

10:15–10:35 Target Identification and Planetary Defense—Dr. John Grunsfeld
 10:35–10:50 Mission—Technology Approach—Mike Gazarik
 10:50–11:05 Mission—Human Exploration—William Gerstenmaier
 11:05–11:20 Extensibility—Steve Stich
 11:20–11:35 Partnership and Innovative Methods—Mason Peck
 11:35–11:50 Summer Engagement Calendar—TBD
 This forum will be open to the public up to the seating capacity of the room.

Attendees should enter the west lobby doors of the NASA Headquarters building at 300 E Street SW., Washington, DC. Upon arrival, all participants will be required to check in at the registration table located in the lobby and show photo identification.

Registration

Individuals who plan to attend the Asteroid Initiative Forum must register online. Due to capacity limitations, a maximum of 150 registrations will be accepted. Those who intend to watch the live web stream are also encouraged to register as a virtual participant. Registration will be available starting Tuesday, May 28: www.nasa.gov/asteroid.

Check In

Any individuals who have registered to attend the Asteroid Initiative Forum should enter the west lobby doors of the NASA Headquarters building at 300 E Street SW., Washington, DC. Upon arrival, all participants will be required to check in at the registration table located in the lobby and show photo identification.

Press

News media interested in attending are required to pre-register and should contact Sarah Becky Ramsey at 202–358–1694 for additional information.

Security

Event attendees will not be required to check in at the security desk to obtain a visitor's badge. However, participants will be subject to personal inspection (e.g., passing through a metal detector), prior to entering the auditorium.

Directions

Directions to NASA Headquarters are available online at the following URL: <http://www.nasa.gov/centers/hq/about/map.html>.

Driving

Parking lots are located near the NASA Headquarters building. Check the

local yellow pages or Internet for exact locations.

Metro

Metro stops nearest NASA Headquarters are L'Enfant Plaza (orange, blue, yellow, and green lines) and Federal Center SW (orange and blue lines).

From L'Enfant Plaza station, take the Department of Transportation exit and turn left at the top of the escalators. Head east (on School St. or E St. SW.) and south (on 4th or 6th St. SW.) to arrive at the west entrance of the NASA building near the corner of E St. SW. and 4th St. SW.

From the exit of the Federal Center SW metro station, head south on 3rd St. SW and then west on E St. SW. to arrive at the west entrance of the NASA building near the corner of E St. SW. and 4th St. SW.

William Gerstenmaier,

Associate Administrator, Human Exploration & Operations Mission Directorate.

[FR Doc. 2013–12547 Filed 5–24–13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7510–13–P

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Proposal Review Panel for Chemistry; Notice of Meeting

In accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92–463, as amended), the National Science Foundation announces the following meeting:

Name: CCI Phase II Panel, #1191

Date and Time: June 10, 2013, 8:30 a.m.–5:30 p.m.; June 11, 2013 8:30 a.m.–2:00 p.m.

Place: National Science Foundation, 4021 Wilson Blvd., Arlington, Virginia 22230.

Type of Meeting: Part-open.

Contact Person: Zeev Rosenzweig, Program Director, Centers for Chemical Innovation Program, Division of Chemistry, Room 1055, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, VA 22230, (703) 292–7719.

To help facilitate your entry into the building, please contact the individual listed above. Your request to attend this meeting should be received by email (zrosenzw@nsf.gov) on or prior to June 6, 2013.

Purpose of Meeting: To conduct an in depth evaluation of performance, to assess progress towards goals, and to provide recommendations.

Agenda:

Monday, June 10, 2013

8:30 a.m.–9:30 a.m. Closed—Panel Briefing -

9:30 a.m.–12:30 a.m.–1 Open—Center Presentation and Poster Session, Stafford I, Room 1235

12:30 a.m.–5:30 p.m. Closed—Panel Briefing, Discussions, Drafting Summary: -

Tuesday, June 11, 2013

8:00 a.m.–1:00 p.m. Closed—Panel Briefing Formulating Recommendation and Finalizing the Panel Summary -

Reason for Closing: The meeting is closed to the public because the Panel will be reviewing proposal actions that will include privileged intellectual property and personal information that could harm individuals if they were disclosed. If discussions were open to the public, these matters that are exempt under 5 U.S.C. 552b(c)(4) and (6) of the Government Sunshine Act would be improperly disclosed.

Dated: May 21, 2013.

Susanne Bolton,

Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 2013–12481 Filed 5–24–13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[NRC–2013–0105]

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

Background

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

This biweekly notice includes all notices of amendments issued, or proposed to be issued from May 2, 2013 to May 15, 2013. The last biweekly notice was published on May 14, 2013 (78 FR 28248).

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

- *Federal Rulemaking Web site:* Go to <http://www.regulations.gov> and search for Docket ID NRC-2013-0105. Address questions about NRC dockets to Carol Gallagher; telephone: 301-492-3668; email: Carol.Gallagher@nrc.gov. For technical questions, contact the individual(s) listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section of this document.

- *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-2013-0105 when contacting the NRC about the availability of information regarding this document. You may access information related to this document, which the NRC possesses and is publicly-available, by the following methods:

- *Federal Rulemaking Web site:* Go to <http://www.regulations.gov> and search for Docket ID NRC-2013-0105.

- *NRC's Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS):* You may access publicly-available documents online in the NRC Library at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html>. To begin the search, select "ADAMS Public Documents" and then select "Begin Web-based ADAMS Search." For problems with ADAMS, please contact the NRC's Public Document Room (PDR) reference staff at 1-800-397-4209, 301-415-4737, or by email to pdr.resource@nrc.gov. Documents may be viewed in ADAMS by performing a search on the document date and docket number.

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

B. Submitting Comments

Please include Docket ID NRC-2013-0105 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 posts all comment submissions at <http://www.regulations.gov> as well as entering 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.

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

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

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

Normally, the Commission will not issue the amendment until the expiration of 60 days after the date of

publication of this notice. The Commission may issue the license amendment before expiration of the 60-day period provided that its final determination is that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration. In addition, the Commission may issue the amendment prior to the expiration of the 30-day comment period should circumstances change during the 30-day comment period such that failure to act in a timely way would result, for example in derating or shutdown of the facility. Should the Commission take action prior to the expiration of either the comment period or the notice period, it will publish in the **Federal Register** a notice of issuance. Should the Commission make a final No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, any hearing will take place after issuance. The Commission expects that the need to take this action will occur very infrequently.

Within 60 days after the date of publication of this notice, any person(s) whose interest may be affected by this action may file a request for a hearing and a petition to intervene with respect to issuance of the amendment to the subject facility operating license or combined license. Requests for a hearing and a petition for leave to intervene shall be filed in accordance with the Commission's "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 by the above date, the Commission or a presiding officer designated by the Commission or by the Chief Administrative Judge of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, will rule on the request and/or petition; and the Secretary or the Chief Administrative Judge of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board will issue a notice of a hearing or an appropriate order.

As required by 10 CFR 2.309, a petition for leave to intervene shall set forth with particularity the interest of the petitioner in the proceeding, and how that interest may be affected by the results of the proceeding. The petition should specifically explain the reasons why intervention should be permitted with particular reference to the

following general requirements: (1) The name, address, and telephone number of the requestor or petitioner; (2) the nature of the requestor's/petitioner's right under the Act to be made a party to the proceeding; (3) the nature and extent of the requestor's/petitioner's property, financial, or other interest in the proceeding; and (4) the possible effect of any decision or order which may be entered in the proceeding on the requestor's/petitioner's interest. The petition must also identify the specific contentions which the requestor/petitioner seeks to have litigated at the proceeding.

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

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

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

would take place before the issuance of any amendment.

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

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

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

If a participant is electronically submitting a document to the NRC in accordance with the E-Filing rule, the

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

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

A person filing electronically using the agency's adjudicatory E-Filing system may seek assistance by contacting the NRC Meta System Help Desk through the "Contact Us" link located on the NRC's Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/e-submittals.html>, by email at MSHD.Resource@nrc.gov, or by a toll-free call at 1-866 672-7640. The NRC Meta System Help Desk is available between 8 a.m. and 8 p.m., Eastern Time, Monday through Friday, excluding government holidays.

Participants who believe that they have a good cause for not submitting documents electronically must file an exemption request, in accordance with 10 CFR 2.302(g), with their initial paper filing requesting authorization to

continue to submit documents in paper format. Such filings must be submitted by: (1) First class mail addressed to the Office of the Secretary of the Commission, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, Attention: Rulemaking and Adjudications Staff; or (2) courier, express mail, or expedited delivery service to the Office of the Secretary, Sixteenth Floor, One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland, 20852, Attention: Rulemaking and Adjudications Staff. Participants filing a document in this manner are responsible for serving the document on all other participants. Filing is considered complete by first-class mail as of the time of deposit in the mail, or by courier, express mail, or expedited delivery service upon depositing the document with the provider of the service. A presiding officer, having granted an exemption request from using E-Filing, may require a participant or party to use E-Filing if the presiding officer subsequently determines that the reason for granting the exemption from use of E-Filing no longer exists.

Documents submitted in adjudicatory proceedings will appear in the NRC's electronic hearing docket which is available to the public at <http://ehd1.nrc.gov/ehd/>, unless excluded pursuant to an order of the Commission, or the presiding officer. Participants are requested not to include personal privacy information, such as social security numbers, home addresses, or home phone numbers in their filings, unless an NRC regulation or other law requires submission of such information. 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 license amendment application, see the application for amendment which is available for public inspection at the NRC's PDR, located at One White Flint North, Room O1-F21, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland 20852. Publicly available documents created or received at the NRC are accessible electronically through ADAMS in the NRC Library at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html>. Persons who do not have access to ADAMS or who encounter problems in accessing the documents located in ADAMS, should contact the NRC's PDR Reference staff at 1-800-397-4209, 301-415-4737, or by email to pdr.resource@nrc.gov.

Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant, LLC, the licensee, Docket Nos. 50-317 and 50-318, Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2, Calvert County, Maryland

Date of amendments request: January 28, 2013, as supplemented by letter dated April 1, 2013.

Description of amendments request: The amendment would revise several Technical Specification (TS) to eliminate the second completion time by adopting TS Task Force (TSTF)-439-A, Revision 2, "Eliminate Second Completion Times Limiting Time from Discovery of Failure to Meet an LCO [limiting condition for operation]."

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 change proposed by incorporating TSTF-439-A, Revision 2, eliminates certain Completion Times from the [TSs]. Completion Times are not an initiator to any accident previously evaluated. As a result, the probability of an accident previously evaluated is not affected. The consequences of an accident during the revised Completion Times are no different than the consequences of the same accident during the existing Completion Times. As a result, the consequences of an accident previously evaluated are not affected by this change. The proposed change does not alter or prevent the ability of structures, systems, or components

from performing their intended function to mitigate the consequences of an initiating event within the assumed acceptance limits.

The proposed change to modify certain Completion Times does not affect the source term, containment isolation, or radiological release assumptions used in evaluating the radiological consequences of an accident previously evaluated. Further, the proposed change does not increase the types or amounts of radioactive effluent that may be released offsite, nor significantly increase the cumulative occupational/public radiation exposures. The proposed change is consistent with the safety analysis assumptions and resultant consequences.

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

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

Response: No.

The proposed changes do not involve a physical alteration of the plant (i.e., no new or different type of equipment will be installed) or a change in the methods governing normal plant operation. The proposed changes do not alter any assumptions made in the safety analysis.

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

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

Response: No.

The proposed change to delete the second Completion Time and the related example of second Completion Times does not alter the manner in which safety limits, limiting safety system settings or [LCOs] are determined. The safety analysis acceptance criteria are not affected by this change. The proposed change will not result in plant operation in a configuration outside of the design basis.

Therefore, the proposed amendment 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 amendments request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Attorney for licensee: Steven L. Miller, General Counsel, Constellation Energy Nuclear Group, LLC., 100 Constellation Way, Suite 200c, Baltimore, MD 21202.

NRC Acting Branch Chief: Sean Meighan.

Carolina Power and Light Company, Docket No. 50–325, Brunswick Steam Electric Plant, Unit 1, Brunswick County, North Carolina

Carolina Power & Light Company, et al., Docket No. 50–400, Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 1, Wake and Chatham Counties, North Carolina

Carolina Power & Light Company, Docket No. 50–261, H.B. Robinson Steam Electric Plant, Unit 2, Darlington County, South Carolina

Date of amendment request: April 20, 2013.

Description of amendment request: The proposed change would revise the corporate name of the licensee in each facility's operating license from Carolina Power & Light Company to Duke Energy Progress, Inc.

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

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

The proposed amendments involve a change of the corporate name of Carolina Power & Light Company to Duke Energy Progress, Inc. The proposed amendments do not involve any change in the technical qualifications of the licensee or the plant's design, configuration, or operation. All Limiting Conditions for Operation, Limiting Safety System Settings and Safety Limits specified in the Technical Specifications remain unchanged. Also, the physical security plan and related plans, the operator training and requalification program, the quality assurance program, and the emergency plan will not be materially changed by the proposed corporate name change. The corporate name change amendments will not affect the executive oversight provided by the Chief Nuclear Officer and his staff.

Therefore, the proposed amendments do not involve any increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously analyzed.

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

The proposed amendments do not involve any change in the plant's design, configuration, or operation. The current plant design, design bases, and plant safety analysis will remain the same.

The Limiting Conditions for Operations, Limiting Safety System Settings, and Safety Limits specified in the Technical Specifications are not affected by the proposed corporate name change. As such, the plant conditions for which the design basis accident analysis was performed remain valid.

The proposed amendments do not introduce a new mode of plant operation or new accident precursors, do not involve any physical alterations to the plant's configuration, or make changes to system setpoints that could initiate a new or different kind of accident.

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

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

The proposed amendments do not involve a change in the plant's design, configuration, or operation. The proposed amendments affect neither the way in which the plant's structures, systems, and components perform their safety function nor its design and licensing bases.

Plant safety margins are established through Limiting Conditions for Operation, Limiting Safety System Settings and Safety Limits specified in the Technical Specifications. Because there is no change to the physical design of the plant, there is no change to any of these margins.

Therefore, the proposed amendments 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: Lara S. Nichols, 550 South Tryon Street, M/C DEC45A, Charlotte, North Carolina 28202.

NRC Branch Chief: Jessie F. Quichocho.

Florida Power and Light Company, Docket No. 50–250, Turkey Point Nuclear Plant, Unit 3, Miami-Dade County, Florida

Date of amendment request: March 8, 2013.

Description of amendment request: The license amendment request proposes a one-time (temporary) extension of Technical Specification (TS) Surveillance Requirement 4.5.1.1.d involving an operability demonstration of emergency core cooling system (ECCS) accumulator check valves. The requested surveillance extension will allow 2 months more than the currently specified refueling outage interval of 18 months plus 4.5-month grace period and facilitate the plant's ability to optimize fuel burn-up during the current operating cycle.

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 requested action is a one-time extension to the performance interval of one TS surveillance requirement. The performance of the surveillance, or the failure to perform the surveillance, is not a precursor to an accident. Performing the surveillance or failing to perform the surveillance does not affect the probability of an accident. Therefore, the proposed delays in performance of the surveillance requirement in this amendment request does not increase the probability of an accident previously evaluated.

A delay in performing the surveillance does not result in a system being unable to perform its required function. In the case of this one-time extension request, the relatively short period of additional time that the system and components will be in service before the next performance of the surveillance will not affect the ability of the system to operate as designed noting that no time-dependent failure modes have been identified for the subject check valves.

The ECCS accumulators will remain capable of performing their required safety function. No new failure modes have been introduced because of this action, and the consequences remain consistent with previously evaluated accidents. Therefore, the proposed delay in the performance of the surveillance requirement in this amendment request does not involve a significant increase in the consequences of an accident.

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

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

Response: No.

The proposed amendment does not involve a physical alteration of any system, structure, or component (SSC) or a change in the way any SSC is operated. The proposed amendment does not involve operation of any SSC in a manner or configuration different from those previously recognized or evaluated. The subject check valves do not have any time-dependent failure modes and no new failure mechanisms will be introduced by the one-time surveillance extension being requested.

Therefore, the proposed amendment 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 the margin of safety?

Response: No.

The proposed amendment is a one-time extension of the performance interval for one TS surveillance requirement. Extending the surveillance requirement does not involve a modification of any TS Limiting Condition for Operation. Extending the surveillance frequency does not involve a change to any limit on accident consequences specified in

the license or regulations. Extending the surveillance frequency does not involve a change to how accidents are mitigated or a significant increase in the consequences of an accident. Extending the surveillance frequency does not involve a change in a methodology used to evaluate consequences of an accident. Extending the surveillance frequency does not involve a change in any operating procedure or process.

The components involved in this request have exhibited reliable operation based on the results of past 18-month surveillance tests over the last six refueling outages. Based on the limited additional period of time that the systems and components will be in service before the surveillances are next performed, as well as the operating experience that indicates this surveillance has been successful when performed, it is reasonable to conclude that any margin of safety associated with the surveillance requirement will not be affected by the requested extension.

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

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

Attorney for licensee: James Petro, Managing Attorney—Nuclear, Florida Power & Light Company, P.O. Box 14000, Juno Beach, Florida 33408–0420.
NRC Branch Chief: Jessie F. Quichocho.

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

Date of amendment request: March 14, 2013

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would modify the Technical Specifications (TS) definition of “Shutdown Margin” (SDM) to adopt TSTF–535, “Revise Shutdown Margin Definition to Address Advanced Fuel Designs”, which would require calculation of the SDM at a reactor moderator temperature of 68°F or a higher temperature that represents the most reactive state throughout the operating cycle.

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

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

Response: No.

The proposed change revises the definition of SDM. SDM is not an initiator to any accident previously evaluated. Accordingly, the proposed change to the definition of SDM has no effect on the probability of any accident previously evaluated. SDM is an assumption in the analysis of some previously evaluated accidents and inadequate SDM could lead to an increase in consequences for those accidents. However, the proposed change revises the SDM definition to ensure that the correct SDM is determined for all fuel types at all times during the fuel cycle. As a result, the proposed change does not adversely affect the consequences of any accident previously evaluated.

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

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

Response: No.

The proposed change revises the definition of SDM. The change does not involve a physical alteration of the plant (i.e., no new or different type of equipment will be installed) or a change in the methods governing normal plant operations. The change does not alter assumptions made in the safety analysis regarding SDM.

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

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

Response: No.

The proposed change revises the definition of SDM. The proposed change does not alter the manner in which safety limits, limiting safety system settings or limiting conditions for operation are determined. The proposed change ensures that the SDM assumed in determining safety limits, limiting safety system settings or limiting conditions for operation is correct for all BWR fuel types at all times during the fuel cycle.

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: Mr. James Petro, P.O. Box 14000, Juno Beach, FL 33408–0420.

NRC Branch Chief: Robert D. Carlson.

South Carolina Electric and Gas Company, South Carolina Public Service Authority, Docket No. 50–395, Virgil C. Summer Nuclear Station, Unit 1, Fairfield County, South Carolina

Date of amendment request: April 2, 2013.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would revise related Technical Specification (TS) surveillance requirements (SRs) for snubbers to conform to planned revisions of the snubber inservice inspection (ISI) program.

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

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

Response: No.

The proposed changes would revise SR 4.7.7 to conform the TS to the revised ISI program for snubbers. Snubber examination, testing and service life monitoring will continue to meet the requirements of 10 CFR 50.55a(g). Snubber examination, testing and service life monitoring is not an initiator of any accident previously evaluated. Therefore, the probability of an accident previously evaluated is not significantly increased. Snubbers will continue to be demonstrated OPERABLE by performance of a program for examination, testing and service life monitoring in compliance with 10 CFR 50.55a or authorized alternatives. The proposed change to TS ACTION 3.7.7 for inoperable snubbers is administrative in nature and is required for consistency with the proposed change to SR 4.7.7. The proposed change does not adversely affect plant operations, design functions or analyses that verify the capability of systems, structures, and components to perform their design functions.

Therefore, the consequences of accidents previously evaluated are not significantly increased. Based on the above, this change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

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

Response: No.

The proposed changes do not involve any physical alteration of plant equipment. The proposed changes do not alter the method by which any safety-related system performs its function. As such, no new or different types of equipment will be installed, and the basic operation of installed equipment is unchanged. The methods governing plant operation and testing remain consistent with current safety analysis assumptions.

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

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

Response: No.

The proposed changes ensure snubber examination, testing and service life monitoring will continue to meet the

requirements of 10 CFR 50.55a(g). Snubbers will continue to be demonstrated OPERABLE by performance of a program for examination, testing and service life monitoring in compliance with 10 CFR 50.55a or authorized alternatives. The proposed change to TS ACTION 3.7.7 for inoperable snubbers is administrative in nature and is required for consistency with the proposed change to SR 4.7.7.

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

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

Attorney for licensee: J. Hagood Hamilton, Jr., South Carolina Electric & Gas Company, Post Office Box 764, Columbia, South Carolina 29218.

NRC Branch Chief: Robert J. Pascarelli.

South Carolina Electric and Gas Docket Nos.: 52-027 and 52-028, Virgil C. Summer Nuclear Station (VCSNS) Units 2 and 3, Fairfield County, South Carolina

Date of amendment request: March 13, 2013.

Description of amendment request: The proposed change would amend Combined License Nos.: NPF-93 and NPF-94 for Virgil C. Summer Nuclear Station (VCSNS) Units 2 and 3 by departing from the plant-specific design control document Tier 2* material by revising reference document APP-OCS-GEH-320, "AP1000 Human Factors Engineering Integrated System Validation Plan" from Revision D to Revision 2. APP-OCS-GEH-320 is incorporated by reference in the updated final safety analysis report (UFSAR) as a means to implement the activities associated with the human factors engineering verification and validation.

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 Integrated System Validation (ISV) provides a comprehensive human performance-based assessment of the design of the AP1000 Human-System Interface (HSI) resources, based on their realistic operation

within a simulator-driven Main Control Room (MCR). The ISV is part of the overall AP1000 Human Factors Engineering (HFE) program. The changes are to the ISV Plan to clarify the scope and amend the details of the methodology. The ISV Plan is needed to perform, in the simulator, the scenarios described in the document. The functions and tasks allocated to plant personnel can still be accomplished after the proposed changes. The performance of the tests governed by the ISV Plan provides additional assurances that the operators can appropriately respond to plant transients. The ISV Plan does not affect the plant itself. Changing the ISV Plan does not affect prevention and mitigation of abnormal events, e.g., accidents, anticipated operational occurrences, earthquakes, floods and turbine missiles, or their safety or design analyses. No safety-related structure, system, component (SSC) or function is adversely affected. The changes do not involve nor interface with any SSC accident initiator or initiating sequence of events, and thus, the probabilities of the accidents evaluated in the UFSAR are not affected. Because the changes do not involve any safety-related SSC or function used to mitigate an accident, the consequences of the accidents evaluated in the UFSAR are not affected.

Therefore, there is no significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

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

Response: No.

The changes to the ISV Plan affect the testing and validation of the Main Control Room and Human System Interface using a plant simulator. Therefore, the changes do not affect the safety-related equipment itself, nor do they affect equipment which, if it failed, could initiate an accident or a failure of a fission product barrier. No analysis is adversely affected. No system or design function or equipment qualification will be adversely affected by the changes. This activity will not allow for a new fission product release path, nor will it result in a new fission product barrier failure mode, nor create a new sequence of events that would result in significant fuel cladding failures. In addition, the changes do not result in a new failure mode, malfunction or sequence of events that could affect safety or safety-related equipment.

Therefore, this activity does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident than any accident previously evaluated.

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

Response: No.

The changes to the ISV Plan affect the testing and validation of the Main Control Room and Human System Interface using a plant simulator. Therefore, the changes do not affect the assessments or the plant itself. These changes do not affect safety-related equipment or equipment whose failure could initiate an accident, nor does it adversely interface with safety-related equipment or fission product barriers. No safety analysis or

design basis acceptance limit/criterion is challenged or exceeded by the requested change.

Therefore, there is no 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: Ms. Kathryn M. Sutton, Morgan, Lewis & Bockius, LLC., 1111 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20004-2514.

NRC Acting Branch Chief: Lawrence Burkhardt.

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

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

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

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

For further details with respect to the action see (1) The applications for amendment, (2) the amendment, and (3) the Commission's related letter, Safety Evaluation and/or Environmental Assessment as indicated. All of these items are available for public inspection at the NRC's Public Document Room

(PDR), located at One White Flint North, Room O1–F21, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland 20852. Publicly available documents created or received at the NRC are accessible electronically through the Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS) in the NRC Library at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html>. If you do not have access to ADAMS or if there are problems in accessing the documents located in ADAMS, contact the PDR's Reference staff at 1–800–397–4209, 301–415–4737 or by email to pdr.resource@nrc.gov.

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

Date of application for amendment: November 13, 2012.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revises surveillance requirements (SRs) which currently require operating the ventilation system for at least 10 continuous hours with the heaters operating every 31 days for SR 3.6.4.3.1 and 31 days on a staggered test basis for SR 3.7.3.1. The SRs would be changed to require at least 15 continuous minutes of ventilation system operation every 31 days and include technical specification (TS) bases changes that summarize and clarify the purpose of the TS in accordance with TS Task Force Traveler (TSTF) 522, “Revise Ventilation System Surveillance Requirements to operate for 10 Hours per Month.”

Date of issuance: May 13, 2013.

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

Amendment No.: 192.

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

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: January 22, 2013 (78 FR 4471).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 13, 2013.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

Date of amendment request: September 5, 2012.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would modify PNPP's Technical Specifications (TS) Table 3.3.5.1–1, “Emergency Core Cooling System (ECCS) Instrumentation,” footnote (a) to require ECCS instrumentation to be operable only when the associated ECCS

subsystems are required to be operable. This proposed change is consistent with Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC)-approved TS Task Force (TSTF) change traveler TSTF–275–A, Revision 0.

Additionally, the proposed amendment would add exceptions to the diesel generator (DG) surveillance requirements (SRs) for TS 3.8.2, “AC Sources—Shutdown,” to eliminate the requirement that the DG be capable of responding to ECCS initiation signals while the ECCS subsystems are not required to be operable. This proposed change is consistent with NRC-approved TSTF–300–A, Revision 0.

Date of issuance: May 6, 2013.

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

Amendment No.: 163.

Facility Operating License No. NPF–58: This amendment revised the Technical Specifications and License.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: January 8, 2013 (78 FR 1270).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 6, 2013.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

Date of application for amendments: August 11, 2011, as supplemented by letters dated February 21, 2012, July 9, 2012, October 4, 2012, February 8, 2013, and April 30, 2013.

Brief description of amendments: The amendments revise the PINGP licensing basis to address plant capability related to the diesel fuel oil supplies during a design basis accident with a loss of offsite power and a single failure. The amendments also revise the technical specification (TS) fuel oil storage volume requirements to reflect the new licensing basis, resolve non-conservative emergency diesel generator fuel oil supply volumes, incorporate portions of Technical Specification Task Force Traveler 501, “Relocate Stored Fuel Oil and Lube Oil Volume Values to Licensee Control,” and make other administrative changes to the TSs.

Date of issuance: May 9, 2013.

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

Amendment Nos.: 207 and 194.

Renewed Facility Operating License Nos. DPR–42 and DPR–60: Amendments revised the Licenses and TSs.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: December 13, 2011 (76 FR 77568).

The supplemental letters contained clarifying information and did not change the initial no significant hazards consideration determination, and did not expand the scope of the original **Federal Register** notice.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 9, 2013.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 17th day of May 2013.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Michele G. Evans,

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

[FR Doc. 2013–12424 Filed 5–24–13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 40–8943–MLA–2; ASLBP No. 13–926–01–MLA–BD01]

Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel; Before the Licensing Board: G. Paul Bollwerk, III, Chairman, Dr. Richard E. Wardwell, Dr. Thomas J. Hirons; Crow Butte Resources, Inc. (Marsland Expansion Area); Memorandum and Order (Notice of Hearing)

May 16, 2013.

This proceeding concerns the May 16, 2012 application of Crow Butte Resources, Inc., (CBR) to amend its 10 CFR part 40 source materials license that authorizes the operation of CBR's existing in situ uranium recovery (ISR) facility near Crawford, Nebraska. If issued by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC), the requested amendment would permit CBR to operate a satellite ISR facility, the Marsland Expansion Area (MEA) site, which is located in Dawes County, Nebraska, some eleven miles to the southeast of CBR's Crawford central processing facility. In response to a November 26, 2012 NRC hearing opportunity notice regarding this application, *see* [CBR], License SUA–1534, License Amendment to Construct and Operate [MEA], 77 FR 71,454 (Nov. 30, 2012), petitioner Oglala Sioux Tribe (OST) and petitioners Antonia Loretta Afraid of Bear Cook, Bruce McIntosh, Debra White Plume, Western Nebraska Resources Council, and Aligning for Responsible Mining, referred to jointly as the Consolidated Petitioners, filed timely requests for hearing/petitions for leave to intervene contesting the CBR ISR amendment application. On