

## II. Method of Collection

Applicants will complete an online application hosted on the AREE Web site. The application form can be downloaded using Adobe software and submitted electronically using the e-mail submit button located on the form. The collection of information from the application, resume, and letters of reference will all occur electronically.

## III. Data

*Title:* Airborne Research Experience for Educators (AREE) Application.

*OMB Number:* 2700-0137.

*Type of review:* New Collection.

*Affected Public:* Individuals or households.

*Estimated Number of Respondents:* 25.

*Estimated Number of Responses per Respondent:* 1.

*Estimated Time per Response:* 1 hour.

*Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours:* 25 hours.

## IV. Request for Comments

Comments are invited on: (1) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of NASA, including whether the information collected has practical utility; (2) the accuracy of NASA's estimate of the burden (including hours and cost) of the proposed collection of information; (3) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (4) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including automated collection techniques or the use of other forms of information technology.

Comments submitted in response to this notice will be summarized and included in the request for OMB approval of this information collection. They will also become a matter of public record.

**Walter Kit,**

*NASA Clearance Officer.*

[FR Doc. E9-17306 Filed 7-20-09; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE P**

## NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

[Notice (09-068)]

### Review of U.S. Human Space Flight Plans Committee; Meeting

**AGENCY:** National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

**ACTION:** Notice of Meeting.

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act, Public

Law 92-463, as amended, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration announces a meeting of the Review of U.S. Human Space Flight Plans Committee.

**DATES:** Wednesday, August 5, 2009, 8 a.m.–12 noon (EDT).

**ADDRESSES:** Carnegie Institution of Washington, 1530 P Street, NW., Washington, DC 20005, Telephone: (202) 939-1138.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mr. Philip R. McAlister, Office of Program Analysis and Evaluation, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, DC 20546. Phone 202-358-0712.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The meeting will be open to the public up to the seating capacity of the room. It is imperative that the meeting be held on this date to accommodate the scheduling priorities of the key participants. The agenda topics for the meeting include:

- Vision for Space Exploration Background.
- Mars Society Views on U.S. Human Space Flight Program.
- Science-related Briefings.
- Arianespace Briefing.
- Public Comment.

**P. Diane Rausch,**

*Advisory Committee Management Officer, National Aeronautics and Space Administration.*

[FR Doc. E9-17305 Filed 7-20-09; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE P**

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[NRC-2009-0270]

### 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 Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations (10 CFR), section 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 (RDB), 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. Written comments may also be faxed to the RDB at 301-492-3446. 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.

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. Requests for a hearing and a petition 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 an exemption 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 should contact the Office of the Secretary by e-mail at [hearing.docket@nrc.gov](mailto: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 using the agency's adjudicatory e-filing system 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 toll-free help line number is 1-866-672-7640. A person filing electronically may also seek assistance by sending an e-mail to the NRC electronic filing Help Desk at [MSHD.Resource@nrc.gov](mailto:MSHD.Resource@nrc.gov).

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.

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

Commission, the presiding officer, or the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board that the request and/or petition 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](http://ehd.nrc.gov/ehd_proceeding/home.asp), unless excluded pursuant to an order of the Commission, the 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 electronically 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](mailto:pdr.resource@nrc.gov).

**FPL Energy Seabrook, LLC, Docket No. 50-443, Seabrook Station, Unit No. 1, Rockingham County, New Hampshire**

*Date of amendment request:* May 28, 2009.

*Description of amendment request:* This amendment request contains sensitive unclassified non-safeguards information (SUNSI). The amendment would revise Technical Specification (TS) 6.7.6.k, Steam Generator (SG) Program, to exclude a portion of the tubes below the top of the SG tube sheet from periodic SG tube inspections. The change also adds additional reporting criteria to TS 6.8.1.7, Steam Generator Tube Inspection Report. This permanent change is supported by Westinghouse Electric Company, LLC Topical Report WCAP-17071-P, "H\*: Alternate Repair Criteria for the Tubesheet Expansion

Region in Steam Generators with Hydraulically Expanded Tubes (Model F)."

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

1. *The proposed changes do not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.*

The previously analyzed accidents are initiated by the failure of plant structures, systems, or components. The proposed change that alters the steam generator (SG) inspection and reporting criteria does not have a detrimental impact on the integrity of any plant structure, system, or component that initiates an analyzed event. The proposed change will not alter the operation of, or otherwise increase the failure probability of any plant equipment that initiates an analyzed accident.

Of the applicable accidents previously evaluated, the limiting transients with consideration to the proposed change to the SG tube inspection and repair criteria are the steam generator tube rupture (SGTR) event, the steam line break (SLB), and the feed line break (FLB) postulated accidents.

During the SGTR event, the required structural integrity margins of the SG tubes and the tube-to-tubesheet joint over the H\* distance will be maintained. Tube rupture in tubes with cracks within the tubesheet is precluded by the constraint provided by the presence of the tubesheet and the tube-to-tubesheet joint. Tube burst cannot occur within the thickness of the tubesheet. The tube-to-tubesheet joint constraint results from the hydraulic expansion process, thermal expansion mismatch between the tube and tubesheet, and from the differential pressure between the primary and secondary side, and tubesheet rotation. Based on this design, the structural margins against burst, as discussed in Regulatory Guide (RG) 1.121, "Bases for Plugging Degraded [pressurized-water reactor] PWR Steam Generator Tubes," and Technical Specification 6.7.6.k, are maintained for both normal and postulated accident conditions.

The proposed change has no impact on the structural or leakage integrity of the portion of the tube outside of the tubesheet. The proposed change maintains structural and leakage integrity of the SG tubes consistent with the performance criteria of Technical Specification 6.7.6.k. Therefore, the proposed change results in no significant increase in the probability of the occurrence of a SGTR accident.

At normal operating pressures, leakage from tube degradation below the proposed limited inspection depth is limited by the tube-to-tubesheet crevice. Consequently, negligible normal operating leakage is expected from degradation below the inspected depth within the tubesheet region. The consequences of an SGTR event are not affected by the primary-to-secondary leakage flow during the event as primary-to-

secondary leakage flow through a postulated tube that has been pulled out of the tubesheet is essentially equivalent to a severed tube. Therefore, the proposed change does not result in a significant increase in the consequences of a SGTR.

The probability of a SLB is unaffected by the potential failure of a steam generator tube as the failure of tube is not an initiator for a SLB event.

The leakage factor of 2.02 for Seabrook Station, for a postulated SLB/FLB, has been calculated as shown in Table 9-7 of [WCAP-17071-P]. However, NextEra will apply a factor of 2.03 to the normal operating leakage associated with the tubesheet expansion region in the condition monitoring (CM) and operational assessment (OA). The leakage factor of 2.03 is a bounding value for all SGs, both hot and cold legs, in Table 9-7 of [WCAP-17071-P]. Through application of the limited tubesheet inspection scope, the existing operating leakage limit provides assurance that excessive leakage (*i.e.*, greater than accident analysis assumptions) will not occur. The assumed accident induced leak rate is 500 gallons per day (gpd) during a postulated steam line break in the faulted loop. Using the limiting leak rate factor of 2.03, this corresponds to an acceptable level of operational leakage of 246 gpd. Therefore, the technical specification leak rate limit of 150 gpd provides significant added margin against the 500 gpd accident analysis leak rate assumption.

No leakage factor will be applied to the locked rotor or control rod ejection transients due to their short duration.

For the CM assessment, the component of leakage from the prior cycle from below the H\* distance will be multiplied by a factor of 2.03 and added to the total leakage from any other source and compared to the allowable accident induced leakage limit. For the OA, the difference in the leakage between the allowable leakage and the accident induced leakage from sources other than the tubesheet expansion region will be divided by 2.03 and compared to the observed operational leakage.

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

2. *The proposed changes do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated.*

The proposed change that alters the steam generator inspection and reporting criteria does not introduce any new equipment, create new failure modes for existing equipment, or create any new limiting single failures. Plant operation will not be altered, and all safety functions will continue to perform as previously assumed in accident analyses. Therefore, the proposed change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated.

3. *The proposed changes do not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety.*

The proposed change limits the portion of the tube that must be inspected and repaired to the portion of the tube within the tubesheet necessary to maintain structural and leakage integrity under both normal and

accident conditions. WCAP-17071-P identifies the specific inspection depth below which any type tube degradation [is] shown to have no impact on the performance criteria in [Nuclear Energy Institute] NEI 97-06 Rev. 2, "Steam Generator Program Guidelines."

The proposed change that alters the steam generator inspection and reporting criteria maintains the required structural margins of the SG tubes for both normal and accident conditions. Nuclear Energy Institute 97-06, "Steam Generator Program Guidelines," and NRC Regulatory Guide (RG) 1.121, "Bases for Plugging Degraded PWR Steam Generator Tubes," are used as the bases in the development of the limited tubesheet inspection depth methodology for determining that SG tube integrity considerations are maintained within acceptable limits. RG 1.121 describes a method acceptable to the NRC for meeting General Design Criteria (GDC) 14, "Reactor Coolant Pressure Boundary," GDC 15, "Reactor Coolant System Design," GDC 31, "Fracture Prevention of Reactor Coolant Pressure Boundary," and GDC 32, "Inspection of Reactor Coolant Pressure Boundary," by reducing the probability and consequences of a SGTR. RG 1.121 concludes that by determining the limiting safe conditions for tube wall degradation, the probability and consequences of a SGTR are reduced. This RG uses safety factors on loads for tube burst that are consistent with the requirements of Section III of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME) Code.

For axially oriented cracking located within the tubesheet, tube burst is precluded due to the presence of the tubesheet. For circumferentially oriented cracking, Westinghouse WCAP-17071-P defines a length of degradation-free expanded tubing that provides the necessary resistance to tube pullout due to the pressure induced forces, with applicable safety factors applied. Application of the limited hot and cold leg tubesheet inspection criteria will preclude unacceptable primary-to-secondary leakage during all plant conditions. The methodology for determining leakage as described in WCAP-17071-P shows that significant margin exists between an acceptable level of leakage during normal operating conditions (246 gpd) that ensures meeting the SLB accident-induced leakage assumption and the technical specification leakage limit of 150 gpd.

Therefore, the proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in any 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:* M.S. Ross, Florida Power & Light Company, P.O. Box 14000, Juno Beach, FL 33408-0420.

*NRC Branch Chief:* Harold Chernoff.

### **Wolf Creek Nuclear Operating Corporation, Docket No. 50-482, Wolf Creek Generating Station, Coffey County, Kansas**

*Date of amendment request:* June 2, 2009.

*Description of amendment request:* This amendment request contains sensitive unclassified non-safeguards information (SUNSI). The amendment would revise Technical Specification (TS) 5.5.9, "Steam Generator (SG) Program," to exclude portions of the tube below the top of the steam generator tubesheet from periodic SG tube inspections. In addition, this amendment request proposes to revise TS 5.6.10, "Steam Generator Tube Inspection Report," to provide reporting requirements specific to the permanent alternate repair criteria. This permanent change is supported by Westinghouse Electric Company LLC, WCAP-17071-P, "H\*: Alternate Repair Criteria for the Tubesheet Expansion Region in Steam Generators with Hydraulically Expanded Tubes (Model F)."

*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 previously analyzed accidents are initiated by the failure of plant structures, systems, or components. The proposed change that alters the steam generator inspection criteria does not have a detrimental impact on the integrity of any plant structure, system, or component that initiates an analyzed event. The proposed change will not alter the operation of, or otherwise increase the failure probability of any plant equipment that initiates an analyzed accident.

Of the applicable accidents previously evaluated, the limiting transients with consideration to the proposed change to the steam generator tube inspection and repair criteria are the steam generator tube rupture (SGTR) event and the feedline break (FLB) postulated accidents.

During the SGTR event, the required structural integrity margins of the steam generator tubes and the tube-to-tubesheet joint over the H\* distance will be maintained. Tube rupture in tubes with cracks within the tubesheet is precluded by the presence of the tubesheet and constraint provided by the tube-to-tubesheet joint. Tube burst cannot occur within the thickness of the tubesheet. The tube-to-tubesheet joint constraint results from the hydraulic expansion process, thermal expansion mismatch between the tube and tubesheet, from the differential pressure between the

primary and secondary side, and tubesheet deflection. Based on this design, the structural margins against burst, as discussed in Regulatory Guide (RG) 1.121, "Bases for Plugging Degraded PWR [Pressurized-Water Reactor] Steam Generator Tubes," and TS 5.5.9 are maintained for both normal and postulated accident conditions.

The proposed change has no impact on the structural or leakage integrity of the portion of the tube outside of the tubesheet. The proposed change maintains structural and leakage integrity of the steam generator tubes consistent with the performance criteria in TS 5.5.9. Therefore, the proposed change results in no significant increase in the probability of the occurrence of [an] SGTR accident.

At normal operating pressures, leakage from tube degradation below the proposed limited inspection depth is limited by the tube-to-tubesheet joint. Consequently, negligible normal operating leakage is expected from degradation below the inspected depth within the tubesheet region. The consequences of an SGTR event are not affected by the primary to secondary leakage flow during the event as primary to secondary leakage flow through a postulated tube that has been pulled out of the tubesheet is essentially equivalent to a severed tube. Therefore, the proposed changes do not result in a significant increase in the consequences of [an] SGTR.

The probability of [an] SLB [steam line break] is unaffected by the potential failure of a steam generator tube as the failure of the tube is not an initiator for [an] SLB event.

The leakage factor of 2.03 for WCGS, for a postulated SLB/FLB, has been calculated as shown in Table 9-7 of WCAP-17071-P and will be applied to the normal operating leakage associated with the tubesheet expansion region in the condition monitoring (CM) and operational assessment (OA). The leakage factor of 2.03 is a bounding value for all steam generators, both hot and cold legs, in Table 9-7 of [WCAP-17071-P]. Through application of the limited tubesheet inspection scope, the existing operating leakage limit provides assurance that excessive leakage (i.e., greater than accident analysis assumptions) will not occur. The accident induced leak rate limit for WCGS is 1.0 gpm [gallons per minute]. The TS 3.4.13, "RCS [Reactor Coolant System] Operational LEAKAGE," operational leak rate limit is 150 gpd [gallons per day] (0.1 gpm) through any one steam generator. Consequently, accident leakage is approximately 10 times the allowable leakage, if only one steam generator is leaking. Using [an] SLB/FLB overall leakage factor of 2.03, accident induced leakage is approximately 0.5 gpm, if all 4 steam generators are leaking at 150 gpd at the beginning of the accident. Therefore, significant margin exists between the conservatively estimated accident induced leakage and the allowable accident leakage (1.0 gpm).

No leakage factor will be applied to the locked rotor or control rod ejection transients due to their short duration.

For the CM assessment, the component of leakage from the prior cycle from below the  $H^*$  distance will be multiplied by a factor of

2.03 and added to the total leakage from any other source and compared to the allowable accident induced leakage limit. For the OA, the difference in the leakage between the allowable leakage and the accident induced leakage from sources other than the tubesheet expansion region will be divided by 2.03 and compared to the observed operational leakage.

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

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

Response: No.

The proposed change that alters the steam generator inspection and reporting criteria does not introduce any new equipment, create new failure modes for existing equipment, or create any new limiting single failures. Plant operation will not be altered, and safety functions will continue to perform as previously assumed in accident analyses.

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 change involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety?

Response: No.

The proposed change defines the portion of the tube that must be inspected and repaired. WCAP-17071-P identifies the specific inspection depth below which any type tube degradation shown to have no impact on the performance criteria in NEI [Nuclear Energy Institute] 97-06, Revision 2.

The proposed change that alters the steam generator inspection and reporting criteria maintains the required structural margins of the steam generator tubes for both normal and accident conditions. NEI 97-06, Revision 2, and RG 1.121, are used as the bases in the development of the limited tubesheet inspection depth methodology for determining that steam generator tube integrity considerations are maintained within acceptable limits. RG 1.121 describes a method acceptable to the NRC [U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission] for meeting GDC [General Design Criterion] 14, "Reactor Coolant Pressure Boundary," GDC 15, "Reactor Coolant System Design," GDC 31, "Fracture Prevention of Reactor Coolant Pressure Boundary," and GDC 32, "Inspection of Reactor Coolant Pressure Boundary," by reducing the probability and consequences of [an] SGTR. RG 1.121 concludes that by determining the limiting safe conditions for tube wall degradation the probability and consequences of [an] SGTR are reduced. This RG uses safety factors on loads for tube burst that are consistent with the requirements of Section III of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME) Code.

For axially-oriented cracking located within the tubesheet, tube burst is precluded due to the presence of the tubesheet. For circumferentially-oriented cracking, WCAP-17071-P, defines a length of degradation-free expanded tubing that provides the necessary resistance to tube pullout due to the pressure induced forces, with applicable safety factors

applied. Application of the limited hot and cold leg tubesheet inspection criteria will preclude unacceptable primary to secondary leakage during all plant conditions. Using the methodology for determining leakage as described in WCAP-17071-P, it is shown that significant margin exists between conservatively estimated accident induced leakage and the allowable accident leakage (1.0 gpm) if all four steam generators are assumed to be leaking at the TS leakage limit at the beginning of the design basis accident.

Therefore, the proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in any 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:* Jay Silberg, Esq., Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw Pittman LLP, 2300 N Street, NW., Washington, DC 20037.

*NRC Branch Chief:* Michael T. Markley.

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

*FPL Energy Seabrook, LLC, Docket No. 50-443, Seabrook Station, Unit No. 1, Rockingham County, New Hampshire*  
*Wolf Creek Nuclear Operating Corporation, Docket No. 50-482, Wolf Creek Generating Station, Coffey County, Kansas*

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). Requirements for access to SGI are primarily set forth in 10 CFR parts 2 and 73. The intent of this order is to make those requirements more specific to this proceeding, but nothing in this order is intended to conflict with those regulations.

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](mailto:hearing.docket@nrc.gov) and [ogcmailcenter.resource@nrc.gov](mailto:ogcmailcenter.resource@nrc.gov), respectively.<sup>1</sup> 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. Pursuant to 10 CFR 73.22(b), no person may have access to SGI without first being determined to be trustworthy and reliable based on a background check. Accordingly, if the requested information is for SGI, Form SF-85, "Questionnaire for Non-Sensitive Positions," and Form FD-258 (fingerprint card)—completed by any individual who would have access to SGI if the request is granted—must be submitted. For Form SF-85, the requestor(s) should only complete sections 1-11, the certification and the authorization for release. 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.<sup>2</sup> The other completed form must be signed in original ink, accompanied by a check or money order payable in the amount of \$200.00 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 Federal Bureau of Investigation 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 adjudicate a specific contention in this NRC proceeding<sup>3</sup> and whether the proposed recipient has the technical competence (demonstrable knowledge, skill, training, or education) to effectively utilize 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 in accordance with 10 CFR 73.22(b). The NRC staff will conduct (as necessary) an inspection to confirm that the recipient's information protection systems meet the requirements of 10 CFR 73.22. 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.<sup>4</sup> Any protective order issued shall provide that the petitioner must file SUNSI or SGI contentions 25 days after

<sup>3</sup> 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.

<sup>4</sup> 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.

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> 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. Administration, Security Processing Unit, Mail Stop TWB-05 B32M, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0012.

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,<sup>5</sup> 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 10 CFR 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.<sup>6</sup>

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 15th day of July 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 FEDERAL REGISTER notice of proposed action and 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.

<sup>5</sup> 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).

<sup>6</sup> 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
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 .....	<i>If access granted:</i> 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. E9-17243 Filed 7-20-09; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

### Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards Meeting of the ACRS Subcommittee on Plant Operations and Fire Protection; Notice of Meeting

The ACRS Subcommittee on Plant Operations and Fire Protection will hold a meeting on August 18, 2009, in the Commission Hearing Room, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland.

The entire meeting will be open to public attendance.

The agenda for the subject meeting shall be as follows:

**Tuesday, August 18, 2009, 8:30 a.m.–12 p.m.**

The Subcommittee will review draft final Revision 2 to Regulatory Guide 1.189, "Fire Protection for Nuclear Power Plants." The Subcommittee will hear presentations by and hold discussions with representatives of the NRC staff, the Nuclear Energy Institute, and other interested persons regarding these matters. 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 Official, Peter Wen (*telephone: 301-415-2832, e-mail: Peter.Wen@nrc.gov*), five days prior to the meeting, if possible, so that appropriate arrangements can be made. Thirty-five hard copies of each presentation or handout should be provided to the Designated Federal

Official 30 minutes before the meeting. In addition, one electronic copy of each presentation should be e-mailed to the Designated Federal Official 1 day before the meeting. If an electronic copy cannot be provided within this timeframe, presenters should provide the Designated Federal Official with a CD containing each presentation at least 30 minutes before the meeting. Electronic recordings will be permitted only during those portions of the meeting that are open to the public. Detailed procedures for the conduct of and participation in ACRS meetings were published in the **Federal Register** on October 6, 2008, (73FR 58268–58269).

Further information regarding this meeting can be obtained by contacting the Designated Federal Official (DFO) between 7:30 a.m. and 5:15 p.m. (ET). Persons planning to attend this meeting are urged to contact the DFO at least two working days prior to the meeting to be advised of any potential changes to the agenda.

Dated: July 15, 2009.

**Cayetano Santos,**

*Chief, Reactor Safety Branch A, Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards.*

[FR Doc. E9-17289 Filed 7-20-09; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

### Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards (ACRS); Meeting of the Subcommittee on Digital Instrumentation and Control Systems; Notice of Meeting

The ACRS Subcommittee on Digital Instrumentation and Control Systems (DI&C) will hold a meeting on August 19–21, 2009, in the Commission Hearing

Room, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland.

The entire meeting will be open to public attendance.

The agenda for the subject meeting shall be as follows:

*Wednesday, August 19, 2009, 8:30 a.m.–5 p.m.*

*Thursday, August 20, 2009, 8:30 a.m.–5 p.m.*

*Friday, August 21, 2009, 8:30 a.m.–3 p.m.*

The Subcommittee will hear presentations by and hold discussions with representatives of the NRC staff and the industry regarding several digital instrumentation and control systems issues: the Digital Instrumentation and Control Plan 2010–2013, Interim Staff Guidances (ISGs) on fuel facilities and licensing process, EPRI reports on operating experience and Diverse Actuation Systems Risk and Benefits, and other DI&C related topics. 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 Official, Ms. Christina Antonescu (*telephone: 301-415-6792, e-mail: cea1@nrc.gov*), five days prior to the meeting, if possible, so that appropriate arrangements can be made. Thirty five hard copies of each presentation or handout should be provided to the Designated Federal Official 30 minutes before the meeting. In addition, one electronic copy of each presentation should be e-mailed to the Designated Federal Official 1 day before the meeting. If an electronic copy cannot be provided within this timeframe, presenters should provide the Designated Federal Official with a