

Nebraska Public Power District, Docket No. 50-298, Cooper Nuclear Station, Nemaha County, Nebraska

Date of amendment request: June 2, 2009.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment (1) deleted Technical Specification (TS) surveillance requirement (SR) 3.1.3.2 and revised SR 3.1.3.3, (2) removed reference to SR 3.1.3.2 from Required Action A.3 of TS 3.1.3, "Control Rod OPERABILITY," and (3) revised Example 1.4-3 in Section 1.4, "Frequency," to clarify the applicability of the 1.25 surveillance test interval extension. The changes are in accordance with NRC-approved TS Task Force (TSTF) traveler TSTF-475, Revision 1, "Control Rod Notch Testing Frequency and SRM [Source Range Monitor] Insert Control Rod Action."

Date of issuance: November 12, 2009.

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

Amendment No.: 235.

Facility Operating License No. DPR-46: Amendment revised the Facility Operating License and Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: June 30, 2009 (74 FR 31325).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated November 12, 2009.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

PPL Susquehanna, LLC, Docket Nos. 50-387 and 50-388, Susquehanna Steam Electric Station, Units 1 and 2, (SSES Units 1 and 2) Luzerne County, Pennsylvania

Date of application for amendments: March 24, 2009, as supplemented by letters dated April 24, and September 11, 2009.

Brief description of amendments: The change revised the allowable value in the Technical Specification (TS) Table 3.3.5.1-1 (Function 3.d) for the high-pressure coolant injection automatic pump suction transfer from the condensate storage tank (CST) to the suppression pool. The present allowable value for this transfer is greater than or equal to 36 inches above the CST bottom. The change is to increase the allowable value for this transfer to occur at greater than or equal to 40.5 inches above the CST bottom.

Additionally, the amendment also included an editorial/administrative change which corrected a typographical error in the SSES Units 1 and 2 TS Section 3.10.8.f.

Date of issuance: November 9, 2009.

Effective date: As of the date of issuance to be implemented within 30 days.

Amendment Nos.: 254 for Unit 1 and 234 for Unit 2.

Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-14 and NPF-22: The amendments revised the License and Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: October 6, 2009, (74 FR 51332).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated November 9, 2009.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Virginia Electric and Power Company, et al., Docket Nos. 50-280 and 50-281, Surry Power Station, Units 1 and 2, Surry County, Virginia

Date of application for amendments: July 28, 2009, supplemented by letters dated September 16 and 30, 2009.

Brief Description of amendments: These amendments revise the Technical Specifications (TS) of Surry Power Station, Units 1 and 2. The request proposed changes to the inspection scope and repair requirements of TS Section 6.4.Q, "Steam Generator (SG) Program," to the reporting requirements of TS Section 6.6.A.3, "Steam Generator (SG) Tube Inspection Report," and to TS Sections 4.13 and 3.1.C, "RCS [Reactor Coolant System] Operational Leakage." The proposed changes would establish alternate repair inspection and criteria for portions of the SG tubes within the tubesheet. The alternate inspection and repair criteria would be applicable to Unit 1 during Refueling Outage 23 (fall 2010) and the subsequent operating cycle and to Unit 2 during Refueling Outage 22 (fall 2009) and the subsequent operating cycle.

Date of issuance: November 5, 2009.

Effective date: Unit 1 is effective as of its date of issuance and shall be implemented by the end of the fall 2010 refueling outage. Unit 2 is effective as of its date of issuance and shall be implemented by the end of the fall 2009 refueling outage.

Amendment Nos.: 267 and 266.

Renewed Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-32 and DPR-37: Amendments change the licenses and the technical specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: August 19, 2009 (74 FR 41939).

The supplements dated September 16, 2009 and September 30, 2009, provided additional information that clarified the application, did not expand the scope of the application as originally noticed,

and did not change the staff's original proposed no significant hazards consideration determination. The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated November 5, 2009.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Dated at Rockville, MD, this 19th day of November 2009.

For The Nuclear Regulatory Commission.
Joseph G. Giitter,
Director, Division of Operating Reactor Licensing, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.
[FR Doc. E9-28630 Filed 11-30-09; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Sunshine Federal Register Notice

AGENCY HOLDING THE MEETINGS: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

DATES: Weeks of November 30, December 7, 14, 21, 28, 2009, January 4, 2010.

PLACE: Commissioners' Conference Room, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland.

STATUS: Public and Closed.

Week of November 30, 2009

Friday, December 4, 2009

9:30 a.m.—Meeting with the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards (Public Meeting) (Contact: Antonio Dias, 301-415-6805).

This meeting will be Webcast live at the Web address—<http://www.nrc.gov>.

Week of December 7, 2009—Tentative

Tuesday, December 8, 2009

9:30 a.m.—Briefing on the Proposed Rule: Enhancements to Emergency, Preparedness Regulations (Public Meeting), (Contact: Lauren Quiñones, 301-415-2007).

This meeting will be Webcast live at the Web address—<http://www.nrc.gov>.

Week of December 14, 2009—Tentative

There are no meetings scheduled for the week of December 14, 2009.

Week of December 21, 2009—Tentative

There are no meetings scheduled for the week of December 21, 2009.

Week of December 28, 2009—Tentative

There are no meetings scheduled for the week of December 28, 2009.

Week of January 4, 2010—Tentative

There are no meetings scheduled for the week of January 4, 2010.

* * * * *

* The schedule for Commission meetings is subject to change on short notice. To verify the status of meetings, call (recording)—(301) 415-1292. Contact person for more information: Rochelle Baval, (301) 415-1651.

* * * * *

The NRC Commission Meeting Schedule can be found on the Internet at: <http://www.nrc.gov/about-nrc/policy-making/schedule.html>.

* * * * *

The NRC provides reasonable accommodation to individuals with disabilities where appropriate. If you need a reasonable accommodation to participate in these public meetings, or need this meeting notice or the transcript or other information from the public meetings in another format (e.g. braille, large print), please notify the NRC's Disability Program Coordinator, Rohn Brown, at 301-492-2279, TDD: 301-415-2100, or by e-mail at rohn.brown@nrc.gov. Determinations on requests for reasonable accommodation will be made on a case-by-case basis.

* * * * *

This notice is distributed electronically to subscribers. If you no longer wish to receive it, or would like to be added to the distribution, please contact the Office of the Secretary, Washington, DC 20555 (301-415-1969), or send an e-mail to darlene.wright@nrc.gov.

Dated: November 25, 2009.

Rochelle C. Baval,

Office of the Secretary.

[FR Doc. E9-28815 Filed 11-27-09; 11:15 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[NRC-2009-0522; Docket No. 50-284; License No. R-110]

Idaho State University; Receipt of Request for Action Under 10 CFR 2.206

Notice is hereby given that by petition dated June 26, 2009, Dr. Kevan Crawford requested that the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) take the following enforcement actions:

(1) The reactor operating license should be suspended immediately. All continuing violations, including items that Dr. Crawford determined: (1) Were unresolved from the 93-1 Notice of Violation (NOV), (2) as well as the

additional 20 violations¹ that Dr. Crawford determined to be concealed must be reconciled with the regulatory requirements immediately.

(2) The licensee should be fined for all damages related to the violations and cover-up of violations.

(3) The licensee should be required to carry a 50-year \$50,000,000 bond to cover latent radiation injuries instead of covering these injuries with unreliable State budget allocations for contingency funds.

(4) Every potential exposure and contamination victim should be identified through facility records, located, and informed of the potential risk to them and their families. The Medical Center in Pocatello, ID, should also be informed so that they may do the same. They should be informed of the entire range of expected symptoms. They should be informed of their right to seek compensation from the licensee.

(5) The following should warrant immediate revocation of the operating license due to the inability of the licensee to account for, with documentation, controlled by-product nuclear materials that were:

- a. Released in clandestine, undocumented shipments before August 4, 1993,
- b. In possession of individuals not licensed to hold the materials, and were not certified to handle the materials,
- c. Without proper *Title 49 Code of Federal Regulations* (49 CFR) Department of Transportation (DOT) certified containers,
- d. Without proper labeling for transport on public roads, and
- e. Concealed via fraudulent Annual Operating Reports as defined in 18 USC 1001 that were never amended even after NOV in 93-1.

(6) It is recommended that the Broad Form License be permanently revoked.

(7) The licensee must publicly acknowledge that there was a loss of Special Nuclear Material (SNM) control.

(8) The licensee must publicly acknowledge persons that served as an accessory to concealing unlawful distribution of controlled substances, fraud (both Annual Operating Reports and National Whistleblower Center), loss of control of SNM, and child endangerment.

The request is being treated pursuant to Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR) 2.206 of the Commission's regulations. The request has been referred to the Director of the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

¹ Page 9 from the June 26, 2009, petition letter to the Executive Director of Operations states 20 "Violations Completely Concealed by the NRC."

(NRR). The Petitioner participated in a conference call with the NRR Petition Review Board (PRB) on September 1, 2009, to discuss the petition. The additional information provided by the Petitioner was considered by the PRB before making its final recommendation.

By letter dated September 21, 2009, the Director accepted in part for review, pursuant to 10 CFR 2.206, the Petitioner's concerns regarding:

(1) Failure to conduct 10 CFR 50.59 safety review of the modification of the Controlled Access Area by the addition of an undocumented roof access for siphon breaker experiment implemented prior to 1991. The June 26, 2009, petition letter states this allowed random student access to the roof of the reactor room.

(2) Release of controlled by-product nuclear materials in containers not certified [10 CFR 49] for transport of such materials on public roads and not labeled with the required labeling.

(3) Failure to require the reactor operator conducting the startup procedures to wear protective clothing to routinely remove the activated startup channel detector from the reactor core. In the June 26, 2009, letter, Dr. Crawford states that this was cited and mishandled in the 93-1 NOV.

(4) Violation of 10 CFR 20 for the routine, unprotected handling of an unshielded neutron source.

The issues that were not accepted into the 2.206 petition process did not satisfy the criteria as specified in NRC Management Directive (MD) 8.11, "Review Process for 10 CFR 2.206 Petitions." In such instances: (1) The incoming correspondence does not ask for an enforcement-related action or fails to provide sufficient facts to support the petition, but simply alleges wrongdoing, violations of NRC regulations, or existence of safety concerns and/or, (2) The petitioner raises issues that have already been the subject of NRC staff review and evaluation, either on that facility, other similar facilities, or on a generic basis, for which a resolution has been achieved, the issues have been resolved, and the resolution is applicable to the facility in question.

On September 28, 2009, the petitioner was contacted via telephone and was provided the initial recommendations of the PRB. Pursuant to NRC MD 8.11, the petitioner was offered the opportunity to comment on the recommendations and to "provide any relevant additional explanation and support for the request in light of the PRB's recommendations." Through subsequent e-mail communication, the petitioner declined the opportunity for response to the