

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50-275 and 50-323; NRC-2010-0059]

### Pacific Gas and Electric Company; Diablo Canyon 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 Nos. DPR-80 and DPR-82, issued to Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E, the licensee), for operation of the Diablo Canyon Power Plant, Unit Nos. 1 and 2 (DCPP), located in San Luis Obispo County, California. 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 PG&E from the required implementation date of March 31, 2010, for several new requirements of 10 CFR Part 73. Specifically, PG&E 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. PG&E has proposed an alternate full compliance implementation date of June 30, 2011, approximately 15 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 PG&E site.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application dated December 4, 2009.

##### *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 PG&E security system to meet the new requirements in 10 CFR Part 73. Implementation of the new requirements will involve physical modifications to the existing plant security system.

##### *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)].

With its request to extend the implementation deadline, the licensee currently maintains a security system acceptable to the NRC and that will continue to provide acceptable physical protection of the DCPP in lieu of the new requirements in 10 CFR Part 73. Therefore, the extension of the implementation date of the new

requirements of 10 CFR Part 73 to June 30, 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 actions, 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 for the DCPP, dated May 1973, with Addendum dated May 1976.

##### *Agencies and Persons Consulted*

In accordance with its stated policy, on January 20, 2010, the NRC staff consulted with the California State official, Mr. Stephen Hsu of the California Department of Public Health, 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.

Portions of the December 4, 2009, submittal contain security-related and safeguards information and, accordingly, is being withheld from the public. For further details with respect to the proposed action, see the redacted version of the December 4, 2009, letter submitted by the licensee on January 22, 2010. The non-proprietary, public version of this document 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 O-1F21, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland 20852. 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 16th day of February 2010.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**James R. Hall,**

Senior Project Manager, Plant Licensing Branch IV, Division of Operating Reactor Licensing, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 2010-3499 Filed 2-22-10; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7590-01-P**

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-298; NRC-2010-0061]

### Nebraska Public Power District; Cooper Nuclear 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. DPR-46, issued to Nebraska Public Power District (NPPD, the licensee), for operation of the Cooper Nuclear Station (CNS), located in Nemaha County, Nebraska. Therefore, as required by 10 CFR 51.21, the NRC performed 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 NPPD from the required implementation date of March 31, 2010, for several new requirements of 10 CFR Part 73. Specifically, NPPD 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. NPPD has proposed an alternate full compliance implementation date of August 31, 2010, 5 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 NPPD site.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application dated December 22, 2009.

##### *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 NPPD security system due to resource and logistical impacts of the fall 2009 refueling outage and other factors, including inclement weather.

##### *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 actions, 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 for the Cooper Nuclear Station dated February 1973.

##### *Agencies and Persons Consulted*

In accordance with its stated policy, on January 5, 2010, the NRC staff consulted with the Nebraska State official, Ms. J. Schmitt of the Office of Radiological Health, 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 December 22, 2009. Portions of the document contain security-related information and, accordingly, are not available to the public. Other parts of the document 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 O-1F21, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor),