

Day	Event/Activity
25 .....	If NRC staff finds no "need" or no likelihood of standing, the deadline for requestor/petitioner 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.
A .....	If access granted: Issuance of presiding officer or other designated officer decision on motion for protective order for access to sensitive information (including schedule for providing access and submission of contentions) or decision reversing a final adverse determination by the NRC staff.
A + 3 .....	Deadline for filing executed Non-Disclosure Affidavits. Access provided to SUNSI consistent with decision issuing the protective order.
A + 28 .....	Deadline for submission of contentions whose development depends upon access to SUNSI. 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 contentions by that later deadline.
A + 53 .....	(Contention receipt +25) Answers to contentions whose development depends upon access to SUNSI.
A + 60 .....	(Answer receipt +7) Petitioner/Intervenor reply to answers.
>A + 60 .....	Decision on contention admission.

[FR Doc. 2010-6071 Filed 3-18-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50-280 and 50-281; NRC-2010-0079]

### Virginia Electric and Power Company; Surry Power Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2 (Surry 1 and 2); Correction to Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

**AGENCY:** Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**ACTION:** Correction notice.

**SUMMARY:** This document corrects a notice appearing in the *Federal Register* on March 3, 2010 (75 FR 9618), that cited the implementation date for compliance with Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR), part 73 as "August 31, 2010," rather than "August 31, 2010, and August 31, 2011, for Surry 1 and 2, respectively." This action is necessary to add an implementation date for Surry Unit 2.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Karen Cotton, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001; telephone, (301) 415-1438; e-mail, [Karen.Cotton@nrc.gov](mailto:Karen.Cotton@nrc.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** On page 9619, in the first column, second line, it reads "implementation dated of August 31, 2010, approximately 5 months beyond the date required by 10 CFR Part 73," and it is corrected to read "\* \* \* implementation date of August 31, 2010 and August 31, 2011, for Surry

1 and 2, respectively, approximately 5 months for Unit 1 and 17 months for Unit 2 beyond the date required by 10 CFR part 73."

Dated in Rockville, Maryland, this 12th day of March 2010.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Karen Cotton,**

*Project Manager, Plant Licensing Branch II-1, Division of Operating Licensing, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 2010-6054 Filed 3-18-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-331; NRC-2010-0107]

### Nextera Energy Duane Arnold, LLC; Duane Arnold Energy Center; Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is considering issuance of an exemption, pursuant to 10 CFR 50.12, from 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J, Option B and associated changes to the Technical Specifications (TSs) for main steamline isolation valve local leakage rate testing for Facility Operating License No. DPR-49, issued to NextEra Energy Duane Arnold, LLC (the licensee), for operation of the Duane Arnold Energy Center, located in Palo, Iowa. In accordance with 10 CFR 51.21, the NRC prepared an environmental assessment documenting its finding. The NRC concluded that the proposed actions will have no significant environmental impact.

## Environmental Assessment

### Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed action would exempt the licensee from certain portions of 10 CFR part 50, Appendix J, Option B. Specifically, the licensee requests to be exempted from the measured leakage rate for the main steamline isolation valves (MSIV), and associated inboard drainline, from inclusion in both the overall measured leakage rate for Type A integrated tests and from the sum of the local leakage rates for Type B and Type C tests as required by Appendix J, Option B, Paragraphs III.A and III.B, respectively.

In conjunction with the exemption request, the licensee also requests approval, pursuant to the requirements of 10 CFR 50.90, of associated changes to the Duane Arnold Energy Center TS, Section 5.5.12 (Primary Containment Leakage Rate Testing Program) that reflects the exemption to Appendix J requested above. Also, there is an additional proposed TS change to TS Section 3.6.1.3 (Primary Containment Isolation Valves) associated with MSIV leakage testing requirements, which does not require a corresponding exemption from 10 CFR part 50, Appendix J. The change to TS Section 3.6.1.3, is included in the amendment request to remove the repair criterion for MSIVs that fail their as-found leakage rate acceptance criterion found in the licensee's Surveillance Requirement 3.6.1.3.9.

### The Need for the Proposed Action

The proposed action is needed to reconcile the requirements of 10 CFR part 50, Appendix J, Option B and their

TS with the plant-specific testing methodology used to determine the MSIV local leakage rate.

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

The NRC has completed its environmental assessment of the proposed exemption and TS changes. The staff has concluded that the changes 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. There will be no change to radioactive effluents that affect radiation exposures to plant workers and members of the public. The proposed action will be performed inside existing plant buildings. No changes will be made to plant buildings or the site property. 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 or 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 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.

The details of the NRC staff's reasoning will be provided in the safety evaluation supporting the amendment.

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

As an alternative to the proposed actions, the staff considered denial of the proposed actions (i.e., the "no-action" alternative). Denial of the exemption and TS change request would result in no change in current environmental impacts. The environmental impacts of the proposed exemption and TS change 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 for the Duane Arnold Energy Center, Docket No. 50-331, issued in March 1973.

#### *Agencies and Persons Consulted*

In accordance with its stated policy, on January 29, 2010, the staff consulted with the Iowa State official, Melanie Rasmusson, Chief of the Bureau of Radiological Health in the Iowa Department of Public Health, who is the State Liaison Officer, 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 March 4, 2009 (ML090680040). Documents may be examined, and/or copied for a fee, at the NRC's Public Document Room (PDR), located at One White Flint North, 1555 Rockville Pike, 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@nrc.gov](mailto:pdr@nrc.gov).

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 8th day of March, 2010.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Karl D. Feintuch,**

*Project Manager, Plant Licensing Branch III-1, Division of Operating Reactor Licensing, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 2010-6057 Filed 3-18-10; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7590-01-P**

## **NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

[Docket No. 50-443; NRC-2010-0108]

### **NextEra Energy Seabrook, LLC, *et al.*,\* Seabrook Station, Unit No. 1 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-86, issued to NextEra Energy Seabrook, LLC (the licensee), for operation of the Seabrook Station, Unit No. 1 (Seabrook), located in Rockingham County, New Hampshire. In accordance with 10 CFR 51.21, the NRC prepared an environmental assessment documenting its finding. The NRC concluded that the proposed actions will have no significant environmental impact.

#### **Environmental Assessment**

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

The proposed action would exempt Seabrook from the required implementation date of March 31, 2010, for several new requirements of 10 CFR Part 73. Specifically, Seabrook 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. Seabrook has proposed an alternate full compliance implementation date of June 4, 2010, approximately 2 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 Seabrook site.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application dated February 25, 2010, as supplemented by letter dated March 5, 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

\* NextEra Energy Seabrook, LLC is authorized to act as agent for the Hudson Light & Power Department, Massachusetts Municipal Wholesale Electric Company, and Taunton Municipal Light and has exclusive responsibility and control over the physical construction, operation and maintenance of the facility.