NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[NRC-2020-0108]

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; notice of opportunity to comment, request a hearing, and petition for leave to intervene; order imposing procedures.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) received and is considering approval of two amendment requests. The amendment requests are for Oconee Nuclear Station, Units 1, 2, and 3; and Watts Bar Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2. For each amendment request, the NRC proposes to determine that they involve no significant hazards consideration. Because each amendment request contains sensitive unclassified non-safeguards information (SUNSI) an order imposes procedures to obtain access to SUNSI for contention preparation.

DATES: Comments must be filed by [INSERT DATE 30 DAYS FROM DATE OF PUBLICATION IN THE FEDERAL REGISTER]. A request for a hearing or petitions for leave to intervene must be filed by [INSERT DATE 60 DAYS AFTER DATE OF PUBLICATION IN THE FEDERAL REGISTER]. Any potential party as defined in § 2.4 of title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations (10 CFR), who believes access to SUNSI is necessary to respond to this notice must request document access by [INSERT DATE 10 DAYS AFTER DATE OF PUBLICATION IN THE FEDERAL REGISTER].
ADDRESSES: You may submit comments by any of the following methods:

- Federal Rulemaking Web Site: Go to https://www.regulations.gov and search for Docket ID NRC-2020-0108. Address questions about NRC Docket IDs in Regulations.gov to Jennifer Borges; telephone: 301-287-9127; e-mail: Jennifer.Borges@nrc.gov. For technical questions, contact the individual listed in the FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT section of this document.

- Mail comments to: Office of Administration, Mail Stop: TWFN-7-A60M, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, ATTN: Program Management, Announcements and Editing Staff.

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: Bernadette Abeywickrama, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, telephone: 301-415-0481, e-mail: bernadette.abeywickrama@nrc.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Obtaining Information and Submitting Comments

A. Obtaining Information

Please refer to Docket ID NRC-2020-0108, facility name, unit number(s), plant docket number(s), 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:

• **NRC’s Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS):** You may obtain publicly-available documents online in the ADAMS Public Documents collection at [https://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html](https://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html). To begin the search, 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 e-mail to 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.

**B. Submitting Comments**

Please include Docket ID **NRC-2020-0108**, facility name, unit number(s), plant docket number(s), 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 [https://www.regulations.gov](https://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. Background**

Pursuant to Section 189a.(2) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), the NRC is publishing this 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 notice includes notices of amendments containing SUNSI.

III. 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 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 a notice of issuance in the Federal Register. 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 https://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/doc-collections/cfr/. 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 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 https://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 e-mail at 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 https://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 https://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 e-mail notice confirming receipt of the document. The E-Filing system also distributes an e-mail 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 https://www.nrc.gov/site-help/e-submittals.html, by e-mail to 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.

Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC, Docket Nos. 50-269, 50-270, and 50-287, Oconee Nuclear Station, Units 1, 2, and 3, Oconee County, South Carolina.

Date of amendment request: February 19, 2020, as supplemented by letter dated April 6, 2020. Publicly-available versions are available in ADAMS under Accession No. ML20050D379 and Accession No. ML20097E117, respectively.

Description of amendment request: This amendment request contains sensitive unclassified non-safeguards information (SUNSI). The proposed amendment would revise the Renewed Operating Licenses and Technical Specifications (TSs) for each unit at the Oconee Nuclear Station, Units 1, 2, and 3, to support a measurement uncertainty recapture power uprate from 2568 megawatts thermal (MWt) to 2610 MWt.
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 amendment changes the rated thermal power from 2568 megawatts thermal (MWt) to 2610 MWt; an increase of approximately 1.64% Rated Thermal Power. Duke Energy's evaluations have shown that all structures, systems and components (SSCs) are capable of performing their design function at the uprated power of 2610 MWt. A review of station accident analyses found that all acceptance criteria are still met at the uprated power of 2610 MWt.

The radiological consequences of operation at the uprated power conditions have been assessed. The proposed power uprate does not affect release paths, frequency of release, or the analyzed reactor core fission product inventory for any accidents previously evaluated in the Updated Final Safety Analysis Report. Analyses performed to assess the effects of mass and energy releases remain valid. All acceptance criteria for radiological consequences continue to be met at the uprated power level.

The proposed change does not involve any change to the design or functional requirements of the safety and support systems. That is, the increased power level neither degrades the performance of, nor increases the challenges to any safety systems assumed to function in the plant safety analysis.

While power level is an input to accident analyses, it is not an initiator of accidents. The proposed change does not affect any accident precursors and does not introduce any accident initiators. The proposed change does not impact the usefulness of the Surveillance Requirements in evaluating the operability of required systems and components.

In addition, evaluation of the proposed TS changes demonstrates that the ability of equipment and systems required to prevent or mitigate the radiological consequences of an accident is not significantly affected. Since the impact on the systems is minimal, it is concluded that the overall impact on the plant safety analysis
is negligible.

Therefore, the proposed TS change does not significantly increase 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.

No new accident scenarios, failure mechanisms, or single failures are introduced as a result of the proposed change. The installation of the Cameron LEFM CheckPlus System has been analyzed and failures of the system will have no adverse effect on any safety-related system or any SSCs required for transient mitigation. SSCs previously required for the mitigation of a transient continue to be capable of fulfilling their intended design functions. The proposed change has no adverse effect on any safety-related system or component and does not change the performance or integrity of any safety-related system.

The proposed 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 previously evaluated. Operation at the uprated power level does not create any new accident initiators or precursors. Credible malfunctions are bounded by the current accident analyses of record or recent evaluations demonstrating that applicable criteria are still met with the proposed change.

Therefore, this 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.

Although the proposed amendment increases the ONS [Oconee Nuclear Station] Units 1, 2, and 3 operating power level, the units retain their margin of safety because it is only increasing power by the amount equal to the reduction in uncertainty in the heat balance calculation. The margins of safety associated with the power uprate are those pertaining to core thermal power. These include fuel cladding, reactor coolant system pressure boundary, and containment barriers. Analyses demonstrate that the current design basis continues to be met after the measurement uncertainty recapture power uprate. Components associated with the reactor coolant system pressure boundary structural integrity,
including pressure-temperature limits, vessel fluence, and pressurized thermal shock are bounded by the current analyses. Systems will continue to operate within their design parameters and remain capable of performing their intended safety functions.

The current ONS safety analyses including the design basis radiological accident dose calculations, bound the power uprate. 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: Kate Nolan, Deputy General Counsel, Duke Energy Carolinas, 550 South Tryon Street, Charlotte, NC 28202.

NRC Branch Chief: Michael T. Markley.

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

Date of amendment request: January 17, 2020. A publicly-available version is available in ADAMS under Accession No. ML20017A338.

Description of amendment request: This amendment request contains SUNSI. The amendment would revise WBN, Units 1 and 2 TS 5.9.5, “Core Operating Limits Report,” to replace the loss-of-coolant accident (LOCA) analysis evaluation model references with reference to the FULL SPECTRUM™ Loss-of-Coolant Accident (FSLOCA™) Evaluation Model analysis applicable to WBN, Units 1 and 2, with replacement steam generators. The amendments would also revise WBN, Unit 2 Operating License condition 2.C(4) to reflect the implementation of the FSLOCA Evaluation Model
methodology. The amendment would also revise WBN, Unit 1 TS 4.2.1, “Fuel Assemblies,” to delete discussion of Zircalloy fuel rods. Lastly, the amendment would approve a new LOCA-specific Tritium Producing Burnable Absorber Rod stress analysis methodology.

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

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

Response: No.

The proposed change to WBN Units 1 and 2, TS 5.9.5, “Core Operating Limits Report,” to replace the LOCA analysis evaluation model references with reference to the FSLOCA Evaluation Model analysis applicable to both WBN Unit 1 and Unit 2 with replacement steam generators. The proposed change would also revise WBN Unit 1 TS 4.2.1, “Fuel Assemblies,” to delete discussion of Zircalloy fuel rods. These changes implement a Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) approved LOCA evaluation model. The analysis results for WBN Units 1 and 2, based on using the new evaluation model meet the regulatory requirements of 10 CFR 50.46. The use of a new NRC-approved LOCA evaluation model will not increase the potential for an accident. Therefore, the possibility of an accident is not increased by the proposed changes. Because the reactor core meets the regulatory requirements of 10 CFR 50.46 after a postulated LOCA, the consequences of an accident are not increased by the proposed changes.

The use of separate simulations performed in accordance with the FSLOCA Evaluation Model as part of the new tritium producing burnable absorber rod (TPBAR) stress analysis methodology developed by Pacific Northwest National Laboratory and Westinghouse provide a recovery of margin in the post-LOCA criticality evaluation in the presence of assumed TPBR failures. The TPBARs were conservatively assumed to rupture due to high cladding temperature and pressure differential during LBLOCA events. TPBAR rupture results in a positive reactivity addition and is a penalty in the post-LOCA criticality evaluation. TVA proposes to use the FSLOCA Evaluation Model methodology and the new
LOCA-specific TPBAR stress analysis methodology to evaluate the integrity of the TPBARs. The results show that TPBARs will not rupture (with high probability and confidence). Crediting the continued integrity of the TPBARs results will be utilized in the core reload design process to simplify core designs, increase tritium production, and improve fuel cycle economics. The safety analysis process for each reload design will continue to demonstrate that all regulatory criteria are met. The use of a new TPBAR stress analysis methodology will not increase the potential for an accident. Therefore, the possibility of an accident is not increased by the proposed changes. Because the TPBAR failure analysis results show that TPBARs will not rupture (with high probability and confidence), the consequences of an accident are not increased by the proposed changes.

Based on the above discussions, the proposed changes do not involve an 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 to WBN Units 1 and 2 TS 5.9.5 to replace the LOCA analysis evaluation model references with reference to FSLOCA Evaluation Model and the corresponding change to WBN Unit 1 TS 4.2.1 implement an NRC-approved LOCA evaluation model. The use of the new TPBAR stress analysis methodology to analyze the potential for TPBAR failures provides recovery of margin in the post-LOCA criticality evaluation in the presence of assumed TPBAR failures. The use of these two new analytical methodologies will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

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 to WBN Units 1 and 2 TS 5.9.5 to replace the LOCA analysis evaluation model references with reference to the FSLOCA Evaluation Model and the corresponding change to WBN Unit 1 TS 4.2.1 implement an NRC-approved LOCA evaluation model. The analysis results for WBN Units 1 and 2,
based on using the new evaluation model, meet the regulatory requirements of 10 CFR 50.46 with increased margin after a postulated LOCA.

The analysis results for WBN Units 1 and 2, based on using the new LOCA specific TPBAR stress analysis methodology show that TPBARs will not rupture (with high probability and confidence), which provides an increase of margin in the post-LOCA criticality evaluation in the presence of assumed TPBAR failures.

Accordingly, 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:** General Counsel, Tennessee Valley Authority, 400 West Summit Hill Drive, 6A West Tower, Knoxville, TN 37902.

**NRC Branch Chief:** Undine Shoop.

---

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

**Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC, Docket Nos. 50-269, 50-270, and 50-287 Oconee Nuclear Station, Units 1, 2, and 3, Oconee County, South Carolina**

**Tennessee Valley Authority, Docket Nos. 50-390 and 50-391, Watts Bar Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2, Rhea County, Tennessee**
A. This Order contains instructions regarding how potential parties to this proceeding may request access to documents containing 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 access to SUNSI. 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 Deputy General Counsel for Hearings and Administration, Office of the General Counsel, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, 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 e-mail address for the Office of the Secretary and the Office of the General Counsel are Hearing.Docket@nrc.gov and RidsOgcMailCenter.Resource@nrc.gov, respectively.¹

The request must include the following information:

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

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

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

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

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

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

E. If the NRC staff determines that the requestor satisfies both D.(1) and D.(2) above, the NRC staff will notify the requestor in writing that access to SUNSI has been granted. The written notification will contain instructions on how the requestor may obtain copies of the requested documents, and any other conditions that may apply to access to those documents. These conditions may include, but are not limited to, the signing of a Non-Disclosure Agreement or Affidavit, or Protective Order\(^2\) setting forth terms and conditions to prevent the unauthorized or inadvertent disclosure of SUNSI by each individual who will be granted access to SUNSI.

\(^2\) 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.
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 requester no later than 25 days after receipt of (or access to) that information. 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.


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

(2) The requester 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.

(3) Further appeals of decisions under this paragraph must be made pursuant to 10 CFR 2.311.

H. Review of Grants of Access. A party other than the requester 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 within 5 days of the notification by the NRC staff of its grant of access and must be filed 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.

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 2.311.3

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. The attachment to this Order summarizes the general target schedule for processing and resolving requests under these procedures.

IT IS SO ORDERED.


For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Annette L. Vietti-Cook,

Secretary of the Commission.

---

3 Requestors should note that the filing requirements of the NRC’s E-Filing Rule (72 FR 49139; August 28, 2007, as amended at 77 FR 46562; August 3, 2012) apply to appeals of NRC staff determinations (because they must be served on a presiding officer or the Commission, as applicable), but not to the initial SUNSI request submitted to the NRC staff under these procedures.
## ATTACHMENT 1—General Target Schedule for Processing and Resolving Requests for Access to Sensitive Unclassified Non-Safeguards Information in this Proceeding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Event/Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Publication of Federal Register notice of hearing and opportunity to petition for leave to intervene, including order with instructions for access requests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Deadline for submitting petition for intervention containing: (i) demonstration of standing; and (ii) all contentions whose formulation does not require access to SUNSI (+25 Answers to petition for intervention; +7 petitioner/requestor reply).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>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 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).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>If NRC staff finds no “need” or no likelihood of standing, the deadline for petitioner/requestor to file a motion seeking a ruling to reverse the NRC staff’s denial of access; NRC staff files copy of access determination with the presiding officer (or Chief Administrative Judge or other designated officer, as appropriate). If NRC staff finds “need” for SUNSI, the deadline for any party to the proceeding whose interest independent of the proceeding would be harmed by the release of the information to file a motion seeking a ruling to reverse the NRC staff’s grant of access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Deadline for NRC staff reply to motions to reverse NRC staff determination(s).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>(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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day</td>
<td>Event/Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SUNSI.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A + 3</td>
<td>Deadline for filing executed Non-Disclosure Affidavits. Access provided to SUNSI consistent with decision issuing the protective order.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A + 28</td>
<td>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 opportunity to request a hearing and petition for leave to intervene), the petitioner may file its SUNSI contentions by that later deadline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A + 53</td>
<td>(Contention receipt +25) Answers to contentions whose development depends upon access to SUNSI.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A + 60</td>
<td>(Answer receipt +7) Petitioner/Intervenor reply to answers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;A + 60</td>
<td>Decision on contention admission.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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