC Branch Chief:* Michael T. Markley.

*PSEG Nuclear LLC, Docket Nos. 50-272 and 50-311, Salem Nuclear Generating Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Salem County, New Jersey*  
*Date of amendment request:* March 27, 2015. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML15086A201.

*Description of amendment request:* This amendment request contains sensitive unclassified non-safeguards information (SUNSI). The proposed amendments would revise Technical Specification 3/4.3.3, "Reactor Trip System Instrumentation," Table 3.3-1, Action 2, to allow one channel to be bypassed for up to 4 hours for surveillance testing and would establish two new action notes for the power range nuclear instrumentation in Table 4.3-1, which would exclude solid state protection system input relays from the surveillance testing when the bypass test capability is used to perform the

surveillance. The proposed changes would support the installation and use of bypass test capability for the power range nuclear instrumentation.

*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 the NRC staff's edits in square brackets:

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

*Response:* No.

The power range (PR) nuclear instrumentation is not an accident initiator or precursor. The PR nuclear instrumentation provides indication and plant protection through a reactor trip. The reactor trip is part of the plant's accident mitigation response. With the existing system, analog channel comparators are placed in the tripped condition for channel testing. This changes the normal two-out-of-four coincidence trip logic to a one-out-of-three trip logic. In this condition, a human error, channel failure, or spurious transient in a redundant channel could result in a reactor trip. Testing the PR nuclear instrumentation channels in bypass eliminates the spurious reactor trip because the trip logic becomes two-out-of-three; thereby retaining the two channels required to actuate the protective function.

The proposed change does not affect how the Reactor Trip System (RTS) functions. The proposed change does not alter or prevent any structures, systems, or components from performing their intended design basis function(s) to mitigate the consequences of an initiating event within the applicable acceptance criteria. Surveillance testing in the bypass condition will not cause any design or analysis acceptance criteria to be exceeded.

PR channel testing in bypass does not affect the source term, containment isolation, or radiological release assumptions used in evaluating the radiological consequences of an accident previously evaluated. The proposed change does not increase the types or amounts of radioactive effluent that may be released offsite, or significantly increase individual or cumulative occupational/public radiation exposures. The change is consistent with safety analysis assumptions and resultant consequences. Implementation of the PR nuclear instrumentation bypass testing capability does not affect the integrity of the fission product barriers utilized for the mitigation of radiological dose consequences as a result of a design basis accident. The plant response as assumed in the safety analyses is unaffected by this change.

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

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

*Response:* No.

The manner in which the RTS provides plant protection is not changed. Surveillance testing in bypass does not affect accident initiation sequences or response scenarios as modeled in the safety analyses. The PR nuclear instrumentation will continue to have the same setpoints. No new failure modes are created for any plant equipment. The bypass test instrumentation has been designed and qualified to applicable regulatory and industry standards. Fault conditions, failure detection, reliability, and equipment qualification have been considered. Existing accident scenarios remain unchanged and new or different accident scenarios are not created. The types of accidents defined in the Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (UFSAR) continue to represent the credible spectrum of events analyzed to determine safe plant operation.

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

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

*Response:* No.

Safety analyses are not changed or modified as a result of the proposed Technical Specification (TS) changes to reflect installed PR nuclear instrumentation bypass test capability. The changes do not alter the manner in which the safety limits, limiting safety system setpoints, or limiting conditions for operation are determined. Margins associated with the applicable safety analyses acceptance criteria are unaffected. The current safety systems remain bounding; their assumptions and conclusions are not affected by performing PR nuclear instrumentation surveillance testing in bypass. The safety systems credited in the safety analyses continue to remain available to perform their required mitigation functions. The impact of testing in bypass upon reactor safety was previously evaluated by the NRC during their review of WCAP-10271-P-A [titled "Evaluation of Surveillance Frequencies and Out of Service Times for the Reactor Protection Instrumentation System"], and determined to be acceptable.

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

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

*Attorney for licensee:* Jeffrie J. Keenan, PSEG Nuclear LLC—N21, P.O. Box 236, Hancocks Bridge, New Jersey 08038.

*NRC Branch Chief:* Douglas A. Broadus.

*Susquehanna Nuclear, LLC, Docket Nos. 50-387 and 50-388, Susquehanna Steam Electric Station (SSES), Units 1 and 2, Luzerne County, Pennsylvania*



*Date of amendment request:*

December 2, 2014, as supplemented by letters dated February 12, 2015, and May 4, 2015. Publicly-available versions are in ADAMS under Accession Nos. ML14336A246, ML15044A053, and ML15124A668, respectively.

*Description of amendment request:*

This request contains sensitive unclassified non-safeguards information (SUNSI). The amendments would revise the SSES Unit 1 and Unit 2 Cyber Security Plan, Milestone 8, full implementation date as set forth in the SSES cyber security plan implementation schedule.

On June 1, 2015, the NRC staff issued an amendment changing the name on the SSES license from PPL Susquehanna, LLC, to Susquehanna Nuclear, LLC. This amendment was issued subsequent to an Order issued on April 10, 2015, to SSES approving an indirect license transfer. As such, all references in the basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration below to PPL Susquehanna, LLC, have been replaced with references to Susquehanna Nuclear, LLC, and are shown in square brackets [ ].

*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 the NRC staff's edits in square brackets:

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

*Response:* No.

The amendment proposes a change to the [Susquehanna Nuclear, LLC, (Susquehanna)] Cyber Security Plan (CSP) Milestone 8 (M8) full implementation date as set forth in the [Susquehanna] CSP implementation schedule. The revision of the full implementation date for the [Susquehanna] CSP does not involve modifications to any safety-related structures, systems or components (SSCs). Rather, the implementation schedule provides a timetable for fully implementing the [Susquehanna] CSP. The CSP describes how the requirements of 10 CFR 73.54 are to be implemented to identify, evaluate, and mitigate cyber-attacks up to and including the design basis cyber-[attack threat, thereby achieving high assurance that the facility's digital computer and communications systems and networks are protected from cyber-attacks. The revision of the [Susquehanna] Cyber Security Plan implementation schedule will not alter previously evaluated design basis accident analysis assumptions, add any accident initiators, modify the function of the plant safety-related SSCs, or affect how any plant safety-related SSCs are operated, maintained, modified, tested, or inspected.

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

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

*Response:* No.

The implementation of the [Susquehanna] CSP does not introduce new equipment that could create a new or different kind of accident, and no new equipment failure modes are created. No new accident scenarios, failure mechanisms, or limiting single failures are introduced as a result of this proposed amendment.

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

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

*Response:* No.

The margin of safety is associated with the confidence in the ability of the fission product barriers (*i.e.*, fuel cladding, reactor coolant pressure boundary, and containment structure) to limit the level of radiation to the public. The proposed amendment does not alter the way any safety-related SSC functions and does not alter the way the plant is operated. The [Susquehanna] CSP provides assurance that safety-related SSCs are protected from cyber-attacks. The proposed amendment does not introduce any new uncertainties or change any existing uncertainties associated with any safety limit. The proposed amendment has no effect on the structural integrity of the fuel cladding, reactor coolant pressure boundary, or containment structure. Based on the above considerations, the proposed amendment does not degrade the confidence in the ability of the fission product barriers to limit the level of radiation to the public.

Therefore, the proposed change does not involve a 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:* Damon D. Obie, Assoc. General Counsel, Talen Energy Supply, LLC, 835 Hamilton Street, Suite 150, Allentown, Pennsylvania 18101.

*NRC Branch Chief:* Douglas A.

Broadus.

*Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA),*

*Docket No. 50-296, Browns Ferry*

*Nuclear Plant (BFN), Unit 3,*

*Limestone County, Alabama*

*Date of amendment request:* March 6, 2015. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML15090A436.

*Description of amendment request:*

This amendment request contains sensitive unclassified non-safeguards

information (SUNSI). The amendment would revise Section 2.1.1.2 of the Technical Specifications (TSs), changing the value of the safety limit minimum critical power ratio (SLMCPR) for two-loop operation from the current 1.09 to 1.06, and for single-loop operation from the current 1.11 to 1.08. The proposed revised values are supported by the application of the methodology approved previously for BFN Unit 3 by Amendment No. 270, dated July 31, 2014 (ADAMS Accession No. ML1411A286).

*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 TS revision is based on the implementation of a previously approved methodology. As such, it involves no changes to the operation of any system or component during normal, accident, or transient operating conditions. The change does not affect the initiators of any [previously evaluated] accident.

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

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

*Response:* No.

The proposed reduction of the SLMCPR values is based upon previously approved methodologies and does not involve changes to the plant hardware or its operating characteristics. As a result, no new failure modes are being introduced.

Therefore, the proposed change does not introduce a new or different kind of accident from those previously evaluated.

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

*Response:* No.

The margin of safety is established through the design of plant structures, systems, and components, and through the parameters for safe operation and setpoints of equipment relied upon to respond to transients and design basis accidents. The proposed change in SLMCPR does not change the requirements governing operation or availability of safety equipment assumed to operate to preserve the margin of safety. The change does not alter the behavior of the plant equipment.

The reduction of the SLMCPR values does not change the requirement that no more than 0.1% of fuel rods in the core experience boiling transition during normal operation and anticipated operational occurrences.

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

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

*Attorney for licensee:* General Counsel, Tennessee Valley Authority, 400 West Summit Hill Drive, WT 6A-K, Knoxville, Tennessee 37902.

*NRC Branch Chief:* Shana R. Helton, Union Electric Company, Docket No. 50-483, Callaway Plant, Unit 1 (Callaway), Callaway County, Missouri

*Date of amendment request:* April 29, 2015. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML15120A482.

*Description of amendment request:* This amendment request contains sensitive unclassified non-safeguards information (SUNSI). The amendment would revise the Cyber Security Plan, Milestone 8, full implementation date as set forth in the Callaway cyber security plan 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:

Criterion 1. The proposed change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The proposed change is administrative in nature as it only involves extending the timeframe for final implementation of the cyber security plan for Callaway. It involves no change to the intended plan itself. The change does not alter accident analysis assumptions, add any initiators, or affect the function of plant systems or the manner in which systems are operated, maintained, modified, tested, or inspected. The proposed change does not require any plant modifications that affect the performance capability of the structures, systems, and components (SSCs) relied upon to mitigate the consequences of postulated accidents, and has no impact on the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

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

Criterion 2. The proposed change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

The proposed change to the Callaway Cyber Security Plan Implementation

Schedule is administrative in nature. This change does not alter accident analysis assumptions, add any initiators, or affect the function of plant systems or the manner in which systems are operated, maintained, modified, tested, or inspected. The proposed change does not require any plant modifications that could introduce new failure modes leading or contributing to a new or different kind of accident.

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

Criterion 3. The proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety.

Plant safety margins are established through limiting conditions for operation, limiting safety system settings, and safety limits specified in the technical specifications. The proposed change to the Callaway Cyber Security Plan Implementation Schedule is administrative in nature.

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

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

*Attorney for licensee:* John O'Neill, Esq., Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw Pittman LLP, 2300 N Street NW., Washington, DC 20037.

*NRC Branch Chief:* Michael T. Markley.

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

Exelon Generation Company, LLC, and PSEG Nuclear LLC, Docket No. 50-278, Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station, Unit 3, York and Lancaster Counties, Pennsylvania

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

Northern States Power Company—Minnesota, Docket No. 50-263, Monticello Nuclear Generating Plant, Wright County, Minnesota

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

PSEG Nuclear LLC, Docket Nos. 50-272 and 50-311, Salem Nuclear Generating Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Salem County, New Jersey  
Susquehanna Nuclear, LLC, Docket Nos. 50-387 and 50-388, Susquehanna

Steam Electric Station, Units 1 and 2, Luzerne County, Pennsylvania  
Tennessee Valley Authority, Docket No. 50-296, Browns Ferry Nuclear Plant, Unit 3, Limestone County, Alabama  
Union Electric Company, Docket No. 50-483, Callaway Plant, Unit 1, Callaway County, Missouri

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](mailto:Hearing.Docket@nrc.gov) and [OGCmailcenter@nrc.gov](mailto:OGCmailcenter@nrc.gov), respectively.<sup>1</sup> 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

<sup>1</sup> 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.



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 Order<sup>2</sup> 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

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 requestor 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 requestor 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.<sup>3</sup>

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 24th day of June 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 <b>Federal Register</b> 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 requestor 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/requestor 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).

<sup>2</sup> 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.

<sup>3</sup> Requesters 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.

## ATTACHMENT 1—GENERAL TARGET SCHEDULE FOR PROCESSING AND RESOLVING REQUESTS FOR ACCESS TO SENSITIVE UNCLASSIFIED NON-SAFEGUARDS INFORMATION IN THIS PROCEEDING—Continued

Day	Event/Activity
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. 2015-16223 Filed 7-6-15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[NRC-2015-0035]

### Natural Phenomena Hazards in Fuel Cycle Facilities

**AGENCY:** Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**ACTION:** Interim staff guidance; issuance.

**SUMMARY:** The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is announcing the availability of Interim Staff Guidance (ISG) for Natural Phenomena Hazards (NPH) in Fuel Cycle Facilities. Fuel cycle facility licensees are required to conduct and maintain an Integrated Safety Analysis (ISA). This analysis must examine potential accident sequences caused by process deviations or other events internal to the facility and credible external events, including natural phenomena. The staff is issuing this ISG to provide additional guidance to the NRC staff for the review of fuel cycle facilities ISA evaluation of accident sequences that may result from NPH. This ISG will be incorporated into future revisions of Appendix D of Chapter 3 of NUREG 1520, "Standard Review Plan for the Review of a License Application for a Fuel Cycle Facility." Specific emphasis was provided on seismic hazards due to recent events such as the Fukushima Dai-ichi accident and recent updates to the U.S. Geological Survey hazard curves.

**DATES:** The final ISG is available as of July 7, 2015.

**ADDRESSES:** Please refer to Docket ID NRC-2015-0035 when contacting the NRC about the availability of information regarding this document.

You may obtain publicly-available information related to this document using any of the following methods:

- *Federal Rulemaking Web site:* Go to <http://www.regulations.gov> and search for Docket ID NRC-2015-0035. Address questions about NRC dockets to Carol Gallagher; telephone: 301-415-3463; email: [Carol.Gallagher@nrc.gov](mailto:Carol.Gallagher@nrc.gov). For technical questions, contact the individual listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section of this document.

- *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](mailto:pdr.resource@nrc.gov). The ADAMS accession number for each document referenced in this document (if that document is available in ADAMS) is provided the first time that a document is referenced.

- *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.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Jonathan Marcano, Office of Nuclear Materials Safety and Safeguards, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001; telephone: 301-415-6731, email: [Jonathan.Marcano@nrc.gov](mailto:Jonathan.Marcano@nrc.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** A notice of opportunity for public comment on Draft Interim Staff Guidance (ISG) for

Natural Phenomena Hazards (NPH) in Fuel Cycle Facilities was published in the **Federal Register** on February 24, 2015 (80 FR 9755). Comments were received from Stephen McDuffie (Agencywide Document and Management System (ADAMS) Accession No. ML15096A476) and the Nuclear Energy Institute (ADAMS Accession No. ML15104A341). The evaluation of these comments and the resulting changes to the interim staff guidance are discussed in a publicly-available document which is available in ADAMS under Accession No. ML15121A039.

The final interim staff guidance is available in ADAMS under Accession No. ML15121A044.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 26th day of June, 2015.

For the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Marissa Bailey,**

*Director, Division of Fuel Cycle Safety, Safeguards, and Environmental Review, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.*

[FR Doc. 2015-16542 Filed 7-6-15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[NRC-2015-0106]

### Standard Review Plan for Renewal of Specific Licenses and Certificates of Compliance for Dry Storage of Spent Nuclear Fuel

**AGENCY:** Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**ACTION:** Draft NUREG; request for comment.

**SUMMARY:** The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is issuing for public