

training in the responsible conduct of research to undergraduate students, graduate students, and postdoctoral researchers who are supported by NSF.

Section 7009 of the America COMPETES Act (codified at 42 U.S.C. 1862o-1) requires NSF to ensure that “each institution that applies for financial assistance from the Foundation for science and engineering research or education describe in its grant proposal a plan to provide appropriate training and oversight in the responsible and ethical conduct of research * * *.” NSF’s implementation of this requirement is described in the NSF Proposal and Award Policies and Procedures Guide, Part II—Award and Administration Guide, Chapter IV, Part B and is available at nsf.gov/pubs/policydocs/pappguide/nsf11001/aag_4.jsp#IVB.

The Office of Inspector General provides independent oversight of NSF’s programs and operations. NSF OIG is responsible for promoting efficiency and effectiveness in agency programs and for preventing and detecting fraud, waste, and abuse. NSF OIG supports NSF in its mission by safeguarding the integrity of NSF programs and operations through audits, investigations, and other reviews.

This information collection is necessary for review of institutional compliance with the responsible conduct of research requirements. NSF OIG will primarily use the data collected to inform the Foundation and Congress whether current responsible conduct of research programs comply with NSF’s requirement and to make recommendations to strengthen these programs if necessary. The results of the information collection also will assist NSF OIG in developing a responsible conduct of research oversight plan.

The scope of this information request will primarily address how awardees have implemented NSF’s requirement by interviewing three groups of people: (1) Upper-level administrators (e.g., Vice Presidents or Vice Provosts), program administrators (e.g., Research Integrity Officers or Compliance Officers), and trainees who have participated in the program (undergraduate students, graduate students and postdoctoral researchers). From the upper-level administrators, we will request information that will allow us to assess the institution’s commitment to the program, including resources (both financial and staff), and how the expectations for the program are communicated to faculty and students. We will request from the program administrators specific information such as course structure and content,

participation requirements and options, compliance tracking, faculty participation, resource allocation, and oversight. From the course participants, we will request information about their experiences in the courses with regard to format, duration, content, and the benefits and drawbacks of taking an RCR course. The information collection will be conducted through video-conferencing between NSF OIG and the institutions’ participants.

Use of the Information: This information is required for NSF OIG’s effective oversight of NSF programs and operations by reviewing institutions’ compliance with the responsible conduct of research requirements of the America COMPETES Act and NSF’s Proposal and Award Policies and Procedures Guide.

This collection primarily will be used for accountability and evaluation purposes, and to inform Congress and NSF on the outcome of the information collection.

Respondents: Institutions that receive funding from NSF and are required to provide adequate training on the responsible conduct of research.

Number of Respondents: NSF OIG anticipates collecting information from a minimum of 20 institutions per year and a maximum of 100 institutions. Participants at each institution will include at least one senior level administrator, one representative from the responsible conduct of research program, and a group of students with at least one undergraduate student, one graduate student, and one postdoctoral researcher. The information collection will involve between 100 and 500 respondents per year.

Burden on the Public: NSF OIG estimates that the time required for information collection from each senior level administrator will be approximately 30 minutes, from each representative from the responsible conduct of research program approximately 1.5 hours, and from students and postdocs approximately 1 hour each.

At a minimum, each institution will require 4 hours to complete the information collection. The minimum total time burden for 20 institutions per year is 80 hours and 400 hours per year for 100 universities.

Dated: September 11, 2012.

Suzanne H. Plimpton,
Reports Clearance Officer, National Science Foundation.

[FR Doc. 2012-22686 Filed 9-13-12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[NRC-2012-0213]

Biweekly Notice; Applications and Amendments to Facility Operating Licenses and Combined 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 (NRC or the Commission) 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 or combined license, as applicable, upon a determination by the Commission that such amendment involves no significant hazards consideration, notwithstanding the pendency before the Commission of a request for a hearing from any person.

This biweekly notice includes all notices of amendments issued, or proposed to be issued from August 23 to September 5, 2012. The last biweekly notice was published on September 4, 2012 (77 FR 53923).

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-2012-0213. 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-2012-0213. Address questions about NRC dockets to Carol Gallagher; telephone: 301-492-3668; email: 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–2012–0213 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–2012–0213.

- *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. Documents may be viewed in ADAMS by performing a search on the document date and docket number.

- *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–2012–0213 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.

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 section 50.92 of Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR), this means that operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; or (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. The basis for this proposed determination for each amendment request is shown below.

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

Normally, the Commission will not issue the amendment until the expiration of 60 days after the date of publication of this notice. The Commission may issue the license amendment before expiration of the 60-day period provided that its final determination is that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration. In addition, the Commission may issue the amendment prior to the expiration of the 30-day comment period should circumstances change during the 30-day comment period such that failure to act in a timely way would result, for example in derating or shutdown of the facility. Should the Commission take action prior to the expiration of either the comment period or the notice period, it will publish in the **Federal Register** a notice of issuance. Should the Commission make a final No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, any hearing will take place after issuance. The Commission expects that the need to take this action will occur very infrequently.

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's regulations are accessible electronically from the NRC Library on the NRC's Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/doc-collections/cfr/>. If a request for a hearing or petition for leave to intervene is filed by the above date, the Commission or a presiding officer designated by the Commission or by the Chief Administrative Judge of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, will rule on the request and/or petition; and the Secretary or the Chief Administrative Judge of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board will issue a notice of a hearing or an appropriate order.

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

Each contention must consist of a specific statement of the issue of law or fact to be raised or controverted. In addition, the requestor/petitioner shall provide a brief explanation of the bases for the contention and a concise statement of the alleged facts or expert opinion which support the contention and on which the requestor/petitioner intends to rely in proving the contention at the hearing. The requestor/petitioner must also provide references to those specific sources and documents of which the petitioner is aware and on which the requestor/petitioner intends to rely to establish those facts or expert opinion. The petition must include

sufficient information to show that a genuine dispute exists with the applicant on a material issue of law or fact. Contentions shall be limited to matters within the scope of the amendment under consideration. The contention must be one which, if proven, would entitle the requestor/petitioner to relief. A requestor/petitioner who fails to satisfy these requirements with respect to at least one contention will not be permitted to participate as a party.

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

If a hearing is requested, the Commission will make a final determination on the issue of no significant hazards consideration. The final determination will serve to decide when the hearing is held. If the final determination is that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration, the Commission may issue the amendment and make it immediately effective, notwithstanding the request for a hearing. Any hearing held would take place after issuance of the amendment. If the final determination is that the amendment request involves a significant hazards consideration, then any hearing held would take place before the issuance of any amendment.

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

To comply with the procedural requirements of E-Filing, at least 10 days prior to the filing deadline, the participant should contact the Office of the Secretary by email at hearing.docket@nrc.gov, 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, 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. Requests for hearing, petitions for leave to intervene, and motions for leave to file new or amended contentions that are filed after the 60-day deadline will not be entertained absent a determination by the presiding officer that the filing demonstrates good cause by satisfying the following three factors in 10 CFR 2.309(c)(1): (i) The information upon which the filing is based was not previously available; (ii) the information upon which the filing is based is materially different from information previously available; and (iii) the filing has been submitted in a timely fashion based on the availability of the subsequent information.

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's PDR Reference staff at 1-800-397-4209, 301-415-4737, or by email to pdr.resource@nrc.gov.

Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc., Docket No. 50-286, Indian Point Nuclear Generating Unit 3, Westchester County, New York

Date of amendment request: May 23, 2012, as supplemented by letter dated August 3, 2012.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment will revise Technical Specification 3.7.4, "Atmospheric Dump Valves (ADV),"

limiting condition for operation (LCO) to require four rather than three ADVs to be operable. The licensee states that the current LCO is non-conservative and is being addressed in accordance with Administrative Letter 98-10.

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. The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis against the standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c). The NRC staff's review 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 current LCO requires three atmospheric dump valves to be operable. The proposed change would be an administrative change to require that all four atmospheric dump valves be operable during the applicable operating modes.

Operating experience has demonstrated that ADVs are significant to public health and safety. ADVs are not the initiators of any accident because a failed open ADV can be isolated with a block valve. ADVs are available to cool the unit to residual heat removal entry conditions should the preferred heat sink via the steam bypass system to the condenser not be available. ADVs are also available to limit the releases during a steam generator tube rupture accident.

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

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

Response: No.

There are no changes to design, no changes to operating procedures and the revised LCO is consistent with the normal operating condition. Also, the ADVs are not the initiators of any accident because a failed open ADV can be isolated with a block valve.

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.

The proposed change is administrative in nature. Revising the LCO to require all four ADVs to be operable during the applicable operating modes adds conservatism to the technical specifications and does not reduce any margin of safety.

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

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

Attorney for licensee: Mr. William C. Dennis, Assistant General Counsel, Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc., 440 Hamilton Avenue, White Plains, NY 10601.

NRC Branch Chief: George Wilson.

Northern States Power Company—Minnesota, Docket No. 50-306, Prairie Island Nuclear Generating Plant, Unit 2, Goodhue County, Minnesota

Date of amendment request: July 25, 2012.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would revise Appendix A of the Operating License to except Prairie Island Nuclear Generating Plant, Unit 2 from the requirements of Regulatory Guide 1.163, as specified in Technical Specification 5.5.14, "Containment Leakage Rate Testing Program," for post-modification containment leak rate testing associated with steam generator replacement.

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 would provide the Prairie Island Nuclear Generating Plant an exception from performing a containment integrated leak rate test following the replacement of the steam generators in Unit 2.

Integrated leak rate tests are performed to assure the leak-tightness of the primary containment boundary system, and as such they are not accident initiators. Therefore, not performing an integrated leak rate test will not affect the probability of an accident previously evaluated.

The intent of post-modification integrated leak rate testing requirements is to assure the leak-tight integrity of the area affected by the modification. For the Unit 2 steam generator replacement modification, this intent will be satisfied by performing the inspections and tests required by the American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME) Code. Because the leak-tightness integrity of the primary containment boundary affected by the steam generator replacement will be assured, there is no change in the primary containment boundary's ability to confine radioactive materials during an accident.

Therefore, adding a Technical Specification statement that provides an exception for Unit 2 from the steam generator replacement post-modification integrated leak rate testing requirements does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. Do the proposed changes create the possibility of a new or different kind of

accident from any accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

The proposed change would provide the Prairie Island Nuclear Generating Plant an exception from performing a required containment integrated leak rate test following the replacement of the steam generators in Unit 2.

Providing an exception from performing a test does not involve a physical change to the plant nor does it change the operation of the plant. Thus, it cannot introduce a new failure mode. Therefore, adding a Technical Specification statement that provides an exception for Unit 2 from the steam generator replacement post-modification integrated leak rate testing requirements does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated.

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

Response: No.

The proposed change would provide the Prairie Island Nuclear Generating Plant an exception from performing a required containment integrated leak rate test following the replacement of the steam generators in Unit 2.

The intent of post-modification integrated leak rate testing requirements is to assure the leak-tight integrity of the area affected by the modification. This intent will be satisfied by performing inspections and tests required by the ASME Code. The acceptance criterion for ASME Code system pressure testing for the base metal and welds is no leakage. In addition, the test pressure for the hydrostatic tests and the inservice system pressure test will be several times that required during an integrated leak rate test. Because the leak-tight integrity of the primary containment boundary affected by the steam generator replacement will be assured, there is no change in the primary containment boundary's ability to confine radioactive materials during an accident. Therefore, adding a Technical Specification statement that provides an exception for Unit 2 from the steam generator replacement post modification integrated leak rate testing requirements 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 requests involve no significant hazards consideration.

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

NRC Acting Branch Chief: Istvan Frankl.

Northern States Power Company—Minnesota, Docket Nos.: 50–282 and 50–306, Prairie Island Nuclear Generating Plant, Units 1 and 2, Goodhue County, Minnesota

Date of amendment request: July 25, 2012.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendments would revise Technical Specifications (TS) 3.4.19—“Steam Generator (SG) Tube Integrity,” 5.5.8—“Steam Generator (SG) Program,” and 5.6.7—“Steam Generator Tube Inspection Report” to apply the appropriate program attributes to the Unit 2 replacement steam generators that are planned for installation in fall 2013. The proposed amendment would also revise the same TS described above to adopt for Unit 1 and Unit 2 the program improvements in Technical Specifications Task Force Traveler (TSTF) 510, Revision 2, “Revision to Steam Generator Program Inspection Frequencies and Tube Sample Selection.”

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 changes associated with Technical Specification Task Force Traveler (TSTF) 510 revise the Steam Generator (SG) Program to modify the frequency of verification of SG tube integrity and SG tube sample selection. A steam generator tube rupture (SGTR) event is one of the design basis accidents that are analyzed as part of a plant's licensing basis. The proposed SG tube inspection frequency and sample selection criteria will continue to ensure that the SG tubes are inspected such that the probability of a SGTR is not increased. The consequences of a SGTR are bounded by the conservative assumptions in the design basis accident analysis. The proposed change will not cause the consequences of a SGTR to exceed those assumptions.

The proposed changes associated with Unit 2 SG replacement preserve the intent of the PINGP TS for the new plant configuration following Unit 2 steam generator replacement. In effect, these changes will eliminate the SG tube repair criteria that were only applicable to the original SGs that will be replaced. These changes will ensure that the Unit 2 replacement SGs are subject to the inservice inspection, testing, and reporting criteria that are applicable to their design as approved for use with TSTF-510.

Therefore, it is concluded that this change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

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

Response: No.

The proposed changes to the Steam Generator Program associated with TSTF-510 will not introduce any adverse changes to the plant design basis or postulated accidents resulting from potential tube degradation. The proposed change does not affect the design of the SGs or their method of operation. In addition, the proposed change does not impact any other plant system or component.

The proposed changes associated with Unit 2 SG replacement preserve the intent of the PINGP TS for the new plant configuration following Unit 2 steam generator replacement. In effect, these changes will eliminate the SG tube repair criteria that were only applicable to the original SGs that will be replaced. Such programmatic changes do not affect the design of the SGs or their method of operation. In addition, these programmatic changes do not impact any other plant system or component.

Therefore, it is concluded that this change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

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

Response: No.

The SG tubes in pressurized water reactors are an integral part of the reactor coolant pressure boundary and, as such, are relied upon to maintain the primary system's pressure and inventory. As part of the reactor coolant pressure boundary, the SG tubes are unique in that they are also relied upon as a heat transfer surface between the primary and secondary systems such that residual heat can be removed from the primary system. In addition, the SG tubes also isolate the radioactive fission products in the primary coolant from the secondary system. In summary, the safety function of a SG is maintained by ensuring the integrity of its tubes.

Steam generator tube integrity is a function of the design, environment, and the physical condition of the tube. The proposed changes do not affect tube design or operating environment. The proposed changes will continue to require monitoring of the physical condition of the SG tubes such that there will not be a reduction in the margin of safety compared to the current requirements.

Therefore, it is concluded that 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 requests involve no significant hazards consideration.

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

NRC Acting Branch Chief: Istvan Frankl.

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

Date of amendment request: June 13, 2012.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would selectively implement an Alternate Source Term (AST) methodology in accordance with Regulatory Position C.1.2.2 of Regulatory Guide (RG) 1.183, “Alternative Radiological Source Terms for Evaluating Design Basis Accidents at Nuclear Power Reactors,” by modifying the WBN, Unit 1 licensing basis for determining offsite and Control Room doses due to a Fuel Handling Accident (FHA). A license amendment is required for AST implementation in accordance with 10 CFR 50.67(b)(1).

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

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

Response: No.

The equipment affected by the proposed changes is mitigative in nature, and relied upon after an accident has been initiated. Application of the AST does not involve any physical changes to the plant design. While the operation of various systems will change as a result of these proposed changes, these systems are not accident initiators. Application of the AST is not an initiator of a design basis accident. The proposed changes to the TS [technical specifications], while they revise certain performance requirements, do not involve any physical modifications to the plant. As a result, the proposed changes do not affect any of the parameters or conditions that could contribute to the initiation of any accidents. As such, removal of operability requirements during the specified conditions will not significantly increase the probability of occurrence for an accident previously analyzed. Since design basis accident initiators are not being altered by adoption of the AST analysis of the FHA, the probability of an accident previously evaluated is not affected.

The dose consequences of a FHA have been re-evaluated utilizing the AST methodology recognized by 10 CFR 50.67 and the guidance contained within Regulatory Guide 1.183. Based upon the results of this analysis, TVA has demonstrated that, with the requested changes, the dose consequences of the FHA are within the appropriate acceptance criteria of 10 CFR 50.67(b)(2) and Table 6 of RG 1.183. The AST involves quantities, isotopic composition, chemical and physical

characteristics, and release timing of radioactive material for use as inputs to the dose analysis of the FHA. Selective implementation of the AST does not create any conditions that could significantly increase the consequences of any of the events being 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 amendment create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

The proposed changes would not require any new or different accidents to be postulated, since no changes are being made to the plant that would introduce any new accident causal mechanisms. This license amendment request does not impact any plant systems that are potential accident initiators. The AST methodology involves quantities, isotopic composition, chemical and physical characteristics, and release timing of radioactive material for use as inputs to the dose analysis of the FHA.

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.

TVA is proposing to modify the methodology for responding to a FHA. Selective implementation of the AST methodology is relevant only to the calculated dose consequences for the FHA. The radiological analysis of the FHA does not credit containment isolation, operation of the Auxiliary Building Gas Treatment System, or operation of the Reactor Building Purge Air Cleanup Units. The results of the revised dose consequences analysis demonstrate that the regulatory acceptance criteria regarding onsite and offsite doses are met for the FHA.

In addition, the selective implementation of the AST methodology does not affect the transient behavior of non-radiological parameters (e.g., RCS [reactor coolant system] pressure, Containment pressure) that are pertinent to a margin of safety.

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

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

Attorney for licensee: General Counsel, Tennessee Valley Authority, 400 West Summit Hill Drive, ET 11A, Knoxville, Tennessee 37902.

NRC Branch Chief: George Wilson.

Notice of Issuance of Amendments to Facility Operating Licenses and Combined Licenses

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

A notice of consideration of issuance of amendment to facility operating license or combined license, as applicable, proposed no significant hazards consideration determination, and opportunity for a hearing in connection with these actions, was published in the **Federal Register** as indicated.

Unless otherwise indicated, the Commission has determined that these amendments satisfy the criteria for categorical exclusion in accordance with 10 CFR 51.22. Therefore, pursuant to 10 CFR 51.22(b), no environmental impact statement or environmental assessment need be prepared for these amendments. If the Commission has prepared an environmental assessment under the special circumstances provision in 10 CFR 51.22(b) and has made a determination based on that assessment, it is so indicated.

For further details with respect to the action see (1) the applications for amendment, (2) the amendment, and (3) the Commission’s related letter, Safety Evaluation and/or Environmental Assessment as indicated. All of these items are available for public inspection at the Commission’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’s Reference staff at 1–800–397–4209, 301–415–4737 or by email to pdr.resource@nrc.gov.

Detroit Edison Company, Docket No. 50–341, Fermi 2, Monroe County, Michigan

Date of application for amendment: December 20, 2011.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revised technical specifications (TS) requirements related to primary containment isolation instrumentation. The changes are in accordance with NRC approved TS Task Force (TSTF), Improved Standard Technical Specifications (ISTS) change TSTF–306, Revision 2.

Date of issuance: August 29, 2012.

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

Amendment No.: 189.

Facility Operating License No. NPF–43: Amendment revised the Technical Specifications and License.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: April 3, 2012 (77 FR 20073).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated August 29, 2012.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

Date of application for amendment: September 29, 2011, as supplemented on July 25, 2012.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revised Technical Specification (TS) 4.2.1, adding Optimized ZIRLO™ clad fuel rods to the fuel matrix in addition to Zircaloy or ZIRLO™ clad fuel rods that are currently in use. The amendment also added a Westinghouse topical report regarding Optimized ZIRLO™ as Reference 8 in TS 5.6.5.b, which lists the analytical methods used to determine the core operating limits.

Date of issuance: August 23, 2012.

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

Amendment No.: 302.

Facility Operating License No. DPR–58: Amendment revised the Renewed Operating License and Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: November 29, 2011 (76 FR 73731). The licensee's July 25, 2012, supplemental letter contained clarifying information, did not change the scope of the original license amendment request, did not change the NRC staff's initial proposed finding of no significant

hazards consideration determination, and did not expand the scope of the original **Federal Register** notice.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated August 23, 2012.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

NextEra Energy Duane Arnold, LLC, Docket No. 50–331, Duane Arnold Energy Center, Linn County, Iowa

Date of application for amendments: September 29, 2011, as supplemented by letter dated March 12, 2012.

Brief description of amendments: The amendment modified existing Technical Specification Surveillance Requirement (SR) 3.4.3.2, SR 3.5.1.9, and SR 3.6.1.5.1, to provide an alternate means for testing of the steam safety/relief valves (SRVs). The change allows for demonstrating the capability of the SRVs to perform their function without requiring the valves to be cycled with steam pressure while installed in the plant in accordance with the Inservice Testing Program.

Date of issuance: August 27, 2012.

Effective date: This license amendment is effective as of the date of issuance and shall be implemented within 30 days from date of issuance.

Amendment No.: 282.

Renewed Facility Operating License No. DPR–49: Amendment revised the Renewed Facility Operating License and Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: June 12, 2012 (77 FR 35075).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated August 27, 2012.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Northern States Power Company—Minnesota (NSPM), Docket No. 50–263, Monticello Nuclear Generating Plant, Wright County, Minnesota

Date of application for amendment: May 25, 2012.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revised the Monticello licensing basis, approving the removal of automatic transfer capability of essential electrical buses to the 1AR transformer due to degraded voltage conditions.

Date of issuance: August 27, 2012.

Effective date: This license amendment is effective as of the date of its issuance, and shall be implemented within 30 days of issuance, except the revision of the updated safety analysis report to reflect the revised licensing basis of the 1AR transformer shall

follow the schedule set forth in 10 CFR 50.71(e).

Amendment No.: 169.

Facility Operating License No. DPR–22: Amendment revised the Renewed Facility Operating License.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: June 26, 2012 (77 FR 38096).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated August 27, 2012.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 6th day of September 2012.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Louise Lund,

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

[FR Doc. 2012–22698 Filed 9–13–12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34–67822; File No. SR–BX–2012–060]

Self-Regulatory Organizations; NASDAQ OMX BX, Inc.; Notice of Filing and Immediate Effectiveness of Proposed Rule Change To Amend Transaction Fees

September 10, 2012.

Pursuant to Section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (“Act”),¹ and Rule 19b–4 thereunder,² notice is hereby given that on August 30, 2012, NASDAQ OMX BX, Inc. (“BX” or “Exchange”) filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission (“Commission”) the proposed rule change as described in Items I, II, and III below, which Items have been prepared by the Exchange. The Commission is publishing this notice to solicit comments on the proposed rule change from interested persons.

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

The Exchange proposes to amend Chapter XV, Section 2 entitled “BX Options Market—Fees and Rebates” to amend rebates and fees relating to various options and make technical corrections to this section.

The text of the proposed rule change is available on the Exchange's Web site at <http://www.nasdaqtrader.com/micro.aspx?id=BXRulefilings>, at the

¹ 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1).

² 17 CFR 240.19b–4.