

Submit, by October 15, 2012, comments that address the following questions:

1. Is the proposed collection of information necessary for the NRC to properly perform its functions? Does the information have practical utility?
2. Is the burden estimate accurate?
3. Is there a way to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected?
4. How can the burden of the information collection be minimized, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology?

The public may examine and have copied for a fee publicly available documents, including the draft supporting statement, at the NRC's Public Document Room, Room O1-F21, One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland 20852. OMB clearance requests are available at the NRC's Web site: <http://www.nrc.gov/public-involve/doc-comment/omb/>.

The document will be available on the NRC's home page site for 60 days after the signature date of this notice. Comments submitted in writing or in electronic form will be made available for public inspection. 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. Comments submitted should reference Docket No. NRC-2012-0172. You may submit your comments by any of the following methods: Electronic comments: Go to <http://www.regulations.gov> and search for Docket No. NRC-2012-0172. Mail comments to NRC Clearance Officer, Tremaine Donnell (T-5 F53), U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001.

Questions about the information collection requirements may be directed to the NRC Clearance Officer, Tremaine Donnell (T-5 F53), U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, by telephone at 301-415-6258, or by email to [INFOCOLLECTS.Resource@NRC.GOV](mailto:INFOCOLLECTS.Resource@NRC.GOV).

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 3rd day of August 2012.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Tremaine Donnell,**

*NRC Clearance Officer, Office of Information Services.*

[FR Doc. 2012-19892 Filed 8-13-12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[NRC-2012-0175]

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

**AGENCY:** Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

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

**DATES:** Comments must be filed by September 13, 2012. A request for a hearing or leave to intervene must be filed by October 15, 2012. Any potential party as defined in Title to or the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR) 2.4, who believes access to Sensitive Unclassified Non-Safeguards Information (SUNSI) is necessary to respond to this notice must request document access by August 24, 2012.

**ADDRESSES:** You may access information and comment submissions related to this document, which the NRC possesses and are publicly available, by searching on <http://www.regulations.gov> under Docket ID NRC-2012-0175. You may submit comments by any of the following methods:

- *Federal Rulemaking Web site:* Go to <http://www.regulations.gov> and search for Docket ID NRC-2012-0175. Address questions about NRC dockets to Carol Gallagher; telephone: 301-492-3668; email: [Carol.Gallagher@nrc.gov](mailto:Carol.Gallagher@nrc.gov).

- *Mail comments to:* Cindy Bladey, 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.

For additional direction on accessing information and submitting comments, see "Accessing Information and Submitting Comments" in the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section of this document.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

## I. Accessing Information and Submitting Comments

### A. Accessing Information

Please refer to Docket ID NRC-2012-0175 when contacting the NRC about the availability of information regarding this document. You may access information related to this document, which the NRC possesses and is publicly available, by the following methods:

- *Federal Rulemaking Web Site:* Go to <http://www.regulations.gov> and search for Docket ID NRC-2012-0175.

- *NRC's Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS):* You may access publicly available documents online in the NRC Library at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html>. To begin the search, select "ADAMS Public Documents" and then select "Begin Web-based ADAMS Search." For problems with ADAMS, please contact the NRC's Public Document Room (PDR) reference staff at 1-800-397-4209, 301-415-4737, or by email to [pdr.resource@nrc.gov](mailto:pdr.resource@nrc.gov). The ADAMS accession number for each document referenced in this notice (if that document is available in ADAMS) is provided the first time that a document is referenced.

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

### B. Submitting Comments

Please include Docket ID NRC-2012-0175 in the subject line of your comment submission, in order to ensure that the NRC is able to make your comment submission available to the public in this docket.

The NRC cautions you not to include identifying or contact information in comment submissions that you do not want to be publicly disclosed. The NRC posts all comment submissions at <http://www.regulations.gov> as well as entering the comment submissions into ADAMS, and the NRC does not 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 in their comment submissions that they do not want to be publicly disclosed. Your request should state that the NRC will not edit comment submissions to remove such information before making the comment submissions available to the public or entering the comment submissions into ADAMS.

## II. Background

Pursuant to Section 189a.(2) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission or NRC staff) is publishing this 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 or combined license, as applicable, upon a determination by the Commission that such amendment involves no significant hazards consideration, notwithstanding the pendency before the Commission of a request for a hearing from any person.

This notice includes notices of amendments containing SUNSI.

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

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

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

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

derating or shutdown of the facility. Should the Commission take action prior to the expiration of either the comment period or the notice period, it will publish in the **Federal Register** a notice of issuance. Should the Commission make a final No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, then 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 or combined 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. The NRC regulations are accessible electronically from the NRC Library on the NRC's Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/doc-collections/cfr/>. If a request for a hearing or petition for leave to intervene is filed within 60 days, the Commission or a presiding officer designated by the Commission or by the Chief Administrative Judge of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, will rule on the request and/or petition; and the Secretary or the Chief Administrative Judge of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board will issue a notice of a hearing or an appropriate order.

As required by 10 CFR 2.309, a petition for leave to intervene shall set forth with particularity the interest of the petitioner in the proceeding, and how that interest may be affected by the results of the proceeding. The petition should specifically explain the reasons why intervention should be permitted with particular reference to the following general requirements: (1) The name, address, and telephone number of the requestor or petitioner; (2) the nature of the requestor's/petitioner's right under the Act to be made a party to the proceeding; (3) the nature and extent of the requestor's/petitioner's property, financial, or other interest in the proceeding; and (4) the possible effect of any decision or order which may be entered in the proceeding on the requestor's/petitioner's interest. The petition must also set forth the specific

contentions which the requestor/petitioner seeks to have litigated at the proceeding.

Each contention must consist of a specific statement of the issue of law or fact to be raised or controverted. In addition, the requestor/petitioner shall provide a brief explanation of the bases for the contention and a concise statement of the alleged facts or expert opinion which support the contention and on which the requestor/petitioner intends to rely in proving the contention at the hearing. The requestor/petitioner must also provide references to those specific sources and documents of which the petitioner is aware and on which the requestor/petitioner intends to rely to establish those facts or expert opinion. The petition must include sufficient information to show that a genuine dispute exists with the applicant on a material issue of law or fact. Contentions shall be limited to matters within the scope of the amendment under consideration. The contention must be one which, if proven, would entitle the requestor/petitioner to relief. A requestor/petitioner who fails to satisfy these requirements with respect to at least one contention will not be permitted to participate as a party.

Those permitted to intervene become parties to the proceeding, subject to any limitations in the order granting leave to intervene, and have the opportunity to participate fully in the conduct of the hearing.

If a hearing is requested, and the Commission has not made a final determination on the issue of no significant hazards consideration, the Commission will make a final determination on the issue of no significant hazards consideration. The final determination will serve to decide when the hearing is held. If the final determination is that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration, the Commission may issue the amendment and make it immediately effective, notwithstanding the request for a hearing. Any hearing held would take place after issuance of the amendment. If the final determination is that the amendment request involves a significant hazards consideration, then any hearing held would take place before the issuance of any amendment.

All documents filed in the 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 email at [hearing.docket@nrc.gov](mailto:hearing.docket@nrc.gov), or by telephone at 301-415-1677, to request (1) a digital identification (ID) certificate, which allows the participant (or its counsel or representative) to digitally sign documents and access the E-Submittal server for any proceeding in which it is participating; and (2) advise the Secretary that the participant will be submitting a request or petition for hearing (even in instances in which the participant, or its counsel or representative, already holds an NRC-issued digital ID certificate). Based upon this information, the Secretary will establish an electronic docket for the hearing in this proceeding if the Secretary has not already established an electronic docket.

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

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

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

Once a participant has obtained a digital ID certificate and a docket has been created, the participant can then submit a request for hearing or petition for leave to intervene. Submissions should be in Portable Document Format (PDF) in accordance with the NRC 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 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 email at [MSHD.Resource@nrc.gov](mailto:MSHD.Resource@nrc.gov), or by a toll-free call at 1-866-672-7640. The NRC Meta System Help Desk is available between 8 a.m. and 8 p.m., Eastern Time, Monday through Friday, excluding government holidays.

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

Sixteenth Floor, One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland, 20852, Attention: Rulemaking and Adjudications Staff. Participants filing a document in this manner are responsible for serving the document on all other participants. Filing is considered complete by first-class mail as of the time of deposit in the mail, or by courier, express mail, or expedited delivery service upon depositing the document with the provider of the service. A presiding officer, having granted an exemption request from using E-Filing, may require a participant or party to use E-Filing if the presiding officer subsequently determines that the reason for granting the exemption from use of E-Filing no longer exists.

Documents submitted in adjudicatory proceedings will appear in the NRC's electronic hearing docket which is available to the public at <http://ehd1.nrc.gov/ehd/>, unless excluded pursuant to an order of the Commission, or the presiding officer. Participants are requested not to include personal privacy information, such as social security numbers, home addresses, or home phone numbers in their filings, unless an NRC regulation or other law requires submission of such information. 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 amendment action, see the application for amendment which is available for public inspection at the NRC's PDR, located at One White Flint North, Room O1-F21, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland 20852. Publicly available documents created or received at the NRC are accessible electronically through ADAMS in the NRC Library at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html>. If you do not have access to ADAMS or if there are problems in accessing the documents located in ADAMS, contact the PDR's Reference staff at 1-800-397-4209, 301-415-4737, or by email to [pdr.resource@nrc.gov](mailto:pdr.resource@nrc.gov).

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

*Date of amendment request:* January 30, 2012, as supplemented by letter dated May 10, 2012.

*Description of amendment request:* This amendment request contains sensitive unclassified non-safeguards information (SUNSI). Publicly available versions are in ADAMS under Accession Nos. ML12038A036 and ML12136A126. The amendment would revise the Technical Specifications (TSs) for new and spent fuel storage as the result of a new criticality analyses for the new fuel vault (NFV) and the spent fuel pool (SFP). The amendment would revise TS to eliminate the current SFP storage configurations which rely on Boraflex absorbing material in the SFP. The proposed new SFP storage configurations would use a combination of partial credit for soluble boron, Boral™ for Region 1, burnup, rod cluster control assemblies, peripheral leakage in one area of Region 2, and cooling time to maintain the effective neutron multiplication factor ( $k_{\text{eff}}$ ) below regulatory limits with a 95-percent probability at 95-percent confidence level. The storage racks in Region 1 will account for the potential for blistering of Boral™ and the storage racks in Region 2 will no longer credit the presence of any Boraflex as a neutron absorbing material. The proposed license amendment would also revise TS to allow full capacity fuel storage in the NFV at the maximum allowable enrichment.

*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. Would operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated?*

No. Operation in accordance with proposed amendment does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated. The proposed amendment does not change or modify the fuel, fuel handling processes, spent fuel storage racks, number of fuel assemblies that may be stored in the spent fuel pool (SFP) or the new fuel vault (NFV, decay heat generation rate, or the SFP cooling and cleanup system. There are also no changes to the NFV storage racks or the new fuel handling processes.

Operation of the SFP utilizes soluble boron; crediting this boron for criticality control does not change the probability of any accident. The proposed amendment was

evaluated for impact on the following previously evaluated events and accidents;

- a. A fuel handling accident (FHA),
- b. A fuel mis-positioning event,
- c. A seismic event, and
- d. A loss of SFP cooling event.

The probability of a FHA is not increased because implementation of the proposed amendment will employ the same equipment and processes to handle fuel assemblies that are currently used. The FHA radiological consequences are not increased because the radiological source term of a single fuel assembly will remain unchanged. Therefore, the proposed amendment does not significantly increase the probability or consequences of a FHA.

Operation in accordance with the proposed amendment will not significantly increase the probability of a fuel mis-positioning event because fuel movement will continue to be controlled by approved fuel handling procedures. These procedures continue to require identification of the initial and target locations for each fuel assembly that is moved. The consequences of a fuel mis-positioning event are not changed because the reactivity analysis demonstrates that the new subcriticality criteria and requirements will be met for the worst-case fuel mis-positioning event.

Operation in accordance with the proposed amendment will not change the probability of a seismic event. The consequences of a seismic event are not increased because the forcing functions for seismic excitation are not increased and because the mass of storage racks has not changed.

Operation in accordance with the proposed amendment will not change the probability of a loss of SFP cooling event because the systems and events that could affect SFP cooling are unchanged. The consequences are not significantly increased because there are no changes in the SFP heat load or SFP cooling systems, structures or components. Furthermore, conservative analyses indicate that the current design requirements and criteria continue to be met with the presence of Boral™ blisters.

The proposed amendment also does not increase the probability of any event in the NFV since there are no changes to the handling of fuel within the NFV or to the fuel storage racks. The proposed amendment was evaluated for impact for the previously evaluated full flooded and optimum moderated accidents. Operation in accordance with the proposed amendment will not change the probability of the NFV being flooded with full density or optimum density water. The consequences of the fully flooded event have been demonstrated to meet applicable criteria. Therefore, the proposed amendments do not significantly increase the probability or consequences of an event within the NFV.

Based on the above, it is concluded that the proposed amendment does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

*2. Would operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated?*

No. Operation in accordance with the proposed amendment does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated. The proposed amendment does not change or modify the fuel, fuel handling processes, spent fuel racks or new fuel vault rack, number of fuel assemblies that may be stored in the pool or the new fuel vault, decay heat generation rate, or the SFP cooling and cleanup system.

Seabrook procedures require soluble boron to be present in the SFP, as such; the possibility of an inadvertent fuel pool dilution event has always existed. However, the SFP dilution analysis that accompanies this submittal demonstrates that no credible dilution event could increase fuel pool reactivity such that the effective neutron multiplication ( $k_{\text{eff}}$ ) exceeds 0.95. Therefore, implementation of credit for soluble boron to control reactivity in the SFP will not create the possibility of a new or different type of criticality accident.

The limiting fuel assembly mispositioning event does not represent a new or different type of accident. The mispositioning of a fuel assembly within the fuel storage racks has always been possible. The locations of SFP rack modules and the specific modules assigned to each storage region remain unchanged; analysis results show that the storage racks remain sub-critical, with substantial margin, following a worst-case fuel misloading event. Therefore, a fuel assembly misload event that involves new fuel storage arrangements required by the criticality analysis does not result in a new or different type of criticality accident.

The potential for blistering on the Boral™ has been evaluated and the neutron poison will continue to fulfill its function. Therefore, there is no possibility of a new or different type of accident associated with this change.

The change in the storage requirements for the NFV does not introduce the probability of a new or different accident since procedures used for fuel movement will remain unchanged.

Based on the above, it is concluded that operation with the proposed amendment does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

*3. Would operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety?*

No. Operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment does not significantly reduce the margin of safety. The proposed change was evaluated for its effect on margins of safety related to criticality and spent fuel heat removal capability.

The changes proposed by this license amendment ensure that the fuel in the SFP will remain sub-critical under normal and accident conditions. The controlled placement of fuel assemblies within the SFP will maintain  $k_{\text{eff}}$  less than or equal to 0.95 as required by TS 5.6.1.1 for spent fuel storage and less than 1.0 if flooded with unborated water. The proposed amendment maintains the 0.95 limit on  $k_{\text{eff}}$  by restricting the placement of fuel and by partially

crediting soluble boron in the fuel pool water.

The proposed change does not affect spent fuel heat generation or the spent fuel cooling systems. A conservative analysis indicates that the design basis requirements and criteria for spent fuel cooling continue to be met with Boral™ blistering considered.

The changes for the NFV proposed by this license amendment ensure that the fuel remains sub-critical under normal and accident conditions. The NFV will continue to meet the  $k_{eff}$  limits as defined by TS 5.6.1.2.a and TS 5.6.1.2.b. Based on these evaluations, operating the facility with the proposed amendment does not involve a significant reduction in any 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:* M.S. Ross, Florida Power & Light Company, P.O. Box 14000, Juno Beach, FL 33408–0420.

*NRC Branch Chief:* Meena Khanna.

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

*Date of amendment request:* June 20, 2012.

*Description of amendment request:* This amendment request contains sensitive unclassified non-safeguards information (SUNSI). Publicly available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML12178A070. The amendment would revise the Facility Operating License (FOL) for paragraph 2.E, “Physical Security.” The proposed amendment would revise FOL paragraph E to change the description of Milestone 6.

*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 Cyber Security Plan Implementation Schedule is administrative in nature. This change does not alter accident analysis assumptions, add any accident initiators, or affect the function of plant systems or the manner in which systems are operated, maintained, modified, tested, or inspected. The proposed change does not require any plant modifications that affect the performance capability of the structures, systems, and components 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 Cyber Security Plan Implementation Schedule is administrative in nature. This proposed change does not alter accident analysis assumptions, add any accident initiators, or affect the function of plant systems or the manner in which systems are operated, maintained, modified, tested, or inspected. The proposed change does not require any plant modifications that affect the performance capability of the structures, systems, and components 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 Cyber Security Plan Implementation Schedule is administrative in nature. Because there is no change to these established safety margins as 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:* M.S. Ross, Florida Power & Light Company, P.O. Box 14000, Juno Beach, FL 33408–0420.

*NRC Branch Chief:* Meena Khanna.

*PPL Susquehanna, LLC, Docket Nos. 50–387 and 50–388, Susquehanna Steam Electric Station, Units 1 and 2, Luzerne County, Pennsylvania*

*Date of amendment request:* April 30, 2012.

*Description of amendment request:* This amendment request contains sensitive unclassified non-safeguards information (SUNSI). Publicly available version is in ADAMS under Accession

No. ML12122A011. The proposed amendment would make changes to the cyber security plan implementation schedule for Milestones 3 and 6 at Susquehanna Steam Electric Station, Units 1 and 2 (Susquehanna). The cyber security plan will be updated accordingly. Specifically, for Milestone 3, PPL Susquehanna, LLC (PPL) proposes to install a deterministic data diode appliance between Layers 3 and 2 instead of between Layers 3 and 4, with no change to the approved implementation date. For Milestone 6, PPL proposes to implement the technical controls for critical digital assets (CDAs) by the approved implementation date, and to implement the operational and management controls for the CDAs in conjunction with the full implementation of the Cyber Security Program. The NRC considers changes of this nature to be site-specific changes, and the proposed changes to Milestone 6 will be reviewed as such.

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

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

Response: No.

#### *Milestone 3*

The proposed amendment changes some details of the architecture to be used to provide protection against cyber attacks at Susquehanna. The proposed modification to the cyber security architecture is an overall increase in protection for the critical digital systems and components. The proposed change to the cyber security plan and cyber security architecture 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. Since the proposed modification is an overall increase in protection, the performance capability of the structures, systems, and components relied upon to mitigate the consequences of postulated accidents are not adversely affected and there is no adverse impact on the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

#### *Milestone 6*

The proposed amendment would [modify] the scope of the [security] controls to be implemented for target set equipment by December 31, 2012. The [site-specific change] to the Cyber Security Plan Implementation Schedule [will continue to provide a high degree of protection against cyber-related attacks that could lead to radiological

sabotage. In addition, existing programs that are currently in place at Susquehanna (e.g., physical protection, maintenance and work management, and configuration management, operations experience, etc.) provide a high degree of operational and management protection]. 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 change does not require any plant modifications, which affect the performance capability of the structures, systems, and components [SSC] relied upon to mitigate the consequences of postulated accidents and has no impact on the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

#### Overall Conclusion

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

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

Response: No.

#### Milestone 3

The proposed amendment changes some details of the architecture to be used to provide protection against cyber attacks at Susquehanna. The proposed modification to the cyber security architecture is an overall increase in protection for the critical digital systems and components. This change to the cyber security architecture does not result in the need for any new or different FSAR [Final Safety Analysis Report] design basis accident analysis. In addition, the change does not introduce new equipment that could create a new or different kind of accident and no new equipment failure modes are created. Since the proposed modification to the cyber security architecture is an overall increase in protection for the critical digital systems and components, the change does not adversely affect the function of any safety-related SSC as to how they are operated, maintained, modified, tested or inspected. As a result, no new accident scenarios, failure mechanisms, or limiting single failures are introduced, and the change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

#### Milestone 6

The proposed amendment would [modify] the scope of the [security] controls to be implemented for target set equipment by December 31, 2012. The [site-specific change] to the Cyber Security Plan Implementation Schedule [will continue to provide a high degree of protection against cyber-related attacks that could lead to radiological sabotage. In addition, existing programs that are currently in place at Susquehanna (e.g., physical protection, maintenance and work management, and configuration management, operations experience, etc.) provide a high degree of operational and management protection]. This [modification] does not result in the need for any new or different FSAR design basis accident analysis. In

addition, the [modification] does not introduce new equipment that could create a new or different kind of accident, and no new equipment failure modes are created. Finally, the [modification] does not affect the function of plant systems or the manner in which systems are operated, maintained, modified, tested, or inspected. As a result, no new accident scenarios, failure mechanisms, or limiting single failures are introduced as a result of this proposed amendment. Therefore, the proposed amendment does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

#### Overall Conclusion

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 amendment involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety?

Response: No.

#### Milestone 3

The proposed amendment changes some details of the architecture to be used to provide protection against cyber attacks at Susquehanna. The proposed modification to the cyber security architecture is an overall increase in protection for the critical digital systems and components. Plant safety margins are established through limiting conditions for operation, limiting safety system settings, and safety limits specified in the technical specifications. Since the proposed modification to the cyber security architecture is an overall increase in protection for the critical digital systems, there is no adverse change to these established safety margins as result of the proposed modification, and the proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

#### Milestone 6

The proposed amendment would [modify] the scope of the [security] controls to be implemented for target set equipment by December 31, 2012. Plant safety margins are established through limiting conditions for operation, limiting safety system settings, and safety limits specified in the technical specifications. The [site-specific change] to the Cyber Security Plan Implementation Schedule [will continue to provide a high degree of protection against cyber-related attacks that could lead to radiological sabotage. In addition, existing programs that are currently in place at Susquehanna (e.g., physical protection, maintenance and work management, and configuration management, operations experience, etc.) provide a high degree of operational and management protection]. Because there is no change to these established safety margins as result of this [modification], the proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

#### Overall Conclusion

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:* Bryan A. Snapp, Esquire, Assoc. General Counsel, PPL Services Corporation, 2 North Ninth St., GENTW3, Allentown, PA 18101-1179.

*NRC Branch Chief:* Meena K. Khanna.

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

#### Date of amendment request:

November 15, 2011, as supplemented January 26, 2012.

#### Description of amendment request:

The licensee's application requests the NRC review and approval for adoption of a new fire protection licensing basis which complies with the requirements in 10 CFR 50.48(a), 10 CFR 50.48(c), and the guidance in Regulatory Guide (RG) 1.205, Revision 1.

*Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:* This amendment request contains sensitive unclassified non-safeguards information (SUNSI). Publicly available versions are in ADAMS under Accession Nos. ML11321A172 and ML12031A149. 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.

Operation of VCSNS in accordance with the proposed amendment does not increase the probability or consequences of accidents previously evaluated. The Final Safety Analysis Report (FSAR) documents the analyses of design basis accidents (DBA) at VCSNS. The applicable accident associated with this license amendment request (LAR) is a fire. The proposed amendment does not adversely affect accident initiators nor alter design assumptions, conditions, or configurations of the facility and does not adversely affect the ability of structures, systems, and components (SSCs) to perform their design function. SSCs required to safely shut down the reactor and to maintain it in an Appendix R safe shutdown (SD) condition will remain capable of performing their design functions.

The purpose of this amendment is to permit VCSNS to adopt a new fire protection (FP) licensing basis which complies with the requirements in 10 CFR 50.48(a) and (c) and the guidance in Revision 1 of Regulatory Guide (RG) 1.205. The NRC considers that National Fire Protection Association (NFPA)



805 provides an acceptable methodology and performance criteria for licensees to identify FP systems and features that are an acceptable alternative to the Appendix R FP features (69 FR 33536, June 16, 2004). Engineering analyses, which may include engineering evaluations, probabilistic safety assessments, and fire modeling calculations, have been performed to demonstrate that the risk-informed, performance-based (RI-PB) requirements per NFPA 805 have been met. NFPA 805, taken as a whole, provides an acceptable alternative to 10 CFR 50.48(b) and satisfies 10 CFR 50.48(a) and General Design Criterion (GDC) 3 of Appendix A to 10 CFR Part 50 and meets the underlying intent of the NRC's existing FP regulations and guidance, and achieves defense-in-depth (DID) and the goals, performance objectives, and performance criteria specified in Chapter 1 of the standard and, if there are any increases in core damage frequency (CDF) or risk, the increase will be small and consistent with the intent of the Commission's Safety Goal Policy.

Based on this, the implementation of this amendment does not significantly increase the probability of any accident previously evaluated. Equipment required to mitigate an accident remains capable of performing the assumed function.

Therefore, the consequences of any accident previously evaluated are not significantly increased with the implementation of this amendment.

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

Response: No.

Operation of VCSNS in accordance with the proposed amendment does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated. Any scenario or previously analyzed accident with offsite dose was included in the evaluation of DBAs documented in the FSAR. The proposed change does not alter the requirements or function for systems required during accident conditions. Implementation of the new FP licensing basis which complies with the requirements in 10 CFR 50.48(a) and (c) and the guidance in Revision 1 of RG 1.205 will not result in new or different accidents.

The proposed amendment does not adversely affect accident initiators nor alter design assumptions, conditions, or configurations of the facility. The proposed amendment does not adversely affect the ability of SSCs to perform their design function. SSCs required to safely shut down the reactor and maintain it in a safe shutdown condition remain capable of performing their design functions.

The purpose of this amendment is to permit VCSNS to adopt a new FP licensing basis which complies with the requirements in 10 CFR 50.48(a) and (c) and the guidance in Revision 1 of RG 1.205. The NRC considers that NFPA 805 provides an acceptable methodology and performance criteria for licensees to identify FP systems and features that are an acceptable alternative to the Appendix R FP features (69 FR 33536, June 16, 2004).

The requirements in NFPA 805 address only FP and the impacts of fire on the plant have already been evaluated. Based on this, the implementation of this amendment does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any kind of accident previously evaluated. The proposed changes do not involve new failure mechanisms or malfunctions that can initiate a new accident.

Therefore, the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any kind of accident previously evaluated is not created with the implementation of this amendment.

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

Response: No.

Operation of VCSNS in accordance with the proposed amendment does not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety. The proposed amendment does 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 this change. The proposed amendment does not adversely affect existing plant safety margins or the reliability of equipment assumed to mitigate accidents in the UFSAR. The proposed amendment does not adversely affect the ability of SSCs to perform their design function. SSCs required to safely shut down the reactor and to maintain it in a safe shutdown condition remain capable of performing their design functions.

The purpose of this amendment is to permit VCSNS to adopt a new FP licensing basis which complies with the requirements in 10 CFR 50.48(a) and (c) and the guidance in Revision 1 of RG 1.205. The NRC considers that NFPA 805 provides an acceptable methodology and performance criteria for licensees to identify FP systems and features that are an acceptable alternative to the Appendix R FP features (69 FR 33536, June 16, 2004). Engineering analyses, which may include engineering evaluations, probabilistic safety assessments, and fire modeling calculations, have been performed to demonstrate that the performance-based methods do not result in a significant reduction in the margin of safety.

Based on this, the implementation of this amendment does not significantly reduce the margin of safety. The proposed changes are evaluated to ensure that risk and safety margins are kept within acceptable limits. Therefore, the transition does not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety.

NFPA 805 continues to protect public health and safety and the common defense and security because the overall approach of NFPA 805 is consistent with the key principles for evaluating license basis changes, as described in RG 1.174, is consistent with the defense-in-depth philosophy, and maintains sufficient safety margins.

Margins previously established for the VCSNS FP program in accordance with 10 CFR 50.48(b) and Appendix R to 10 CFR Part 50 are not significantly reduced.

Therefore, this LAR does not result in a reduction in a margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this

review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

*Attorney for licensee:* J. Hagood Hamilton, Jr., South Carolina Electric & Gas Company, Post Office Box 764, Columbia, South Carolina 29218.

*NRC Branch Chief:* Nancy L. Salgado.

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

*NextEra Energy Seabrook, LLC, Docket No. 50-443, Seabrook Station, Unit 1, Rockingham County, New Hampshire; NextEra Energy Seabrook, LLC, Docket No. 50-443, Seabrook Station, Unit 1, Rockingham County, New Hampshire; PPL Susquehanna, LLC, Docket Nos. 50-387 and 50-388, Susquehanna Steam Electric Station, Units 1 and 2, Luzerne County, Pennsylvania; South Carolina Electric and Gas Company, South Carolina Public Service Authority, Docket No. 50-395, Virgil C. Summer Nuclear Station, Unit 1, Fairfield County, South Carolina*

A. This Order contains instructions regarding how potential parties to this proceeding may request access to documents containing Sensitive Unclassified Non-Safeguards Information (SUNSI).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

E. If the NRC staff determines that the requestor satisfies both D.(1) and D.(2) above, the NRC staff will notify the requestor in writing that access to SUNSI has been granted. The written notification will contain instructions on how the requestor may obtain copies of the requested documents, and any other

conditions that may apply to access to those documents. These conditions may include, but are not limited to, the signing of a Non-Disclosure Agreement or Affidavit, or Protective Order<sup>2</sup> setting forth terms and conditions to prevent the unauthorized or inadvertent disclosure of SUNSI by each individual who will be granted access to SUNSI.

F. Filing of Contentions. Any contentions in these proceedings that are based upon the information received as a result of the request made for SUNSI must be filed by the requestor no later than 25 days after the requestor is granted access to that information. However, if more than 25 days remain between the date the petitioner is granted access to the information and the deadline for filing all other contentions (as established in the notice of hearing or opportunity for hearing), the petitioner may file its SUNSI contentions by that later deadline.

G. Review of Denials of Access.

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

(2) The requestor may challenge the NRC staff's adverse determination by filing a challenge within 5 days of receipt of that determination with: (a) the presiding officer designated in this proceeding; (b) if no presiding officer has been appointed, the Chief Administrative Judge, or if he or she is unavailable, another administrative judge, or an administrative law judge with jurisdiction pursuant to 10 CFR 2.318(a); or (c) if another officer has

been designated to rule on information access issues, with that officer.

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

If challenges to the NRC staff determinations are filed, these procedures give way to the normal process for litigating disputes concerning access to information. The availability of interlocutory review by the Commission of orders ruling on such NRC staff determinations (whether granting or denying access) is governed by 10 CFR 2.311.<sup>3</sup>

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

It is so ordered.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 24th day of July 2012.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Annette L. Vietti-Cook,**

*Secretary of the Commission.*

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

Day	Event/activity
0 .....	Publication of Federal Register notice of hearing and opportunity to petition for leave to intervene, including order with instructions for access requests.
10 .....	Deadline for submitting requests for access to Sensitive Unclassified Non-Safeguards Information (SUNSI) with information: supporting the standing of a potential party identified by name and address; describing the need for the information in order for the potential party to participate meaningfully in an adjudicatory proceeding.
60 .....	Deadline for submitting petition for intervention containing: (i) Demonstration of standing; (ii) all contentions whose formulation does not require access to SUNSI (+25 Answers to petition for intervention; +7 requestor/petitioner reply).

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

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

<sup>3</sup> Requestors should note that the filing requirements of the NRC's E-Filing Rule (72 FR 49139; August 28, 2007) apply to appeals of NRC staff determinations (because they must be served on a presiding officer or the Commission, as applicable), but not to the initial SUNSI request submitted to the NRC staff under these procedures.



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

Day	Event/activity
20 .....	Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff informs the requestor of the staff's determination whether the request for access provides a reasonable basis to believe standing can be established and shows need for SUNSI. (NRC staff also informs any party to the proceeding whose interest independent of the proceeding would be harmed by the release of the information.) If NRC staff makes the finding of need for SUNSI and likelihood of standing, NRC staff begins document processing (preparation of redactions or review of redacted documents).
25 .....	If NRC staff finds no "need" or no likelihood of standing, the deadline for requestor/petitioner to file a motion seeking a ruling to reverse the NRC staff's denial of access; NRC staff files copy of access determination with the presiding officer (or Chief Administrative Judge or other designated officer, as appropriate). If NRC staff finds "need" for SUNSI, the deadline for any party to the proceeding whose interest independent of the proceeding would be harmed by the release of the information to file a motion seeking a ruling to reverse the NRC staff's grant of access.
30 .....	Deadline for NRC staff reply to motions to reverse NRC staff determination(s).
40 .....	(Receipt +30) If NRC staff finds standing and need for SUNSI, deadline for NRC staff to complete information processing and file motion for Protective Order and draft Non-Disclosure Affidavit. Deadline for applicant/licensee to file Non-Disclosure Agreement for SUNSI.
A .....	If access granted: Issuance of presiding officer or other designated officer decision on motion for protective order for access to sensitive information (including schedule for providing access and submission of contentions) or decision reversing a final adverse determination by the NRC staff.
A + 3 .....	Deadline for filing executed Non-Disclosure Affidavits. Access provided to SUNSI consistent with decision issuing the protective order.
A + 28 .....	Deadline for submission of contentions whose development depends upon access to SUNSI. However, if more than 25 days remain between the petitioner's receipt of (or access to) the information and the deadline for filing all other contentions (as established in the notice of hearing or opportunity for hearing), the petitioner may file its SUNSI contentions by that later deadline.
A + 53 .....	(Contention receipt +25) Answers to contentions whose development depends upon access to SUNSI.
A + 60 .....	(Answer receipt +7) Petitioner/Intervenor reply to answers.
>A + 60 .....	Decision on contention admission.

[FR Doc. 2012-18758 Filed 8-13-12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[NRC-2012-0002]

### Sunshine Federal Register Notice

**AGENCY HOLDING THE MEETINGS:** Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**DATE:** Weeks of August 13, 20, 27, September 3, 10, 17, 2012.

**PLACE:** Commissioners' Conference Room, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland.

**STATUS:** Public and Closed.

#### Week of August 13, 2012

There are no meetings scheduled for the week of August 13, 2012.

#### Week of August 20, 2012—Tentative

There are no meetings scheduled for the week of August 20, 2012.

#### Week of August 27, 2012—Tentative

There are no meetings scheduled for the week of August 27, 2012.

#### Week of September 3, 2012—Tentative

There are no meetings scheduled for the week of September 3, 2012.

#### Week of September 10, 2012—Tentative

*Tuesday, September 11, 2012*

9:00 a.m. Briefing on Economic Consequences (Public Meeting)  
(Contact: Richard Correia, 301-251-7430)

This meeting will be webcast live at the Web address—[www.nrc.gov](http://www.nrc.gov).

#### Week of September 17, 2012—Tentative

There are no meetings scheduled for the week of September 17, 2012.

\* \* \* \* \*

\* The schedule for Commission meetings is subject to change on short notice. To verify the status of meetings, call (recording)—301-415-1292.

Contact person for more information: Rochelle Baval, 301-415-1651.

\* \* \* \* \*

The NRC Commission Meeting Schedule can be found on the Internet at: <http://www.nrc.gov/public-involve/public-meetings/schedule.html>.

\* \* \* \* \*

The NRC provides reasonable accommodation to individuals with disabilities where appropriate. If you need a reasonable accommodation to participate in these public meetings, or need this meeting notice or the transcript or other information from the public meetings in another format (e.g. braille, large print), please notify Bill

Dosch, Chief, Work Life and Benefits Branch, at 301-415-6200, TDD: 301-415-2100, or by email at [william.dosch@nrc.gov](mailto:william.dosch@nrc.gov). Determinations on requests for reasonable accommodation will be made on a case-by-case basis.

\* \* \* \* \*

This notice is distributed electronically to subscribers. If you no longer wish to receive it, or would like to be added to the distribution, please contact the Office of the Secretary, Washington, DC 20555 (301-415-1969), or send an email to [darlene.wright@nrc.gov](mailto:darlene.wright@nrc.gov).

Dated: August 9, 2012.

**Rochelle C. Baval,**

*Policy Coordinator, Office of the Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 2012-20026 Filed 8-10-12; 4:15 pm]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P