

CFR part 73, for certain alarm station requirements. DNC has also proposed an alternate full compliance date of August 31, 2010, 5 months beyond the date required by 10 CFR part 73, for certain uninterruptible power supply requirements. The proposed action, an extension of the schedule for completion of certain actions required by the revised 10 CFR part 73, does not involve any physical changes to the reactor, fuel, plant structures, support structures, water, or land at MPS1, MPS2, and MPS3 site.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application dated January 12, 2010 (Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS) Accession No. ML100131116), as supplemented by letter dated January 12, 2010 (ADAMS Accession No. ML100131115).

#### *The Need for the Proposed Action*

The proposed action is needed to provide the licensee with additional time to perform the required upgrades to the combined MPS1, MPS2, and MPS3 security system due to the procurement needs and installation activities.

#### *Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action*

The NRC has completed its environmental assessment of the proposed exemption. The NRC staff has concluded that the proposed action to extend the implementation deadline would not significantly affect plant safety and would not have a significant adverse effect on the probability of an accident occurring.

The proposed action would not result in an increased radiological hazard beyond those previously analyzed in the environmental assessment and finding of no significant impact made by the Commission in promulgating its revisions to 10 CFR part 73 as discussed in a **Federal Register** notice dated March 27, 2009 (74 FR 13926). There will be no change to radioactive effluents that affect radiation exposures to plant workers and members of the public. Therefore, no changes or different types of radiological impacts are expected as a result of the proposed exemption.

The proposed action does not result in changes to land use or water use, or result in changes to the quality or quantity of non-radiological effluents. No changes to the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System permit are needed. No effects on the aquatic or terrestrial habitat in the vicinity of the plant, or to threatened, endangered, or protected species under the Endangered Species Act, or impacts to essential fish

habitat covered by the Magnuson-Steven's Act are expected. There are no impacts to the air or ambient air quality.

There are no impacts to historical and cultural resources. There would be no impact to socioeconomic resources. Therefore, no changes to or different types of non-radiological environmental impacts are expected as a result of the proposed exemption.

Accordingly, the NRC concludes that there are no significant environmental impacts associated with the proposed action. In addition, in promulgating its revisions to 10 CFR part 73, the Commission prepared an environmental assessment and published a finding of no significant impact (74 FR 13926).

The NRC staff's safety evaluation will be provided in the exemption that will be issued as part of the letter to the licensee approving the exemption to the regulation, if granted.

#### *Environmental Impacts of the Alternatives to the Proposed Action*

As an alternative to the proposed action, the NRC staff considered denial of the proposed action (i.e., the "no-action" alternative). Denial of the exemption request would result in no change in current environmental impacts. If the proposed action was denied, the licensee would have to comply with the March 31, 2010, implementation deadline. The environmental impacts of the proposed exemption and the "no action" alternative are similar.

#### *Alternative Use of Resources*

The action does not involve the use of any different resources than those considered in the Final Environmental Statement (FES) for MPS1, dated June 1973, or the FES for MPS2, dated June 1973, as supplemented through the "Generic Environmental Impact Statement for License Renewal of Nuclear Plants: Millstone Power Station, Units 2 and 3—Final Report (NUREG-1437, Supplement 22)," or the FES for MPS3, NUREG-1064, dated December 1984, as supplemented through the "Generic Environmental Impact Statement for License Renewal of Nuclear Plants: Millstone Power Station, Units 2 and 3—Final Report (NUREG-1437, Supplement 22)."

#### *Agencies and Persons Consulted*

In accordance with its stated policy, on February 18, 2010, the NRC staff consulted with the Connecticut State official, Mr. Michael Firsick of the Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection regarding the environmental impact of the proposed

action. The State official had no comments.

#### **Finding of No Significant Impact**

On the basis of the environmental assessment, the NRC concludes that the proposed action will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment. Accordingly, the NRC has determined not to prepare an environmental impact statement for the proposed action.

For further details with respect to the proposed action, see the licensee's letter dated January 12, 2010, as supplemented by letter dated January 12, 2010. Portions of the submittal contain safeguards information and, accordingly, are not available to the public. Other parts of these documents may be examined, and/or copied for a fee, at the NRC's Public Document Room (PDR), located at One White Flint North, Room O-1 F21, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland 20852. Publicly available records will be accessible electronically from the Agencywide Document Access and Management System (ADAMS) Public Electronic Reading Room on the Internet at the NRC Web site: <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html>.

Persons who do not have access to ADAMS or who encounter problems in accessing the documents located in ADAMS should contact the NRC PDR Reference staff by telephone at 1-800-397-4209 or 301-415-4737, or send an e-mail to [pdr.resource@nrc.gov](mailto:pdr.resource@nrc.gov).

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 19th day of March, 2010.

For The Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Carleen J. Sanders,**

*Project Manager, Plant Licensing Branch I-2, Division of Operating Reactor Licensing, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 2010-6719 Filed 3-25-10; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7590-01-P**

## **NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

**[Docket No. 50-346; NRC-2010-0125]**

### **FirstEnergy Nuclear Operating Company, Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station; Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact**

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is considering issuance of an Exemption, pursuant to Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR) Section 73.5, "Specific exemptions," from the implementation date for certain new requirements of 10 CFR part 73, "Physical protection of plants and

materials,” for Facility Operating License No. NPF-3, issued to FirstEnergy Nuclear Operating Company (FENOC, the licensee), for operation of the Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1 (DBNPS), located in Ottawa County, Ohio. Therefore, as required by 10 CFR 51.21, the NRC performed an environmental assessment. Based on the results of this environmental assessment, the NRC is issuing a finding of no significant impact.

### Environmental Assessment

#### *Identification of the Proposed Action*

The proposed action would exempt the DBNPS from the required implementation date of March 31, 2010, for a certain new requirement of 10 CFR part 73. Specifically, DBNPS would be granted an exemption from being in full compliance with certain new requirements contained in 10 CFR 73.55 by the March 31, 2010, deadline. FENOC has proposed an alternate full compliance date of February 3, 2011, approximately 11 months beyond the date required by 10 CFR part 73. The proposed action, an extension of the schedule for completion of certain actions required by the revised 10 CFR part 73, does not involve any physical changes to the reactor, fuel, plant structures, support structures, water or land at the DBNPS site.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application dated November 30, 2009 (Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS) Accession No. ML093370138, not publicly available, contains security-related information), as supplemented on December 23, 2009 (ADAMS Accession No. ML093650293, not publicly available, contains security-related information).

#### *The Need for the Proposed Action*

The proposed action is needed to provide the licensee with additional time to perform and design the necessary modifications, procure equipment and material, and implement upgrades to comply with a specific aspect of 10 CFR 73.55.

#### *Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action*

The NRC has completed its evaluation of the proposed exemption. The staff has concluded that the proposed action to extend the implementation deadline would not significantly affect plant safety and would not have a significant adverse effect on the probability of an accident occurring.

The details of the staff's safety evaluation will be provided in the

exemption that will be issued as part of the letter to the licensee approving the exemption.

The proposed action would not result in an increased radiological hazard beyond those previously analyzed in the environment assessment and finding of no significant impact made by the Commission in promulgating its revisions to 10 CFR, part 73 as discussed in a **Federal Register** notice dated March 27, 2009 (74 FR 13967). There will be no change to radioactive effluents that effect radiation exposures to plant workers and members of the public. Therefore, no changes or different types of radiological impacts are expected as a result of the proposed exemption.

The proposed action does not result in changes to land use or water use, or result in changes to the quality or quantity of non-radiological effluents. No changes to the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System permit are needed. No effects on the aquatic or terrestrial habitat in the vicinity of the plant, or to threatened, endangered, or protected species under the Endangered Species Act, or impacts to essential fish habitat covered by the Magnuson-Steven's Act are expected. There are no impacts to the air or ambient air quality.

There are no impacts to historical and cultural resources. There would be no impact to socioeconomic resources. Therefore, no changes to or different types of non-radiological environmental impacts are expected as a result of the proposed exemption.

Accordingly, the NRC concludes that there are no significant environmental impacts associated with the proposed action. In addition, in promulgating its revisions to 10 CFR, part 73, the Commission prepared an environment assessment and published a finding of no significant impact (Part 73, Power Reactor Security Requirements, 74 FR 13926, 13967 (March 27, 2009)).

The licensee currently maintains a security system acceptable to the NRC. The new 10 CFR part 73 security measures that would be implemented by March 31, 2010, would continue to provide acceptable onsite physical protections of DBNPS. Therefore, the extension of the implementation date of the new requirements of 10 CFR part 73 to February 3, 2011, would not have any significant environmental impacts.

The NRC staff's safety evaluation will be provided in the exemption that will be issued as part of the letter to the licensee approving the exemption to the regulation, if granted.

#### *Environmental Impacts of the Alternatives to the Proposed Action*

As an alternative to the proposed action, the staff considered denial of the proposed action (i.e., the “no-action” alternative). Denial of the application would result in no change in current environmental impacts. If the proposed action was denied, the licensee would have to comply with the March 31, 2010, implementation deadline. The environmental impacts of the proposed action and the “no-action” alternative action are similar.

#### *Alternative Use of Resources*

The action does not involve the use of any different resources than those previously considered in the Final Environmental Statement, NUREG-75/097, dated October 1975, for the DBNPS.

#### *Agencies and Persons Consulted*

In accordance with its stated policy, on February 24, 2009, the staff consulted with the Ohio State official, Ms. Carol O'Claire of the Ohio Emergency Management Agency, regarding the environmental impact of the proposed action. The State official had no comments.

#### *Finding of No Significant Impact*

On the basis of the environmental assessment, the NRC concludes that the proposed action will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment. Accordingly, the NRC has determined not to prepare an environmental impact statement for the proposed action.

For further details with respect to the proposed action, see the licensee's letter dated November 30, 2009, as supplemented on December 23, 2009. Documents may be examined, and/or copied for a fee, at the NRC's Public Document Room (PDR), located at One White Flint North, Room O1 F21, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland. Publicly available records will be accessible electronically from the Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS) Public Electronic Reading Room on the Internet at the NRC Web site, <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html>. Persons who do not have access to ADAMS or who encounter problems in accessing the documents located in ADAMS should contact the NRC PDR Reference staff by telephone at 1-800-397-4209 or 301-415-4737, or send an e-mail to [pdr.resource@nrc.gov](mailto:pdr.resource@nrc.gov).

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 18th day of March 2010.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
**Michael Mahoney,**  
*Project Manager, Plant Licensing Branch III-2, Division of Operating Reactor Licensing, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*  
 [FR Doc. 2010-6758 Filed 3-25-10; 8:45 am]  
**BILLING CODE 7590-01-P**

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-333; NRC-2010-0136]

### James A. FitzPatrick Nuclear Power Plant; Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is considering issuance of an exemption, pursuant to Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR) Section 73.5, "Specific exemptions," from the implementation date for certain new requirements of 10 CFR Part 73, "PHYSICAL PROTECTION OF PLANTS AND MATERIALS," for Facility Operating License No. DPR-59, issued to Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc. (the licensee), for the operation of the James A. FitzPatrick Nuclear Power Plant (JAFNPP) located in Oswego County, NY. In accordance with 10 CFR 51.21, the NRC prepared an environmental assessment. Based on the results of the environmental assessment, the NRC is issuing a finding of no significant impact.

#### Environmental Assessment

##### *Identification of the Proposed Action*

The proposed action would exempt JAFNPP from the required implementation date of March 31, 2010, for several new requirements of 10 CFR part 73. Specifically, JAFNPP would be granted an exemption from being in full compliance with certain new requirements contained in 10 CFR 73.55 by the March 31, 2010, deadline. JAFNPP has proposed an alternate full compliance implementation date of December 31, 2010, approximately 9 months beyond the date required by 10 CFR part 73. The proposed action, an extension of the schedule for completion of certain actions required by the revised 10 CFR part 73, does not involve any physical changes to the reactor, fuel, plant structures, support structures, water, or land at the JAFNPP site.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application dated January 21, 2010, as supplemented by letters dated February 25 and March 2, 2010.

##### *The Need for the Proposed Action*

The proposed action is needed to provide the licensee with additional time to perform the required upgrades to the JAFNPP security system due to design, resource and logistical impacts from adverse winter weather and from material delivery dates.

##### *Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action*

The NRC has completed its environmental assessment of the proposed exemption. The staff has concluded that the proposed action to extend the implementation deadline would not significantly affect plant safety and would not have a significant adverse effect on the probability of an accident occurring.

The proposed action would not result in an increased radiological hazard beyond those previously analyzed in the environmental assessment and finding of no significant impact made by the Commission in promulgating its revisions to 10 CFR part 73 as discussed in a **Federal Register** notice dated March 27, 2009 (74 FR 13926). There will be no change to radioactive effluents that affect radiation exposures to plant workers and members of the public. Therefore, no changes or different types of radiological impacts are expected as a result of the proposed exemption.

The proposed action does not result in changes to land use or water use, or result in changes to the quality or quantity of non-radiological effluents. No changes to the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System permit are needed. No effects on the aquatic or terrestrial habitat in the vicinity of the plant, or to threatened, endangered, or protected species under the Endangered Species Act, or impacts to essential fish habitat covered by the Magnuson-Steven's Act are expected. There are no impacts to the air or ambient air quality. There are no impacts to historical and cultural resources. There would be no impact to socioeconomic resources. Therefore, no changes to or different types of non-radiological environmental impacts are expected as a result of the proposed exemption.

Accordingly, the NRC concludes that there are no significant environmental impacts associated with the proposed action. In addition, in promulgating its revisions to 10 CFR part 73, the Commission prepared an environmental assessment and published a finding of no significant impact part 73, Power Reactor Security Requirements, 74 FR 13926, (March 27, 2009).

The NRC staff's safety evaluation will be provided in the exemption that will

be issued as part of the letter to the licensee approving the exemption to the regulation, if granted.

##### *Environmental Impacts of the Alternatives to the Proposed Action*

As an alternative to the proposed action, the NRC staff considered denial of the proposed actions (*i.e.*, the "no-action" alternative). Denial of the exemption request would result in no change in current environmental impacts. If the proposed action was denied, the licensee would have to comply with the March 31, 2010, implementation deadline. The environmental impacts of the proposed exemption and the "no action" alternative are similar.

##### *Alternative Use of Resources*

The action does not involve the use of any different resources than those considered in the "Final Environmental Statement related to operation of James A. FitzPatrick Nuclear Power Plant Power Authority of the State of New York, Docket No. 50-333," dated March 1973, as supplemented through the "Generic Environmental Impact Statement for License Renewal of Nuclear Plants: Supplement 31 Regarding James A. FitzPatrick Nuclear Power Plant, Final Report" (NUREG-1437, Supplement 31), January 2008.

##### *Agencies and Persons Consulted*

In accordance with its stated policy, on February 19, 2010, the NRC staff consulted with the New York State official, Alyse Peterson, of the New York State Energy Research and Development Authority, regarding the environmental impact of the proposed action. The State official had no comments.

##### **Finding of No Significant Impact**

On the basis of the environmental assessment, the NRC concludes that the proposed action will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment. Accordingly, the NRC has determined not to prepare an environmental impact statement for the proposed action.

For further details with respect to the proposed action, see the licensee's letter dated January 21, 2010, as supplemented by letters dated February 25 and March 2, 2010. Portions of the submittal dated January 21, 2010, as supplemented by letter dated February 25, 2010, contain sensitive security related information and, accordingly, are withheld from public disclosure in accordance with 10 CFR 2.390. The letter dated March 2, 2010, is the redacted version of the letter dated February 25, 2010. Publicly available