

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**[NRC–2015–0181]****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 July 9, 2015, to July 22, 2015. The last biweekly notice was published on July 21, 2015.

DATES: Comments must be filed by September 30, 2015. A request for a hearing must be filed by October 5, 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–2015–0181. Address questions about NRC dockets to Carol Gallagher; telephone: 301–415–3463; email: Carol.Gallagher@nrc.gov. For technical questions, contact the individual listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section of this document.

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

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

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Lynn Ronewicz, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington DC 20555–0001; telephone: 301–415–1927 email: Lynn.Ronewicz@nrc.gov.

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

Please refer to Docket ID NRC–2015–0181 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–2015–0181.

- *NRC’s Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS):* You may obtain publicly-available documents online in the ADAMS Public Documents collection at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html>. To begin the search, select “ADAMS Public Documents” and then select “Begin Web-based ADAMS Search.” For problems with ADAMS, please contact the NRC’s Public Document Room (PDR) reference staff at 1–800–397–4209, 301–415–4737, or by email to pdr.resource@nrc.gov. The ADAMS accession number for each document referenced (if it is available in ADAMS) is provided the first time that it is mentioned in the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section.

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

B. Submitting Comments

Please include Docket ID NRC–2015–0181, 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 will post all comment submissions at <http://www.regulations.gov>, as well as enter the comment submissions into ADAMS. The NRC does not routinely edit comment submissions to remove identifying or contact information.

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

Your request should state that the NRC does not routinely edit comment submissions to remove such information before making the comment submissions available to the public or entering the comment 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 section 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 ten 10 days prior to the filing deadline, the participant should contact the Office of the Secretary by email at hearing.docket@nr.gov, or by telephone at 301-415-1677, to request (1) a digital identification (ID) certificate, which allows the participant (or its counsel or representative) to digitally sign documents and access the E-Submittal server for any proceeding in which it is participating; and (2) advise the Secretary that the participant will be submitting a request or petition for hearing (even in instances in which the participant, or its counsel or representative, already holds an NRC-issued digital ID certificate). Based upon this information, the Secretary will establish an electronic docket for the hearing in this proceeding if the Secretary has not already established an electronic docket.

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

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

Once a participant has obtained a digital ID certificate and a docket has been created, the participant can then

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

A person filing electronically using the NRC's adjudicatory E-Filing system may seek assistance by contacting the NRC Meta System Help Desk through the "Contact Us" link located on the NRC's public Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/e-submittals.html>, by email to MSHD.Resource@nrc.gov, or by a toll-free call at 1-866-672-7640. The NRC Meta System Help Desk is available between 8:00 a.m. and 8:00 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, MD 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 these license amendment applications, see the application for amendment which is available for public inspection in ADAMS and at the NRC's PDR. For additional direction on accessing information related to this document, see the "Obtaining Information and Submitting Comments" section of this document.

Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC, Docket Nos. 50-413 and 50-414, Catawba Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2, York County, South Carolina; Docket Nos. 50-369 and 50-370, McGuire Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2, Mecklenburg County, North Carolina

Date of amendment request: June 23, 2015. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML15190A381.

Description of amendment request: The amendments would delete text from the Technical Specifications that was included to facilitate a phased implementation of new nuclear instrumentation systems.

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:

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

Response: No.

This LAR [license amendment request] proposes administrative non-technical changes only. These proposed changes do not adversely affect accident initiators or precursors nor alter the design assumptions, conditions, or configurations of the facility. The proposed changes do not alter or prevent the ability of structures, systems[,] and components (SSCs) to perform their intended function to mitigate the consequences of an initiating event within the assumed acceptance limits.

Given the above discussion, it is concluded the proposed amendment does not significantly increase the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

Criterion 2:

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

Response: No.

The LAR proposes administrative non-technical changes only. The proposed changes will not alter the design requirements of any [SSC] or its function during accident conditions. No new or different accidents result from the changes proposed. The changes do not involve a physical alteration of the plant or any changes in methods governing normal plant operation. The changes do not alter assumptions made in the safety analysis.

Given the above discussion, it is concluded the proposed amendment does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

Criterion 3:

Does the proposed amendment involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety?
Response: No.

This LAR proposes administrative non-technical changes only. The proposed changes do not alter the manner in which safety limits, limiting safety system settings or limiting conditions for operation are determined. The safety analysis acceptance criteria are not affected by these changes. The proposed changes will not result in plant operation in a configuration outside the design basis. The proposed changes do not adversely affect systems that respond to safety shutdown the plant and to maintain the plant in a safe shutdown condition.

Given the above discussion, it is concluded [that] the proposed amendment 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: Lara S. Nichols, Associate General Counsel, Duke Energy Corporation, 526 South Church Street—EC07H, Charlotte, NC 28202.

NRC Branch Chief: Robert J. Pascarelli.

Duke Energy Progress, Inc., Docket No. 50–261, H.B. Robinson Steam Electric Plant Unit No. 2, Darlington County, South Carolina

Date of amendment request: May 13, 2015. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML15133A452.

Description of amendment request: The amendment would revise the emergency plan by changing the emergency action levels from a scheme based upon Revision 4 of Nuclear Energy Institute (NEI) 99–01, “Methodology for Development of Emergency Action Levels,” to one based upon Revision 6 of NEI 99–01, “Development of Emergency Action Levels for Non-Passive Reactors.” The NRC formally endorsed NEI 99–01, Revision 6, in a letter dated March 28, 2013 (ADAMS Accession No. ML12346A463).

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.

These changes affect the HBRSEP2 [H. B. Robinson Steam Electric Plant Unit No. 2] Emergency Plan and do not alter any of the requirements of the Operating License or the Technical Specifications. The proposed changes do not modify any plant equipment and do not impact any failure modes that could lead to an accident. Additionally, the proposed changes do not impact the consequence of any analyzed accident since the changes do not affect any equipment related to accident mitigation.

Based on this discussion, the proposed amendment does not increase 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.

These changes affect the HBRSEP2 Emergency Plan and do not alter any of the requirements of the Operating License or the Technical Specifications. They do not modify any plant equipment and there is no impact on the capability of the existing equipment to perform their intended functions. No system setpoints are being modified and no changes are being made to the method in which plant operations are conducted. No new failure modes are introduced by the proposed changes. The proposed amendment does not introduce an accident initiator or malfunctions that would cause a new or different kind of accident.

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

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

Response: No.

These changes affect the HBRSEP2 Emergency Plan and do not alter any of the requirements of the Operating License or the Technical Specifications. The proposed changes do not affect any of the assumptions used in the accident analysis, nor do they affect any operability requirements for equipment important to plant safety.

Therefore, the proposed changes will not result in a significant reduction in the margin of safety as defined in the bases for technical specifications covered in this license amendment request.

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: Lara S. Nichols, Deputy General Counsel, Duke Energy Corporation, 550 South Tyron Street, Mail Code DEC45A, Charlotte, NC 28202.

NRC Branch Chief: Shana R. Helton.

Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc., Docket Nos. 50–003, 50–247, and 50–286, Indian Point Nuclear Generating, Unit Nos. 1, 2, and 3, Westchester County, New York

Date of amendment request: June 16, 2015. A publicly available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML15173A070.

Description of amendment request: The amendments would change the Indian Point Nuclear Generating, Unit Nos. 1, 2, and 3 Cyber Security Plan (CSP) Milestone 8 full implementation date from June 30, 2016, to December 31, 2017.

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

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

Response: No.

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

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

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

Response: No.

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

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

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

Response: No.

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

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

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

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

Acting NRC Branch Chief: Michael I. Dudek.

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

Date of amendment request: June 22, 2015. A publicly available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML15173A380.

Description of amendment request: The amendment would change the James A. FitzPatrick Nuclear Power Plant Cyber Security Plan (CSP) Milestone 8 full implementation date from June 30, 2016, to December 15, 2017.

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

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

Response: No.

The proposed change to the CSP Implementation Schedule is administrative in nature. This change does not alter accident analysis assumptions, add any initiators, or affect the function of plant systems or the manner in which systems are operated, maintained, modified, tested, or inspected. The proposed change does not require any plant modifications which affect the

performance capability of the structures, systems, and components relied upon to mitigate the consequences of postulated accidents and has no impact on the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

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

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

Response: No.

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

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

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

Response: No.

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

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

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

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

Acting NRC Branch Chief: Michael I. Dudek.

Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc.,
Docket No. 50–255, Palisades Nuclear
Plant (PNP), Van Buren County,
Michigan

Date of amendment request: June 11, 2015. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML15162A736.

Description of amendment request: The amendment would change the PNP Cyber Security Plan (CSP) Milestone 8 full implementation date from the previously approved date of June 30, 2016, to December 15, 2017.

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

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

Response: No.

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

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

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

Response: No.

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

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

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

Response: No.

Plant safety margins are established through limiting conditions for operation,

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

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

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

Attorney for licensee: Ms. Jeanne Cho, Senior Counsel, Entergy Services, Inc., 440 Hamilton Ave., White Plains, NY 10601.

NRC Branch Chief: David L. Pelton.

NextEra Energy Seabrook LLC, et al., Docket No. 50–443, Seabrook Station, Unit No. 1, Rockingham County, New Hampshire

Date of amendment request: July 13, 2015. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML15198A027.

Description of amendment request: The amendment would change the Technical Specifications (TSs). The proposed change would add a note to TS Surveillance Requirement (SR) 4.4.1.3.4, which requires verification that residual heat removal loop operations susceptible to gas accumulation are sufficiently filled with water in accordance with the Surveillance Frequency Control Program.

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, along with NRC edits in square brackets, 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.

SR 4.4.1.3.4 verifies RHR [residual heat removal] loop locations susceptible to gas accumulation are sufficiently filled with water in accordance with the Surveillance Frequency Control Program. The proposed change adds a note to allow SR 4.4.1.3.4 to be performed 12 hours after entering the

Mode of Applicability. Gas accumulation in the subject system 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 note does not change SR 4.4.1.3.4 which ensures that the subject system continues to be capable of performing its assumed safety function and is not rendered inoperable due to gas accumulation.

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

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

Response: No.

The proposed change does not involve a physical alteration of the plant (i.e., no new or different type of equipment will be installed) 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 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 has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Attorney for licensee: William Blair, Managing Attorney—Nuclear, Florida Power & Light Company, P.O. Box 14000, Juno Beach, FL 33408–0420.

NRC Branch Chief: Douglas A. Broadus.

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: April 3, 2015, as supplemented by letter dated June 2, 2015. Publicly-available versions are in ADAMS under Accession Nos. ML15093A291 and ML15153A193, respectively.

Description of amendment request:

The amendments would revise Technical Specification (TS) 3/4.3.1, “Reactor Trip System Instrumentation,” to support planned plant modifications to replace the existing source range (SR) and intermediate range (IR) nuclear instrumentation with a Thermo Scientific Neutron Flux Monitoring Systems. Specifically, the changes would modify the SR and IR neutron flux reactor trip Allowable Values and the permissive P–6 reset value, and would add two new footnotes to the Channel Functional Test and Channel Calibration in TS 3/4.3.1, Table 4.3–1.

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

Response: No.

The Nuclear Instrumentation System (NIS) provides indication and plant protection through the reactor trip function; it is not an accident initiator or precursor. The reactor trip is part of the plant's accident mitigation response. Thus, the probability of an accident previously evaluated is not significantly increased.

The performance of the replacement SR and IR detectors and associated equipment will equal or exceed that of the existing Westinghouse instrumentation. The proposed changes are based on accepted industry standards and will preserve assumptions in the applicable accident analyses. The proposed changes do not affect the integrity of the fission product barriers utilized for the mitigation of radiological dose consequences as a result of an accident. The proposed changes do not alter any assumptions previously made in the radiological consequences evaluations, nor do they affect mitigation of the radiological 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.

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 Reactor Trip System (RTS) provides plant protection is not changed. The replacement SR and IR detectors and associated equipment do not affect accident initiation sequences or response scenarios as modeled in the safety analyses. The SR and IR detectors and associated equipment are not accident initiators or precursors. The only physical changes to the plant involve the replacement detectors and associated equipment. The replacement SR and IR detectors and

associated equipment have been designed to applicable regulatory and industry standards.

No changes to the overall manner in which the plant is operated are being proposed. Existing accident scenarios remain unchanged and new or different accident scenarios are not created. The types of accident 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.

Margin of safety is related to the confidence in the ability of the fission product barriers to perform their intended functions. These barriers include the fuel cladding, the reactor coolant system pressure boundary, and the containment. Neither the modification to replace the SR and IR detectors and associated equipment, nor the proposed Technical Specification changes will impact these barriers. Accident mitigating equipment will not be adversely impacted as a result of the modification. The safety systems credited in the safety analyses continue to remain available to perform their required mitigation functions. The proposed changes do not affect any safety analysis conclusions because the SR and IR neutron flux reactor trips are not explicitly credited in any accident analyses. Their functional capability enhances the overall reliability of the Reactor Protection System.

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, Hancock Bridge, NJ 08038.

NRC Branch Chief: Douglas A. Broadus.

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.

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: May 29, 2015. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML15149A473.

Description of amendment request: The amendment would change a license condition pertaining to the PBAPS, Unit 3, replacement steam dryer (RSD). Currently, the license condition requires that a revised analysis for the RSD be submitted to the NRC, as a report, at least 90 days prior to the start of the Unit 3 extended power uprate (EPU) outage. The proposed amendment would reduce the period before the outage by which the analysis is to be submitted from 90 days to 30 days. The licensee indicated that the EPU outage is scheduled to start on September 14, 2015.

*Date of publication of individual notice in **Federal Register**:* June 10, 2015 (80 FR 32991).

Expiration date of individual notice: July 10, 2015 (public comments); August 10, 2015 (hearing requests).

Tennessee Valley Authority, Docket No. 50–390, Watts Bar Nuclear Plant (WBN), Unit 1, Rhea County, Tennessee

Date of amendment request: June 17, 2015. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML15170A474.

Description of amendment request: The amendment would modify the technical specifications to define support systems needed in the first 48 hours after a unit shutdown when steam generators are not available for heat removal. The proposed change is required to support dual unit operation of WBN (a licensing decision for WBN, Unit 2, is currently expected to be made in the fall of 2015). The proposed amendment also requests changes consistent with Technical Specification Task Force-273–A, Revision 2, “SFDP [Safety Function Determination Program] Clarifications,” to provide clarification related to the requirements of the SFDP.

*Date of publication of individual notice in **Federal Register**:* July 17, 2015 (80 FR 42554).

Expiration date of individual notice: August 16, 2015 (public comments); September 15, 2015 (hearing requests).

IV. 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 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.

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

Date of amendment request: September 16, 2014, as supplemented by letter dated April 17, 2015.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revised the Technical Specifications (TSs) by relocating

specific surveillance frequencies to a licensee-controlled program. The changes are based on NRC-approved TS Task Force (TSTF) Change Traveler TSTF-425, Revision 3, "Relocate Surveillance Frequencies to Licensee Control—RITSTF [Risk-Informed TSTF] Initiative 5b."

Date of issuance: July 14, 2015.

Effective date: As of the date of issuance and shall be implemented within 120 days of issuance.

Amendment No.: 201. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML15155B416; documents related to this amendment are listed in the Safety Evaluation enclosed with the amendment.

Facility Operating License No. NPF-43: Amendment revised the Facility Operating License and TSs.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: November 12, 2014 (79 FR 67199). The supplemental letter dated April 17, 2015, provided additional information that clarified the application, did not expand the scope of the application as originally noticed, and did not change the staff's original proposed no significant hazards consideration determination as published in the **Federal Register**.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated July 14, 2015.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: None.

Exelon Generation Company, LLC and PSEG Nuclear LLC, Docket Nos. 50-277 and 50-278, Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station, Units 2 and 3, York and Lancaster Counties, Pennsylvania

Date of amendment request: July 25, 2014, as supplemented by letters dated January 13, 2015, and May 26, 2015.

Brief description of amendments: The amendments changed the definition in the Technical Specifications (TSs) for RECENTLY IRRADIATED FUEL. Specifically, the amendments revised requirements pertaining to secondary containment hatches in order to facilitate activities performed during refueling outages.

Date of issuance: July 17, 2015.

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

Amendment Nos.: 298 and 301. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML15162A139; documents related to these amendments are listed in the Safety Evaluation enclosed with the amendments.

Renewed Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-44 and DPR-56: The amendments revised the Facility Operating Licenses and the TSs.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: September 30, 2014 (79 FR 58816). The supplemental letters dated January 13, 2015, and May 26, 2015, provided additional information that clarified the application, did not expand the scope of the application as originally noticed, and did not change the staff's original proposed no significant hazards consideration determination as published in the **Federal Register**.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated July 17, 2015.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

Date of amendment request: September 18, 2014, as supplemented by letters dated February 17, 2015, and April 2, 2015.

Brief description of amendments: The amendments revised Technical Specification (TS) 5.5.16, "Containment Leakage Rate Testing Program," by replacing the reference to Regulatory Guide 1.163 (September 1995) with a reference to Topical Report (TR) Nuclear Energy Institute (NEI) 94-01, Revision 3-A, and Section 4.1, "Limitations and Conditions for NEI TR 94-01, Revision 2," of the NRC Safety Evaluation in NEI 94-01, Revision 2-A, dated October 2008. This reference is the implementation document to develop 10 CFR part 50, appendix J, Option B, performance-based primary containment leakage testing program for CCNPP, Unit Nos. 1 and 2. The changes allow an increase in the Type A test interval from the current 10 years to a maximum of 15 years, and allow an increase in the Type C test interval from the current 60 months to 75 months. The change also deletes the one-time exceptions granted to the Type A test interval and exceptions from the post-modification Type A test when the steam generators at CCNPP are replaced.

Date of issuance: July 16, 2015.

Effective date: As of the date of issuance and shall be implemented within 75 days of issuance.

Amendment Nos.: 310 and 288. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML15154A661; documents related to these amendments are listed in the Safety Evaluation enclosed with the amendments.

Renewed Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-53 and DPR-69: Amendments revised the Renewed Facility Operating Licenses and TSs.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: November 25, 2014 (79 FR 70214). The supplemental letters dated February 17, 2015, and April 2, 2015, provided additional information that clarified the application, did not expand the scope of the application as originally noticed, and did not change the staff's original proposed no significant hazards consideration determination as published in the **Federal Register**.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated July 16, 2015.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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 2), Beaver County, Pennsylvania

Date of amendment request: September 4, 2014, as supplemented by letter dated December 1, 2014.

Brief description of amendments: The amendments revised the BVPS Emergency Planning Zone boundary to align it with the boundary that is currently in use by the emergency management agencies of the three counties that implement public protective actions around BVPS.

Date of issuance: July 9, 2015.

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

Amendment Nos.: 294 and 181. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML15131A006; documents related to these amendments are listed in the Safety Evaluation enclosed with the amendments.

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

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: October 28, 2014 (79 FR 64224). The supplemental letter dated December 1, 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 July 9, 2015.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Florida Power and Light Company, et al., Docket Nos. 50–335 and 50–389, St. Lucie Plant, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, St. Lucie County, Florida

Date of amendment request: July 14, 2014, as supplemented by letter dated June 30, 2015.

Brief description of amendments: The amendments revised the Technical Specifications (TSs) by modifying or adding surveillance requirements to verify that system locations susceptible to gas accumulation are sufficiently filled with water and to provide allowances that permit performance of the verification. The changes 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).

Date of issuance: July 20, 2015.

Effective date: As of the date of issuance and shall be implemented within 120 days of issuance.

Amendment Nos.: 224 and 174. The amendments are in ADAMS under Accession No. ML15182A160; documents related to these amendments are listed in the Safety Evaluation enclosed with the amendments.

Renewed Facility Operating License Nos. DPR–67 and NPF–16: Amendments revised the TSs.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: October 28, 2014 (79 FR 64225). The licensee’s supplement dated June 30, 2015, did not expand the scope of the request 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 July 20, 2015.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

Date of amendment request: April 9 2014, as supplemented by letters dated August 29, 2014, and February 20, April 3, and July 7, 2015.

Brief description of amendments: The amendments revised the Technical Specifications (TSs) by relocating specific surveillance frequency requirements to a licensee-controlled program with implementation of

Nuclear Energy Institute (NEI) 04–10, “Risk Informed Technical Specification Initiative 5b, Risk Informed Method for Control of Surveillance Frequencies” (ADAMS Accession No. ML071360456). The NEI 04–10 methodology provides reasonable acceptance guidelines and methods for evaluating the risk increase of proposed changes to surveillance frequencies, consistent with Regulatory Guide 1.177, “An Approach for Plant-Specific Risk-Informed Decisionmaking: Technical Specifications” (ADAMS Accession No. ML003740176). The changes are consistent with NRC-approved Technical Specification Task Force (TSTF) Standard Technical Specifications Change TSTF–425, “Relocate Surveillance Frequencies to Licensee Control—RITSTF [Risk Informed Technical Specifications Task Force] Initiative 5b,” Revision 3 (ADAMS Accession No. ML090850642). The **Federal Register** notice published on July 6, 2009 (74 FR 31996), announced the availability of TSTF–425, Revision 3. The amendments also include editorial changes to the TSs, administrative deviations from TSTF–425, and other changes resulting from differences between the licensee’s TSs and the TSs on which TSTF–425 was based.

Date of issuance: July 16, 2015.

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

Amendment Nos.: 263 and 258. The amendments are in ADAMS under Accession No. ML15166A320; documents related to these amendments are listed in the Safety Evaluation enclosed with the amendments.

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

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: The NRC staff initially made a proposed determination that the amendment request dated April 9, 2014, involved no significant hazards consideration (NSHC) (July 22, 2014, 79 FR 44551). By letters dated August 29, 2014, and February 20, 2015, the licensee provided clarifying information that did not expand the scope of the application and did not change the NRC staff’s original proposed NSHC determination, as published in the **Federal Register** on July 22, 2014 (79 FR 44551). Subsequently, by letter dated April 3, 2015, the licensee supplemented its amendment request with a proposed change that expanded the scope of the request. Therefore, the NRC published a second proposed NSHC determination in the **Federal Register** on May 12, 2015 (80 FR 27199),

which superseded the notice dated July 22, 2014 (79 FR 44551). The licensee’s supplement dated July 7, 2015, did not expand the scope of the request and did not change the staff’s proposed NSHC determination that was published in the **Federal Register** on May 12, 2015 (80 FR 27199).

The Commission’s related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated July 16, 2015.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Nebraska Public Power District, Docket No. 50–298, Cooper Nuclear Station, Nemaha County, Nebraska

Date of amendment request: July 17, 2014, as supplemented by letter dated February 19, 2015.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment moved the Linear Heat Generation Rate (LHGR) and Single Loop Operation LHGR limits from the Technical Requirements Manual to the Technical Specifications (TSs). Accordingly, the amendment added TS 3.2.3, “Linear Heat Generation Rate (LHGR),” and modified TS 1.1, “Definitions”; TS 3.4.1, “Recirculation Loops Operating”; TS 3.7.7, “The Main Turbine Bypass System”; and TS 5.6.5, “Core Operating Limits Report (COLR).”

Date of issuance: July 14, 2015.

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

Amendment No.: 251. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML15168A171; documents related to this amendment are listed in the Safety Evaluation enclosed with the amendment.

Renewed Facility Operating License No. DPR–46: Amendment revised the Facility Operating License and TSs.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: September 30, 2014 (79 FR 58820). The supplemental letter dated February 19, 2015, provided additional information that clarified the application, did not expand the scope of the application as originally noticed, and did not change the staff’s original proposed no significant hazards consideration determination as published in the **Federal Register**.

The Commission’s related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated July 14, 2015.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

Date of amendment request: July 18, 2014, as supplemented by letter dated November 7, 2015.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment changed the Cyber Security Plan for Point Beach Nuclear Plants, Units 1 and 2, by revising the completion date of Milestone 8 of the Cyber Security Plan Implementation schedule.

Date of issuance: July 14, 2015.

Effective date: These amendments will be effective as of their date of issuance.

Amendment Nos.: 252 and 256. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML15155A539; documents related to these amendments are listed in the Safety Evaluation enclosed with the amendments.

Renewed Facility Operating License Nos. DPR–24 and DPR–27: Amendments revised the Facility Operating License and Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: January 6, 2015 (80 FR 536). The supplemental letter dated November 7, 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 July 14, 2015.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

NextEra Energy Seabrook, LLC., Docket No. 50–443, Seabrook Station, Unit No. 1, Rockingham County, New Hampshire

Date of amendment request: July 24, 2014, as supplemented by two letters dated December 11, 2014, and a letter dated June 30, 2015.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revised Seabrook Station Technical Specification (TS) 3.3.3.1, "Radiation Monitoring for Plant Operations," to eliminate duplicate requirements, resolve an inconsistency, and correct a deficiency.

Date of issuance: July 17, 2015.

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

Amendment No.: 149. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML15096A131; documents related to this amendment

are listed in the Safety Evaluation enclosed with the amendment.

Facility Operating License No. NPF–86: Amendment revised the Facility Operating License and Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: September 30, 2014 (79 FR 58821). The supplemental letters dated December 11, 2014, and June 29, 2015, provided additional information that clarified the application, did not expand the scope of the application as originally noticed, and did not change the staff's original proposed no significant hazards consideration determination as published in the **Federal Register**.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated July 17, 2015.

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: March 21, 2014, as supplemented by letters dated October 1, 2014; and February 23, February 25, and March 18, 2015.

Brief description of amendment: The amendments revised the SONGS, Units 2 and 3, Facility Operating Licenses and associated Technical Specifications (TSs) to conform to the permanent shutdown and defueled status of these facilities.

Date of issuance: July 17, 2015.

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

Amendment Nos.: 230 and 223. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML15139A390; 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: September 16, 2014 (79 FR 55513). The supplemental letters dated October 1, 2014; and February 23, February 25, 2015, and March 18, 2015, 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 amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated July 17, 2015.

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 email 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 email at hearing.docket@nr.gov, or by telephone at 301-415-1677, to request (1) a digital identification (ID) certificate, which allows the participant (or its counsel or representative) to digitally sign documents and access the E-Submittal server for any proceeding in which it is participating; and (2) advise the Secretary that the participant will be submitting a request or petition for hearing (even in instances in which the participant, or its counsel or representative, already holds an NRC-issued digital ID certificate). Based upon this information, the Secretary will establish an electronic docket for the

hearing in this proceeding if the Secretary has not already established an electronic docket.

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

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

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

apply for and receive a digital ID certificate before a hearing request/petition to intervene is filed so that they can obtain access to the document via the E-Filing system.

A person filing electronically using the NRC's adjudicatory E-Filing system may seek assistance by contacting the NRC Meta System Help Desk through the "Contact Us" link located on the NRC's public Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/e-submittals.html>, by email to MSHD.Resource@nrc.gov, or by a toll-free call at 1-866-672-7640. The NRC Meta System Help Desk is available between 8:00 a.m. and 8:00 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, MD 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 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.

Indiana Michigan Power Company, Docket No. 50-315, Donald C. Cook Nuclear Plant, Unit 1, Berrien County, Michigan

Date of amendment request: June 29, 2015, as supplemented by letter dated July 2, 2015.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revised Technical Specification (TS) 3.3.2, "Engineered Safety Feature Actuation System (ESFAS) Instrumentation," by adding a new condition for one or more inoperable required channels for main feedwater pump trips, changing Table 3.3.2-1 to add a footnote to the Applicable Mode Column for Mode 2 and to reflect the new Condition, and renumbering existing Conditions.

Date of issuance: July 10, 2015.

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

Amendment No.: 328. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML15187A002; documents related to the amendment are listed in the Safety Evaluation enclosed with the amendment.

Renewed Facility Operating License No. DPR-58: Amendment revised the Renewed Facility Operating License and TSs.

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

notice of the proposed amendment was published in *The Herald-Palladium*, located in the City of St. Joseph, Berrien County, Michigan, on July 3 and July 4, 2015. The notice provided an opportunity to submit comments on the Commission's proposed NSHC determination. No comments were received.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment, finding of exigent circumstances, State consultation, public comments, and final NSHC determination are contained in a Safety Evaluation dated July 10, 2015.

Attorney for licensee: Robert B. Haemer, Senior Nuclear Counsel, One Cook Place, Bridgman, MI 49106.

NRC Branch Chief: David L. Pelton.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 27th day of July, 2015.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

George A. Wilson, Jr.,

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

[FR Doc. 2015-18896 Filed 8-3-15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

POSTAL REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. CP2015-116; Order No. 2625]

New Postal Product

AGENCY: Postal Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Commission is noticing a recent Postal Service filing concerning an additional Global Expedited Package Services 3 negotiated service agreement. This notice informs the public of the filing, invites public comment, and takes other administrative steps.

DATES: *Comments are due:* August 6, 2015.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments electronically via the Commission's Filing Online system at <http://www.prc.gov>. Those who cannot submit comments electronically should contact the person identified in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section by telephone for advice on filing alternatives.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: David A. Trissell, General Counsel, at 202-789-6820.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Table of Contents

- I. Introduction
- II. Notice of Commission Action
- III. Ordering Paragraphs

I. Introduction

On July 29, 2015, the Postal Service filed notice that it has entered into an additional Global Expedited Package Services 3 (GEPS 3) negotiated service agreement (Agreement).¹

To support its Notice, the Postal Service filed a copy of the Agreement, a copy of the Governors' Decision authorizing the product, a certification of compliance with 39 U.S.C. 3633(a), and an application for non-public treatment of certain materials. It also filed supporting financial workpapers.

II. Notice of Commission Action

The Commission establishes Docket No. CP2015-116 for consideration of matters raised by the Notice.

The Commission invites comments on whether the Postal Service's filing is consistent with 39 U.S.C. 3632, 3633, or 3642, 39 CFR part 3015, and 39 CFR part 3020, subpart B. Comments are due no later than August 6, 2015. The public portions of the filing can be accessed via the Commission's Web site (<http://www.prc.gov>).

The Commission appoints Lyudmila Y. Bzhilyanskaya to serve as Public Representative in this docket.

III. Ordering Paragraphs

It is ordered:

1. The Commission establishes Docket No. CP2015-116 for consideration of the matters raised by the Postal Service's Notice.

2. Pursuant to 39 U.S.C. 505, Lyudmila Y. Bzhilyanskaya is appointed to serve as an officer of the Commission to represent the interests of the general public in this proceeding (Public Representative).

3. Comments are due no later than August 6, 2015.

4. The Secretary shall arrange for publication of this order in the **Federal Register**.

By the Commission.

Shoshana M. Grove,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2015-19085 Filed 8-3-15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7710-FW-P

¹ Notice of United States Postal Service of Filing a Functionally Equivalent Global Expedited Package Services 3 Negotiated Service Agreement and Application for Non-Public Treatment of Materials Filed Under Seal, July 29, 2015 (Notice).

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34-75548; File No. SR-CBOE-2015-070]

Self-Regulatory Organizations; Chicago Board Options Exchange, Incorporated; Notice of Filing and Immediate Effectiveness of a Proposed Rule Change Relating To Amending Its Simple Auction Liaison ("SAL") Rule

July 29, 2015.

Pursuant to Section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934,¹ and Rule 19b-4 thereunder,² notice is hereby given that on July 24, 2015, Chicago Board Options Exchange, Incorporated ("Exchange" or "CBOE") filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission ("Commission") the proposed rule change as described in Items I and II below, which Items have been prepared by the Exchange. The Commission is publishing this notice to solicit comments on the proposed rule change from interested persons.

I. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Terms of Substance of the Proposed Rule Change

The Exchange is proposing to amend its SAL rule to make it explicit that 6.13A(d) applies to Hybrid 3.0 classes.

The text of the proposed rule change is available on the Exchange's Web site (<http://www.cboe.com/AboutCBOE/CBOELegalRegulatoryHome.aspx>), at the Exchange's Office of the Secretary, and at the Commission's Public Reference Room.

II. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Purpose of, and Statutory Basis for, the Proposed Rule Change

In its filing with the Commission, the Exchange included statements concerning the purpose of and basis for the proposed rule change and discussed any comments it received on the proposed rule change. The text of these statements may be examined at the places specified in Item IV below. The Exchange has prepared summaries, set forth in sections A, B, and C below, of the most significant aspects of such statements.

A. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Purpose of, and Statutory Basis for, the Proposed Rule Change

1. Purpose

The Exchange is proposing to amend language to clarify that certain

¹ 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1).

² 17 CFR 240.19b-4.