

Agenda

(1) Chair's opening remarks—Clerk of the House.

(2) Recognition of Co-chair—Secretary of the Senate

(3) Recognition of the Acting Archivist of the United States.

(4) Approval of the minutes of the last meeting.

(5) Discussion of on-going projects and activities.

(6) Activities Report of the Center for Legislative Archives.

(7) Other current issues and new business.

The meeting is open to the public.

Dated: April 8, 2009.

Mary Ann Hadyka,

Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. E9-8506 Filed 4-13-09; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7515-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. NRC-2009-0150]

Agency Information Collection Activities: Proposed Collection; Comment Request

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

ACTION: Notice of pending NRC action to submit an information collection request to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) and solicitation of public comment.

SUMMARY: The NRC invites public comment about our intention to request the OMB's approval for renewal of an existing information collection that is summarized below. We are required to publish this notice in the **Federal Register** under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35).

Information pertaining to the requirement to be submitted:

1. *The Title of the Information Collection:* 10 CFR Part 60—"Disposal of High-Level Radioactive Wastes in Geologic Repositories."

2. *Current OMB Approval Number:* 3150-0127.

3. *How Often the Collection is Required:* The information need only be submitted one time.

4. *Who is Required or Asked to Report:* State or Indian Tribes, or their representatives, requesting consultation with the NRC staff regarding review of a potential high-level radioactive waste geologic repository site, or wishing to participate in a license application review for a potential geologic

repository (other than a potential geologic repository site at Yucca Mountain, Nevada, currently under investigation by the U.S. Department of Energy, which is now regulated under 10 CFR Part 63).

5. *The Number of Annual Respondents:* 1; however none are expected in the next three years.

6. *The Number of Hours Needed Annually to Complete the Requirement or Request:* 1; however, none are expected in the next three years.

7. *Abstract:* Part 60 requires States and Indian Tribes to submit certain information to the NRC if they request consultation with the NRC staff concerning the review of a potential repository site, or wish to participate in a license application review for a potential repository (other than the Yucca Mountain, Nevada site proposed by the U.S. Department of Energy). Representatives of States or Indian Tribes must submit a statement of their authority to act in such a representative capacity. The information submitted by the States and Indian Tribes is used by the Director of the Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards as a basis for decisions about the commitment of NRC staff resources to the consultation and participation efforts. As provided in § 60.1, the regulations in 10 CFR Part 60 no longer apply to the licensing of a geologic repository at Yucca Mountain. All of the information collection requirements pertaining to Yucca Mountain were included in 10 CFR Part 63, and were approved by the Office of Management and Budget under control number 3150-0199. The Yucca Mountain site is regulated under 10 CFR Part 63 (66 FR 55792, November 2, 2001).

Submit, by June 15, 2009, comments that address the following questions:

1. Is the proposed collection of information necessary for the NRC to properly perform its functions? Does the information have practical utility?

2. Is the burden estimate accurate?

3. Is there a way to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected?

4. How can the burden of the information collection be minimized, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology?

A copy of the draft supporting statement may be viewed free of charge at the NRC Public Document Room, One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Room O-1 F21, Rockville, MD 20852. OMB clearance requests are available at the NRC worldwide Web site: <http://www.nrc.gov/public-involve/doc-comment/omb/index.html>. The

document will be available on the NRC home page site for 60 days after the signature date of this notice. Comments submitted in writing or in electronic form will be made available for public inspection. Because your comments will not be edited to remove any identifying or contact information, the NRC cautions you against including any information in your submission that you do not want to be publicly disclosed. Comments submitted should reference Docket No. NRC-2009-0150. You may submit your comments by any of the following methods. Electronic comments: Go to <http://www.regulations.gov> and search for Docket No. NRC-2009-0150. Mail comments to NRC Clearance Officer, Gregory Trussell (T-5 F53), U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001. Questions about the information collection requirements may be directed to the NRC Clearance Officer, Gregory Trussell (T-5 F53), U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, by telephone at 301-415-6445, or by e-mail to INFOCOLLECTS.Resource@NRC.GOV.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 2nd day of April 2009.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Gregory Trussell,

NRC Clearance Officer, Office of Information Services.

[FR Doc. E9-8447 Filed 4-13-09; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[NRC-2009-0160]

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

I. Background

Pursuant to section 189a.(2) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission or NRC) staff is publishing this notice. The Act requires the Commission publish notice of any amendments issued, or proposed to be issued and grants the Commission the authority to issue and make immediately effective any amendment to an operating license 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 sensitive unclassified non-safeguards information (SUNSI) or safeguards information (SGI).

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

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

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

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

Written comments may be submitted by mail to the Chief, Rulemaking and Directives Branch, TWB-05-B01M, Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, and should cite the publication date and page number of this **Federal Register** notice. Documents may be examined, and/or copied for a fee, at the NRC's Public Document Room (PDR), located at One White Flint North, Public File Area O1 F21, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland.

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

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 subject amendment to the facility operating license. Such request(s) and petition(s) should be filed via electronic submission through the NRC E-Filing system. Request(s) for a hearing and petition(s) for leave to intervene shall be filed in accordance with the Commission's "Rules of Practice for Domestic Licensing Proceedings" in 10 CFR Part 2. Interested person(s) should consult a current copy of 10 CFR 2.309, which is available at the Commission's PDR, located at One White Flint North, Public File Area O1F21, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland, or at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/doc-collections/cfr/part002/part002-0309.html>. Publicly available records will be accessible from the Agencywide Documents Access and Management System's (ADAMS) Public Electronic Reading Room on the Internet at the NRC Web site, <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm.html>. If a request for a hearing or petition for leave to intervene is filed within 60 days, the Commission or a presiding officer designated by the Commission or by the Chief Administrative Judge of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, will rule on the request and/or petition; and the Secretary or the Chief Administrative Judge of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board will issue a notice of a hearing or an appropriate order.

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

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

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

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

If a hearing is requested, and the Commission has not made a final determination on the issue of no significant hazards consideration, the Commission will make a final determination on the issue of no significant hazards consideration. The final determination will serve to decide when the hearing is held. If the final determination is that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration, the Commission may issue the amendment and make it immediately effective, notwithstanding the request for a hearing. Any hearing held would take place after issuance of the amendment. If the final

determination is that the amendment request involves a significant hazards consideration, 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, which the NRC promulgated in August 28, 2007 (72 FR 49139). 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 a waiver in accordance with the procedures described below.

To comply with the procedural requirements of E-Filing, at least ten (10) days prior to the filing deadline, the petitioner/requestor must contact the Office of the Secretary by e-mail at hearing.docket@nrc.gov, or by calling (301) 415-1677, to request (1) a digital ID certificate, which allows the participant (or its counsel or representative) to digitally sign documents and access the E-Submittal server for any proceeding in which it is participating; and/or (2) creation of an electronic docket for the proceeding (even in instances in which the petitioner/requestor (or its counsel or representative) already holds an NRC-issued digital ID certificate). Each petitioner/requestor will need to download the Workplace Forms Viewer™ to access the Electronic Information Exchange (EIE), a component of the E-Filing system. The Workplace Forms Viewer™ is free and is available at <http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/e-submittals/install-viewer.html>. Information about applying for a digital ID certificate is available on NRC's public Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/e-submittals/apply-certificates.html>.

Once a petitioner/requestor has obtained a digital ID certificate, had a docket created, and downloaded the EIE viewer, it can then submit a request for hearing or petition for leave to intervene. Submissions should be in Portable Document Format (PDF) in accordance with NRC guidance available on the NRC public Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/e-submittals.html>. A filing is considered complete at the time the filer submits its

documents through EIE. To be timely, an electronic filing must be submitted to the EIE system no later than 11:59 p.m. Eastern Time on the due date. Upon receipt of a transmission, the E-Filing system time-stamps the document and sends the submitter an e-mail notice confirming receipt of the document. The EIE system also distributes an e-mail notice that provides access to the document to the NRC Office of the General Counsel and any others who have advised the Office of the Secretary that they wish to participate in the proceeding, so that the filer need not serve the documents on those participants separately. Therefore, applicants and other participants (or their counsel or representative) must apply for and receive a digital ID certificate before a hearing request/petition to intervene is filed so that they can obtain access to the document via the E-Filing system.

A person filing electronically may seek assistance through the "Contact Us" link located on the NRC Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/e-submittals.html> or by calling the NRC electronic filing Help Desk, which is available between 8 a.m. and 8 p.m., Eastern Time, Monday through Friday, excluding government holidays. The electronic filing Help Desk can be contacted by telephone at 1-866-672-7640 or by e-mail at MSHD.Resource@nrc.gov.

Participants who believe that they have a good cause for not submitting documents electronically must file a motion, in accordance with 10 CFR 2.302(g), with their initial paper filing requesting authorization to continue to submit documents in paper format. Such filings must be submitted by: (1) First class mail addressed to the Office of the Secretary of the Commission, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, Attention: Rulemaking and Adjudications Staff; or (2) courier, express mail, or expedited delivery service to the Office of the Secretary, Sixteenth Floor, One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland 20852, Attention: Rulemaking and Adjudications Staff. Participants filing a document in this manner are responsible for serving the document on all other participants. Filing is considered complete by first-class mail as of the time of deposit in the mail, or by courier, express mail, or expedited delivery service upon depositing the document with the provider of the service.

Non-timely requests and/or petitions and contentions will not be entertained absent a determination by the Commission or the presiding officer of

the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board that the petition and/or request should be granted and/or the contentions should be admitted, based on a balancing of the factors specified in 10 CFR 2.309(c)(1)(i)-(viii).

Documents submitted in adjudicatory proceedings will appear in NRC's electronic hearing docket which is available to the public at http://ehd.nrc.gov/ehd_proceeding/home.asp, unless excluded pursuant to an order of the Commission, an Atomic Safety and Licensing Board, or a Presiding Officer. Participants are requested not to include personal privacy information, such as social security numbers, home addresses, or home phone numbers in their filings, unless an NRC regulation or other law requires submission of such information. With respect to copyrighted works, except for limited excerpts that serve the purpose of the adjudicatory filings and would constitute a Fair Use application, participants are requested not to include copyrighted materials in their submission.

For further details with respect to this amendment action, see the application for amendment which is available for public inspection at the Commission's PDR, located at One White Flint North, Public File Area 01F21, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland. Publicly available records will be accessible from the ADAMS Public Electronic Reading Room on the Internet at the NRC Web site, <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 Reference staff at 1 (800) 397-4209, (301) 415-4737 or by e-mail to pdr.resource@nrc.gov.

Entergy Operations Inc., Docket No. 50-382, Waterford Steam Electric Station, Unit 3, St. Charles Parish, Louisiana

Date of Amendment Request: September 17, 2008, as supplemented by letter dated February 26, 2009. The revised proposed no significant hazards consideration (NSHC) included in the February 26, 2009, letter replaces the NSHC in the letter dated September 17, 2008, in its entirety.

Description of Amendment Request: This amendment request contains sensitive unclassified non-safeguards information (SUNSI). The Waterford Steam Electric Station, Unit 3 Technical Specification (TS) 5.6, "Fuel Storage," is being revised to take credit for soluble boron in Region 1 (cask storage pit) and Region 2 (spent fuel pool and refueling canal) fuel storage racks for the storage of both Standard and Next Generation

Fuel (NGF) assemblies. Two new TS Limiting Conditions for Operation and associated Surveillance Requirements, 3/4 9.12, "Spent Fuel Pool (SFP) Boron Concentration," and 3/4 9.13, "Spent Fuel Pool," have been added to ensure the required boron concentration is maintained in the spent fuel storage racks and that spent fuel storage racks are within the design parameters, respectively. The proposed change is evaluated for both normal operation and accident conditions and is intended to provide more flexibility in storing the more reactive NGF assemblies in the spent fuel storage racks.

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 purpose of the spent fuel storage racks is to maintain fresh and irradiated fuel in a safe storage condition. The proposed changes for the Region 1 (spent fuel cask storage area) and Region 2 (spent fuel pool and, after permanent plant shutdown, refueling canal) fuel storage racks, which involve taking credit for soluble boron, revising the burnup-enrichment limits and loading restrictions for the storage of fuel assemblies, and increasing the k_{eff} [effective (neutron) multiplication factor] limit for the flooding of the fuel storage racks with unborated water will not affect any accident initiator or mitigator. The proposed changes will provide more flexibility in storing the more reactive NGF assemblies in the spent fuel pool storage racks. The effects of the new fuel parameters of NGF assemblies on radiation shielding, thermal-hydraulics, seismic/structural, and mechanical drop analyses have been separately reviewed and were found to be acceptable.

The proposed changes will not alter the configuration of the storage racks or their environment. The fuel racks will not be operated outside of their design limits, and no additional loads will be imposed on them. Therefore, these changes will not affect fuel storage rack performance or reliability. No new equipment will be introduced into the plant. The accuracies and response characteristics of existing instrumentation will not be modified. The proposed changes will not require, or result in, a change in safety system operation, and will not affect any system interface with the fuel storage racks. Fuel assembly placement will continue to be controlled in accordance with approved fuel handling procedures. The proposed changes in the Technical Specifications, including surveillance requirements, will not add any significant complexities or increase the possibility of operator error.

The proposed changes will not affect any barrier that mitigates dose to the public, and

will not result in a new release pathway being created. The functions of equipment designed to control the release of radioactive material will not be impacted, and no mitigating actions described or assumed for an accident in the UFSAR [Updated Final Safety Analyses Report] will be altered or prevented. No assumptions previously made in evaluating the consequences of an accident will need to be modified. Onsite dose will not be increased, so the access of plant personnel to vital areas of the plant will not be restricted and mitigating actions will not be impeded.

Therefore, it is concluded that the proposed changes do not significantly increase either the probability or consequences of any 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 for the Region 1 (spent fuel cask storage area) and Region 2 (spent fuel pool and, after permanent plant shutdown, refueling canal) fuel storage racks, which involve taking credit for soluble boron, revising the burnup-enrichment limits and loading restrictions for the storage of fuel assemblies, and increasing the k_{eff} limit for the flooding of the fuel storage racks with unborated water will not increase the probability of an accident which was previously considered to be incredible nor create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident initiator previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

The proposed changes do not involve changes to the configuration of plant systems, or the manner in which they are operated. Crediting soluble boron in the spent fuel pool storage rack criticality analysis will have no effect on normal pool operation and maintenance since soluble boron in Region 1 and Region 2 is currently required by procedure. The crediting of soluble boron will only result in increased sampling to verify compliance with the minimum boron concentration required by the new TS 3/4.9.12. The increased sampling ensures that a new kind of accident, boron dilution in the spent fuel pool, will not be created.

The addition of large amounts of unborated water would be necessary to reduce the boron concentration in the spent fuel pool from the normal level of $\geq 1,900$ ppm [parts per million] specified in new TS 3/4.9.12 to either 838 ppm (needed to accommodate the most limiting fuel loading accident) or 447 ppm (required for normal conditions). A small dilution flow might result from a leak from the cooling system into the spent fuel pool. Routine surveillance measurements of the soluble boron concentration conducted every 7 days per the new TS 3/4.9.12 would readily detect the reduction in concentration and provide sufficient time for corrective action prior to exceeding the regulatory limits.

A high flow rate dilution accident involving continuous operation of the Condensate Storage Pool pump could add a large amount of unborated water to the spent fuel pool. However, multiple alarms would

alert the Control Room to the situation, including the fuel pool high-level alarm, Fuel Handling Building sump high-level alarm, and the Liquid Waste Management Trouble alarm. It is not considered credible that either multiple alarms would fail or be ignored by Operators, or that the spilling of large volumes of water from the spent fuel pool would be observed by plant personnel who would not take corrective actions. Moreover, if the soluble boron in the spent fuel storage racks would be completely diluted, the fuel in the racks will remain subcritical by a design margin of at least $0.005 \Delta k$, and so the k_{eff} of the fuel in the racks will remain below 1.00.

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

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

Response: No.

The proposed changes for the Region 1 (spent fuel cask storage area) and Region 2 (spent fuel pool and, after permanent plant shutdown, refueling canal) fuel storage racks, which involve taking credit for soluble boron, revising the burnup-enrichment limits and loading restrictions for the storage of fuel assemblies, and increasing the k_{eff} limit for the flooding of the fuel storage racks with unborated water, will not result in a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

Detailed analysis with approved and benchmarked methods has shown, with a 95% probability at a 95% confidence level, that the neutron multiplication factor, k_{eff} , of the Region 1 and Region 2 high-density spent fuel pool storage racks, loaded with either Standard or NGF assemblies, and including biases, tolerances, and uncertainties, is less than 1.00 with unborated water, and less than 0.95 with 447 ppm of soluble boron credited. In addition, the effects of abnormal and accident conditions have been evaluated to demonstrate that under credible conditions the k_{eff} will not exceed 0.95 with soluble boron credited. To ensure that the margin of safety for subcriticality is maintained, and that k_{eff} will be below 0.95, a new TS 3/4.9.12 will require a soluble boron level of $\geq 1,900$ ppm in the spent fuel pool. This is much greater than the required soluble boron concentration of 447 ppm under normal conditions, and 838 ppm for all credible accident conditions.

Therefore, it is concluded that 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: Terence A. Burke, Associate General Counsel—Nuclear Entergy Services, Inc., 1340 Echelon Parkway, Jackson, Mississippi 39213.

NRC Branch Chief: Michael T. Markley.

FPL Energy, Point Beach, LLC, Docket Nos. 50-266 and 50-301, Point Beach Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2, Town of Two Creeks, Manitowoc County, Wisconsin

Date of Amendment Request: December 8, 2008, as supplemented by letters dated January 16 and 27, 2009, and February 20, 2009.

Description of Amendment Request: This amendment request contains sensitive unclassified non-safeguards information (SUNSI). The proposed amendment would revise the Point Beach Nuclear Plant Units 1 and 2 current licensing basis to implement the alternate source term (AST) through reanalysis of the radiological consequences of the Final Safety Analysis Report (FSAR) Chapter 14 accidents. The following technical specifications (TS) are requested to be modified:

TS 1.1 is reduced from 0.4 percent of containment air weight per day to 0.2 percent of containment air weight per day at peak design containment pressure.

Surveillance Requirement (SR) 3.4.16.2 is revised to change the specific activity of the reactor coolant from dose equivalent (DE) I-131 less than or equal to 0.8 uCi/gm to less than or equal to 0.5 uCi/gm.

SR 3.7.9.3 and SR 3.7.9.6 are revised to delete the word "makeup."

TS 3.7.13 is revised to change the specific activity of the secondary coolant from less than or equal to 1.00 uCi/gm to less than or equal to 0.1 uCi/gm DE I-131.

TS 5.5.15c is revised to change the maximum allowable containment leakage rate, from 0.4 percent to 0.2 percent of containment air weight per day.

TS 5.6.4 adds WCAP-16259-P-A "Westinghouse Methodology for Application of 3-D Transient Neutronics to Non-LOCA Analyses" to the list of approved analytical methods.

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 results of the applicable radiological [design basis accident] DBA re-evaluation demonstrated that, with the requested changes, the dose consequences of these

limiting events are within the regulatory limits and guidance provided by the NRC in 10 CFR 50.67 and [Regulatory Guide] RG 1.183 ["Alternative Radiological Source Terms for Evaluating Design Basis Accidents at Nuclear Power Plants," July 2000] for the AST methodology. The AST is an input to calculations used to evaluate the consequences of an accident and does not by itself affect the plant response or the actual pathway of the activity released from the fuel. It does, however, better represent the physical characteristics of the release, such that appropriate mitigation techniques may be applied.

The change from the original source term to the new proposed AST is a change in the analysis method and assumptions and has no effect on the probability of occurrence of previously analyzed accidents. Use of an AST to analyze the dose effect of DBAs shows that regulatory acceptance criteria for the new methodology continues to be met. The dose consequences in the [control room] CR, the exclusion area boundary, and the low population zone [LPZ] do not exceed the regulatory limits provided by the NRC in 10 CFR 50.67 and Regulatory Guide 1.183 for the AST methodology.

For the locked rotor [LR] event, an NRC approved methodology RAVE (Westinghouse WCAP-16259-P-A, "Westinghouse Methodology for Application of 3-D Transient Neutronics to Non-LOCA Accident Analysis,") is used to determine rods in [departure from nucleate boiling] DNB. The use of an NRC approved methodology provides an input assumption to the radiological dose consequences calculations. The use of the new methodology does not change the sequence or progression of the accident scenario.

The proposed TS changes reflect the plant configuration that is required to implement the AST analyses. The equipment affected by the proposed changes is mitigating in nature and relied upon after an accident has been initiated. The operation of various filtration systems, the [residual heat removal] RHR and the [containment spray] CS systems, including associated support systems, has been considered in the evaluations of these proposed changes. The operation of this equipment has been evaluated for emergency diesel generator loading and fuel consumption. The evaluation demonstrated that the diesel generator loading and fuel consumption do not exceed the diesel generator criteria. While the operation of these systems does change with the implementation of an AST, the affected systems are not accident initiators, and application of the AST methodology itself is not an initiator of a DBA.

The operation of containment spray on sump recirculation has been evaluated for increased strainer blockage or reduction in flow from the sump. The evaluation demonstrated that the increase in containment spray will not adversely affect the operation of the emergency core cooling systems during the sump recirculation phase of a DBA.

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

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

Response: No.

The changes proposed in this [license amendment request] LAR involve the use of a new analysis methodology and related regulatory acceptance criteria. The proposed TS changes reflect the plant configuration that is required to implement the AST analyses. No new or different accidents result from utilizing the proposed changes. Although the proposed changes require modifications to the [control room ventilation system] VNCR system, as well as modifications to the RHR system and CS system, these changes will not create a new or different kind of accident since they are related to system capabilities that provide protection from accidents that have already occurred. The operation of this equipment has been evaluated for emergency diesel generator loading and fuel consumption. The evaluation demonstrated that the diesel generator loading and fuel consumption do not exceed the diesel generator criteria.

The operation of containment spray on sump recirculation has been evaluated for increased strainer blockage or reduction in flow from the sump. The evaluation demonstrated that the increase in containment spray will not adversely affect the operation of the emergency core cooling systems during the sump recirculation phase of a DBA.

As a result, no new failure modes are being introduced that could lead to different accidents. These changes do not alter the nature of events postulated in the FSAR nor do they introduce any unique precursor mechanisms.

For the LR event, an NRC approved methodology RAVE (Westinghouse WCAP-16259-P-A, "Westinghouse Methodology for Application of 3-D Transient Neutronics to Non-LOCA Accident Analysis,") is used to determine rods in DNB. The use of an NRC approved methodology provides an input assumption to the radiological dose consequences calculations. The use of the new methodology does not alter the nature of events postulated in the FSAR nor do they introduce any unique precursor mechanisms.

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

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

Response: No.

The changes proposed in this license amendment involve the use of a new analysis methodology and related regulatory acceptance criteria. The proposed TS changes reflect the plant configuration that is required to implement the AST analyses. Safety margins and analytical conservatism have been evaluated and have been found to be acceptable. The analyzed events have been carefully selected and, with plant modifications, no significant reduction of margin has occurred and analyses adequately bound postulated event scenarios. The proposed changes continue to ensure that the dose consequences of DBAs at the exclusion

area and LPZ boundaries and in the CR are within the corresponding acceptance criteria presented in RG 1.183 and 10 CFR 50.67. The margin of safety for the radiological consequences of these accidents is provided by meeting the applicable regulatory limits, which are set at or below the 10 CFR 50.67 limits. An acceptable margin of safety is inherent in these limits.

For the LR event, an NRC approved methodology RAVE (Westinghouse WCAP-16259-P-A, "Westinghouse Methodology for Application of 3-D Transient Neutronics to Non-LOCA Accident Analysis,") is used to determine rods in DNB. The use of an NRC approved methodology provides an input assumption to the radiological dose consequences calculations. The use of the new methodology does not reduce any margins of safety for the LR event; 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: Antonio Fernandez, Senior Attorney, FPL Energy Point Beach, LLC, P.O. Box 14000, Juno Beach, FL 33408-0420.

NRC Branch Chief: Lois M. James.

Order Imposing Procedures for Access to Sensitive Unclassified Non-Safeguards Information (SUNSI) and Safeguards Information (SGI) for Contention Preparation

Entergy Operations, Inc., Docket No. 50-382, Waterford Steam Electric Station, Unit 3, St. Charles Parish, Louisiana

FPL Energy Point Beach, LLC, Docket Nos. 50-266 and 50-301, Point Beach Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2, Town of Two Creeks, Manitowoc County, Wisconsin

1. This order contains instructions regarding how potential parties to the proceedings listed above may request access to documents containing sensitive unclassified information (SUNSI and SGI).

2. Within ten (10) days after publication of this notice of opportunity for hearing, any potential party as defined in 10 CFR 2.4 who believes access to SUNSI or SGI is necessary for a response to the notice may request access to SUNSI or SGI. A "potential party" is any person who intends or may intend to participate as a party by demonstrating standing and the filing of an admissible contention under 10 CFR 2.309. Requests submitted later than ten (10) days will not be considered, absent a showing of good cause for the late

filing, addressing why the request could not have been filed earlier.

3. The requester shall submit a letter requesting permission to access SUNSI and/or SGI to the Office of the Secretary, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, Attention: Rulemakings and Adjudications Staff, and provide a copy to the Associate General Counsel for Hearings, Enforcement and Administration, Office of the General Counsel, Washington, DC 20555-0001. The expedited delivery or courier mail address for both offices is U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, MD 20852. The e-mail address for the Office of the Secretary and the Office of the General Counsel are hearing.docket@nrc.gov and ogcmailcenter.resource@nrc.gov, respectively.¹ The request must include the following information:

- a. A description of the licensing action with a citation to this **Federal Register** notice of opportunity for hearing;
- b. 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 (a);
- c. If the request is for SUNSI, the identity of the individual requesting access to SUNSI and the requester's need for the information in order to meaningfully participate in this adjudicatory proceeding, particularly why publicly available versions of the application would not be sufficient to provide the basis and specificity for a proffered contention;
- d. If the request is for SGI, the identity of the individual requesting access to SGI and the identity of any expert, consultant or assistant who will aid the requester in evaluating the SGI, and information that shows:

- (i) Why the information is indispensable to meaningful participation in this licensing proceeding; and
- (ii) The technical competence (demonstrable knowledge, skill, experience, training or education) of the requester to understand and use (or evaluate) the requested information to provide the basis and specificity for a proffered contention. The technical competence of a potential party or its counsel may be shown by reliance on a qualified expert, consultant or assistant who demonstrates technical competence

as well as trustworthiness and reliability, and who agrees to sign a non-disclosure affidavit and be bound by the terms of a protective order; and

e. If the request is for SGI, Form SF-85, "Questionnaire for Non-Sensitive Positions," Form FD-258 (fingerprint card), and a credit check release form completed by the individual who seeks access to SGI and each individual who will aid the requester in evaluating the SGI. For security reasons, Form SF-85 can only be submitted electronically, through a restricted-access database. To obtain online access to the form, the requester should contact the NRC's Office of Administration at 301-492-3524.² The other completed forms must be signed in original ink, accompanied by a check or money order payable in the amount of \$191.00 to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission for each individual, and mailed to the: Office of Administration, Security Processing Unit, Mail Stop TWB-05 B32M, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0012.

These forms will be used to initiate the background check, which includes fingerprinting as part of a criminal history records check. *Note:* Copies of these forms do *not* need to be included with the request letter to the Office of the Secretary, but the request letter should state that the forms and fees have been submitted as described above.

4. To avoid delays in processing requests for access to SGI, all forms should be reviewed for completeness and accuracy (including legibility) before submitting them to the NRC. Incomplete packages will be returned to the sender and will not be processed.

5. Based on an evaluation of the information submitted under items 2 and 3.a through 3.d, above, the NRC staff will determine within ten days of receipt of the written access 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) there is a legitimate need for access to SUNSI or need to know the SGI requested. For SGI, the need to know determination is made based on whether the information requested is necessary (*i.e.*, indispensable) for the proposed recipient to proffer and litigate a specific contention in this NRC

¹ See footnote 6. 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 and/or SGI under these procedures should be submitted as described in this paragraph.

² The requester will be asked to provide his or her full name, Social Security number, date and place of birth, telephone number, and e-mail address. After providing this information, the requester usually should be able to obtain access to the online form within one business day.

proceeding³ and whether the proposed recipient has the technical competence (demonstrable knowledge, skill, training, education, or experience) to evaluate and use the specific SGI requested in this proceeding.

6. If standing and need to know SGI are shown, the NRC staff will further determine based upon completion of the background check whether the proposed recipient is trustworthy and reliable. The NRC staff will conduct (as necessary) an inspection to confirm that the recipient's information protection systems are sufficient to protect SGI from inadvertent release or disclosure. Recipients may opt to view SGI at the NRC's facility rather than establish their own SGI protection program to meet SGI protection requirements.

7. A request for access to SUNSI or SGI will be granted if:

a. The request has demonstrated that there is a reasonable basis to believe that a potential party is likely to establish standing to intervene or to otherwise participate as a party in this proceeding;

b. The proposed recipient of the information has demonstrated a need for SUNSI or a need to know for SGI, and that the proposed recipient of SGI is trustworthy and reliable;

c. The proposed recipient of the information has executed a Non-Disclosure Agreement or Affidavit and agrees to be bound by the terms of a Protective Order setting forth terms and conditions to prevent the unauthorized or inadvertent disclosure of SUNSI and/or SGI; and

d. The presiding officer has issued a protective order concerning the information or documents requested.⁴ Any protective order issued shall provide that the petitioner must file SUNSI or SGI contentions 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 or SGI contentions by that later deadline.

8. If the request for access to SUNSI or SGI is granted, the terms and conditions for access to sensitive unclassified information will be set forth in a draft protective order and affidavit of non-disclosure appended to a joint motion by the NRC staff, any other affected parties to this proceeding,⁵ and the petitioner(s). If the diligent efforts by the relevant parties or petitioner(s) fail to result in an agreement on the terms and conditions for a draft protective order or non-disclosure affidavit, the relevant parties to the proceeding or the petitioner(s) should notify the presiding officer within ten (10) days, describing the obstacles to the agreement.

9. If the request for access to SUNSI is denied by the NRC staff or a request for access to SGI is denied by NRC staff either after a determination on standing and need to know or, later, after a determination on trustworthiness and reliability, the NRC staff shall briefly state the reasons for the denial. Before the Office of Administration makes an adverse determination regarding access, the proposed recipient must be provided an opportunity to correct or explain information. The requester may challenge the NRC staff's adverse determination with respect to access to SUNSI or with respect to standing or need to know for SGI by filing a challenge within ten (10) 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 § 2.318(a); or (c) if another officer has been designated to rule on information access issues, with that officer. In the same manner, an SGI requester may challenge

an adverse determination on trustworthiness and reliability by filing a challenge within fifteen (15) days of receipt of that determination.

In the same manner, 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 ten (10) days of the notification by the NRC staff of its grant of such a request.

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 2.311.⁶

10. 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/or SGI, and motions for protective orders, in a timely fashion in order to minimize any unnecessary delays in identifying those petitioners who have standing and who have propounded contentions meeting the specificity and basis requirements in 10 CFR Part 2. Attachment 1 to this Order summarizes the general target schedule for processing and resolving requests under these procedures.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 7th day of April 2009.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Andrew L. Bates,

Acting Secretary of the Commission.

Attachment 1—General Target Schedule for Processing and Resolving Requests for Access to Sensitive Unclassified Non-Safeguards Information (SUNSI) and Safeguards Information (SGI) in This Proceeding

Day	Event/activity
0	Publication of Federal Register notice of proposed action and opportunity for hearing, including order with instructions for access requests.

³ Broad SGI requests under these procedures are thus highly unlikely to meet the standard for need to know; furthermore, staff redaction of information from requested documents before their release may be appropriate to comport with this requirement. These procedures do not authorize unrestricted disclosure or less scrutiny of a requester's need to know than ordinarily would be applied in connection with an already-admitted contention.

⁴ If a presiding officer has not yet been designated, the Chief Administrative Judge will

issue such orders, or will appoint a presiding officer to do so.

⁵ Parties/persons other than the requester and the NRC staff will be notified by the NRC staff of a favorable access determination (and may participate in the development of such a motion and protective order) if it concerns SUNSI and if the party/person's interest independent of the proceeding would be harmed by the release of the information (e.g., as with proprietary information).

⁶ As of October 15, 2007, the NRC's final "E-Filing Rule" became effective. See Use of Electronic Submissions in Agency Hearings (72 FR 49139; Aug. 28, 2007). Requesters should note that the filing requirements of that rule 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/SGI requests submitted to the NRC staff under these procedures.

Day	Event/activity
10	Deadline for submitting requests for access to SUNSI and/or SGI 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; demonstrating that access should be granted (e.g., showing technical competence for access to SGI); and, for SGI, including application fee for fingerprint/background check.
60	Deadline for submitting petition for intervention containing: (i) Demonstration of standing; (ii) all contentions whose formulation does not require access to SUNSI and/or SGI (+25 Answers to petition for intervention; +7 petitioner/requestor reply).
20	NRC staff informs the requester of the staff's determination whether the request for access provides a reasonable basis to believe standing can be established and shows (1) need for SUNSI or (2) need to know for SGI. (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). If NRC staff makes the finding of need to know for SGI and likelihood of standing, NRC staff begins background check (including fingerprinting for a criminal history records check), information processing (preparation of redactions or review of redacted documents), and readiness inspections.
25	If NRC staff finds no "need," "need to know," or likelihood of standing, the deadline for petitioner/requester 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.
30	Deadline for NRC staff reply to motions to reverse NRC staff determination(s).
40	(Receipt +30) If NRC staff finds standing and need for SUNSI, deadline for NRC staff to complete information processing and file motion for Protective Order and draft Non-Disclosure Affidavit. Deadline for applicant/licensee to file Non-Disclosure Agreement for SUNSI.
190	(Receipt +180) If NRC staff finds standing, need to know for SGI, and trustworthiness and reliability, deadline for NRC staff to file motion for Protective Order and draft Non-disclosure Affidavit (or to make a determination that the proposed recipient of SGI is not trustworthy or reliable). <i>Note:</i> Before the Office of Administration makes an adverse determination regarding access, the proposed recipient must be provided an opportunity to correct or explain information.
205	Deadline for petitioner to seek reversal of a final adverse NRC staff determination either before the presiding officer or another designated officer.
A	If access granted: Issuance of presiding officer or other designated officer decision on motion for protective order for access to sensitive information (including schedule for providing access and submission of contentions) or decision reversing a final adverse determination by the NRC staff.
A + 3	Deadline for filing executed Non-Disclosure Affidavits. Access provided to SUNSI and/or SGI consistent with decision issuing the protective order.
A + 28	Deadline for submission of contentions whose development depends upon access to SUNSI and/or SGI. 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 or SGI contentions by that later deadline.
A + 53	(Contention receipt +25) Answers to contentions whose development depends upon access to SUNSI and/or SGI.
A + 60	(Answer receipt +7) Petitioner/Intervenor reply to answers.
B	Decision on contention admission.

[FR Doc. E9-8455 Filed 4-13-09; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards (ACRS) Subcommittee Meeting on Regulatory Policies and Practices; Notice of Meeting

The ACRS Subcommittee on Regulatory Policies and Practices will hold a meeting on May 6, 2009, in Room T-2B3, Two White Flint North, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland.

The entire meeting will be open to public attendance.

The agenda for the subject meeting shall be as follows:

Wednesday, May 6, 2009—1:30 p.m. until the conclusion of business.

The Subcommittee will discuss the proposed rule on a voluntary, risk-informed alternative to the current requirements for analyzing the

performance of emergency core cooling systems (ECCS) during loss-of-coolant accidents (LOCAs). The proposed rule would also establish procedures and acceptance criteria for evaluating certain changes in plant design and operation, based upon the results of the new analyses of ECCS performance. The Subcommittee will hear presentations by and hold discussions with representatives of the NRC staff, consultants to the staff, and other interested persons regarding this matter. The Subcommittee will gather information, analyze relevant issues and facts, and formulate proposed positions and actions, as appropriate, for deliberation by the full Committee.

Members of the public desiring to provide oral statements and/or written comments should notify the Designated Federal Officer, Dr. Hossein Nourbakhsh (telephone 301-415-5622), five days prior to the meeting, if possible, so that appropriate arrangements can be made. Electronic recordings will be permitted.

Detailed procedures for the conduct of and participation in ACRS meetings were published in the **Federal Register** on October 6, 2008, (73 FR 58268–58269).

Further information regarding this meeting can be obtained by contacting the Designated Federal Officers between 7:45 a.m. and 4:30 p.m. (ET). Persons planning to attend this meeting are urged to contact the above named individual at least two working days prior to the meeting to be advised of any potential changes to the agenda.

Dated: April 8, 2009.

Antonio Dias,

Chief, Reactor Safety Branch B, Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards.

[FR Doc. E9-8466 Filed 4-13-09; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P