

Dated: February 5, 2008.

P. Diane Rausch,

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

[FR Doc. E8-2513 Filed 2-11-08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7510-13-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Biweekly Notice; Applications and Amendments to Facility Operating Licenses Involving No Significant Hazards Considerations

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 regular biweekly 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 biweekly notice includes all notices of amendments issued, or proposed to be issued from January 17, 2008, to January 30, 2008. The last biweekly notice was published on (73 FR 5215).

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 10 CFR 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, Directives and Editing Branch, 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 delivered to Room 6D22, Two White Flint North, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland, from 7:30 a.m. to 4:15 p.m. Federal workdays. Copies of written comments received may be examined at the Commission's Public Document Room (PDR), located at One White Flint North, Public File Area O1F21, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland. The filing of requests for a hearing and petitions for leave to intervene is discussed below.

Within 60 days after the date of publication of this notice, person(s) may file a request for a hearing with respect to issuance of the amendment to the subject facility operating license and any person whose interest may be affected by this proceeding and who wishes to participate as a party in the proceeding must file a written request via electronic submission through the NRC E-Filing system for a hearing and a petition for leave to intervene. 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. 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/doc-collections/cfr/>. 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.

A request for hearing or a petition for leave to intervene 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 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 a waiver in accordance with the procedures described below.

To comply with the procedural requirements of E-Filing, at least five (5) days prior to the filing deadline, the petitioner/requestor must contact the Office of the Secretary by e-mail at hearingdocket@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 website 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 may seek assistance through the "Contact Us" link located on the NRC website at <http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/e-submittals.html> or by calling the NRC technical help line, which is available between 8:30 a.m. and 4:15 p.m., Eastern Time, Monday through Friday. The help line number is (800) 397-4209 or locally, (301) 415-4737.

Participants who believe that they have a good cause for not submitting documents electronically must file a motion, 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 petition and/or request 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). To be timely, filings must be submitted no later than 11:59 p.m. Eastern Time on the due date.

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, unless excluded pursuant to an order of the Commission, an 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. 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 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 email to pdr@nrc.gov.

AmerGen Energy Company, LLC, Docket No. 50-461, Clinton Power Station, Unit No.1, DeWitt County, Illinois

Date of amendment request: June 21, 2007.

Description of amendment request: A change is proposed to the technical specifications (TSs) of Clinton Power Station, Unit No. 1 (CPS), consistent with TS Task Force (TSTF) change TSTF-423 to the standard technical specifications (STSs) for boiling-water reactor (BWR) plants to allow, for some systems, entry into hot shutdown rather than cold shutdown to repair equipment, if risk is assessed and managed consistent with the program in place for complying with the requirements of Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR) Section 50.65(a)(4). The proposed amendment would modify the TS to risk-informed requirements regarding selected required action end states provided in TSTF-423, Revision 0, "Technical Specification End States, NEDC-32988-A."

The CPS has reviewed the proposed no significant hazards consideration (NSHC) determination published on March 23, 2006, (71 FR 14743) as part of the consolidated line item improvement process and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. The licensee has affirmed the applicability of the following NSHC determination in its application.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), an analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration is presented below:

Criterion 1—The Proposed Change Does Not Involve a Significant Increase in the Probability or Consequences of an Accident Previously Evaluated

The proposed change allows a change to certain required end states when the TS Completion Times for remaining in power operation will be exceeded. Most of the requested technical specification (TS) changes are to permit an end state of hot shutdown (Mode 3) rather than an end state of cold shutdown (Mode 4) contained in the current TS. The request was limited to: (1) Those end states where entry into the shutdown mode is for a short interval, (2) entry is initiated by inoperability of a single train of equipment or a restriction on a plant operational parameter, unless otherwise stated in the applicable technical specification, and (3) the primary purpose is to correct the initiating condition and return to power operation as soon as is practical. Risk insights from both the qualitative and quantitative risk assessments were used in specific TS assessments. Such assessments are documented in Section 6 of GE NEDC-

32988, Revision 2, "Technical Justification to Support Risk Informed Modification to Selected Required Action End States for BWR Plants." They provide an integrated discussion of deterministic and probabilistic issues, focusing on specific technical specifications, which are used to support the proposed TS end state and associated restrictions. The [NRC] staff finds that the risk insights support the conclusions of the specific TS assessments. Therefore, the probability of an accident previously evaluated is not significantly increased, if at all. The consequences of an accident after adopting proposed TSTF-423, are no different than the consequences of an accident prior to adopting TSTF-423. Therefore, the consequences of an accident previously evaluated are not significantly affected by this change. The addition of a requirement to assess and manage the risk introduced by this change will further minimize possible concerns. Therefore, this change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

Criterion 2—The Proposed Change Does Not Create the Possibility of a New or Different Kind of Accident From Any Previously Evaluated.

The proposed change does not involve a physical alteration of the plant (no new or different type of equipment will be installed). If risk is assessed and managed, allowing a change to certain required end states when the TS Completion Times for remaining in power operation are exceeded, i.e., entry into hot shutdown rather than cold shutdown to repair equipment, will not introduce new failure modes or effects and will not, in the absence of other unrelated failures, lead to an accident whose consequences exceed the consequences of accidents previously evaluated. The addition of a requirement to assess and manage the risk introduced by this change and the commitment by the licensee to adhere to the guidance in TSTF-IG-05-02, Implementation Guidance for TSTF-423, Revision 0, "Technical Specifications End States, NEDC-32988-A," will further minimize possible concerns. Thus, this change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from an accident previously evaluated.

Criterion 3—The Proposed Change Does Not Involve a Significant Reduction in the Margin of Safety

The proposed change allows, for some systems, entry into hot shutdown rather than cold shutdown to repair equipment, if risk is assessed and managed. The BWR0G's risk assessment approach is comprehensive and follows [NRC] staff guidance as documented in RGs [Regulatory Guides] 1.174 and 1.177. In addition, the analyses show that the criteria of the three-tiered approach for allowing TS changes are met. The risk impact of the proposed TS changes was assessed following the three-tiered approach recommended in RG 1.177. A risk assessment was performed to justify the proposed TS changes. The net change to the margin of safety is insignificant. Therefore, this change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the analysis adopted by the licensee and based on this review, it appears that the standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the requested amendments involve no significant hazards consideration.

Attorney for licensee: Mr. Bradley J. Fewell, Associate General Counsel, Exelon Generation Company, LLC, 4300 Winfield Road, Warrenville, IL 60555.
NRC Branch Chief: Russell Gibbs.

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

Date of amendment request: January 14, 2008.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would revise the Technical Specification (TS) requirements related to control room envelope habitability in accordance with TS Task Force (TSTF) traveler TSTF-448-A, "Control Room Habitability," Revision 3.

The NRC staff issued a "Notice of Availability of Technical Specification Improvement to Modify Requirements Regarding Control Room Envelope Habitability Using the Consolidated Line Item Improvement Process" in the **Federal Register** on January 17, 2007 (72 FR 2022). The notice referenced a model safety evaluation, a model no significant hazards consideration (NSHC) determination, and a model license amendment request published in the **Federal Register** on October 17, 2006 (71 FR 61075). In its application dated January 14, 2008, the licensee affirmed the applicability of the model NSHC determination which is presented below.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), an analysis of the issue of NSHC adopted by the licensee is presented below:

Criterion 1—The Proposed Change Does Not Involve a Significant Increase in the Probability or Consequences of an Accident Previously Evaluated

The proposed change does not adversely affect accident initiators or precursors nor alter the design assumptions, conditions, or configuration of the facility. The proposed change does not alter or prevent the ability of structures, systems, and components (SSCs) to perform their intended function to mitigate the consequences of an initiating event within the assumed acceptance limits. The proposed change revises the TS for the CRE emergency ventilation system, which is a mitigation system designed to minimize unfiltered air leakage into the CRE and to filter the CRE atmosphere to protect the CRE occupants in the event of accidents previously analyzed. An important part of

the CRE emergency ventilation system is the CRE boundary. The CRE emergency ventilation system is not an initiator or precursor to any accident previously evaluated. Therefore, the probability of any accident previously evaluated is not increased. Performing tests to verify the operability of the CRE boundary and implementing a program to assess and maintain CRE habitability ensure that the CRE emergency ventilation system is capable of adequately mitigating radiological consequences to CRE occupants during accident conditions, and that the CRE emergency ventilation system will perform as assumed in the consequence analyses of design basis accidents. Thus, the consequences of any accident previously evaluated are not increased. Therefore, the proposed change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

Criterion 2—The Proposed Change Does Not Create the Possibility of a New or Different Kind of Accident From Any Accident Previously Evaluated

The proposed change does not impact the accident analysis. The proposed change does not alter the required mitigation capability of the CRE emergency ventilation system, or its functioning during accident conditions as assumed in the licensing basis analyses of design basis accident radiological consequences to CRE occupants. No new or different accidents result from performing the new surveillance or following the new program. The proposed change does not involve a physical alteration of the plant (i.e., no new or different type of equipment will be installed) or a significant change in the methods governing normal plant operation. The proposed change does not alter any safety analysis assumptions and is consistent with current plant operating practice. Therefore, this change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

Criterion 3—The Proposed Change Does Not Involve a Significant Reduction in the Margin of Safety

The proposed change does not alter the manner in which safety limits, limiting safety system settings or limiting conditions for operation are determined. The proposed change does not affect safety analysis acceptance criteria. The proposed change will not result in plant operation in a configuration outside the design basis for an unacceptable period of time without compensatory measures. The proposed change does not adversely affect systems that respond to safely shut down the plant and to maintain the plant in a safe shutdown condition. Therefore, the proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the analysis adopted by the licensee and, based upon this review, it appears that the standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff

proposes to determine that the request for amendment involves NSHC.

Attorney for licensee: Mr. John C. McClure, Nebraska Public Power District, Post Office Box 499, Columbus, NE 68602-0499.

NRC Branch Chief: Thomas G. Hiltz.

Pacific Gas and Electric Co., Docket No. 50-133, Humboldt Bay Power Plant (HBPP), Unit 3 Humboldt County, California

Date of amendment request: November 5, 2007.

Description of amendment request: The licensee has proposed an amendment to Facility Operating License No. DPR-7 for HBPP Unit 3 to delete the paragraph 2.C.1 requirement to implement and maintain a physical security plan. In conjunction with this request the licensee is also requesting exemptions from the requirements in 10 CFR 50.54(p) "Conditions of Licenses" and 10 CFR 73 "Physical Protection of Plants and Materials." In addition, the licensee is requesting rescission of NRC Order EA-02-077, "Order for Interim Safeguards and Security Compensatory Measures" and NRC Order EA-03-099, "Order for the Implementation of Additional Security Measures Associated with Access Authorization, Fitness for Duty and Behavior Observation."

The requested license amendment, exemption and rescission would eliminate the security, fitness for duty and access authorization requirements for HBPP Unit 3 after spent nuclear fuel assemblies and fuel fragment containers have been transferred from the Spent Fuel Pool (SFP) to the Humboldt Bay (HB) Independent Spent Fuel Storage Installation (ISFSI).

The licensee will be required to provide protection for the spent fuel in the HB ISFSI in accordance with the HB ISFSI physical security plan approved by NRC License SNM-2514, dated November 17, 2005, to meet the requirements of 10 CFR 72, subpart H, "Physical Protection."

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 change involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

The structures, systems, and components of the Humboldt Bay Power Plant (HBPP) Unit 3 and the operating procedures for their use are unaffected by the proposed change. The elimination of the security requirements

for HBPP Unit 3 does not affect possible initiating events for accidents previously evaluated or alter the configuration or operation of the facility.

The accidents previously evaluated include spent fuel handling accident, Spent Fuel Pool (SFP) rupture, heavy load drop onto fuel in the SFP, uncontrolled release of radioactive liquid radioactive waste, explosions, release of toxic chemicals and fire. None of these accidents are impacted by the elimination of security requirements.

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

Response: No.

The proposed change is security related and has no direct impact on plant equipment or the procedures for operating plant equipment. The safety analysis for the facility remains complete and accurate. There are no physical changes to the facility, and the plant conditions for which the design basis accidents have been evaluated are still valid.

(3) Does the change involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety?

Response: No.

The proposed change is security related and has no direct impact on plant equipment or the procedures for operating plant equipment. There are no changes to the design or operation of the facility.

The assumptions for a fuel handling and other accidents are not affected by the proposed license amendment. Accordingly, neither the design basis nor the accident assumptions in the Defueled Safety Analysis Report nor the Technical Specifications Bases are affected. Therefore, the proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in a 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: Ms. Jennifer K. Post, Pacific Gas and Electric Company, 77 Beale Street, B30A, San Francisco, CA.

NRC Branch Chief: Andrew Persinko.

South Carolina Electric & Gas Company, South Carolina Public Service Authority, Docket No. 50-395, Virgil C. Summer Nuclear Station, Unit No. 1, Fairfield County, South Carolina Date of Amendment Request: January 17, 2008.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendments would revise Technical Specification (TS) 3.7.6, "Control Room Normal and Emergency Air Handling System," and TS Section 6.8, "Procedures and Programs." These changes are based on TS Task Force (TSTF) change traveler TSTF-448, Revision 3 that has been approved generically for the Standard Technical Specifications—

Westinghouse Plants, NUREG-1431. The NRC staff issued a notice of availability of a model safety evaluation and model no significant hazards consideration (NSHC) determination for referencing in license amendment applications in the **Federal Register** on January 17, 2007 (72 FR 2022). The licensee affirmed the applicability of the model NSHC determination in its application dated January 17, 2008.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), an analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration is presented below:

Criterion 1—The Proposed Change Does Not Involve a Significant Increase in the Probability or Consequences of an Accident Previously Evaluated

The proposed change does not adversely affect accident initiators or precursors nor alter the design assumptions, conditions, or configuration of the facility. The proposed change does not alter or prevent the ability of structures, systems, and components (SSCs) to perform their intended function to mitigate the consequences of an initiating event within the assumed acceptance limits.

The proposed change revises the TS for the CRE [control room envelope] emergency ventilation system, which is a mitigation system designed to minimize unfiltered air leakage into the CRE and to filter the CRE atmosphere to protect the CRE occupants in the event of accidents previously analyzed. An important part of the CRE emergency ventilation system is the CRE boundary. The CRE emergency ventilation system is not an initiator or precursor to any accident previously evaluated.

Therefore, the probability of any accident previously evaluated is not increased. Performing tests to verify the operability of the CRE boundary and implementing a program to assess and maintain CRE habitability ensure that the CRE emergency ventilation system is capable of adequately mitigating radiological consequences to CRE occupants during accident conditions, and that the CRE emergency ventilation system will perform as assumed in the consequence analyses of design basis accidents. Thus, the consequences of any accident previously evaluated are not increased.

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

Criterion 2—The Proposed Change Does Not Create the Possibility of a New or Different Kind of Accident From Any Accident Previously Evaluated

The proposed change does not impact the accident analysis. The proposed change does not alter the required mitigation capability of the CRE emergency ventilation system, or its functioning during accident conditions as assumed in the licensing basis analyses of design basis accident radiological consequences to CRE occupants. No new or different accidents result from performing the

new surveillance or following the new program. The proposed change does not involve a physical alteration of the plant (i.e., no new or different type of equipment will be installed) or a significant change in the methods governing normal plant operation.

The proposed change does not alter any safety analysis assumptions and is consistent with current plant operating practice.

Therefore, this change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

Criterion 3—The Proposed Change Does Not Involve a Significant Reduction in the Margin of Safety

The proposed change does not alter the manner in which safety limits, limiting safety system settings or limiting conditions for operation are determined. The proposed change does not affect safety analysis acceptance criteria. The proposed change will not result in plant operation in a configuration outside the design basis for an unacceptable period of time without compensatory measures. The proposed change does not adversely affect systems that respond to safely shut down the plant and to maintain the plant in a safe shutdown condition. Therefore, the proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

Based upon the reasoning presented above and the previous discussion of the amendment request, the requested change does not involve a no significant hazards consideration.

The NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Attorney for Licensee: Thomas G. Eppink, South Carolina Electric & Gas Company, Post Office Box 764, Columbia, South Carolina 29218.

NRC Branch Chief: Melanie Wong, Acting Chief.

STP Nuclear Operating Company, Docket Nos. 50-498 and 50-499, South Texas Project, Units 1 and 2, Matagorda County, Texas

Date of amendment request: November 8, 2007.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendments would revise Technical Specification 3/4.8.2, "DC Sources," to modify battery surveillance requirements. Specifically, the proposed changes would allow battery performance discharge testing to be performed while the associated unit is at power.

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:

- The proposed change[s] [do] not involve a significant increase in the probability or

consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

Performance of the surveillance is not an accident initiator. Consequently, the probability of an accident occurring is not affected by [these] proposed change[s]. Accident mitigation will be provided by the redundant channels should an accident occur while a channel is being tested.

The risk-informed configuration management program, as approved in Amendments 179 and 166, effectively manages the availability of required systems, structures, and components to assure there is no significant increase in the probability of an accident. Therefore, the proposed change[s] [do] not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

- The proposed change[s] [do] not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated.

The proposed change[s] [do] not involve a new mode of operation or design configuration. The only change is in the duration of a battery's unavailability, which is established consistent with the level of associated risk. Therefore, the proposed change[s] [do] not create the possibility of a new or different accident from any accident previously evaluated.

- The proposed change[s] [do] not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety.

The risk-informed configuration management program assures that adequate margins of safety are maintained. The configuration management program considers cumulative effects of multiple systems and components being out of service. Therefore, the proposed change[s] [do] not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the request for amendments involves no significant hazards consideration.

Attorney for licensee: A.H. Gutterman, Esq., Morgan, Lewis & Bockius, 1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20004.

NRC Branch Chief: Thomas G. Hiltz.

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

Date of amendment request: January 15, 2008.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would modify the Technical Specification (TS) to establish more effective and appropriate action, surveillance, and administrative requirements related to ensuring the habitability of the control room envelope (CRE) in accordance with Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC)-approved TS Task Force (TSTF) Standard Technical Specification

change traveler TSTF-448, Revision 3, "Control Room Habitability." Specifically, the proposed amendment would modify TS 3.7.10, "Control Room Emergency Ventilation System (CREVS)," and would establish a CRE habitability (CREH) program in TS Section 5.5, "Administrative Controls—Programs and Manuals." The NRC staff issued a "Notice of Availability of Technical Specification Improvement to Modify Requirements Regarding Control Room Envelope Habitability Using the Consolidated Line Item Improvement Process" associated with TSTF-448, Revision 3, in the **Federal Register** on January 17, 2007 (72 FR 2022). The notice included a model safety evaluation, a model no significant hazards consideration (NSHC) determination, and a model license amendment request. In its application dated January 15, 2008, the licensee affirmed the applicability of the model NSHC determination which is presented below.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), an analysis of the issue of NSHC adopted by the licensee is presented below:

Criterion 1—The Proposed Change Does Not Involve a Significant Increase in the Probability or Consequences of an Accident Previously Evaluated

The proposed change does not adversely affect accident initiators or precursors nor alter the design assumptions, conditions, or configuration of the facility. The proposed change does not alter or prevent the ability of structures, systems, and components (SSCs) to perform their intended function to mitigate the consequences of an initiating event within the assumed acceptance limits. The proposed change revises the TS for the CRE emergency ventilation system, which is a mitigation system designed to minimize unfiltered air leakage into the CRE and to filter the CRE atmosphere to protect the CRE occupants in the event of accidents previously analyzed. An important part of the CRE emergency ventilation system is the CRE boundary. The CRE emergency ventilation system is not an initiator or precursor to any accident previously evaluated. Therefore, the probability of any accident previously evaluated is not increased. Performing tests to verify the operability of the CRE boundary and implementing a program to assess and maintain CRE habitability ensure that the CRE emergency ventilation system is capable of adequately mitigating radiological consequences to CRE occupants during accident conditions, and that the CRE emergency ventilation system will perform as assumed in the consequence analyses of design basis accidents. Thus, the consequences of any accident previously evaluated are not increased. Therefore, the proposed change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or

consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

Criterion 2—The Proposed Change Does Not Create the Possibility of a New or Different Kind of Accident From Any Accident Previously Evaluated

The proposed change does not impact the accident analysis. The proposed change does not alter the required mitigation capability of the CRE emergency ventilation system, or its functioning during accident conditions as assumed in the licensing basis analyses of design basis accident radiological consequences to CRE occupants. No new or different accidents result from performing the new surveillance or following the new program. The proposed change does not involve a physical alteration of the plant (i.e., no new or different type of equipment will be installed) or a significant change in the methods governing normal plant operation. The proposed change does not alter any safety analysis assumptions and is consistent with current plant operating practice. Therefore, this change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

Criterion 3—The Proposed Change Does Not Involve a Significant Reduction in the Margin of Safety

The proposed change does not alter the manner in which safety limits, limiting safety system settings or limiting conditions for operation are determined. The proposed change does not affect safety analysis acceptance criteria. The proposed change will not result in plant operation in a configuration outside the design basis for an unacceptable period of time without compensatory measures. The proposed change does not adversely affect systems that respond to safely shut down the plant and to maintain the plant in a safe shutdown condition. Therefore, the proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the analysis adopted by the licensee and, based on this review, it appears that the standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the request for amendments involves NSHC.

Attorney for licensee: Terence A. Burke, Associate General Counsel—Nuclear Entergy Services, Inc., 1340 Echelon Parkway, Jackson, Mississippi 39213.

NRC Branch Chief: Thomas G. Hiltz.

Notice of Issuance of Amendments to Facility Operating Licenses

During the period since publication of the last biweekly notice, the Commission has issued the following amendments. The Commission has determined for each of these amendments that the application complies with the standards and requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), and the

Commission's rules and regulations. The Commission has made appropriate findings as required by the Act and the Commission's rules and regulations in 10 CFR Chapter I, which are set forth in the license amendment.

Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating License, Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity for a Hearing in connection with these actions was published in the **Federal Register** as indicated.

Unless otherwise indicated, the Commission has determined that these amendments satisfy the criteria for categorical exclusion in accordance with 10 CFR 51.22. Therefore, pursuant to 10 CFR 51.22(b), no environmental impact statement or environmental assessment need be prepared for these amendments. If the Commission has prepared an environmental assessment under the special circumstances provision in 10 CFR 51.22(b) and has made a determination based on that assessment, it is so indicated.

For further details with respect to the action see (1) the applications for amendment, (2) the amendment, and (3) the Commission's related letter, Safety Evaluation and/or Environmental Assessment as indicated. All of these items are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room (PDR), located at One White Flint North, Public File Area 01F21, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland. Publicly available records will be accessible from the Agencywide Documents Access and Management Systems (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@nrc.gov.

Carolina Power & Light Company, Docket Nos. 50-325 and 50-324, Brunswick Steam Electric Plant, Units 1 and 2, Brunswick County, North Carolina

Date of application for amendments: December 21, 2006.

Brief Description of amendments: The amendments change the Technical Specifications (TSs) related to the reactor recirculation system flow balance.

Date of issuance: December 17, 2007.

Effective date: Date of issuance, to be implemented within 60 days.

Amendment Nos.: 244 and 272.

Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-71 and DPR-62: Amendments changed the TSs.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: March 13, 2007 (72 FR 11385).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated December 17, 2007.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Dominion Nuclear Connecticut, Inc., Docket No. 50-336, Millstone Power Station, Unit No. 2 New London County, Connecticut

Date of amendment request: November 8, 2006, as supplemented by letters dated May 4, October 4, and November 27, 2007.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revises the Millstone Power Station, Unit No. 2 Technical Specifications (TSs) Action and Surveillance Requirements for instrumentation identified in TSs 3.3.1 and 3.3.2. In particular, the amendment adds actions to address the inoperability of one or more automatic bypass removal channels; revises the terminology used in the notation of TS 2.2-1 and 3.3-1 relative to the implementation and automatic removal of certain Reactor Protective System trip bypasses; revises the frequency for performing surveillance of the automatic bypass removal function logic; and incorporates two administrative changes.

Date of issuance: January 29, 2008.

Effective date: As of the date of issuance and shall be implemented within 90 days from the date of issuance.

Amendment No.: 301.

Facility Operating License No. DPR-65: Amendment revised the License and Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: April 24, 2007 (72 FR 20380).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated January 29, 2008.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Indiana Michigan Power Company, Docket Nos. 50-315, Donald C. Cook Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2 (DCCNP-1 and DCCNP-2), Berrien County, Michigan

Date of application for amendments: May 11, 2007.

Brief description of amendments: The amendments revise the DCCNP-1 and DCCNP-2 Technical Specifications to increase the power level at which

performance of the trip actuating device operational test (TADOT) of a reactor trip following a turbine trip signal is required. Specifically, the previous Surveillance Requirement 3.3.1.18 required performance of a TADOT of a reactor trip on turbine trip prior to exceeding the P-7 interlock (at approximately 10 percent of the rated thermal power (RTP)) whenever the unit has been in Mode 3, if not performed within the previous 31 days. The amendments replace the "P-7" interlock with the "P-8" interlock (at approximately 31 percent RTP).

Date of issuance: January 11, 2008.

Effective date: As of the date of issuance, and shall be implemented within 45 days.

Amendment No.: 301 (for DCCNP-1) and 284 (for DCCNP-2).

Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-58 and DPR-74: Amendments revise the Renewed Operating Licenses and Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: June 19, 2007 (72 FR 33783).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a safety evaluation dated January 11, 2008.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Luminant Generation Company LLC, Docket Nos. 50-445 and 50-446, Comanche Peak Steam Electric Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Somervell County, Texas

Date of amendment request: December 19, 2006, as supplemented by letters dated November 30, and December 6, 2007.

Brief description of amendments: The amendments revise Technical Specifications (TS) 3.7.5, "Auxiliary Feedwater (AFW) System," TS 3.8.1, "AC [Alternating Current] Sources—Operating," TS 3.8.9, "Distribution Systems—Operating," and TS Example 1.3-3.

Date of issuance: January 25, 2008.

Effective date: As of the date of issuance and shall be implemented within 120 days from the date of issuance.

Amendment Nos.: Unit 1—142; Unit 2—142.

Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-87 and NPF-89: The amendments revised the Facility Operating Licenses and Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: April 10, 2007 (72 FR 17952). The supplemental letters dated November 30, and December 6, 2007, 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 as published in the **Federal Register** on April 10, 2007 (72 FR 17952). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated January 25, 2008.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Nuclear Management Company, LLC, Docket No. 50-263, Monticello Nuclear Generating Plant, Wright County, Minnesota

Date of application for amendment: September 17, 2007.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revised Technical Specifications Section 3.7.5 to specify the conditions and required actions associated with two control room ventilation subsystems inoperable. The revised Section 3.7.5 follows Technical Specifications Task Force (TSTF) Change Traveler TSTF-477, Revision 3, "Add Action for Two Inoperable Control Room AC Subsystems."

Date of issuance: January 23, 2008.

Effective date: As of the date of issuance and shall be implemented within 90 days.

Amendment No.: 154.

Facility Operating License No. DPR-22: Amendment revised the Facility Operating License and Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: November 6, 2007 (72 FR 62689).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated January 23, 2008.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Nuclear Management Company, LLC, Docket Nos. 50-282 and 50-306, Prairie Island Nuclear Generating Plant, Units 1 and 2, Goodhue County, Minnesota

Date of application for amendments: January 29, 2007, supplemented by letters dated November 19, 2007, and December 13, 2007.

Brief description of amendments: The amendments revised the Technical Specification (TS) 3.5.3 "ECCS-Shutdown" for Prairie Island Nuclear Generating Plant (PINGP), Units 1 and 2 to change operability requirements for the safety injection (SI) subsystem by addition of a Note to the Limiting Condition for Operation 3.5.3 "One ECCS train shall be OPERABLE." The Note states "An SI train may be considered OPERABLE when the pump is capable of being manually started from the control room."

Date of issuance: January 28, 2008.

Effective date: As of the date of issuance and shall be implemented within 90 days.

Amendment Nos.: 183, 173.

Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-42 and DPR-60: Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: March 13, 2007 (72 FR 11392).

The supplemental letters contained clarifying information and did not change the initial no significant hazards consideration determination, and did not expand the scope of the original **Federal Register** notice. The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated January 28, 2008.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

PSEG Nuclear LLC, Docket No. 50-354, Hope Creek Generating Station, Salem County, New Jersey

Date of application for amendment: April 17, 2007, as supplemented by letter dated June 29, 2007.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment establishes more effective and appropriate action, surveillance, and administrative requirements related to ensuring the habitability of the control room envelope in accordance with Nuclear Regulatory Commission approved Technical Specification Task Force (TSTF) Standard Technical Specification change traveler TSTF-448, Revision 3, "Control Room Habitability."

Date of issuance: January 24, 2008.

Effective date: As of the date of issuance, to be implemented within 180 days.

Amendment No.: 173.

Facility Operating License No. NPF-57: The amendment revised the Technical Specifications and the License.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: June 5, 2007 (72 FR 31103).

The letter dated June 29, 2007, provided clarifying information that did not change the initial proposed no significant hazards consideration determination or expand the application beyond the scope of the original **Federal Register** notice.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated January 24, 2008.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

PSEG Nuclear LLC, Docket Nos. 50-272 and 50-311, Salem Nuclear Generating Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Salem County, New Jersey

Date of application for amendments: April 15, 2007, as supplemented on December 10, 2007.

Brief description of amendments: The amendments establish more effective and appropriate action, surveillance, and administrative requirements related to ensuring the habitability of the control room envelope in accordance with Nuclear Regulatory Commission approved Technical Specification Task Force (TSTF) Standard Technical Specification change traveler TSTF-448, Revision 3, "Control Room Habitability."

Date of issuance: January 24, 2008.

Effective date: As of the date of issuance, to be implemented within 180 days.

Amendment Nos.: 286 and 269.

Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-70 and DPR-75: The amendments revised the Technical Specifications and the License.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: June 5, 2007 (72 FR 31104).

The letter dated December 10, 2007, provided clarifying information that did not change the initial proposed no significant hazards consideration determination or expand the application beyond the scope of the original **Federal Register** notice.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated January 24, 2008.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

Tennessee Valley Authority, Docket No. 50-390, Watts Bar Nuclear Plant, Unit 1, Rhea County, Tennessee

Date of application for amendment: April 25, 2007, as supplemented August 22, 2007.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revises Technical Specification Surveillance Requirements 3.5.1.4, "Accumulators," and 3.5.4.3, "Refueling Water Storage Tanks," to remove the note limiting the number of tritium producing burnable absorber rods (TPBARs) to no more than 240, and revises TS 4.2.1, "Fuel Assemblies," to revise the maximum number of TPBARs that can be irradiated in the Watts Bar Unit 1 reactor core to 400.

Date of issuance: January 18, 2008.

Effective date: As of the date of issuance and shall be implemented within 45 days of issuance.

Amendment No.: 67.

Facility Operating License No. NPF-90: Amendment revises the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: June 5, 2007 (72 FR 31105). The supplemental letter dated August 22, 2007, provided clarifying information that was within the scope of the initial notice and did not change the initial proposed no significant hazards consideration determination.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated January 18, 2008.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

Date of application for amendments: February 26, 2007, as supplemented on April 5, May 31, July 13, July 20, September 25, and November 28, 2007, and January 14, 2008.

Brief description of amendments: These amendments added an operating license condition and revised the technical specifications to permit the replacement of main control room (MCR) and emergency switchgear room (ESGR) air-conditioning system (ACS) chilled water piping by using temporary 45-day and 14-day allowed outage times (AOTs) four times in a 24-month span.

Date of issuance: January 23, 2008.

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

Amendment Nos.: 258, 257.

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

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: March 27, 2007 (72 FR 14308).

The supplements dated April 5, May 31, July 13, July 20, September 25, and November 28, 2007, and January 14, 2008, 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 January 23, 2008.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 31st day of January 2008.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.
Catherine Haney,
 Director, Division of Operating Reactor
 Licensing, Office of Nuclear Reactor
 Regulation.
 [FR Doc. E8-2143 Filed 2-11-08; 8:45 am]
 BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Sunshine Act Meeting Notice

AGENCY HOLDING THE MEETINGS: Nuclear
 Regulatory Commission.

DATES: Weeks of February 11, 18, 25,
 March 3, 10, 17, 2008.

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

STATUS: Public and Closed.

Matters To Be Considered

Week of February 11, 2008

Monday, February 11, 2008

1 p.m. Discussion of Security Issues
 (Closed—Ex. 1)

Week of February 18, 2008—Tentative

Tuesday, February 19, 2008

10:30 a.m. Meeting with the National
 Academies Radiation Source Use
 and Replacement Study Committee
 (Closed—Ex. 1)

Wednesday, February 20, 2008

9:30 a.m. Periodic Meeting on New
 Reactor Issues, Part 1 (Public
 Meeting) (Contact: Donna Williams,
 301-415-1322)

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

1:25 p.m. Affirmation Session (Public
 Meeting) (Tentative)

- a. Final Rule—10 CFR Part 73
 “Safeguards Information Protection
 Requirements” (RIN 3150—AH57)
 (Tentative)

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

1:30 p.m. Periodic Meeting on New
 Reactor Issues, Part 2 (Public
 Meeting) (Contact: Donna Williams,
 301-415-1322)

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

Week of February 25, 2008—Tentative

There are no meetings scheduled for
 the Week of February 25, 2008.

Week of March 3, 2008—Tentative

There are no meetings scheduled for
 the Week of March 3, 2008.

Week of March 10, 2008—Tentative

There are no meetings scheduled for
 the Week of March 10, 2008.

Week of March 17, 2008—Tentative

Tuesday, March 18, 2008

9:30 a.m. Briefing by Independent
 External Panel to Identify
 Vulnerabilities in the U.S. NRC's
 Materials Licensing Program (Public
 Meeting) (Contact: Aaron T.
 McCraw, 301-415-1277)

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

* * * * *

* 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:
 Michelle Schroll, (301) 415-1662.

* * * * *

Additional Information

Affirmation of “Final Rule—10 CFR
 Part 73 ‘Safeguards Information
 Protection Requirements’ (RIN 3150—
 AH57)” tentatively scheduled on
 February 11, 2008, at 12:55 p.m. has
 been tentatively rescheduled on
 Wednesday, February 20, 2008, at 1:25
 p.m.

* * * * *

The NRC Commission Meeting
 Schedule can be found on the Internet
 at: [http://www.nrc.gov/about-nrc/policy-
 making/schedule.html](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
REB3@nrc.gov. Determinations on
 requests for reasonable accommodation
 will be made on a case-by-case basis.

* * * * *

This notice is distributed by mail to
 several hundred 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).
 In addition, distribution of this meeting
 notice over the Internet system is
 available. If you are interested in
 receiving this Commission meeting
 schedule electronically, please send an
 electronic message to dkw@nrc.gov.

Dated: February 7, 2008.

R. Michelle Schroll,

Office of the Secretary.

[FR Doc. 08-657 Filed 2-8-08; 1:43 pm]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

POSTAL SERVICE

Notice of Intent To Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the Proposed Construction and Operation of a Mail Processing Facility in Aliso Viejo, CA

AGENCY: Postal Service.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: To comply with the
 requirements of the National
 Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the
 Postal Service intends to prepare an
 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)
 for the proposed construction and
 operation of a mail processing facility in
 Aliso Viejo, Orange County, California.
 The public is invited to participate in
 the project scoping process, to review
 and comment on the draft EIS, and to
 attend public meetings.

DATES: Please submit written scoping
 comments by March 9, 2008. This notice
 is the first step in the EIS process. A
 separate notice of availability will be
 issued when the draft EIS is available
 for public review.

To solicit public comments, a public
 scoping hearing will be held from 5:30
 to 8:30 p.m. on February 27, 2008, at the
 Wood Canyon Elementary School,
 23431 Knollwood Avenue, Aliso Viejo,
 California; (949) 448-0012.

ADDRESSES: To submit comments,
 request copies of the draft EIS or final
 EIS when available, or for more
 information, contact Emmy Andrews,
 Pacific Facilities Service Office, United
 States Postal Service, 395 Oyster Point
 Boulevard, Suite 225, South San
 Francisco, CA 94080-0300; (650) 615-
 7200.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:
 Emmy Andrews, 650-615-7200.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: To comply
 with the requirements of the National
 Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the
 Postal Service intends to prepare an
 environmental impact statement (EIS)
 for the proposed construction and
 operation of a mail processing facility
 on a 25-acre parcel owned by the Postal
 Service at 50 Liberty, Aliso Viejo,
 Orange County, California. The EIS will
 be prepared in accordance with the
 National Environmental Policy Act
 (NEPA) of 1969, 42 U.S.C. 4321 *et seq.*,
 the Council on Environmental Quality
 regulations for implementing NEPA, 40