

Dated: April 3, 2013.

**Suzanne H. Plimpton,**

*Reports Clearance Officer, National Science Foundation.*

[FR Doc. 2013-08153 Filed 4-8-13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555-01-P

## NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

### Agency Information Collection Activities: Comment Request

**AGENCY:** National Science Foundation.

**ACTION:** Notice; Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

**SUMMARY:** The National Science Foundation (NSF) has submitted the following information collection requirement to OMB for review and clearance under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Public Law 104-13. This is the second notice for public comment; the first was published in the **Federal Register** at 78 FR 6141, and no comments were received. NSF is forwarding the proposed renewal submission to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for clearance simultaneously with the publication of this second notice. The full submission may be found at: <http://www.reginfo.gov/public/do/PRAMain>. Comments regarding (a) whether the collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of burden including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility and clarity of the information to be collected; (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology should be addressed to: Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs of OMB, Attention: Desk Officer for National Science Foundation, 725-17th Street, NW, Room 10235, Washington, DC 20503, and to Suzanne Plimpton, Reports Clearance Officer, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Room 295, Arlington, VA 22230, or by email to [splimpton@nsf.gov](mailto:splimpton@nsf.gov). Comments regarding these information collections are best assured of having their full effect if received within 30 days of this notification. Copies of the submission(s) may be obtained by calling 703-292-7556.

NSF may not conduct or sponsor a collection of information unless the collection of information displays a currently valid OMB control number and the agency informs potential persons who are to respond to the collection of information that such persons are not required to respond to the collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number.

Under OMB regulations, the agency may continue to conduct or sponsor the collection of information while this submission is pending at OMB.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit written comments to Suzanne Plimpton, Reports Clearance Officer, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Room 295, Arlington, VA 22230, or by email to [splimpton@nsf.gov](mailto:splimpton@nsf.gov).

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Call or write, Suzanne Plimpton, Reports Clearance Officer, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Room 295, Arlington, VA 22230, or by email to [splimpton@nsf.gov](mailto:splimpton@nsf.gov). Individuals who use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) may call the Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) at 1-800-877-8339 between 8:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m., Eastern time, Monday through Friday.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

*Title of Collection:* Antarctic emergency response plan and environmental protection information.

*OMB Approval Number:* 3145-0180

*Abstract:* The NSF, pursuant to the Antarctic Conservation Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2401 et seq.) ("ACA") regulates certain non-governmental activities in Antarctica. The ACA was amended in 1996 by the Antarctic Science, Tourism, and Conservation Act. On September 7, 2001, NSF published a final rule in the **Federal Register** (66 FR 46739) implementing certain of these statutory amendments. The rule requires non-governmental Antarctic expeditions using non-U.S. flagged vessels to ensure that the vessel owner has an emergency response plan. The rule also requires persons organizing a non-governmental expedition to provide expedition members with information on their environmental protection obligations under the Antarctic Conservation Act.

*Expected Respondents.* Respondents may include non-profit organizations and small and large businesses. The majority of respondents are anticipated to be U.S. tour operators, currently estimated to number twelve.

*Burden on the Public.* The Foundation estimates that a one-time paperwork and recordkeeping burden of 40 hours or less, at a cost of \$500 to \$1400 per

respondent, will result from the emergency response plan requirement contained in the rule. Presently, all respondents have been providing expedition members with a copy of the Guidance for Visitors to the Antarctic (prepared and adopted at the Eighteenth Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting as Recommendation XVIII-1). Because this Antarctic Treaty System document satisfies the environmental protection information requirements of the rule, no additional burden shall result from the environmental information requirements in the proposed rule.

Dated: April 3, 2013.

**Suzanne H. Plimpton,**

*Reports Clearance Officer, National Science Foundation.*

[FR Doc. 2013-08161 Filed 4-8-13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555-01-P

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[NRC-2013-0059]

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

**AGENCY:** Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

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

**DATES:** Comments must be filed by May 9, 2013. A request for a hearing must be filed by June 10, 2013. Any potential party as defined in § 2.4 of Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR), who believes access to Sensitive Unclassified Non-Safeguards Information (SUNSI) is necessary to respond to this notice must request document access by April 19, 2013.

**ADDRESSES:** You may access information and comment submissions related to this document, which the NRC possesses and is publicly available, by searching on <http://www.regulations.gov> under Docket ID NRC-2013-0059. You may submit comments by the following methods:

- *Federal Rulemaking Web site:* Go to <http://www.regulations.gov> and search for Docket ID NRC-2013-0059. Address questions about NRC dockets to Carol

Gallagher; telephone: 301-492-3668; email: [Carol.Gallagher@nrc.gov](mailto:Carol.Gallagher@nrc.gov).

- *Mail comments to:* Cindy Bladey, Chief, Rules, Announcements, and Directives Branch (RADB), Office of Administration, Mail Stop: TWB-05-B01M, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001.

- *Fax comments to:* RADB at 301-492-3446.

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

#### **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

### **I. Accessing Information and Submitting Comments**

#### *A. Accessing Information*

Please refer to Docket ID NRC-2013-0059 when contacting the NRC about the availability of information regarding this document. You may access information related to this document, which the NRC possesses and is publicly available, by any the following methods:

- *Federal Rulemaking Web site:* Go to <http://www.regulations.gov> and search for Docket ID NRC-2013-0059.

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

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

#### *B. Submitting Comments*

Please include Docket ID NRC-2013-0059 in the subject line of your comment submission, in order to ensure that the NRC is able to make your comment submission available to the public in this docket.

The NRC cautions you not to include identifying or contact information 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 submissions into ADAMS.

### **II. Background**

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

This notice includes notices of amendments containing SUNSI.

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

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

The Commission is seeking public comments on this proposed

determination. Any comments received within 30 days after the date of publication of this notice will be considered in making any final determination.

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

Within 60 days after the date of publication of this notice, any person(s) whose interest may be affected by this action may file a request for a hearing and a petition to intervene with respect to issuance of the amendment to the subject facility operating license or combined license. Requests for a hearing and a petition for leave to intervene shall be filed in accordance with the Commission's "Agency Rules of Practice and Procedure" in 10 CFR part 2. Interested person(s) should consult a current copy of 10 CFR 2.309, which is available at the NRC's PDR, located at One White Flint North, Room O1-F21, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland 20852. The NRC regulations are accessible electronically from the NRC Library on the NRC's Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/doc-collections/cfr/>. If a request for a hearing or petition for leave to intervene is filed within 60 days, the Commission or a presiding officer designated by the Commission or by the Chief Administrative Judge of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, will rule on the request and/or petition; and the Secretary or the Chief Administrative Judge of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board will issue a notice of a hearing or an appropriate order.

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

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

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

If a hearing is requested, and the Commission has not made a final determination on the issue of no significant hazards consideration, the Commission will make a final determination on the issue of no significant hazards consideration. The final determination will serve to decide

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

All documents filed in the NRC adjudicatory proceedings, including a request for hearing, a petition for leave to intervene, any motion or other document filed in the proceeding prior to the submission of a request for hearing or petition to intervene, and documents filed by interested governmental entities participating under 10 CFR 2.315(c), must be filed in accordance with the NRC's E-Filing rule (72 FR 49139; August 28, 2007). The E-Filing process requires participants to submit and serve all adjudicatory documents over the internet, or in some cases to mail copies on electronic storage media. Participants may not submit paper copies of their filings unless they seek an exemption in accordance with the procedures described below.

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

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

If a participant is electronically submitting a document to the NRC in accordance with the E-Filing rule, the participant must file the document using the NRC's online, Web-based submission form. In order to serve documents through the Electronic Information Exchange System, users will be required to install a Web browser plug-in from the NRC's Web site. Further information on the Web-based submission form, including the installation of the Web browser plug-in, is available on the NRC's public Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/e-submittals.html>.

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

A person filing electronically using the agency's adjudicatory E-Filing system may seek assistance by contacting the NRC Meta System Help Desk through the "Contact Us" link located on the NRC's Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/e-submittals.html>, by email to

*MShD.Resource@nrc.gov*, or by a toll-free call at 1-866-672-7640. The NRC Meta System Help Desk is available between 8 a.m. and 8 p.m., Eastern Time, Monday through Friday, excluding government holidays.

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

Documents submitted in adjudicatory proceedings will appear in the NRC's electronic hearing docket which is available to the public at <http://ehd1.nrc.gov/ehd/>, unless excluded pursuant to an order of the Commission, or the presiding officer. Participants are requested not to include personal privacy information, such as social security numbers, home addresses, or home phone numbers in their filings, unless an NRC regulation or other law requires submission of such information. However, a request to intervene will require including information on local residence in order to demonstrate a proximity assertion of interest in the proceeding. With respect to copyrighted works, except for limited excerpts that serve the purpose of the adjudicatory filings and would constitute a Fair Use application, participants are requested not to include copyrighted materials in their submission.

Petitions for leave to intervene must be filed no later than 60 days from the

date of publication of this notice. Requests for hearing, petitions for leave to intervene, and motions for leave to file new or amended contentions that are filed after the 60-day deadline will not be entertained absent a determination by the presiding officer that the filing demonstrates good cause by satisfying the following three factors in 10 CFR 2.309(c)(1): (i) The information upon which the filing is based was not previously available; (ii) the information upon which the filing is based is materially different from information previously available; and (iii) the filing has been submitted in a timely fashion based on the availability of the subsequent information.

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

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

*Date of amendment request:* December 21, 2012. A publicly available version is available under ADAMS Accession No. ML130040160.

*Description of amendment request:* This amendment request contains sensitive unclassified non-safeguards information (SUNSI). The amendment would revise Fermi 2 Plant Operating License, Technical Specification (TS) Section 1.1, "Definitions," Section 3.4.10, "RCS Pressure and Temperature (P/T) Limits," and Section 5.6, "Reporting Requirements," by replacing the existing reactor vessel heatup and cooldown rate limits and the P/T limit curves with references to the Pressure and Temperature Limits Report (PTLR) at Fermi 2.

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

The proposed changes modify the TS by replacing references to existing reactor vessel heatup and cooldown rate limits and P/T limit curves with references to the PTLR. The proposed amendment also adopts the NRC approved methodology of the GEH Nuclear Energy Licensing Topical Report NEDC-33178P-A, Revision 1, for the preparation of the Fermi 2 P/T limit curves. In 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix G, requirements are established to protect the integrity of the Reactor Coolant Pressure Boundary in nuclear power plants. Implementing the NRC-approved methodology for calculating P/T limit curves and relocating those curves to the PTLR provides an equivalent level of assurance that Reactor Coolant Pressure Boundary integrity will be maintained, as specified in 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix G.

The proposed changes do not adversely affect accident initiators or precursors, and do not alter the design assumptions, conditions, or configuration of the plant or the manner in which the plant is operated and maintained. The ability of structures, systems, and components to perform their intended safety functions is not altered or prevented by the proposed changes, and the assumptions used in determining the radiological consequences of previously evaluated accidents are not affected.

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

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

The change in methodology for calculating P/T limits and the relocation of those limits to the PTLR does not alter or involve any design basis accident initiators. Reactor Coolant Pressure Boundary integrity will continue to be maintained in accordance with 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix G, and the assumed accident performance of plant structures, systems and components will not be affected. These changes do not involve any physical alteration of the plant (i.e., no new or different type of equipment will be installed), and installed equipment is not being operated in a new or different manner. Thus, no new failure modes are introduced.

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

3. The proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety. The proposed changes do not affect the function of the Reactor Coolant Pressure Boundary or its response during plant transients. By calculating the P/T limits using NRC-approved methodology, adequate margins of safety relating to Reactor Coolant Pressure Boundary integrity are maintained. The proposed changes do not alter the manner in which safety limits, limiting safety system settings, or limiting conditions for operation are determined. There are no changes to setpoints at which protective actions are initiated, and the operability requirements for equipment assumed to operate for accident mitigation are 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:* Bruce R. Masters, DTE Energy, General Counsel—Regulatory, 688 WCB, One Energy Plaza, Detroit, MI 48226-1279.

*NRC Branch Chief:* Robert D. Carlson.

Exelon Generation Company, LLC, and PSEG Nuclear LLC, Docket Nos. 50-277 and 50-278, Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station, Units 2 and 3, York and Lancaster Counties, Pennsylvania

*Date of application for amendments:* September 28, 2012, as supplemented on February 15, 2013. A publicly available version is available under ADAMS Accession Nos. ML122860201 and ML13051A032, respectively.

*Description of amendment request:* This amendment request contains sensitive unclassified non-safeguards information (SUNSI). The proposed amendments would authorize an increase in the maximum power level from 3514 megawatts thermal (MWt) to 3951 MWt. The requested change, referred to as an extended power uprate (EPU), represents an increase of approximately 12.4 percent above the current licensed thermal power level.

*Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:* As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below with the NRC staff's 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 increase in power level does not significantly increase the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The proposed change will increase the maximum authorized core power level for PBAPS [Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station] from the current licensed thermal power (CLTP) of 3514 megawatts thermal (MWt) to 3951 MWt. Evaluations and analyses of the nuclear steam supply system (NSSS) and balance of plant (BOP) structures, systems, and components (SSCs) that could be affected by the power uprate were performed in accordance [with] the approaches described in:

- NEDC-33004P-A (commonly called CLTR), Licensing Topical Report Constant Pressure Power Uprate, Revision 4,
- NEDC-32424P-A (commonly called ELTR1), Generic Guidelines for General Electric Boiling Water Reactor Extended Power Uprate, and
- NEDC-32523P-A (commonly called ELTR2), Generic Evaluations of General Electric Boiling Water Reactor Extended Power Uprate.

The evaluations concluded that all plant components, as modified, will continue to be capable of performing their design function at the proposed uprated core power level.

The PBAPS licensing and design bases, including PBAPS accident analyses, were also evaluated for the effect of the proposed power increase. The evaluation concluded that the applicable analysis acceptance criteria continue to be met.

Power level is not an initiator of any transient or accident; it is used as an input assumption to equipment design and accident analyses. The proposed change does not affect the release paths or the frequency of release for any accidents previously evaluated in the UFSAR [Updated Final Safety Analysis Report]. Structures, systems, and components required to mitigate transients remain capable of performing their design functions considering radiological consequences associated with the effect of the proposed EPU. The source terms used to evaluate the radiological consequences were reviewed and were determined to bound [plant] operation at EPU power levels. The results of EPU accident evaluations do not exceed NRC-approved acceptance limits.

The spectrum of postulated accidents and transients were reviewed and were shown to meet the regulatory criteria to which PBAPS is currently licensed. In the area of fuel and core design, the Safety Limit Minimum Critical Power Ratio (SLMPCR) and other Specified Acceptable Fuel Design Limits (SAFDLs) are still met. Continued compliance with the SLMPCR and other SAFDLs is confirmed on a cycle specific basis consistent with the criteria accepted by the NRC.

Challenges to the reactor coolant pressure boundary were evaluated at EPU conditions (pressure, temperature, flow, and radiation) and found to meet the acceptance criteria for allowable stresses. Adequate overpressure margin is maintained with the addition of one main steam safety valve.

Challenges to the containment were also evaluated. Containment and its associated cooling system continue to meet applicable regulatory requirements. The calculated post Loss of Coolant Accident (LOCA) suppression pool temperature decreases due to modifications and methodology changes and remain acceptable.

Radiological releases were evaluated and found to be within the regulatory limits of 10 CFR 50.67, ["Accident source term."]

The modifications and methodology associated with the elimination of containment accident pressure credit do not change the design functions of the systems. By maintaining these functions they do not significantly increase the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The non-safety related Replacement Steam Dryer (RSD) must function to maintain structural integrity and avoid generation of loose parts that may affect other SSCs. The RSD analyses demonstrate the structural integrity of the steam dryer is maintained at EPU conditions. Therefore, the RSD does not significantly increase the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

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

The proposed change increases the maximum authorized core power level for PBAPS from the current maximum license thermal power of 3514 MWt to 3951 MWt. An evaluation of the equipment that could be affected by the power uprate has been performed. No new accident scenarios or equipment failure modes were identified. Due to the voluntary elimination of the need for containment accident pressure credit, the EPU safety analysis for primary containment response credits a modification to the residual heat removal system which involves a change in a safety-related equipment lineup. However, this modification and new line up does not result in a new type of accident. The full spectrum of accident considerations was evaluated and no new or different kinds of accidents were identified. For PBAPS, the standard evaluation methods outlined in CLTR, ELTR1, and ELTR2 were applied to the capability of existing or modified safety-related plant equipment. No new accidents or event precursors were identified.

All [SSCs] previously required for the mitigation of a transient remain capable of fulfilling their intended design functions with the addition of one main steam safety valve. The addition of the main steam safety valve does not adversely affect the main steam system nor create an accident or malfunction of a different kind. The proposed increase in power does not adversely affect safety-related systems or components and does not challenge the performance or integrity of any safety-related systems. The change does not adversely affect any current system interfaces or create any new interfaces that could result in an accident or malfunction of a different kind than was previously evaluated. Operating at the proposed EPU power level does not create any new accident initiators or precursors.

The modifications and methodology associated with the elimination of containment accident pressure credit do not change the design functions of the systems. The systems are not accident initiators and by maintaining their current functions they do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident.

The new RSD does not have any new design functions. RSD analyses demonstrate

the RSD will be capable of performing the design function of maintaining structural integrity. Therefore, there are no new or different kinds of accidents from those previously evaluated.

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

Based on the analyses of the proposed power increase, the relevant design and safety acceptance criteria will be met without a significant reduction in margins of safety. The analyses supporting EPU have demonstrated that the PBAPS [SSCs] are capable of safely performing at EPU conditions with the addition of one main steam safety valve. The analyses identified and defined the major input parameters to the [NSSS], analyzed NSSS design transients, and evaluated the capabilities of the primary containment, NSSS fluid systems, NSSS and [BOP], NSSS control systems and NSSS and BOP components, as appropriate. Radiological consequences of design basis events remain within regulatory limits and are not increased significantly. The analyses confirmed that NSSS and BOP SSCs are capable of achieving EPU conditions without significant reduction in margins of safety, with the modifications discussed in this application.

Analyses have shown that the integrity of primary fission product barriers will not be significantly affected as a result of the power increase.

Calculated loads on SSCs important to safety have been shown to remain within design allowables under EPU conditions for all design basis event categories, including with the addition of one main steam safety valve. Plant response to transients and accidents do not result in exceeding acceptance criteria.

As appropriate, the evaluations that demonstrate acceptability of EPU have been performed using methods that have either been reviewed and approved by the NRC staff, or that are in compliance with regulatory review guidance and standards established for maintaining adequate margins of safety. These evaluations demonstrate that there are no significant reductions in the margins of safety.

Maximum power level is one of the inherent inputs that determine the safe operating range defined by the accident analyses. The Technical Specifications ensure that PBAPS is operated within the bounds of the inputs and assumptions used in the accident analyses. The acceptance criteria for the accident analyses are conservative with respect to the operating conditions defined by the Technical Specifications. The engineering reviews performed for the constant pressure [EPU] confirm that the accident analyses criteria are met at the revised maximum allowable thermal power level of 3951 MWt. Therefore, the adequacy of the revised Facility

Operating License and Technical Specifications to maintain the plant in a safe operating range is also confirmed, and the increase in maximum allowable power level does not involve a significant decrease in a margin of safety.

The modifications and methodology associated with the elimination of [containment accident pressure] credit do not change the design functions within the applicable limits. The systems are associated with accident or event response and do not significantly affect accident initiators by maintaining their current functions and they do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident. The proposed Technical Specifications associated with these modifications ensure that PBAPS is operated within the bounds of the inputs and assumptions used in the accident analyses.

The steam dryer is being replaced in order to ensure adequate margin to the established structural requirements is maintained. The new RSD does not have any new design functions and an analysis was performed to confirm it will be capable of maintaining its structural integrity. The power ascension test plan will verify that the RSD conservatively meets the vibration and stress requirements.

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, and with the changes noted above in square brackets, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

*Attorney for Licensee:* Mr. J. Bradley Fewell, Assistant General Counsel, Exelon Generation Company, LLC, 200 Exelon Way, Kennett Square, PA 19348.  
*NRC Branch Chief:* Meena K. Khanna.

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

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

Exelon Generation Company, LLC, and PSEG Nuclear LLC, Docket Nos. 50-277 and 50-278, Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station, Units 2 and 3, York and Lancaster Counties

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

B. Within 10 days after publication of this notice of hearing and opportunity to petition for leave to intervene, any potential party who believes access to SUNSI is necessary to respond to this notice may request such access. A "potential party" is any person who

intends to participate as a party by demonstrating standing and filing an admissible contention under 10 CFR 2.309. Requests for access to SUNSI submitted later than 10 days after publication of this notice will not be considered absent a showing of good cause for the late filing, addressing why the request could not have been filed earlier.

C. The requestor shall submit a letter requesting permission to access SUNSI to the Office of the Secretary, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, Attention: Rulemakings and Adjudications Staff, and provide a copy to the Associate General Counsel for Hearings, Enforcement and Administration, Office of the General Counsel, Washington, DC 20555-0001. The expedited delivery or courier mail address for both offices is: U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland 20852. The email address for the Office of the Secretary and the Office of the General Counsel are *Hearing.Docket@nrc.gov* and *OGCmailcenter@nrc.gov*, respectively.<sup>1</sup> The request must include the following information:

- (1) A description of the licensing action with a citation to this **Federal Register** notice;
- (2) The name and address of the potential party and a description of the potential party's particularized interest that could be harmed by the action identified in C.(1); and
- (3) The identity of the individual or entity requesting access to SUNSI and the requestor's basis for the need for the information in order to meaningfully participate in this adjudicatory proceeding. In particular, the request must explain why publicly-available versions of the information requested would not be sufficient to provide the basis and specificity for a proffered contention.

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

- (1) There is a reasonable basis to believe the petitioner is likely to establish standing to participate in this NRC proceeding; and
- (2) The requestor has established a legitimate need for access to SUNSI.

E. If the NRC staff determines that the requestor satisfies both D.(1) and D.(2)

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

above, the NRC staff will notify the requestor in writing that access to SUNSI has been granted. The written notification will contain instructions on how the requestor may obtain copies of the requested documents, and any other conditions that may apply to access to those documents. These conditions may include, but are not limited to, the signing of a Non-Disclosure Agreement or Affidavit, or Protective Order<sup>2</sup> setting forth terms and conditions to prevent the unauthorized or inadvertent disclosure of SUNSI by each individual who will be granted access to SUNSI.

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

G. Review of Denials of Access.

(1) If the request for access to SUNSI is denied by the NRC staff after a

determination on standing and need for access, the NRC staff shall immediately notify the requestor in writing, briefly stating the reason or reasons for the denial.

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

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

If challenges to the NRC staff determinations are filed, these procedures give way to the normal process for litigating disputes

concerning access to information. The availability of interlocutory review by the Commission of orders ruling on such NRC staff determinations (whether granting or denying access) is governed by 10 CFR 2.311.<sup>3</sup>

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

*It is so ordered.*

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 1st day of April 2013.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Annette L. Vietti-Cook,**  
*Secretary of the Commission.*

**ATTACHMENT 1—General Target Schedule for Processing and Resolving Requests for Access to Sensitive Unclassified Non-Safeguards Information in this Proceeding**

Day	Event/Activity
0	Publication of <i>Federal Register</i> notice of hearing and opportunity to petition for leave to intervene, including order with instructions for access requests.
10	Deadline for submitting requests for access to Sensitive Unclassified Non-Safeguards Information (SUNSI) with information: supporting the standing of a potential party identified by name and address; describing the need for the information in order for the potential party to participate meaningfully in an adjudicatory proceeding.
60	Deadline for submitting petition for intervention containing: (i) Demonstration of standing; (ii) all contentions whose formulation does not require access to SUNSI (+25 Answers to petition for intervention; +7 requestor/petitioner reply).
20	The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff informs the requestor of the staff's determination whether the request for access provides a reasonable basis to believe standing can be established and shows need for SUNSI. (NRC staff also informs any party to the proceeding whose interest independent of the proceeding would be harmed by the release of the information.) If the NRC staff makes the finding of need for SUNSI and likelihood of standing, NRC staff begins document processing (preparation of redactions or review of redacted documents).
25	If NRC staff finds no "need" or no likelihood of standing, the deadline for requestor/petitioner to file a motion seeking a ruling to reverse the NRC staff's denial of access; NRC staff files copy of access determination with the presiding officer (or Chief Administrative Judge or other designated officer, as appropriate). If the NRC staff finds "need" for SUNSI, the deadline for any party to the proceeding whose interest independent of the proceeding would be harmed by the release of the information to file a motion seeking a ruling to reverse the NRC staff's grant of access.
30	Deadline for NRC staff reply to motions to reverse NRC staff determination(s).
40	(Receipt +30) If NRC staff finds standing and need for SUNSI, deadline for NRC staff to complete information processing and file motion for Protective Order and draft Non-Disclosure Affidavit. Deadline for applicant/licensee to file Non-Disclosure Agreement for SUNSI.
A	If access granted: Issuance of presiding officer or other designated officer decision on motion for protective order for access to sensitive information (including schedule for providing access and submission of contentions) or decision reversing a final adverse determination by the NRC staff.
A + 3	Deadline for filing executed Non-Disclosure Affidavits. Access provided to SUNSI consistent with decision issuing the protective order.

<sup>2</sup> Any motion for Protective Order or draft Non-Disclosure Affidavit or Agreement for SUNSI must be filed with the presiding officer or the Chief Administrative Judge if the presiding officer has not

yet been designated, within 30 days of the deadline for the receipt of the written access request.

<sup>3</sup> Requestors should note that the filing requirements of the NRC's E-Filing Rule (72 FR 49139; August 28, 2007) apply to appeals of NRC

staff determinations (because they must be served on a presiding officer or the Commission, as applicable), but not to the initial SUNSI request submitted to the NRC staff under these procedures.

Day	Event/Activity
A + 28 .....	Deadline for submission of contentions whose development depends upon access to SUNSI. However, if more than 25 days remain between the petitioner's receipt of (or access to) the information and the deadline for filing all other contentions (as established in the notice of hearing or opportunity for hearing), the petitioner may file its SUNSI contentions by that later deadline.
A + 53 .....	(Contention receipt +25) Answers to contentions whose development depends upon access to SUNSI.
A + 60 .....	(Answer receipt +7) Petitioner/Intervenor reply to answers.
>A + 60 .....	Decision on contention admission.

[FR Doc. 2013-07957 Filed 4-8-13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

### Sunshine Act Meetings

**AGENCY HOLDING THE MEETINGS:** Nuclear Regulatory Commission [NRC-2013-0001]

**DATE:** Weeks of April 8, 15, 22, 29, May 6, 13, 2013.

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

**STATUS:** Public and Closed.

#### Week of April 8, 2013

There are no meetings scheduled for the week of April 8, 2013.

#### Week of April 15, 2013—Tentative

There are no meetings scheduled for the week of April 15, 2013.

#### Week of April 22, 2013—Tentative

*Monday, April 22, 2013*

9:00 a.m. Meeting with the Department of Energy Office of Nuclear Energy (Public Meeting) (Contact: Brett Rini, 301-251-7615)

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

2:30 p.m. Discussion of Management and Personnel Issues (Closed—Ex. 2 and 6)

*Tuesday, April 23, 2013*

9:00 a.m. Briefing on the Status of Lessons Learned from the Fukushima Dai'ichi Accident (Public Meeting) (Contact: William D. Reckley, 301-415-7490)

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

#### Week of April 29, 2013—Tentative

There are no meetings scheduled for the week of April 29, 2013.

#### Week of May 6, 2013—Tentative

There are no meetings scheduled for the week of May 6, 2013.

### Week of May 13, 2013—Tentative

There are no meetings scheduled for the week of May 13, 2013.

\* \* \* \* \*

\* The schedule for Commission meetings is subject to change on short notice. To verify the status of meetings, call (recording)—301-415-1292. Contact person for more information: Rochelle Bavol, 301-415-1651.

\* \* \* \* \*

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

\* \* \* \* \*

The NRC provides reasonable accommodation to individuals with disabilities where appropriate. If you need a reasonable accommodation to participate in these public meetings, or need this meeting notice or the transcript or other information from the public meetings in another format (e.g. braille, large print), please notify Kimberly Meyer, NRC Disability Program Manager, at 301-287-0727, or by email at [kimberly.meyer-chambers@nrc.gov](mailto:kimberly.meyer-chambers@nrc.gov). Determinations on requests for reasonable accommodation will be made on a case-by-case basis.

\* \* \* \* \*

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

Dated: April 4, 2013.

**Rochelle C. Bavol,**

*Policy Coordinator, Office of the Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 2013-08362 Filed 4-5-13; 4:15 pm]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

## POSTAL REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. CP2013-57; Order No. 1690]

### International Mail Product

**AGENCY:** Postal Regulatory Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The Commission is noticing a recent Postal Service filing concerning an additional International Reply Service Competitive Contract 3 Negotiated Service Agreement. This notice informs the public of the filing, invites public comment, and takes other administrative steps.

**DATES:** *Comments are due:* April 10, 2013.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit comments electronically via the Commission's Filing Online system at <http://www.prc.gov>. Those who cannot submit comments electronically should contact the person identified in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section by telephone for advice on filing alternatives.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Stephen L. Sharfman, General Counsel, at 202-789-6820.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

#### Table of Contents

- I. Introduction
- II. Contents of Filing
- III. Notice of Proceeding
- IV. Ordering Paragraphs

#### I. Introduction

On April 2, 2013, the Postal Service filed a notice pursuant to 39 CFR 3015.5 announcing that it has entered into an additional International Business Reply Service (IBRS) Competitive Contract 3 negotiated service agreement (Agreement).<sup>1</sup> It seeks to have the Agreement included within the existing IBRS Competitive Contract 3 product on grounds of functional equivalence to the baseline agreement filed in Docket No. CP2011-59.<sup>2</sup> Notice at 4-6.

#### II. Contents of Filing

*Agreement.* The Postal Service states that the Agreement is the successor to the agreement included in the IBRS Competitive Contract 3 product in Docket No. CP2012-18. *Id.* at 3.

<sup>1</sup> Notice of United States Postal Service Filing of a Functionally Equivalent International Business Reply Service Competitive Contract 3 Negotiated Service Agreement, April 2, 2013 (Notice).

<sup>2</sup> See Docket Nos. MC2011-21 and CP2011-59, Order No. 684, Order Approving International Business Reply Service Competitive Contract 3 Negotiated Service Agreement, February 28, 2011.