

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: September 25, 2007 (72 FR 54479). The supplement dated January 24, 2008, provided additional information that clarified the application, did not expand the scope of the application as originally noticed, and did not change the staff's original proposed no significant hazards consideration determination. The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated February 20, 2008.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

PSEG Nuclear LLC, Docket Nos. 50-272 and 50-311, Salem Nuclear Generating Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Salem County, New Jersey

Date of application for amendments: March 16, 2007, as supplemented on August 30, September 14, and November 20, 2007, and January 16, 2008.

Brief description of amendments: The amendments revise the Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (UFSAR) to modify the Salem licensing basis with respect to the response times associated with a steam generator feedwater pump (SGFP) trip and feedwater isolation valve (FIV) closure. The amendments also revise the Technical Specification (TS) requirements for the containment fan cooler unit (CFCU) cooling water flow rate. These changes are associated with a revised containment response analysis that credits an SGFP trip and FIV closure (on a feedwater regulator valve failure) to reduce the mass/energy release to the containment during a main steam line break. The containment analysis also credits a reduced heat removal capability for the CFCUs, allowing a reduction in the required service water flow to the CFCUs.

Date of issuance: February 27, 2008.

Effective date: As of the date of issuance, to be implemented prior to restart from refueling outage 1R19 for Salem Unit 1 and prior to restart from refueling outage 2R16 for Salem Unit 2.

Amendment Nos.: 287 and 270.

Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-70 and DPR-75: The amendments revise the TSs, the license and the UFSAR.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: April 10, 2007 (72 FR 17951). The letters dated August 30, September 14, and November 20, 2007, and January 16, 2008, provided clarifying information that did not change the initial proposed no significant hazards consideration determination or expand the application beyond the scope of the original **Federal Register** notice.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a

Safety Evaluation dated February 27, 2008.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Southern Nuclear Operating Company, Inc., Georgia Power Company, Oglethorpe Power Corporation, Municipal Electric Authority of Georgia, City of Dalton, Georgia, Docket Nos. 50-321 and 50-366, Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2, Appling County, Georgia

Date of application for amendments: October 18, 2007.

Brief description of amendments: The amendments revised the Technical Specifications for unit staff qualifications and also included a revised position title for "Health Physics Superintendent."

Date of issuance: February 21, 2008.

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

Amendment Nos.: 255 and 199.

Renewed Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-57 and NPF-5: Amendments revised the licenses and the technical specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: November 20, 2007 (72 FR 65372).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated February 21, 2008.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 29th day of February 2008.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

John W. Lubinski,

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

[FR Doc. E8-4690 Filed 3-10-08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. STN 50-456 and STN 50-457]

Braidwood Station, Units 1 and 2; Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating License, Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity for a Hearing

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission, or the NRC) is considering issuance of an amendment to Facility Operating License No. NPF-72 and Facility Operating License No. NPF-77 to

Exelon Generation Company, LLC (the licensee) for operation of the Braidwood Station, Units 1 and 2 (Braidwood), which is located in Will County, Illinois.

The proposed amendment in the licensee's application dated February 25, 2008, would revise Technical Specification (TS) 5.5.9, "Steam Generator (SG) Program," and TS 5.6.9, "Steam Generator Tube Inspection Report." For TS 5.5.9, the amendment would replace the existing alternate repair criteria (ARC) in the provisions for SG tube repair criteria during Braidwood, Unit 2, refueling outage 13 and the subsequent operating cycle. For TS 5.6.9, three new reporting requirements are proposed to be added to the existing seven requirements. The proposed changes would only affect Braidwood, Unit 2; however this is docketed for Braidwood, Units 1 and 2, since the TS are common to Units 1 and 2.

Before issuance of the proposed license amendment, the Commission will have made findings required by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), and the Commission's regulations.

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

Of the various accidents previously evaluated, the proposed changes only affect the steam generator tube rupture (SGTR), postulated steam line break (SLB), locked rotor and control rod ejection accident evaluations. Loss-of-coolant accident (LOCA) conditions cause a compressive axial load to act on the tube. Therefore, since the LOCA tends to force the tube into the tubesheet rather than pull it out, it is not a factor in this amendment request. Another faulted load consideration is a safe shutdown earthquake (SSE); however, the seismic

analysis of Model D5 steam generators has shown that axial loading of the tubes is negligible during an SSE.

At normal operating pressures, leakage from primary water stress corrosion cracking (PWSCC) below 17 inches from the top of the tubesheet is limited by both the tube-to-tubesheet crevice and the limited crack opening permitted by the tubesheet constraint. Consequently, negligible normal operating leakage is expected from cracks within the tubesheet region.

For the SGTR event, the required structural margins of the steam generator tubes is maintained by limiting the allowable ligament size for a circumferential crack to remain in service to 214 degrees below 17 inches from the top of the tubesheet. Tube rupture is precluded for cracks in the hydraulic expansion region due to the constraint provided by the tubesheet. The potential for tube pullout is mitigated by limiting the allowable crack size to 214 degrees, which takes into account eddy current uncertainty and crack growth rate. It has been shown that a circumferential crack with an azimuthal extent of 214 degrees meets the performance criteria of NEI [Nuclear Energy Institute] 97-06, Rev. 2, "Steam Generator Program Guidelines" and the Draft Regulatory Guide (RG) 1.121, "Bases for Plugging Degraded PWR Steam Generator Tubes." Likewise, a visual inspection will be conducted as necessary to confirm that a circumferential crack of greater than 294 degrees does not remain in service in the tube-to-tubesheet weld metal in any tube thereby mitigating the potential for tube pullout. Therefore, the margin against tube burst/pullout is maintained during normal and postulated accident conditions and the proposed change does not result in a significant increase in the probability or consequence of a SGTR.

The probability of a SLB is unaffected by the potential failure of a SG tube as the failure of a tube is not an initiator for a SLB event. SLB leakage is limited by leakage flow restrictions resulting from the leakage path above potential cracks through the tube-to-tubesheet crevice. The leak rate during postulated accident conditions has been shown to remain within the accident analysis assumptions for all axial or circumferentially oriented cracks occurring 17 inches below the top of the tubesheet. Since normal operating leakage is limited to 0.10 gallons per minute (gpm) (or 150 gallons per day (gpd)), the attendant accident condition leak rate, assuming all leakage to be from indications below 17 inches from the top of the tubesheet would be bounded by 0.5 gpm. This value is within the accident analysis assumptions for the limiting design basis accident for Braidwood 2, which is the postulated SLB event.

Based on the above, the performance criteria of NEI-97-06, Rev. 2 and RG 1.121 continue to be met and the proposed change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

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

Response: No.

The proposed change does not introduce any changes or mechanisms that create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident. Tube bundle integrity is expected to be maintained for all plant conditions upon implementation of the interim alternate repair criteria. The proposed change does not introduce any new equipment or any change to existing equipment. No new effects on existing equipment are created nor are any new malfunctions introduced.

Therefore, based on the above evaluation, 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 change involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety?

Response: No.

The proposed change maintains the required structural margins of the steam generator tubes for both normal and accident conditions. NEI 97-06, Rev. 2 and RG 1.121 are used as the basis in the development of the interim alternate repair criteria (IARC) methodology for determining that steam generator tube integrity considerations are maintained within acceptable limits. RG 1.121 describes a method acceptable to the NRC staff for meeting General Design Criteria 14, 15, 31, and 32 by reducing the probability and consequences of an SGTR. RG 1.121 concludes that by determining the limiting safe conditions of tube wall degradation beyond which tubes with unacceptable cracking, as established by inservice inspection, should be removed from service or repaired, the probability and consequences of a SGTR are reduced. This RG uses safety factors on loads for tube burst that are consistent with the requirements of Section III of the ASME Code.

For axially oriented cracking located within the tubesheet, tube burst is precluded due to the presence of the tubesheet. For circumferentially oriented cracking in a tube or the tube-to-tubesheet weld, the Westinghouse analysis, provided in report "LTR-CDME-08-11 P-Attachment," defines a length of remaining tube ligament that provides the necessary resistance to tube pullout due to the pressure induced forces (with applicable safety factors applied). Additionally, it is shown that application of the IARC will not result in unacceptable primary-to-secondary leakage during all plant conditions, including transients and postulated accident conditions.

Based on the above, it is concluded that the proposed changes do not result in any reduction in a margin of safety.

Based on the above, EGC [the licensee] concludes that the proposed amendment presents no significant hazards consideration under the standards set forth in 10 CFR 50.92(c) and, accordingly, a finding of "no significant hazards consideration" is justified.

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.

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.

Written comments may be submitted by mail to the Chief, Rulemaking, Directives and Editing Branch, Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, and should cite the publication date and page number of this **Federal Register** notice. Written comments may also be delivered to Room 6D59, Two White Flint North, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland, from 7:30 a.m. to 4:15 p.m. Federal workdays. Documents may be examined, and/or copied for a fee, at the NRC's Public Document Room (PDR), located at One White Flint North, Public File Area O1F21, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland.

The filing of requests for hearing and petitions for leave to intervene is discussed below.

Within 60 days after the date of publication of this notice, the person(s) may file a request for a hearing with respect to issuance of the amendment to the subject facility operating license and any person(s) whose interest may be affected by this proceeding and who wishes to participate as a party in the proceeding must file a written request via electronic submission through the

NRC E-filing system for a hearing and a petition for leave to intervene. 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 Commission's PDR, located at One White Flint North, Public File Area O1F21, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland. Publicly available records will be accessible from the Agencywide Documents Access and Management System's (ADAMS) Public Electronic Reading Room on the Internet at the NRC Web site, <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 petitioner/requestor 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 petitioner/requestor shall provide a brief explanation of the bases for the contention and a concise statement of the alleged facts or expert opinion which support the contention and on which the petitioner intends to rely in proving the contention at the hearing. The petitioner/requestor must also provide references to those specific

sources and documents of which the petitioner is aware and on which the petitioner intends to rely to establish those facts or expert opinion. The petition must include sufficient information to show that a genuine dispute exists with the applicant on a material issue of law or fact. Contentions shall be limited to matters within the scope of the amendment under consideration. The contention must be one which, if proven, would entitle the petitioner to relief. A petitioner/requestor 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, any hearing held would take place before the issuance of any amendment.

A request for hearing or a petition for leave to intervene must be filed in accordance with the NRC E-Filing rule, which the NRC promulgated on August 28, 2007 (72 FR 49139). The E-Filing process requires participants to submit and serve 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 a waiver in accordance with the procedures described below.

To comply with the procedural requirements of E-Filing, at least five (5) days prior to the filing deadline, the petitioner/requestor must contact the Office of the Secretary by e-mail at HEARINGDOCKET@NRC.GOV, or by calling (301) 415-1677, to request (1) a digital 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/or (2) creation of an electronic docket for the proceeding

(even in instances in which the petitioner/requestor (or its counsel or representative) already holds an NRC-issued digital ID certificate). Each petitioner/requestor will need to download the Workplace Forms Viewer™ to access the Electronic Information Exchange (EIE), a component of the E-Filing system. The Workplace Forms Viewer™ is free and is available at <http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/e-submittals/install-viewer.html>. Information about applying for a digital ID certificate is available on NRC's public Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/e-submittals/apply-certificates.html>.

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

A person filing electronically may seek assistance through the "Contact Us" link located on the NRC Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/e-submittals.html> or by calling the NRC technical help line, which is available between 8:30 a.m. and 4:15 p.m., Eastern Time, Monday through Friday. The help line number is (800) 397-4209 or locally, (301) 415-4737. Participants who believe that they have a good cause for not submitting documents electronically must file a motion, 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.

Non-timely requests and/or petitions and contentions will not be entertained absent a determination by the Commission, the presiding officer, or the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board that the petition and/or request should be granted and/or the contentions should be admitted, based on a balancing of the factors specified in 10 CFR 2.309(c)(1)(i)-(viii). To be timely, filings must be submitted no later than 11:59 p.m. Eastern Time on the due date.

Documents submitted in adjudicatory proceedings will appear in NRC's electronic hearing docket which is available to the public at http://ehd.nrc.gov/EHD_Proceeding/home.asp, unless excluded pursuant to an order of the Commission, an Atomic Safety and Licensing Board, or a 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. 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 submissions.

For further details with respect to this license amendment application, see the letter dated February 25, 2008, from the Exelon Generation Company, LLC, which is available for public inspection at the Commission's PDR, located at One White Flint North, File Public Area O1 F21, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland. Publicly available records will be accessible electronically from the Agencywide Documents Access and Management System's (ADAMS) Public Electronic Reading Room on the Internet at the NRC Web site, <http://www.nrc.gov/>

[reading-rm/adams.html](#). Persons who do not have access to ADAMS or who encounter problems in accessing the documents located in ADAMS, should contact the NRC PDR Reference staff by telephone at 1-800-397-4209, 301-415-4737, or by e-mail to pdrc@nrc.gov.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 4th day of March 2008.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Meghan M. Thorpe-Kavanaugh,
Project Manager, Plant Licensing Branch III-2,
Division of Operating Reactor Licensing,
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. E8-4861 Filed 3-10-08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-354]

PSEG Nuclear, LLC; Hope Creek Generating Station Final Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact; Related to the Proposed License Amendment To Increase the Maximum Reactor Power Level

AGENCY: U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC).

SUMMARY: As required by Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations (10 CFR) Part 51, the NRC has prepared a final Environmental Assessment (EA) as its evaluation of a request by the PSEG Nuclear, LLC (PSEG) for a license amendment to increase the maximum thermal power at Hope Creek Generating Station (HCGS) from 3,339 megawatts-thermal (MWt) to 3,840 MWt. The EA assesses environmental impacts up to a maximum thermal power level of 3,952 MWt, as the applicant's environmental report was based on that power level. The NRC staff did not identify any significant impact from the information provided in the licensee's EPU application for HCGS or from the NRC staff's independent review. The final EA and Finding of No Significant Impact are being published in the **Federal Register**.

The NRC published a draft EA and finding of no significant impact on the proposed action for public comment in the **Federal Register** on October 22, 2007 (72 FR 59563). Two sets of comments were received on the draft EA: (1) From PSEG Nuclear, LLC by letter dated November 21, 2007 (Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS) Accession No. ML073600851); and (2) from the State of New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (NJDEP) by letter dated November 21, 2007

(ADAMS Accession No. ML073600859). These comments are addressed below.

Disposition of Public Comments on the Draft Environmental Assessment E

PSEG Comment Number 1: Modify the Cooling Tower Impacts section to more clearly reflect that NJDEP has issued the Title V Air Operating Permit authorizing emissions at 42 lbs/hr upon approval of the [United States Environmental Protection Agency] USEPA.

NRC Response Number 1: This comment is a clarification and editorial correction to the draft Environmental Assessment. Based on this comment, the NRC staff revised the appropriate section of the final EA.

PSEG Comment Number 2: Modify the Discharge Impacts section to reflect that the [total dissolved solids] TDS limits are indirectly in the Title V Air Operating Permit and not in the [New Jersey Pollutant Discharge Elimination System] NJPDES Permit.

NRC Response Number 2: This comment is a clarification and editorial correction to the draft Environmental Assessment. Based on this comment, the NRC staff revised the appropriate section of the final EA.

PSEG Comment Number 3: Modify the Discharge Impacts section to reflect that total suspended solids and [total organic carbon] TOC are not routinely monitored and acute and chronic biological toxicity tests are performed during each NJPDES Permit renewal.

NRC Response Number 3: This comment is a clarification and editorial correction to the draft Environmental Assessment. Based on this comment, the NRC staff revised the appropriate section of the final EA.

PSEG Comment Number 4: Modify the Impacts on Aquatic Biota section, Table 1, to reflect that Atlantic Croaker are considered to be a single Atlantic coast stock.

NRC Response Number 4: Upon further review, the NRC agrees with the comment. Based on this comment, the NRC staff revised the appropriate section of the final EA.

PSEG Comment Number 5: Modify the Impacts on Aquatic Biota section to identify inland silversides instead of tidal silversides.

NRC Response Number 5: Upon further review, the NRC agrees with the comment. Based on this comment, the NRC staff revised the appropriate section of the final EA.

PSEG Comment Number 6: Modify the Impacts on Aquatic Biota section to reflect the extensive biological monitoring program at the adjacent Salem Generating Station, reflect the