NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 70–7015–ML; ASLBP No. 10–899–02–ML–BD01]

Atomic Safety and Licensing Board; Notice of Opportunity To Participate in Uncontested/Mandatory Hearing (Procedures for Participation by Interested Governmental Entities Regarding Safety Portion of Enrichment Facility Licensing Proceeding)

October 7, 2010.

Before Administrative Judges: G. Paul Bollwerk, III, Chairman, Dr. Kaye D. Lathrop, Dr. Craig M. White.

In the Matter of Areva Enrichment Services, LLC (Eagle Rock Enrichment Facility)

In this 10 CFR part 70 proceeding regarding the request of applicant AREVA Enrichment Services, LLC, (AES) to construct and operate its proposed Eagle Rock Enrichment Facility in Bonneville County, Idaho, on September 30, 2010, the NRC staff issued its final safety evaluation report (SER) analyzing the Atomic Energy Act (AEA)-related safety aspects of the AES application (NUREG–1951, ADAMS Accession No. ML102710296). In accord with AEA section 274 (10 U.S.C. 4214), on or before Friday, November 12, 2010, using the agency’s E-Filing system,¹ any interested State, local governmental body, or affected, federally-recognized Indian Tribe may file with the Licensing Board in this proceeding a statement of any issues or questions about which the State, local governmental body, or Indian Tribe wishes the Board to give particular attention as part of the safety/SER-related uncontested/mandatory hearing process associated with the AES application and the staff’s safety review of that application.² Such a statement may be accompanied by any supporting documentation that the State, local governmental body, or Indian Tribe sees fit to provide. Any statements and supporting documentation (if any) received by the Board by the deadline indicated above will be made part of the record of this proceeding.

The Board will use such statements and documents as appropriate to inform its prehearing questions to the staff and applicant AES; its inquiries at the oral hearing currently scheduled for the week of January 24, 2011, at the Licensing Board Panel’s Rockville, Maryland hearing room; and its decision following the hearing.³ The Board may also request, no later than Thursday, January 13, 2011, that one or more particular States, local governmental bodies, or Indian Tribes send representatives to the hearing to participate as the Board may deem appropriate, including answering Board questions and/or making a statement for the purpose of assisting the Board’s exploration of one or more of the issues raised by the State, local governmental body, or Indian Tribe in the prehearing filings described above. The decision on whether to request the presence of representatives of a State, local governmental body, or Indian Tribe at the hearing to participate in the oral proceeding is governed by 10 CFR 2.309 (for persons other than States, local governments, or Indian Tribes participating as described above may take any position they wish, or no position at all, with respect to the AES application or the staff’s associated safety review, they should be cognizant that, due to the inherently adversarial nature of such proceedings, many of the procedures and rights applicable to the NRC’s contested hearing process generally are not available with respect to this uncontested hearing. Participation in the NRC’s contested hearing process is governed by 10 CFR 2.309 (for persons or entities, including States, local governments, or Indian Tribes, seeking to file contentions of their own) and 10 CFR 2.315(c) (for interested States, local governments, and Indian Tribes seeking to participate with respect to contentions filed by others). Participation in this uncontested hearing does not affect the right of a State, local governmental entity, or Indian Tribe to participate in any separate contested hearing process that might be requested relative to this proceeding.³

The Board will use such statements and documents as appropriate to inform its prehearing questions to the staff and applicant AES; its inquiries at the oral hearing currently scheduled for the week of January 24, 2011, at the Licensing Board Panel’s Rockville, Maryland hearing room; and its decision following the hearing. The Board may also request, no later than Thursday, January 13, 2011, that one or more particular States, local governmental bodies, or Indian Tribes send representatives to the hearing to participate as the Board may deem appropriate, including answering Board questions and/or making a statement for the purpose of assisting the Board’s exploration of one or more of the issues raised by the State, local governmental body, or Indian Tribe in the prehearing filings described above. The decision on whether to request the presence of representatives of a State, local governmental body, or Indian Tribe at the hearing to participate in the oral proceeding is governed by 10 CFR 2.309 (for persons other than States, local governments, or Indian Tribes participating as described above may take any position they wish, or no position at all, with respect to the AES application or the staff’s associated safety review, they should be cognizant that, due to the inherently adversarial nature of such proceedings, many of the procedures and rights applicable to the NRC’s contested hearing process generally are not available with respect to this uncontested hearing. Participation in the NRC’s contested hearing process is governed by 10 CFR 2.309 (for persons or entities, including States, local governments, or Indian Tribes, seeking to file contentions of their own) and 10 CFR 2.315(c) (for interested States, local governments, and Indian Tribes seeking to participate with respect to contentions filed by others). Participation in this uncontested hearing does not affect the right of a State, local governmental entity, or Indian Tribe to participate in any separate contested hearing process that might be requested relative to this proceeding.³

² States, local governments, or Indian Tribes should be aware that the uncontested/mandatory hearing is separate and distinct from the NRC’s contested hearing process, which has not been invoked in this proceeding. While States, local governments, or Indian Tribes participating as described above may take any position they wish, or no position at all, with respect to the AES application or the staff’s associated safety review, they should be cognizant that, due to the inherently adversarial nature of such proceedings, many of the procedures and rights applicable to the NRC’s contested hearing process generally are not available with respect to this uncontested hearing. Participation in the NRC’s contested hearing process is governed by 10 CFR 2.309 (for persons or entities, including States, local governments, or Indian Tribes, seeking to file contentions of their own) and 10 CFR 2.315(c) (for interested States, local governments, and Indian Tribes seeking to participate with respect to contentions filed by others). Participation in this uncontested hearing does not affect the right of a State, local governmental entity, or Indian Tribe to participate in any separate contested hearing process that might be requested relative to this proceeding.³

³ States, local governments, or Indian Tribes should be aware that the uncontested/mandatory hearing is separate and distinct from the NRC’s contested hearing process, which has not been invoked in this proceeding. While States, local governments, or Indian Tribes participating as described above may take any position they wish, or no position at all, with respect to the AES application or the staff’s associated safety review, they should be cognizant that, due to the inherently adversarial nature of such proceedings, many of the procedures and rights applicable to the NRC’s contested hearing process generally are not available with respect to this uncontested hearing. Participation in the NRC’s contested hearing process is governed by 10 CFR 2.309 (for persons or entities, including States, local governments, or Indian Tribes, seeking to file contentions of their own) and 10 CFR 2.315(c) (for interested States, local governments, and Indian Tribes seeking to participate with respect to contentions filed by others). Participation in this uncontested hearing does not affect the right of a State, local governmental entity, or Indian Tribe to participate in any separate contested hearing process that might be requested relative to this proceeding.³

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50–282 and 50–306; NRC–2010–0324]

Northern States Power Company—Minnesota; Prairie Island Nuclear Generating Plant, Units 1 and 2; Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is considering the issuance of an exemption from Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations, (10 CFR), 50.46, “Acceptance criteria for emergency core cooling systems for light-water nuclear power reactors”, and 10 CFR 50, Appendix K, “ACECS Evaluation Models,” for Facility Operating License Nos. DPR–42 and DPR–60, issued to Northern States Power Company, a Minnesota corporation (NSPM, the licensee), for operation of the Prairie Island Nuclear Generating Plant, Units 1 and 2 (PINGP), located in Goodhue County, Minnesota. In accordance with 10 CFR 51.21, the NRC performed an environmental assessment in support of this requested exemption. 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 consider approval of an exemption for PINGP to the requirements of 10 CFR 50.46 and 10 CFR Appendix K, by allowing NSPM to use Optimized ZIRLO™, an advanced alloy fuel cladding material for pressurized-water reactors. The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee’s application dated November 24, 2009 (Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS) Accession No. ML093280883), as supplemented by letter dated May 26, 2010 (ADAMS Accession No. ML101480083).
The Need for the Proposed Action

The proposed action is needed so that NSPM can use Optimized ZIRLO™, an advanced alloy for fuel rod cladding and other assembly structural components at the PINGP.

Section 50.46 of 10 CFR and 10 CFR part 50, Appendix K, make no provisions for use of fuel rods clad in a material other than zircaloy or ZIRLO™. Since the chemical composition of the Optimized ZIRLO™ alloy differs from the specifications for zircaloy or ZIRLO™, a plant-specific exemption is required to allow the use of the Optimized ZIRLO™ alloy as a cladding material or in other assembly structural components at the PINGP.

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 approve the use of an additional fuel rod cladding material would not significantly affect plant safety and would not have a significant adverse effect on the probability of an accident occurring.

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.

The proposed action would not result in an increased radiological hazard beyond those previously analyzed in the Final Environmental Statement for the PINGP dated May 1973 (ADAMS Accession No. ML081840311). 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 NRC has completed its environmental assessment of the proposed action. The staff has concluded that there are no significant environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

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 request would result in no change in current environmental impacts. The environmental impacts of the proposed action and the alternative action 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 PINGP dated May 1973 (ADAMS Accession No. ML081840311).

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on September 3, 2010, the staff consulted with the Minnesota State official, Mr. Stephen Rakow of the Minnesota Office of Energy Security, 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.

Further Information

For further details with respect to the proposed action, see the licensee’s letter dated November 24, 2009 (ADAMS Accession No. ML093280883), as supplemented by letter dated May 26, 2010 (ADAMS Accession No. ML101480083). Documents 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 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.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 27th day of September 2010.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Thomas J. Wengert,
Senior Project Manager, Plant Licensing Branch III–1, Division of Operating Reactor Licensing, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 2010–25878 Filed 10–13–10; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[NRC–2010–0267]
Errata Notice; Notice of Public Workshop on a Potential Rulemaking for Spent Nuclear Fuel Reprocessing Facilities

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Errata Notice; Notice of Public Workshop.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jose Cuadrado, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001, telephone 301–492–3287; e-mail Jose.Cuadrado@nrc.gov.

SUMMARY: The Notice of Public Workshop on a Potential Rulemaking for Spent Nuclear Fuel Reprocessing Facilities issued on July 23, 2010 (75 FR 45167, August 2, 2010), states that the date and location of the public workshops are as follows:

The public workshops will be held in Rockville, Maryland, on September 7–8, 2010, from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. and in Albuquerque, New Mexico, on the week of October 4, 2010, from a.m. to 5 p.m. The September 7–8, 2010, workshop will be held at the Hilton Washington, DC/Rockville Hotel & Executive Meeting Center, located at 1750 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland. The exact dates and location for the October 2010 workshop in Albuquerque, New Mexico, will be noticed no fewer than ten (10) days prior to the workshop [* * *]

The dates and location for the October 2010 workshop have been finalized. The workshop will be held on October 19–20, 2010, at the Sheraton Albuquerque Uptown Hotel, located at 2600 Louisiana Boulevard NE, Albuquerque, New Mexico.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland this 5th day of October, 2010.