

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 1st day of May 2009.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.
Annette L. Vietti-Cook,
Secretary of the Commission.

ATTACHMENT 1—GENERAL TARGET SCHEDULE FOR PROCESSING AND RESOLVING REQUESTS FOR ACCESS TO SENSITIVE UNCLASSIFIED NON-SAFEGUARDS INFORMATION (SUNSI) AND SAFEGUARDS INFORMATION (SGI) IN THIS PROCEEDING

Day	Event/Activity
0	Publication of notice of receipt of update to application for facility operating license and notice of opportunity for hearing, including order with instructions for access requests.
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). NOTE : 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. E9-11903 Filed 5-21-09; 8:45 am]
 BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 72-7-EA; ASLBP No. 09-888-03-EA-BD01]

Detroit Edison Company; Establishment of Atomic Safety and Licensing Board

Pursuant to delegation by the Commission dated December 29, 1972 (37 FR 28710), and the Commission's regulations, see 10 CFR 2.106, 2.300, 2.313(a), and 2.318, notice is hereby given that an Atomic Safety and

Licensing Board (Board) is being established to preside over the following proceeding:

Detroit Edison Company Fermi Power Plant

(Independent Spent Fuel Storage Installation)

This proceeding concerns a Petition to Intervene dated May 7, 2009 from Beyond Nuclear, *et al.*, that was submitted in response to an April 17, 2009 notice issued by the NRC Staff that provided the Issuance of Order for Implementation of Additional Security Measures and Fingerprinting for Unescorted Access to Detroit Edison Company (74 FR 17890).

The Board is comprised of the following administrative judges:
 Ronald M. Spritzer, Chair, Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001.
 Michael F. Kennedy, Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001.
 Randall J. Charbeneau, Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001.

All correspondence, documents, and other materials shall be filed in accordance with the NRC E-Filing Rule, which the NRC promulgated in August 2007 (72 FR 49139).

Issued at Rockville, Maryland, this 15th day of May 2009.

E. Roy Hawkens,

Chief Administrative Judge, Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel.

[FR Doc. E9-11985 Filed 5-21-09; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[NRC 2009-0214]

Announcement of a Proposed Process Change Regarding the Review of Research and Test Reactor License Renewal Applications; Notice of Public Meeting

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Notice of stakeholder meeting regarding a proposed process change for the renewal of research and test reactor licenses.

SUMMARY: The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is proposing a streamlined review process for license renewal applications (LRAs) for research and test reactor (RTR) licenses with the objective of expeditiously resolving the backlog of LRAs while maintaining safety standards. Draft Interim Staff Guidance (ISG) proposed to be implemented will be published for public review prior to the meeting on the NRC Public Meeting Schedule Web site, <http://www.nrc.gov/public-involve/public-meetings/index.cfm>.

DATES: A public meeting for stakeholders will be held June 4, 2009, commencing at 1 p.m.

ADDRESSES: The meeting will be held at the Legacy Hotel and Meeting Center, 1775 Rockville Pike, Rockville, MD 20852.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Alexander Adams Jr., Division of Policy and Rulemaking, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, telephone (301) 415-1127, e-mail alexander.adams@nrc.gov; or Marcus Voth, Division of Policy and Rulemaking, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, telephone (301) 415-1210, e-mail marcus.voth@nrc.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

At the present time 21 of the 32 RTRs licensed to operate in the United States have LRAs before the NRC. Several issues have contributed to the large backlog, including NRC licensing

staffing levels, emergent issues, limited licensee resources, existing license infrastructure, regulatory requirements, and the broad scope of the RTR license renewal process as discussed in SECY-08-0161, "Review of Research and Test Reactor License Renewal Applications," dated October 24, 2008. In a staff requirements memorandum (SRM) dated March 26, 2009, the staff was directed to streamline the current license renewal process incorporating concepts discussed in SECY-08-0161 among other measures. These documents can be found on the NRC Agencywide Documents Access and Management system (ADAMS) under accession numbers ML0825501403 and ML0908501591, respectively. The staff is presently developing proposed guidance along with the rationale for the focused license renewal process for RTRs.

The traditional process currently being used for reviewing LRAs is to perform a full review based on the standard review plan for RTRs, NUREG-1537, "Guidelines for Preparing and Reviewing Applications for the Licensing of Non-Power Reactors, Part 2," February 1996. The standard review plan addresses all of the topics required to be addressed in applications by 10 CFR 50.33 and 50.34, the same process as used for an initial license issuance. The staff is proposing to continue this full review process for those LRAs well into the renewal review process and for RTRs licensed for power levels equal to or greater than 2 megawatts. The staff proposes to apply the new focused review process to the remaining LRAs in the backlog.

Two public meetings were held to discuss formulation of the proposed process with stakeholders, the first on September 15, 2008, and a second on March 25, 2009. In each meeting the staff presented aspects of the proposed streamlined review process and addressed questions from the public.

Objectives of the Focused Review Process for RTR License Renewal

The objective of the focused review process for license renewal is to provide a process that ensures that applications are properly evaluated, documented, and implemented in accordance with the following goals:

- To ensure the continued health and safety of the public and protection of the environment,
- To provide public confidence in the regulatory oversight process,
- To propose an effective, efficient, and timely method of processing the existing LRA backlog,

- To develop, document, and implement Interim Staff Guidance (ISG) for a focused review process,

- To acknowledge the safe operating histories of RTRs demonstrated over the facility lifetime documented in reports of periodic NRC inspections, and

- To meet requirements of Section 104.c of the Atomic Energy Act calling for " * * * only such minimum amount of regulation of the licensee as the Commission finds will permit the common defense and security to protect the health and safety of the public and will permit the conduct of widespread and diverse research and development."

The staff is proposing that a focused approach be implemented for those facilities in the current LRA backlog that have been reviewed in the past and found to have low risk to the public health and safety. ISG is being prepared that will define a focused review process which meets regulatory requirements and the goals stated above while taking credit for previous reviews of structures, systems, and components. Likewise, a Safety Evaluation Report will be prepared that contains fewer than the entire 18 topics addressed in the standard review plan but at a minimum will address the three areas most critical to safety; reactor design and operation, accident analysis, and technical specifications. The staff is proposing that the ISG not be applied in the following two situations.

First, the staff proposes that the traditional full review process be used for RTRs licensed for greater than 2 megawatts. The licensed maximum thermal power levels of the RTRs range from 5 watts to 20 megawatts. The staff routinely uses a graded approach to apply regulations commensurate with the risk of licensed RTRs. A long-standing demarcation used by the staff has required additional regulatory attention to RTRs licensed for 2 megawatts or greater. Part of the technical basis for this threshold is that reactor power is related to the potential fission product inventory which in turn determines the potential dose consequence of an accident.

Second, the review of some LRAs which are currently nearing completion using the traditional full review process will continue to be performed in that manner rather than using the ISG to allow for the efficient use of staff resources. In implementing the proposed ISG the staff may find that one or more exemptions to certain regulations may be required. If a need for an exemption should arise it is proposed to be processed using existing provisions in the regulations for granting exemptions.