fixtures, and electronic equipment. For many of these incidental items, U.S. manufactured alternatives are not always readily or reasonably available. The miscellaneous character of these manufactured goods, together with their low individual cost, characterize them as items incidental to the project. Requiring individual exemptions for low cost, incidental items would be time prohibitive and overly burdensome for the awardee (University of Alaska, Fairbanks), subcontractor (shipyard) and for NSF. Such a de minimis exemption allows the award recipients to focus their efforts on the major manufactured goods within the ARRV project. The terms and conditions of the award still require UAF to Buy American to the extent practicable for items less than $10,000. Therefore, a limited project-specific de minimis exemption for any such incidental item costing $10,000 or less used in and incorporated into the ARRV project is justified in the public interest. The Department of Energy has issued a similar type of de minimis exemption, relating to its Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy [75 FR 35447 (June 22, 2010)].

At this phase in the ARRV project, it is estimated that only $750,000 of incidental items will require use of the de minimis exemption. To ensure proper oversight with regard to use of this exemption within the project, the agency hereby establishes an allowable ceiling of $1.5M for the application of this de minimis exemption; this represents approximately 2.5% of the total value of materials used in the vessel. (Since the previously-granted exemptions for the purchase of ARRV equipment were not granted on this de minimis basis, but instead because there was not a domestic manufacturer of the qualifying equipment, those purchases do not fall within the $1.5M ceiling for the use of this de minimis exemption.)

Issuance of this limited project-specific exemption recognizes NSF's commitment to expeditious spending of Recovery Act dollars balanced against the need for efficient implementation of the Recovery Act provision while still maintaining the Buy American requirements for manufactured goods that are greater than the de minimis amount of $10,000.

III. Exemption

On July 6, 2011, and under the authority of section 1605(b)(1) of the Public Law 111–5 and delegation order dated 27 May 2010, with respect to the Alaska Region Research Vessel Project funded by NSF, the NSF Chief Financial Officer granted a limited project exemption for any incidental item costing $10,000 or less used in and incorporated into the project. With this exemption, the agency hereby establishes a $1.5M ceiling for the total allowable value of de minimis exemptions used on this project.

Dated: July 7, 2011.

Lawrence Rudolph,

General Counsel.

[FR Doc. 2011–18643 Filed 7–25–11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[NRC–2011–0167]

Biweekly Notice; Applications and Amendments to Facility Operating Licenses Involving No Significant Hazards Considerations

Background

Pursuant to Section 189a. (2) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission or NRC) is publishing this regular biweekly notice. The Act requires the Commission 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 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 June 30, 2011 to July 13, 2011. The last biweekly notice was published on July 12, 2011 (76 FR 40937).

ADDRESSES: Please include Docket ID NRC–2011–0167 in the subject line of your comments. Comments submitted in writing or in electronic form will be posted on the NRC Web site and on the Federal rulemaking Web site *http://www.regulations.gov.* Because your comments will not be edited to remove any identifying or contact information, the NRC cautions you against including any information in your submission that you do not want to be publicly disclosed.

The NRC requests that any party soliciting or aggregating comments received from other persons for submission to the NRC inform those persons that the NRC will not edit their comments to remove any identifying or contact information, and therefore, they should not include any information in their comments that they do not want publicly disclosed.

You may submit comments by any one of the following methods.

- *Federal Rulemaking Web site:* Go to *http://www.regulations.gov* and search for documents filed under Docket ID NRC–NRC–2011–0167. Address questions about NRC dockets to Carol Gallagher 301–492–3668; e-mail *Carol.Gallagher@nrc.gov.*
- *Mail comments to:* Chief, Rules, Announcements, and Directives Branch (RADB), Office of Administration, Mail Stop: TWB–05–B01M, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001.
- *Fax comments to:* RADB at 301–492–3446.

You can access publicly available documents related to this notice using the following methods:

- *NRC's Public Document Room (PDR):* The public may examine and have copied, for a fee, publicly available documents at the NRC's PDR, Room O1–F21, One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland 20852.
- *NRC's Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS):* Publicly available documents created or received at the NRC are accessible electronically through ADAMS in the NRC Library at *http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html.* From this page, the public can gain entry into ADAMS, which provides text and image files of the NRC's public documents. If you do not have access to ADAMS or if there are problems in accessing the documents located in ADAMS, contact the NRC's PDR reference staff at 1–800–397–4209, 301–415–4737, or by e-mail to *pdr.resource@nrc.gov.*
- *Federal Rulemaking Web site:* Public comments and supporting materials related to this notice can be found at *http://www.regulations.gov* by searching on Docket ID: NRC–2011–0167.

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

The Commission has made a proposed determination that the following amendment requests involve no significant hazards consideration. Under the Commission's regulations in Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations (10 CFR), 50.92, this means that operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not (1) Involve a significant increase in the probability or

consequences of an accident previously evaluated; or (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. The basis for this proposed determination for each amendment request is shown below.

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

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

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. Requests for a hearing and a petition for leave to intervene shall be filed in accordance with the Commission's ''Rules of Practice for Domestic Licensing Proceedings'' 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. NRC regulations are accessible electronically from the NRC Library on the NRC 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.

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 E-Filing rule (72 FR 49139, August 28, 2007). The E-Filing process requires participants to submit and serve all adjudicatory documents over the internet, or in some cases to mail copies on electronic storage media. Participants may not submit paper copies of their filings unless they seek an exemption in accordance with the procedures described below.

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

Information about applying for a digital ID certificate is available on NRC's public Web site at *http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/e-submittals/apply-certificates.html.* System

requirements for accessing the E-Submittal server are detailed in 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 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 public Web site at *http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/e-submittals.html.* A filing is considered complete at the time the documents are submitted through the NRC's E-Filing system. To be timely, an electronic filing must be submitted to the E-Filing system no later than 11:59 p.m. Eastern Time on the due date. Upon receipt of a transmission, the E-Filing system time-stamps the document and sends the submitter an e-mail notice confirming receipt of the document. The E-Filing system also distributes an e-mail notice that provides access to the document to the NRC 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 agency'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 Web site at *http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/e-submittals.html,* by e-mail at *MSHD.Resource@nrc.gov,* or by a toll-free call at 1–866–672–7640. The NRC Meta System Help Desk is available between 8 a.m. and 8 p.m., Eastern Time, Monday through Friday, excluding government holidays.

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

Documents submitted in adjudicatory proceedings will appear in 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. 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. Non-timely filings will not be entertained absent a determination by the presiding officer that the petition or request should be granted or the contentions should be admitted, based on a balancing of the factors specified in 10 CFR 2.309(c)(1)(i)–(viii).

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

Entergy Gulf States Louisiana, LLC, and Entergy Operations, Inc., Docket No. 50–458, River Bend Station, Unit 1, West Feliciana Parish, Louisiana

Date of amendment request: June 10, 2011.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would revise the Technical Specifications (TSs) to add a new limiting condition for operation (LCO) Applicability requirement, LCO 3.0.9, and its associated Bases, relating to the modification of requirements regarding the impact of unavailable barriers, not explicitly addressed in TSs, but required for operability of supported systems in TSs. This change is consistent with NRC-approved Technical Specification Task Force (TSTF) Improved Standard Technical Specification Change Traveler, TSTF–427, Revision 2, ''Allowance for Non Technical Specification Barrier Degradation on Supported System OPERABILITY.''

The NRC staff issued a Notice of Opportunity to Comment in the **Federal Register** on June 2, 2006 (71 FR 32145), on possible amendments to revise the plant-specific TSs, including a model safety evaluation and model no significant hazards consideration determination using the consolidated line item improvement process. The NRC staff subsequently issued a Notice of Availability of this TS improvement in the **Federal Register** on October 3, 2006 (71 FR 58444). The licensee affirmed the applicability of the model no significant hazards consideration

determination in its application dated June 10, 2011.

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

Criterion 1—The Proposed Change Does Not Involve a Significant Increase in the Probability or Consequences of an Accident Previously Evaluated

The proposed change allows a delay time for entering a supported system technical specification (TS) when the inoperability is due solely to an unavailable barrier if risk is assessed and managed. The postulated initiating events which may require a functional barrier are limited to those with low frequencies of occurrence, and the overall TS system safety function would still be available for the majority of anticipated challenges. Therefore, the probability of an accident previously evaluated is not significantly increased, if at all. The consequences of an accident while relying on the allowance provided by proposed LCO 3.0.9 are no different than the consequences of an accident while relying on the TS required actions in effect without the allowance provided by proposed LCO 3.0.9. Therefore, the consequences of an accident previously evaluated are not significantly affected by this change. The addition of a requirement to assess and manage the risk introduced by this change will further minimize possible concerns. Therefore, this change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

Criterion 2—The Proposed Change Does Not Create the Possibility of a New or Different Kind of Accident From any Previously Evaluated

The proposed change does not involve a physical alteration of the plant (no new or different type of equipment will be installed). Allowing delay times for entering supported system TS when inoperability is due solely to an unavailable barrier, if risk is assessed and managed, will not introduce new failure modes or effects and will not, in the absence of other unrelated failures, lead to an accident whose consequences exceed the consequences of accidents previously evaluated. The addition of a requirement to assess and manage the risk introduced by this change will further minimize possible concerns. Thus, this change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from an accident previously evaluated.

Criterion 3—The Proposed Change Does Not Involve a Significant Reduction in the Margin of Safety

The proposed change allows a delay time for entering a supported system TS when the inoperability is due solely to an unavailable barrier, if risk is assessed and managed. The postulated initiating events which may require a functional barrier are limited to those with low frequencies of occurrence, and the overall TS system safety function would still be available for the majority of anticipated challenges. The risk impact of the proposed TS changes was assessed following the three-tiered approach recommended in [NRC Regulatory Guide (RG) 1.177, ''An Approach for Plant-Specific, Risk-Informed Decisionmaking: Technical Specifications'']. A bounding risk assessment was performed to justify the proposed TS changes. This application of LCO 3.0.9 is predicated upon the licensee's performance of a risk assessment and the management of plant risk. The net change to the margin of safety is insignificant as indicated by the anticipated low levels of associated risk (ICCDP [incremental conditional core damage probability] and ICLERP [incremental conditional large early release probability]) as shown in Table 1 of Section 3.1.1 in the Safety Evaluation. Therefore, this change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the 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: Joseph A. Aluise, Associate General Council—Nuclear, Entergy Services, Inc., 639 Loyola Avenue, New Orleans, Louisiana 70113.

NRC Branch Chief: Michael T. Markley.

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

Date of amendment request: June 23, 2011.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment will remove the Table of Contents from the Technical Specifications and place it under licensee control. The Table of Contents (TOCs) for the Technical Specifications (TSs) is not being eliminated. The responsibility for maintenance and issuance of updates to the TOCs will transfer from the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) to the licensee. The TOCs will no longer be included in the TSs and, as such, will no longer be part of Appendix A to the Operating License.

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

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

Response: No.

The proposed amendment is administrative and affects control of a document, the TOCs, listing the specifications in the plant TSs. Transferring control from the NRC to NextEra does not affect the operation, physical configuration, or function of plant equipment or systems. The proposed amendment does not impact the initiators or assumptions of analyzed events, nor does it impact the mitigation of accidents or transient events.

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

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

Response: No.

The proposed amendment is administrative and does not alter plant configuration, require installation of new equipment, alter assumptions about previously analyzed accidents, or impact operation or function of plant equipment or systems.

Therefore, this 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.

The proposed amendment is administrative. The TOCs is not required by regulation to be in the TSs. Removal does not impact any safety assumptions or have the potential to reduce a margin of safety. The proposed amendment involves a transfer of control of the TOCs from the NRC to NextEra. No change in the technical content of the TSs is involved. Consequently, transfer from the NRC to NextEra has no impact on the margin of safety.

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

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the

amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Attorney for licensee: William Blair, Senior Attorney, NextEra Energy Point Beach, LLC, P.O. Box 14000, Juno Beach, FL 33408–0420.

NRC Branch Chief: Robert J. Pascarelli.

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

Date of amendment request: July 19, 2010, as supplemented September 9, 2010, January 26, May 16, and June 23, 2011.

Description of amendment request: Changes are proposed to the Technical Specifications to include an analytical methodology for the critical heat flux correlation.

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

Response: No.

Approval of the proposed changes will allow Dominion to use the VIPRE [Versatile Internals and Components Program for Reactors—EPRI]–DIWRB–2M and VIPRE–DIW–3 code/correlation pairs to perform licensing calculations of Westinghouse RFA–2 fuel in North Anna Cores, using the DDLs [deterministic design limits] documented in Appendix C of the DOM–NAF–2–A Fleet Report and the SDL [statistical design limit] documented herein. Neither the code/correlation pair nor the Statistical Departure from Nucleate Boiling Ratio (DNBR) Evaluation Methodology affect accident initiators and thus cannot increase the probability of any accident. Further, since both the deterministic and statistical DNBR limits meet the required design basis of avoiding Departure from Nucleate Boiling (DNB) with 95% probability at a 95% confidence level, the use of the new code/correlation and Statistical DNBR Evaluation Methodology do not increase the potential consequences of any accident. Finally, the full core DNB design limit provides increased assurance that the consequences of a postulated accident which includes radioactive release would be minimized because the overall number of rods in DNB would not exceed the 0.1% level. The pertinent evaluations to be performed as part of the cycle specific reload safety analysis to confirm that the existing safety analyses remain applicable have been performed and determined to be acceptable. The use of a different code/correlation pair will not increase the probability of an accident because plant systems will not be operated in a different manner, and system interfaces will not change. The use of the VIPRE–DIWRB–2M and VIPRE–DIW–3 code/correlation pairs to perform licensing calculations of Westinghouse RFA–2 fuel in North Anna cores will not result in a measurable impact on normal operating plant releases and will not increase the predicted radiological consequences of accidents postulated in the UFSAR [Updated Final Safety Analysis Report].

Therefore, neither the probability of occurrence nor the consequences of any accident previously evaluated is significantly increased.

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

Response: No.

The proposed change does not involve a physical alteration of the plant (no new or different type of equipment will be installed). The use of VIPRE–D/WRB–2M and the VIPRE–D/W–3 code/correlation pairs and the applicable fuel design limits for DNBR does not impact any of the applicable design criteria and the licensing basis criteria will continue to be met. Demonstrated adherence to these standards and criteria precludes new challenges to components and systems that could introduce a new type of accident. Setpoint safety analysis evaluations have demonstrated that the use of VIPRE–D/WRB–2M and VIPRE–D/W3 is acceptable. Design and performance criteria will continue to be met and no new single failure mechanisms will be created. The use of the VIPRE–D/WRB–2M and VIPRE–D/W–3 code/correlation pairs and the Statistical DNBR Evaluation Methodology does not involve any alteration to plant equipment or procedures that would introduce any new or unique operational modes or accident precursors. Thus, this change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

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

Response: No.

Approval of the proposed changes will allow Dominion to use the VIPRE–D/WRB–2M and VIPRE–D/W–3 code/correlation pairs to perform licensing calculations of Westinghouse RFA–2 fuel in North Anna cores, using the DDLs documented in Appendix C of the DOM–NAF–2–A Fleet Report and the SDL documented herein. The SDL has been developed in accordance with the Statistical DNBR Evaluation Methodology. North Anna TS 2.1, ''Safety Limits,'' specifies that any DNBR limit established by any code/correlation must provide at least 95% non-DNB probability at a 95% confidence level. The DNBR limits meet the design basis of avoiding DNB with 95% probability at a 95% confidence level. The required DNBR margin of safety for North Anna Power Station, which in this case is the margin between the 95/95 DNBR limit and clad failure, is therefore not reduced.

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

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

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

NRC Branch Chief: Gloria Kulesa.

Previously Published Notices of Consideration of Issuance of Amendments to Facility Operating 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.

Arizona Public Service Company, et al., Docket Nos. STN 50–528, STN 50–529, and STN 50–530, Palo Verde Nuclear Generating Station, Units 1, 2, and 3, Maricopa County, Arizona

Date of amendment request: August 27, 2010, as supplemented by letters dated February 11 and May 25, 2011.

Brief description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would revise the feedwater line break with loss of offsite power and single failure (FWLB/LOP/SF) analysis summarized in the Palo Verde Nuclear Generating Station Updated Safety Analysis Report. The revision would change the credited operator action to 20 minutes from 30 minutes to control the pressurizer level. The revision would also revise the rate of reactor coolant pump (RCP) bleed-off to the reactor drain tank from three gallons per minute to zero.

Date of publication of individual notice in ***Federal Register:*** June 28, 2011 (76 FR 37853).

Expiration date of individual notice: July 28, 2011, for comments and August 29, 2011, for hearings.

Notice of Issuance of Amendments to Facility Operating Licenses

During the period since publication of the last biweekly notice, the

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

Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating License, 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 are available for public inspection at the NRC's Public Document Room (PDR), located at One White Flint North, Room O1–F21, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland 20852. Publicly available documents created or received at the NRC are accessible electronically through the Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS) in the NRC Library at *http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html.* If you do not have access to ADAMS or if there are problems in accessing the documents located in ADAMS, contact the PDR Reference staff at 1–800–397–4209, 301–415–4737 or by email to *pdr.resource@nrc.gov.*

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

Date of application for amendment: June 29, 2010, as supplemented on August 24, 2010, and January 13, 2011.

Brief description of amendment: The license amendments revise Technical Specifications (TS) Section 3.4.12, ''Low Temperature Overpressure Protection (LTOP) System,'' to correct an inconsistency between the TS, and implementation of procedures and administrative controls for Safety Injection pumps required to mitigate a postulated loss of decay heat removal during mid-loop operation as discussed in NRC Generic Letter 88–17, ''Loss of Decay Heat Removal.''

Date of issuance: June 29, 2011.

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

Amendment Nos.: 167, 167, 174, 174.

Facility Operating License Nos. NPF–72, NPF–77, NPF–37, and NPF–66: The amendments revise the TSs and license.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: October 5, 2010 (75 FR 61526). The August 24, 2010, and January 13, 2011, supplements contained clarifying information and did not change the NRC staff's initial proposed finding of no significant hazards consideration.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a safety evaluation dated June 29, 2011.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 15th day of July 2011.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Joseph G. Giitter,

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

[FR Doc. 2011–18525 Filed 7–25–11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 030–33305; License No. 25–10994–04; EA–10–258; NRC–2011–0163]

In the Matter of Bozeman Deaconess Foundation, dba Bozeman Deaconess Hospital, Bozeman, MT; Confirmatory Order Modifying License; (Effective Immediately)

I

Bozeman Deaconess Hospital (Licensee) is the holder of Materials License No. 25–10994–04 issued by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC or the Commission) pursuant to Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations (10 CFR) parts 30 and 35. The license authorizes the operation of the Licensee's facility in accordance with the conditions specified therein, at 915 Highland Boulevard, Bozeman, Montana.

This Confirmatory Order is the result of an agreement reached during an alternative dispute resolution (ADR) mediation session conducted on May 25, 2011, at the NRC Region IV offices in Arlington, Texas.

II

On January 27, 2010, the NRC conducted a routine unannounced inspection of the Bozeman Deaconess Hospital facility to evaluate radiation safety and security, as well as compliance with Commission rules and regulations and the conditions of the license. During the inspection, it was determined that an employee of Bozeman Deaconess Hospital failed to secure radioactive materials from unauthorized access or removal from the facility's nuclear medicine laboratory (hot lab). On March 8, 2010, the NRC Office of Investigations (OI), Region IV, began an investigation (OI Case No. 4–2010–033) to determine whether employees from Bozeman Deaconess Hospital willfully failed to secure radioactive material during periods when authorized personnel were absent from the hot lab. Based on the results of the inspection and the evidence developed during the investigation, the NRC identified two apparent violations. The first apparent violation involved a willful failure to secure licensed materials from unauthorized removal or access as required by 10 CFR 20.1801. The second violation involved a failure to control and maintain constant surveillance of licensed material as required by 10 CFR 20.1802.

By letter dated April 12, 2011, the NRC transmitted the results of the inspection and a factual summary of OI's Investigation Report 4–2010–033 to Bozeman Deaconess Hospital. In the April 12 letter, the NRC informed the Licensee that the NRC was considering escalated enforcement action for the apparent violations. The NRC offered the Licensee the opportunity to request a predecisional enforcement conference or request ADR with the NRC in an attempt to resolve issues associated with this matter. In response, on April 21, 2011, Bozeman Deaconess Hospital requested ADR to resolve this matter with the NRC.

On May 25, 2011, the NRC and Licensee representatives met in an ADR session with a professional mediator, arranged through the Cornell University Institute on Conflict Resolution. ADR is a process in which a neutral mediator with no decision-making authority assists the parties in reaching an agreement on resolving any differences regarding the dispute. This