

e.g., permitting electronic submission of responses.

Agency: DOL–BLS.

Title of Collection: Report on Current Employment Statistics.

OMB Control Number: 1220–0011.

Affected Public: Private Sector—businesses or other for-profits and not-for-profit institutions; State, Local, and Tribal Governments; and Federal Government.

Total Estimated Number of Respondents: 297,683.

Total Estimated Number of Responses: 3,572,196.

Total Estimated Annual Time Burden: 538,240 hours.

Total Estimated Annual Other Costs Burden: \$0.

Dated: October 31, 2017.

Michel Smyth,

Departmental Clearance Officer.

[FR Doc. 2017–24176 Filed 11–6–17; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–24–P

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Office of the Secretary

#### Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration and Management; Request for Comments on the Draft DOL FY 2018–2022 Strategic Plan

AGENCY: Office of the Secretary, Labor.

ACTION: Request for comments on the draft DOL FY 2018–2022 strategic plan.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Labor (DOL) is seeking public comment on its Draft FY 2018–2022 Strategic Plan.

**DATES:** Comments must be received by December 7, 2017.

**ADDRESSES:** Comments can be provided by email to [dolstratplan@dol.gov](mailto:dolstratplan@dol.gov).

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Steve Richardson, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration and Management, Performance Management Center, (202) 693–7122.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Department of Labor's Draft FY 2018–2022 Strategic Plan is provided to satisfy a requirement of the Government Performance and Results Modernization Act (GPRMA) that agency stakeholders have an opportunity to comment. This plan presents the Secretary's vision, the Department's mission, and a description of how component agencies will achieve supporting goals and strategic objectives in the next four years. We look forward to receiving your comments. The text of the draft strategic plan is available in pdf on the Department of Labor Web site at <https://www.dol.gov/agencies/osec/stratplan>.

Dated: November 1, 2017.

Bryan Slater,

Assistant Secretary for Administration and Management.

[FR Doc. 2017–24212 Filed 11–6–17; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–04–P

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[NRC–2017–0212]

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

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Biweekly notice.

**SUMMARY:** Pursuant to Section 189a. (2) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is publishing this regular biweekly notice. The Act requires the Commission to publish notice of any amendments issued, or proposed to be issued, and grants the Commission the authority to issue and make immediately effective any amendment to an operating license or combined license, as applicable, upon a determination by the Commission that such amendment involves no significant hazards consideration, notwithstanding the pendency before the Commission of a request for a hearing from any person.

This biweekly notice includes all notices of amendments issued, or proposed to be issued, from October 7 to October 23, 2017. The last biweekly notice was published on October 24, 2017.

**DATES:** Comments must be filed by December 7, 2017. A request for a hearing must be filed by January 8, 2018.

**ADDRESSES:** You may submit comments by any of the following methods (unless this document describes a different method for submitting comments on a specific subject):

- *Federal Rulemaking Web site:* Go to <http://www.regulations.gov> and search for Docket ID NRC–2017–0212. Address questions about NRC dockets to Carol Gallagher; telephone: 301–415–3463; email: [Carol.Gallagher@nrc.gov](mailto:Carol.Gallagher@nrc.gov). For technical questions, contact the individual listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section of this document.

- *Mail comments to:* May Ma, Office of Administration, Mail Stop: OWFN–2–A13, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory

Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001.

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

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Beverly A. Clayton, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001; telephone: 301–415–3475, email: [beverly.clayton@nrc.gov](mailto:beverly.clayton@nrc.gov).

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

#### I. Obtaining Information and Submitting Comments

##### A. Obtaining Information

Please refer to Docket ID NRC–2017–0212, facility name, unit number(s), plant docket number, application date, and subject when contacting the NRC about the availability of information for this action. You may obtain publicly-available information related to this action by any of the following methods:

- *Federal Rulemaking Web site:* Go to <http://www.regulations.gov> and search for Docket ID NRC–2017–0212.

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

- *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–2017–0212, facility name, unit number(s), plant docket number, application date, and subject in your comment submission.

The NRC cautions you not to include identifying or contact information that you do not want to be publicly disclosed in your comment submission. The NRC will post all comment submissions at <http://www.regulations.gov> as well as enter the comment submissions into ADAMS. The NRC does not routinely edit

comment submissions to remove identifying or contact information.

If you are requesting or aggregating comments from other persons for submission to the NRC, then you should inform those persons not to include identifying or contact information that they do not want to be publicly disclosed in their comment submission. Your request should state that the NRC does not routinely edit comment submissions to remove such information before making the comment submissions available to the public or entering the comment into ADAMS.

## **II. Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendments to Facility Operating Licenses and Combined Licenses and Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination**

The Commission has made a proposed determination that the following amendment requests involve no significant hazards consideration. Under the Commission's regulations in § 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 if 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. If the Commission takes 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. If the Commission makes a

final no significant hazards consideration determination, any hearing will take place after issuance. The Commission expects that the need to take this action will occur very infrequently.

### ***A. Opportunity To Request a Hearing and Petition for Leave To Intervene***

Within 60 days after the date of publication of this notice, any persons (petitioner) whose interest may be affected by this action may file a request for a hearing and petition for leave to intervene (petition) with respect to the action. Petitions shall be filed in accordance with the Commission's "Agency Rules of Practice and Procedure" in 10 CFR part 2. Interested persons should consult a current copy of 10 CFR 2.309. 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/>. Alternatively, a copy of the regulations is available at the NRC's Public Document Room, located at One White Flint North, Room O1-F21, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland 20852. If a petition is filed, the Commission or a presiding officer will rule on the petition and, if appropriate, a notice of a hearing will be issued.

As required by 10 CFR 2.309(d) the petition should specifically explain the reasons why intervention should be permitted with particular reference to the following general requirements for standing: (1) The name, address, and telephone number of the petitioner; (2) the nature of the petitioner's right under the Act to be made a party to the proceeding; (3) the nature and extent of the 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 petitioner's interest.

In accordance with 10 CFR 2.309(f), the petition must also set forth the specific contentions which the petitioner seeks to have litigated in 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 petitioner must provide a brief explanation of the bases for the contention and a concise statement of the alleged facts or expert opinion which support the contention and on which the petitioner intends to rely in proving the contention at the hearing. The petitioner must also provide references to the specific sources and documents on which the petitioner intends to rely to support its position on the issue. The petition must include sufficient information to show

that a genuine dispute exists with the applicant or licensee on a material issue of law or fact. Contentions must be limited to matters within the scope of the proceeding. The contention must be one which, if proven, would entitle the petitioner to relief. A petitioner who fails to satisfy the requirements at 10 CFR 2.309(f) 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. Parties have the opportunity to participate fully in the conduct of the hearing with respect to resolution of that party's admitted contentions, including the opportunity to present evidence, consistent with the NRC's regulations, policies, and procedures.

Petitions must be filed no later than 60 days from the date of publication of this notice. Petitions and motions for leave to file new or amended contentions that are filed after the deadline will not be entertained absent a determination by the presiding officer that the filing demonstrates good cause by satisfying the three factors in 10 CFR 2.309(c)(1)(i) through (iii). The petition must be filed in accordance with the filing instructions in the "Electronic Submissions (E-Filing)" section of this document.

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 establish 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 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 the amendment unless the Commission finds an imminent danger to the health or safety of the public, in which case it will issue an appropriate order or rule under 10 CFR part 2.

A State, local governmental body, Federally-recognized Indian Tribe, or agency thereof, may submit a petition to the Commission to participate as a party under 10 CFR 2.309(h)(1). The petition should state the nature and extent of the petitioner's interest in the proceeding.

The petition should be submitted to the Commission no later than 60 days from the date of publication of this notice. The petition must be filed in accordance with the filing instructions in the "Electronic Submissions (E-Filing)" section of this document, and should meet the requirements for petitions set forth in this section, except that under 10 CFR 2.309(h)(2) a State, local governmental body, or federally recognized Indian Tribe, or agency thereof does not need to address the standing requirements in 10 CFR 2.309(d) if the facility is located within its boundaries. Alternatively, a State, local governmental body, Federally-recognized Indian Tribe, or agency thereof may participate as a non-party under 10 CFR 2.315(c).

If a hearing is granted, any person who is not a party to the proceeding and is not affiliated with or represented by a party may, at the discretion of the presiding officer, be permitted to make a limited appearance pursuant to the provisions of 10 CFR 2.315(a). A person making a limited appearance may make an oral or written statement of his or her position on the issues but may not otherwise participate in the proceeding. A limited appearance may be made at any session of the hearing or at any prehearing conference, subject to the limits and conditions as may be imposed by the presiding officer. Details regarding the opportunity to make a limited appearance will be provided by the presiding officer if such sessions are scheduled.

#### *B. Electronic Submissions (E-Filing)*

All documents filed in NRC adjudicatory proceedings, including a request for hearing and petition for leave to intervene (petition), 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 that request to participate under 10 CFR 2.315(c), must be filed in accordance with the NRC's E-Filing rule (72 FR 49139; August 28, 2007, as amended at 77 FR 46562, August 3, 2012). 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. Detailed guidance on making electronic submissions may be found in the Guidance for Electronic Submissions to the NRC and on the NRC Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/e-submittals.html>. 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 (1) request a digital identification (ID) certificate, which allows the participant (or its counsel or representative) to digitally sign submissions and access the E-Filing system for any proceeding in which it is participating; and (2) advise the Secretary that the participant will be submitting a petition or other adjudicatory document (even in instances in which the participant, or its counsel or representative, already holds an NRC-issued digital ID certificate). Based upon this information, the Secretary will establish an electronic docket for the hearing in this proceeding if the Secretary has not already established an electronic docket.

Information about applying for a digital ID certificate is available on the NRC's public Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/e-submittals/getting-started.html>. Once a participant has obtained a digital ID certificate and a docket has been created, the participant can then submit adjudicatory documents. Submissions must be in Portable Document Format (PDF). Additional guidance on PDF submissions is available on the NRC's public Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/electronic-sub-ref-mat.html>. A filing is considered complete at the time the document is 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 document on those participants separately. Therefore, applicants and other participants (or their counsel or representative) must apply for and receive a digital ID certificate before adjudicatory documents are filed so that they can obtain access to the documents via the E-Filing system.

A person filing electronically using the NRC's adjudicatory E-Filing system may seek assistance by contacting the

NRC's Electronic Filing Help Desk through the "Contact Us" link located on the NRC's public Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/e-submittals.html>, by email to [MSHD.Resource@nrc.gov](mailto:MSHD.Resource@nrc.gov), or by a toll-free call at 1-866-672-7640. The NRC Electronic Filing Help Desk is available between 9 a.m. and 6 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 stating why there is good cause for not filing electronically and 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, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland, 20852, Attention: Rulemaking and Adjudications Staff. Participants filing adjudicatory documents 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 <https://adams.nrc.gov/ehd>, unless excluded pursuant to an order of the Commission or the presiding officer. If you do not have an NRC-issued digital ID certificate as described above, click cancel when the link requests certificates and you will be automatically directed to the NRC's electronic hearing dockets where you will be able to access any publicly available documents in a particular hearing docket. Participants are requested not to include personal privacy information, such as social security numbers, home addresses, or personal phone numbers in their filings, unless an NRC regulation or other law requires submission of such information. For example, in some

instances, individuals provide home addresses in order to demonstrate proximity to a facility or site. 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.

For further details with respect to these license amendment applications, see the application for amendment which is available for public inspection in ADAMS and at the NRC's PDR. For additional direction on accessing information related to this document, see the "Obtaining Information and Submitting Comments" section of this document.

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

*Date of amendment request:* August 31, 2017. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML17243A422.

*Description of amendment request:* The proposed amendment would replace existing technical specifications (TS) requirements related to "operations with a potential for draining the reactor vessel" (OPDRVs) with new requirements on reactor pressure vessel water inventory control (RPV WIC) to protect Safety Limit 2.1.1.3, which requires reactor vessel water level to be greater than the top of active irradiated fuel.

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

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

*Response:* No.

The proposed change replaces existing TS requirements related to OPDRVs with new requirements on RPV WIC that will protect Safety Limit 2.1.1.3. Draining of RPV water inventory in Mode 4 (*i.e.*, cold shutdown) and Mode 5 (*i.e.*, refueling) is not an accident previously evaluated and, therefore, replacing the existing TS controls to prevent or mitigate such an event with a new set of controls has no effect on any accident previously evaluated. RPV water inventory control in Mode 4 or Mode 5 is not an initiator of any accident previously evaluated. The existing OPDRV controls or the proposed RPV WIC controls are not mitigating actions assumed in any accident previously evaluated.

The proposed change reduces the probability of an unexpected draining event (which is not a previously evaluated

accident) by imposing new requirements on the limiting time in which an unexpected draining event could result in the reactor vessel water level dropping to the top of the active fuel (TAF). These controls require cognizance of the plant configuration and control of configurations with unacceptably short drain times. These requirements reduce the probability of an unexpected draining event. The current TS requirements are only mitigating actions and impose no requirements that reduce the probability of an unexpected draining event.

The proposed change reduces the consequences of an unexpected draining event (which is not a previously evaluated accident) by requiring an Emergency Core Cooling System (ECCS) subsystem to be operable at all times in Modes 4 and 5. The current TS requirements do not require any water injection systems, ECCS or otherwise, to be Operable in certain conditions in Mode 5. The change in requirement from two ECCS subsystems to one ECCS subsystem in Modes 4 and 5 does not significantly affect the consequences of an unexpected draining event because the proposed Actions ensure equipment is available within the limiting drain time that is as capable of mitigating the event as the current requirements. The proposed controls provide escalating compensatory measures to be established as calculated drain times decrease, such as verification of a second method of water injection and additional confirmations that containment and/or filtration would be available if needed.

The proposed change reduces or eliminates some requirements that were determined to be unnecessary to manage the consequences of an unexpected draining event, such as automatic initiation of an ECCS subsystem and control room ventilation. These changes do not affect the consequences of any accident previously evaluated since a draining event in Modes 4 and 5 is not a previously evaluated accident and the requirements are not needed to adequately respond to a draining event.

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 change replaces existing TS requirements related to OPDRVs with new requirements on RPV WIC that will protect Safety Limit 2.1.1.3. The proposed change will not alter the design function of the equipment involved. Under the proposed change, some systems that are currently required to be operable during OPDRVs would be required to be available within the limiting drain time or to be in service depending on the limiting drain time. Should those systems be unable to be placed into service, the consequences are no different than if those systems were unable to perform their function under the current TS requirements.

The event of concern under the current requirements and the proposed change is an

unexpected draining event. The proposed change does not create new failure mechanisms, malfunctions, or accident initiators that would cause a draining event or a new or different kind of accident not previously evaluated or included in the design and licensing bases.

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

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

*Response:* No.

The proposed change replaces existing TS requirements related to OPDRVs with new requirements on RPV WIC. The current requirements do not have a stated safety basis and no margin of safety is established in the licensing basis. The safety basis for the new requirements is to protect Safety Limit 2.1.1.3. New requirements are added to determine the limiting time in which the RPV water inventory could drain to the top of the active fuel in the reactor vessel should an unexpected draining event occur. Plant configurations that could result in lowering the RPV water level to the TAF within one hour are now prohibited. New escalating compensatory measures based on the limiting drain time replace the current controls. The proposed TS establish a safety margin by providing defense-in-depth to ensure that the Safety Limit is protected and to protect the public health and safety. While some less restrictive requirements are proposed for plant configurations with long calculated drain times, the overall effect of the change is to improve plant safety and to add safety margin.

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:* Jon P. Christinidis, DTE Energy, Expert Attorney—Regulatory, 688 WCB, One Energy Plaza, Detroit, MI 48226–1279.

Energy Northwest, Docket No. 50–397, Columbia Generating Station, Benton County, Washington

*Date of amendment request:* July 25, 2017. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML17206A543.

*Description of amendment request:* The amendment would delete the Note associated with Surveillance Requirement 3.5.1.2 to reflect the Residual Heat Removal system's design, and ensure that the system's operation is consistent with the limiting condition for operation requirements in Technical Specification 3.5.1, "ECCS [Emergency Core Cooling System]—Operating."

*Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:*

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

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

*Response:* No.

No physical changes to the facility will occur as a result of this proposed amendment. The proposed change will not alter the physical design. The current Technical Specification Note could make Columbia susceptible to potential water hammer in the Residual Heat Removal system if in the Shutdown Cooling Mode of Residual Heat Removal in Mode 3 when swapping from the Shutdown Cooling to Low Pressure Core Injection mode of Residual Heat Removal system. The proposed License Amendment Request will eliminate the risk for cavitation of the pump and voiding in the suction piping, thereby avoiding potential to damage the Residual Heat Removal system, including water hammer.

Therefore there is no 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 analyzed?

*Response:* No.

The proposed change does not alter the physical design, safety limits, or safety analysis assumptions associated with the operation of the plant. Accordingly, the change does not introduce any new accident initiators, nor does it reduce or adversely affect the capabilities of any plant structure, system, or component to perform their safety function. Deletion of the Technical Specification Note is appropriate because current Technical Specification could put the plant at risk for potential cavitation of the pump and voiding in the suction piping, resulting in potential to damage the Residual Heat Removal system, including water hammer.

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.

The proposed change does not alter the physical design, safety limits, or safety analysis assumptions associated with the operation of the plant. Accordingly, the change does not introduce any new accident initiators, nor does it reduce or adversely affect the capabilities of any plant structure, system, or component to perform their safety function. Deletion of the Technical Specification Note is appropriate because current Technical Specification could put the plant at risk for potential cavitation of the pump and voiding in the suction piping, resulting in potential to damage the Residual Heat Removal system, including water hammer.

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

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

*Attorney for licensee:* William A. Horin, Esq., Winston & Strawn, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, DC 20006–3817.

*NRC Branch Chief:* Robert J. Pascarelli.

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

*Date of amendment request:* March 30, 2017, as supplemented by letter dated October 17, 2017. Publicly-available versions are in ADAMS under Accession Nos. ML17089A380 and ML17290A342, respectively.

*Description of amendment request:* The license amendment request was originally noticed in the **Federal Register** on May 23, 2017 (82 FR 23623). The notice is being reissued in its entirety to include the revised scope, description of the amendment request, and proposed no significant hazards consideration determination. The proposed amendment would revise the PNP Cyber Security Plan Milestone 8 full implementation date from December 15, 2017, to March 31, 2019.

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

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

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

*Response:* No.

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

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

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

*Attorney for licensee:* William Glew, Associate General Counsel—Nuclear, Entergy Services, Inc., 440 Hamilton Ave., White Plains, NY 10601.

*NRC Branch Chief:* David J. Wrona.

Exelon Generation Company, LLC, Docket No. 50–333, James A. FitzPatrick Nuclear Power Plant, Oswego County, New York

*Date of amendment request:* September 14, 2017. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML17257A193.

*Description of amendment request:* The amendment would revise the James A. FitzPatrick Nuclear Power Plant

Technical Specifications (TSs) to address secondary containment personnel access door openings.

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

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

*Response:* No.

The proposed change addresses conditions during which the secondary containment SR [Surveillance Requirement] 3.6.4.1.3 is not met. The secondary containment is not an initiator of any accident previously evaluated. As a result, the probability of any accident previously evaluated is not increased. The consequences of an accident previously evaluated while utilizing the proposed changes are no different than the consequences of an accident while utilizing the existing four-hour Completion Time for an inoperable secondary containment. As a result, the consequences of an accident previously evaluated are not significantly increased.

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

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

*Response:* No.

The proposed change does not alter the protection system design, create new failure modes, or change any modes of operation. The proposed change does not involve a physical alteration of the plant; and no new or different kind of equipment will be installed. Consequently, there are no new initiators that could result in a new or different kind of accident.

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

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

*Response:* No.

The proposed change would provide an allowance for brief, inadvertent, simultaneous opening of redundant secondary containment personnel access doors during normal entry and exit conditions. The allowance for both an inner and outer secondary containment access door to be open simultaneously for entry and exit does not significantly impact the ability to maintain the required secondary containment vacuum as the doors are promptly closed after entry or exit, thereby restoring the secondary containment boundary. In addition, brief, inadvertent, simultaneous opening and closing of redundant secondary containment personnel access doors during entry and exit conditions does not significantly impact the ability of the Standby Gas Treatment (SGT) System to

maintain the required secondary containment vacuum. Therefore, the safety function of the secondary containment is not affected.

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

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

*Attorney for licensee:* Donald P. Ferraro, Assistant General Counsel, Exelon Generation Company, LLC, 200 Exelon Way, Suite 305, Kennett Square, PA 19348.

*NRC Branch Chief:* James G. Danna.

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

FirstEnergy Nuclear Operating Company, et al., Docket No. 50–346, Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station, Unit No. 1, Ottawa County, Ohio

FirstEnergy Nuclear Operating Company, et al., Docket No. 50–440, Perry Nuclear Power Plant, Unit No. 1, Lake County, Ohio

*Date of amendment request:* August 11, 2017. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML17227A172.

*Description of amendment request:* The proposed amendments change the respective technical specifications (TSs) as follows:

The proposed changes revise Section 1.3, "Completion Times," and Section 3.0, "LCO Applicability" of the TSs to clarify the use and application of the TS usage rules, as described below:

- Section 1.3 is revised to clarify "discovery" and to discuss exceptions to starting the Completion Time at condition entry.
- Limiting Condition for Operation (LCO) 3.0.4.b is revised to clarify that LCO 3.0.4.a, LCO 3.0.4.b, and LCO 3.0.4.c are independent options.
- Surveillance Requirement (SR) 3.0.3 is revised to allow application of SR 3.0.3 when an SR has not been previously performed and to clarify the application of SR 3.0.3.

The proposed changes to the TSs are consistent with Technical Specification Task Force (TSTF–529), Revision 4, "Clarify Use and Application Rules." The NRC staff issued a safety evaluation for TSTF–529 (ADAMS Accession No. ML16060A440) provided to the Technical Specifications Task Force in

a letter dated April 21, 2016 (ADAMS Package Accession No. ML16060A441). This review included a review of the NRC staff's evaluation, as well as the information provided in TSTF–529. The NRC letter dated April 21, 2016, included the model application, No Significant Hazards Consideration (NSHC) Determination, and the model safety evaluation for referencing in license amendment applications. The licensee affirmed the applicability of the model NSHC determination in its application dated August 11, 2017, which is presented below.

*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, along with NRC edits in square brackets:

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

*Response:* No.

The proposed changes to Section 1.3 and LCO 3.0.4 have no effect on the requirement for systems to be Operable and have no effect on the application of TS actions. The proposed change to SR 3.0.3 states that the allowance may only be used when there is a reasonable expectation the surveillance will be met when performed. Since the proposed change does not significantly affect system Operability, the proposed change will have no significant effect on the initiating events for accidents previously evaluated and will have no significant effect on the ability of the systems to mitigate accidents previously evaluated.

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

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

*Response:* No.

The proposed change to the TS usage rules does not affect the design or function of any plant systems. The proposed change does not change the Operability requirements for plant systems or the actions taken when plant systems are not operable.

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

*Response:* No.

The proposed change clarifies the application of Section 1.3 and LCO 3.0.4 and does not result in changes in plant operation. SR 3.0.3 is revised to allow application of SR 3.0.3 when an SR has not been previously performed if there is reasonable expectation that the SR will be met when performed. This expands the use of SR 3.0.3 while ensuring the affected system is capable of performing



its safety function. As a result, plant safety is either improved or unaffected.

Therefore, it is concluded that this change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

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

*Attorney for licensee:* David W. Jenkins, FirstEnergy Nuclear Operating Company, FirstEnergy Corporation, 76 South Main Street, Mail Stop A-GO-15, Akron, OH 44308.

*NRC Acting Branch Chief:* David J. Wrona.

FirstEnergy Nuclear Operating Company, Docket No. 50-440, Perry Nuclear Power Plant, Unit No. 1, Lake County, Ohio

*Date of amendment request:* September 11, 2017. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML17254A495.

*Description of amendment request:* The proposed amendment would revise the technical specification (TS) requirements in TS 3.3.6.1, "Primary Containment and Drywell Isolation Instrumentation," by adding an Actions note allowing intermittent opening, under administrative control, of penetration flow paths that are isolated. The proposed change is consistent with NRC-approved Technical Specifications Task Force (TSTF) traveler TSTF-306-A, Revision 2, "Add Action to [Limiting Condition for Operation (LCO)] 3.3.6.1 to Give Option to Isolate the Penetration."

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

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

*Response:* No.

The proposed change to adopt TSTF-306-A allows primary containment and drywell isolation valves to be unisolated under administrative controls when the associated isolation instrumentation is not operable. The isolation function is an accident mitigating function and is not an initiator of an accident previously evaluated. Administrative controls are required to be in effect when the valves are unisolated so that the penetration can be rapidly isolated when the need is indicated.

The addition of the note that the penetration flow paths may be unisolated

under administrative control provides consistency and clarification with the intermittent opening allowances contained in LCO 3.6.1.3, "Primary Containment Isolation Valves (PCIVs)," and LCO 3.6.5.3, "Drywell Isolation Valves," allowed elsewhere in the Technical Specifications (TS).

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 change does not involve any physical changes to plant equipment and does not change the method by which any safety-related system performs its function. The Perry Nuclear Power Plant TS currently allow containment and drywell isolation valves to be open under administrative control after being closed to comply with TS ACTIONS for inoperable valves.

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

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

*Response:* No.

The proposed change does not affect the operation of plant equipment or the function of any equipment assumed in the accident analysis. The allowance to unisolate a penetration flow path will not have a significant effect on the margin of safety because the penetration flow path can be isolated manually, if needed. This change simply provides consistency with what is already allowed elsewhere in the TSs. There are no changes being made to safety analysis assumptions or results. When the valves are unisolated, the design basis function of containment isolation is maintained by administrative controls.

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

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

*Attorney for licensee:* David W. Jenkins, Attorney, FirstEnergy Corporation, Mail Stop A-GO-15, 76 South Main Street, Akron, OH 44308.

*NRC Branch Chief:* David J. Wrona.

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

*Date of amendment request:* September 14, 2017. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML17257A300.

*Description of amendment request:* The amendments would revise the

Technical Specifications related to inoperable Auxiliary Feedwater pump steam supply.

*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 Auxiliary Feedwater (AFW) system is not an initiator of any design basis accident or event, and therefore the proposed changes do not increase the probability of any accident previously evaluated. The proposed changes to address the condition of one inoperable AFW pump due to an inoperable steam supply or one inoperable AFW pump due to an inoperable steam supply concurrent with one inoperable motor-driven AFW pump do not change the response of the plant to any accidents. The proposed changes do not adversely affect accident initiators or precursors nor alter the design assumptions, conditions, and configuration of the facility or the manner in which the plant is operated and maintained. The proposed changes do not adversely affect the ability of structures, systems, and components (SSCs) to perform their intended safety function to mitigate the consequences of an initiating event within the assumed acceptance limits. The proposed changes do not affect the source term, containment isolation, or radiological release assumptions used in evaluating the radiological consequences of any accident previously evaluated. Further, the proposed changes do not increase the types and amounts of radioactive effluent that may be released offsite, nor significantly increase individual or cumulative occupational/public radiation exposures.

Therefore, facility operation in accordance with the proposed license amendments would 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 changes do not result in a change in the manner in which the AFW system provides plant protection. The AFW system will continue to supply water to the Steam Generators to remove decay heat and other residual heat by delivering at least the minimum required flow rate. There are no design changes associated with the proposed changes. The changes to the required actions and completion times do not change any existing accident scenarios, nor create any new or different accident scenarios. The changes do not involve a physical alteration of the plant (i.e., no new or different type of equipment will be installed) or a change in the methods governing normal plant operation. In addition, the changes do not

impose any new or different requirements or eliminate any existing requirements. The changes do not alter assumptions made in the safety analysis. The proposed changes are consistent with the safety analysis assumptions and current plant operating practice.

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

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

*Response:* No.

The proposed changes do not alter the manner in which safety limits, limiting safety system settings or limiting conditions for operation are determined. The safety analysis acceptance criteria are not impacted by these changes. The proposed changes will not result in plant operation in a configuration outside the design basis.

Therefore, operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment will 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:* William S. Blair, Managing Attorney—Nuclear, Florida Power & Light Company, 700 Universe Boulevard, MS LAW/JB, Juno Beach, FL 33408–0420.

*NRC Branch Chief:* Undine Shoop.

Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Docket Nos. 50–275 and 50–323, Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2, San Luis Obispo County, California

*Date of amendment request:* September 28, 2017. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML17271A090.

*Description of amendment request:* The amendments would revise Technical Specifications (TSs) 3.1.4, “Rod Group Alignment Limits”; 3.1.5, “Shutdown Bank Insertion Limits”; 3.1.6, “Control Rod Insertion Limits”; and 3.1.7, “Rod Position Indication,” to adopt Technical Specification Task Force (TSTF) Traveler TSTF–547, Revision 1, “Clarification of Rod Position Requirements (ADAMS Accession No. ML15365A610). The NRC staff approved the TSTF and issued an associated model safety evaluation by letter dated March 4, 2016 (ADAMS Accession No. ML16012A126).

*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.

Control and shutdown rods are assumed to insert into the core to shut down the reactor in evaluated accidents. Rod insertion limits ensure that adequate negative reactivity is available to provide the assumed shutdown margin (SDM). Rod alignment and overlap limits maintain an appropriate power distribution and reactivity insertion profile.

Control and shutdown rods are initiators to several accidents previously evaluated, such as rod ejection. The proposed change does not change the limiting conditions for operation for the rods or make any technical changes to the Technical Specification (TS) Surveillance Requirements (SRs) governing the rods. Therefore, the proposed change has no effect on the probability of any accident previously evaluated.

Revising the TS Actions to provide a limited time to repair rod movement control has no effect on the SDM assumed in the accident analysis as the proposed Actions require verification that SDM is maintained. The effects on power distribution will not cause a significant increase in the consequences of any accident previously evaluated as all TS requirements on power distribution continue to be applicable.

Revising the TS Actions to provide an alternative to frequent use of the moveable incore detector system or the Power Distribution Monitoring System to verify the position of rods with inoperable rod position indicator does not change the requirement for the rods to be aligned and within the insertion limits.

Therefore, the assumptions used in any accidents previously evaluated are unchanged and there is no significant increase in the consequences.

The proposed change to resolve the differences in the TS ensure that the intended Actions are followed when equipment is inoperable. Actions taken with inoperable equipment are not assumptions in the accidents previously evaluated and have no significant effect on the consequences.

The proposed change to eliminate an unnecessary action has no effect on the consequences of accidents previously evaluated as the analysis of those accidents did not consider the use of the action.

The proposed change to increase consistency within the TS has no effect on the consequences of accidents previously evaluated as the proposed change clarifies the application of the existing requirements and does not change the intent.

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 accident from any accident previously evaluated?

*Response:* No.

The proposed change does not involve a physical alteration of the plant (*i.e.*, no new or different type of equipment will be

installed). The change does not alter assumptions made in the safety analyses. The proposed change does not alter the limiting conditions for operation for the rods or make any technical changes to the Surveillance Requirements governing the rods. The proposed change maintains or improves safety when equipment is inoperable and does not introduce new failure modes.

Therefore, the proposed change does not create the possibility of a new or different 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 to allow an alternative method of verifying rod position has no effect on the safety margin as actual rod position is not affected. The proposed change to provide time to repair rods that are operable but immovable does not result in a significant reduction in the margin of safety because all rods must be verified to be operable, and all other banks must be within the insertion limits. The remaining proposed changes to make the requirements internally consistent and to eliminate unnecessary actions do not affect the margin of safety as the changes do not affect the ability of the rods to perform their specified safety function.

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 requests involve no significant hazards consideration.

*Attorney for licensee:* Jennifer Post, Esq., Pacific Gas and Electric Company, P.O. Box 7442, San Francisco, California 94120.

*NRC Branch Chief:* Robert J. Pascarelli.

### III. 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 can be accessed as described in the "Obtaining Information and Submitting Comments" section of this document.

*Entergy Operations, Inc., Docket No. 50-313, Arkansas Nuclear One, Unit 1 (ANO-1), Pope County, Arkansas*

*Date of amendment request:* April 24, 2017.

*Brief description of amendment:* The amendment revised technical specification requirements regarding steam generator tube inspections and reporting as described in Technical Specifications Task Force (TSTF) Traveler TSTF-510, Revision 2, "Revision to Steam Generator Program Inspection Frequencies and Tube Sample Selection," using the Consolidated Line Item Improvement Process for ANO-1.

*Date of issuance:* October 10, 2017.

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

*Amendment No.:* 258. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML17235A519; documents related to this amendment are listed in the Safety Evaluation enclosed with the amendment.

*Renewed Facility Operating License No. DPR-51:* Amendment revised the Operating License and Technical Specifications.

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* July 5, 2017 (82 FR 31092).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated October 10, 2017.

*No significant hazards consideration comments received:* No.

*Entergy Operations, Inc., Docket No. 50-368, Arkansas Nuclear One, Unit 2 (ANO-2), Pope County, Arkansas*

*Date of amendment request:* April 24, 2017.

*Brief description of amendment:* The amendment revised technical specification requirements regarding steam generator tube inspections and reporting as described in Technical Specifications Task Force (TSTF) Traveler TSTF-510, Revision 2, "Revision to Steam Generator Program Inspection Frequencies and Tube Sample Selection," using the Consolidated Line Item Improvement Process for ANO-2.

*Date of issuance:* October 10, 2017.

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

*Amendment No.:* 307. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML17251A211; documents related to this amendment are listed in the Safety Evaluation enclosed with the amendment.

*Renewed Facility Operating License No. NPF-6:* Amendment revised the Operating License and Technical Specifications.

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* July 5, 2017 (82 FR 31093).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated October 10, 2017.

*No significant hazards consideration comments received:* No.

*FirstEnergy Nuclear Operating Company and FirstEnergy Nuclear Generation, LLC, Docket Nos. 50-334 and 50-412, Beaver Valley Power Station, Units 1 and 2, Beaver County, Pennsylvania*

*Date of amendment request:* September 28, 2016, as supplemented by letters dated May 20, 2017; September 7, 2017; and September 20, 2017.

*Brief description of amendments:* The amendments revised the Beaver Valley Power Station, Units 1 and 2, emergency action level (EAL) scheme to one based on Nuclear Energy Institute (NEI) document NEI 99-01, Revision 6, "Development of Emergency Action Level for Non-Passive Reactors," November 2012.

*Date of issuance:* October 12, 2017.

*Effective date:* As of the date of issuance and shall be implemented within 180 days of issuance.

*Amendment Nos.:* 300 (Unit 1) and 189 (Unit 2). A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML17216A570; documents related to these amendments are listed in the Safety Evaluation enclosed with the amendments.

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

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* December 20, 2016 (81 FR 92868). The supplemental letters dated May 20, 2017; September 7, 2017; and September 20, 2017, provided additional information that clarified the application, did not expand the scope of the application as originally noticed, and did not change the NRC staff's original proposed no significant hazards consideration determination as published in the **Federal Register**.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated October 12, 2017.

*No significant hazards consideration comments received:* No.

*FirstEnergy Nuclear Operating Company, et al., Docket No. 50-346, Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station, Unit No. 1, Ottawa County, Ohio*

*Date of application for amendment:* January 11, 2017.

*Brief description of amendment:* The amendment changes Technical Specification 3.3.1, "Reactor Protection System (RPS) Instrumentation" for Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station, Unit No. 1, by modifying the format and by providing an alternative set of required actions, with longer completion times, to be used when the ultrasonic flow meter is out of service.

*Date of issuance:* October 19, 2017.

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

*Amendment No.:* 296. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML17270A112; documents related to this amendment are listed in the Safety Evaluation enclosed with the amendment.

*Renewed Facility Operating License No. NPF-3:* The amendment revised the renewed facility operating license and technical specifications.

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* March 14, 2017 (82 FR 13665).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated October 19, 2017.

*No significant hazards consideration comments received:* No.

*FirstEnergy Nuclear Operating Company, Docket No. 50-440, Perry Nuclear Power Plant (PNPP), Unit No. 1, Lake County, Ohio*

*Date of amendment request:* April 26, 2017.

*Brief description of amendment:* The amendment revised the PNPP Environmental Protection Plan (Nonradiological) to clarify and enhance wording, to remove duplicative or outdated program information, and to relieve the burden of submitting unnecessary or duplicative information to the NRC.

*Date of issuance:* October 19, 2017.

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

*Amendment No.:* 178. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML17257A098; documents related to this amendment are listed in the Safety Evaluation enclosed with the amendment.

*Facility Operating License No. NPF-58:* Amendment revised the Facility Operating License.

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* July 5, 2017 (82 FR 31097).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated October 19, 2017.

*No significant hazards consideration comments received:* No.

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

*Date of amendment request:* May 2, 2017.

*Brief description of amendments:* The amendments revised the Renewed Facility Operating Licenses' "Fire Protection" license conditions. The changes incorporated new references into these license conditions that approved a revision to plant modifications previously approved in the March 31, 2016, NRC issuance of National Fire Protection Association Standard 805 license amendments (ADAMS Accession No. ML15344A346).

*Date of issuance:* October 23, 2017.

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

*Amendment Nos.:* 242 (Unit No. 1) and 193 (Unit No. 2). A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML17248A379; documents related to these amendments are listed in the Safety Evaluation enclosed with the amendments.

*Renewed Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-67 and NPF-16:* Amendments revised the Renewed Facility Operating Licenses.

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* July 5, 2017 (82 FR 31098).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated October 23, 2017.

*No significant hazards consideration comments received:* No.

*NextEra Energy Duane Arnold, LLC, Docket No. 50-331, Duane Arnold Energy Center (DAEC), Linn County, Iowa*

*Date of amendment request:* March 31, 2017.

*Brief description of amendment:* The amendment revised the DAEC Plume Exposure Pathway Emergency Planning Zone (EPZ) in its Emergency Preparedness Plan. The DAEC Evacuation Time Estimates Study has also been revised to encompass the changes proposed to the DAEC Plume Exposure Pathway EPZ boundary.

*Date of issuance:* October 18, 2017.

*Effective date:* As of the date of issuance and shall be implemented within 180 days.

*Amendment No.:* 301. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML17212A646; documents related to this amendment are listed in the Safety Evaluation enclosed with the amendment.

*Renewed Facility Operating License No. DPR-49:* The amendment revised the Emergency Plan.

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* June 6, 2017 (82 FR 26132).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated October 18, 2017.

*No significant hazards consideration comments received:* No.

*Tennessee Valley Authority, Docket Nos. 50-390 and 50-391, Watts Bar Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2, Rhea County, Tennessee*

*Date of amendment request:* October 20, 2016, as supplemented by letters dated May 5, 2017, and July 21, 2017.

*Brief description of amendments:* The amendments revised Technical Specification 3.7.12, "Auxiliary Building Gas Treatment System (ABGTS)," to provide an action when both trains of the ABGTS are inoperable due to the auxiliary building secondary containment enclosure boundary being inoperable.

*Date of issuance:* October 17, 2017.

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

*Amendment Nos.:* 116 (Unit 1) and 16 (Unit 2). A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML17236A057; documents related to these amendments are listed in the Safety Evaluation enclosed with the amendments.

*Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-90 and NPF-96:* Amendments revised the Facility Operating Licenses and Technical Specifications.

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* February 28, 2017 (82 FR 12137). The supplemental letters dated May 5, 2017, and July 21, 2017, provided additional information that clarified the application, did not expand the scope of the application as originally noticed, and did not change the NRC staff's original proposed no significant hazards consideration determination as published in the **Federal Register**.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated October 17, 2017.

*No significant hazards consideration comments received:* No.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Anne T. Boland,**

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

[FR Doc. 2017-23749 Filed 11-6-17; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7590-01-P**

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[NRC-2017-0215]

### Yttrium-90 Microsphere Brachytherapy Sources and Devices TheraSphere® and SIR-Spheres®

**AGENCY:** Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

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

**SUMMARY:** The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is revising its licensing guidance for licenses authorizing the use of Yttrium-90 (Y-90) Microsphere Brachytherapy Sources and Devices TheraSphere® and SIR-Spheres®. The NRC is requesting public comment on the draft revision of the licensing guidance (Rev. 10). The document has been revised to significantly update the criteria for training and experience, medical event reporting, inventory requirement specifications, and waste disposal issues. The revised guidance document