

Automation, Inc., and Seaton Corporation working on-site at the Winston-Salem, North Carolina location of Dell Products LP, Winston-Salem (WS-1) Division.

The amended notice applicable to TA-W-72,575 is hereby issued as follows:

All workers of Dell Products LP, Winston-Salem (WS-1) Division, including on-site leased workers of Adecco, Spherion, Patriot Staffing, Manpower, TEKsystems, APN, ICONMA, Staffing Solutions, South East, Omni Resources and Recovery, SecurAmerica, LLC, Industrial Distribution Group (IDG), LLC, ARM Automation, Inc., and Seaton Corporation, Winston-Salem, North Carolina, who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after October 13, 2008 through March 1, 2012, and all workers in the group threatened with total or partial separation from employment on date of certification through two years from the date of certification, are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Chapter 2 of Title II of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 18th day of November 2010.

**Michael W. Jaffe,**

*Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. 2010-30543 Filed 12-6-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-FN-P

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-70,784]

#### **Chrysler Group LLC Formerly Known as Chrysler LLC Kenosha Engine Plant Including On-Site Leased Workers From Caravan Knight Facilities Management LLC, Syncreon, Mahar Tool Supply Company, Waste Management, Quaker Chemical Corporation, K+S Services, Inc., G4S Secure Solutions, Crassociates, Inc., CES, Inc., Evans Distribution Systems, Prodriver Leasing Systems, Inc., Teksystems, Inc., and Arcadis Kenosha, WI; Amended Certification Regarding Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance**

In accordance with Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended ("Act"), 19 U.S.C. 2273, the Department of Labor issued a Certification of Eligibility to Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance on August 13, 2010, applicable to workers of Chrysler Group, LLC, formerly known as Chrysler, LLC, Kenosha Engine Plant, Kenosha, Wisconsin (subject firm). The Department's notice of determination was published in the **Federal Register**

on November 5, 2009 (74 57340). The certification applicable to workers of the subject firm was amended May 10, 2010 to include on-site leased workers from Caravan Knight Facilities Management and on August 13, 2010 to include on-site leased workers from Syncreon. The Department's notices of amended certification were published in the **Federal Register** on June 16, 2010 (75 FR 34170) and August 30, 2010 (75 FR 52982), respectively.

The workers at the subject firm were engaged in employment related to the production of V-6 automobile engines.

At the request of the State agency, the Department reviewed the certification for workers of the subject firm.

The company reports that workers leased from not only Caravan Knight Facilities Management LLC and Syncreon, but also Mahar Tool Supply Company, Waste Management, Quaker Chemical Corporation, K+S Services, Inc., G4S Secure Solutions, CRAssociates, Inc., CES, Inc., Evans Distribution Systems, ProDriver Leasing Systems, Inc., Teksystems, Inc., and Arcadis, Kenosha, Wisconsin were employed on-site at the Kenosha, Wisconsin location of Chrysler Group, LLC, formerly known as Chrysler, LLC, Kenosha Engine Plant. The Department has determined that these workers were sufficiently under the control of the subject firm to be considered leased workers.

Based on these findings, the Department is amending this certification to include workers leased from Mahar Tool Supply Company, Waste Management, Quaker Chemical Corporation, K+S Services, Inc., G4S Secure Solutions, CRAssociates, Inc., CES, Inc., Evans Distribution Systems, ProDriver Leasing Systems, Inc., Teksystems, Inc., and Arcadis working on-site at the Kenosha, Wisconsin location of Chrysler Group, LLC, formerly known as Chrysler, LLC, Kenosha Engine Plant.

The amended notice applicable to TA-W-70,784 is hereby issued as follows:

All workers of Chrysler Group, LLC, formerly known as Chrysler, LLC, Kenosha Engine Plant, including on-site leased workers of Caravan Knight Facilities Management LLC, Syncreon, Mahar Tool Supply Company, Waste Management, Quaker Chemical Corporation, K+S Services, Inc., G4S Secure Solutions, CRAssociates, Inc., CES, Inc., Evans Distribution Systems, ProDriver Leasing Systems, Inc., Teksystems, Inc., and Arcadis, Kenosha, Wisconsin, who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after May 27, 2008, through September 2, 2011, and all workers in the group threatened with total or partial separation from employment on the date of

certification through two years from the date of certification, are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Chapter 2 of Title II of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended.

Signed in Washington, DC, this 18th day of November 2010.

**Del Min Amy Chen,**

*Certifying Officer, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. 2010-30540 Filed 12-6-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-FN-P

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[NRC-2010-0364]

### **Notice; Applications and Amendments to Facility Operating Licenses Involving Proposed No Significant Hazards Considerations and Containing Sensitive Unclassified Non-Safeguards Information and Order Imposing Procedures for Access to Sensitive Unclassified Non-Safeguards Information**

#### **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, NRC, or NRC staff) is publishing this 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 notice includes notices of amendments containing sensitive unclassified non-safeguards information (SUNSI).

#### **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 Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations (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, Rules, Announcements and Directives Branch (RADB), TWB-05-B01M, 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 faxed to the RADB at 301-492-3446. Documents may be examined, and/or copied for a fee, at the NRC's Public Document Room (PDR), located at One White Flint North, Room O1-F21, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland 20852.

Within 60 days after the date of publication of this notice, any person(s) whose interest may be affected by this action may file a request for a hearing and a petition to intervene with respect to issuance of the amendment to the subject facility operating license. 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, Room O1-F21, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland 20852, or at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/doc-collections/cfr/part002/part002-0309.html>. 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.html>. 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 (the Board) Panel, will rule on the request and/or petition; and the Secretary or the Chief Administrative Judge of the 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 requestor/petitioner 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 requestor/petitioner 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 requestor/petitioner intends to rely in proving the contention at the hearing. The requestor/petitioner must also provide references to those specific sources and documents of which the petitioner is aware and on which the requestor/petitioner 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 requestor/petitioner to relief. A requestor/petitioner 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, then any hearing held would take place before the issuance of any amendment.

All documents filed in NRC adjudicatory proceedings, including a request for hearing, a petition for leave to intervene, any motion or other document filed in the proceeding prior to the submission of a request for hearing or petition to intervene, and documents filed by interested governmental entities participating under 10 CFR 2.315(c), must be filed in accordance with the NRC E-Filing rule (72 FR 49139, August 28, 2007). The E-Filing process requires participants to submit and serve all adjudicatory 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 an exemption in accordance with the procedures described below.

To comply with the procedural requirements of E-Filing, at least ten (10) days prior to the filing deadline, the participant should contact the Office of the Secretary by e-mail at [hearing.docket@nrc.gov](mailto:hearing.docket@nrc.gov), or by telephone at 301-415-1677, to request (1) a digital

identification (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 (2) advise the Secretary that the participant will be submitting a request or petition for hearing (even in instances in which the participant, or its counsel or representative, already holds an NRC-issued ID certificate). Based upon this information, the Secretary will establish an electronic docket for the hearing in this proceeding if the Secretary has not already established an electronic docket.

Information about applying for a digital ID certificate is available on NRC's public Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/e-submittals/apply-certificates.html>. System requirements for accessing the E-Submittal server are detailed in NRC's "Guidance for Electronic Submission," which is available on the agency's public Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/e-submittals.html>. Participants may attempt to use other software not listed on the Web site, but should note that the NRC's E-Filing system does not support unlisted software, and the NRC Meta System Help Desk will not be able to offer assistance in using unlisted software.

If a participant is electronically submitting a document to the NRC in accordance with the E-Filing rule, the participant must file the document using the NRC's online, Web-based submission form. In order to serve documents through the Electronic Information Exchange System, users will be required to install a Web browser plug-in from the NRC Web site. Further information on the Web-based submission form, including the installation of the Web browser plug-in, is available on the NRC's public Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/e-submittals.html>.

Once a participant has obtained a digital ID certificate and a docket has been created, the participant 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 documents are submitted through the NRC's E-Filing system. To be timely, an electronic filing must be submitted to the E-Filing 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 E-Filing 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 an 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 using the agency's adjudicatory E-Filing system may seek assistance by contacting the NRC Meta System Help Desk through the "Contact Us" link located on the NRC Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/e-submittals.html>, by e-mail at [MSHD.Resource@nrc.gov](mailto:MSHD.Resource@nrc.gov), or by a toll-free call at 1-866-672-7640. The NRC Meta System Help Desk is available between 8 a.m. and 8 p.m., Eastern Time, Monday through Friday, excluding government holidays.

Participants who believe that they have a good cause for not submitting documents electronically must file an exemption request, 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. A presiding officer, having granted an exemption request from using E-Filing, may require a participant or party to use E-Filing if the presiding officer subsequently determines that the reason for granting the exemption from use of E-Filing no longer exists.

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](http://ehd.nrc.gov/EHD_Proceeding/home.asp), unless excluded pursuant to an order of the Commission, or the 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, unless an NRC regulation or other law requires submission of such information. 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.

Petitions for leave to intervene must be filed no later than 60 days from the date of publication of this notice. Non-timely filings will not be entertained absent a determination by the presiding officer that the petition or request should be granted or the contentions should be admitted, based on a balancing of the factors specified in 10 CFR 2.309(c)(1)(i)-(viii).

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, Room O1-F21, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland 20852. Publicly available records will be accessible electronically 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 e-mail to [pdr.resource@nrc.gov](mailto:pdr.resource@nrc.gov).

**Detroit Edison Company, Docket No. 50-341, Fermi 2, Monroe County, Michigan**

*Date of amendment request:* July 27, 2010.

*Description of amendment request:* This amendment request contains sensitive unclassified non-safeguards information (SUNSI). The proposed license amendment request includes three parts: (1) The proposed Fermi 2 Cyber Security Plan, (2) an Implementation Schedule, and (3) a proposed sentence to be added to the existing Facility Operating License Physical Protection license condition to require Fermi 2 to fully implement and maintain in effect all provisions of the Commission approved Cyber Security Plan as required by Title 10 of the *Code*

of *Federal Regulations* (10 CFR) Section 73.54.

A **Federal Register** notice on March 27, 2009 (74 FR 13926), issued the final rule that amended 10 CFR part 73. The regulations in 10 CFR 73.54, "Protection of digital computer and communication systems and networks," establish the requirements for a cyber security program. This regulation specifically requires each licensee currently licensed to operate a nuclear power plant under 10 CFR part 50 to submit a cyber security plan that satisfies the requirements of the Rule. Each submittal must include a proposed implementation schedule and implementation of the licensee's cyber security program must be consistent with approved schedule.

*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:

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

The proposed change incorporates a new requirement, in the Operating License, to implement and maintain a cyber security plan as part of the facility's overall program for physical protection. The Cyber Security Plan itself does not require any plant modifications. Rather, the Cyber Security Plan describes how the requirements of 10 CFR 73.54 are implemented in order to identify, evaluate, and mitigate cyber attacks up to and including the design basis threat, thereby achieving high assurance that the facility's digital computer and communications systems and networks are protected from cyber attacks. The proposed change requiring the implementation and maintenance of a Cyber Security Plan does not alter accident analysis assumptions, add any accident initiators, or affect the function of plant systems or the manner in which systems are operated.

Therefore, the inclusion of the Cyber Security Plan as a part of the facility's other physical protection programs specified in the facility's operating license has no impact on 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 incorporates a new requirement, in the Operating License, to implement and maintain a cyber security plan as part of the facility's overall program for physical protection. The creation of the possibility of a new or different kind of accident requires creating one or more new accident precursors. New accident precursors may be created by modifications of the plant's configuration, including changes in the allowable modes of operation. Issuance of the Cyber Security Plan itself does not require any modifications; however, implementation of the plan will require future modifications. The Cyber Security Plan does not affect the control parameters governing unit operation or the response of plant equipment to a transient condition. Because the proposed change does not change or introduce any new equipment, modes of system operation, or failure mechanisms, no new accident precursors are created.

Therefore, the proposed 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 a Margin of Safety**

The proposed change incorporates a new requirement, in the Operating License, to implement and maintain a cyber security plan as part of the facility's overall program for physical protection. Plant safety margins are established through Limiting Conditions for Operation, Limiting Safety System Settings, and Safety limits specified in the Technical Specifications. Because the Cyber Security Plan does not alter the operation of plant equipment, the proposed change does not change established safety margins.

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:* David G. Pettinari, Attorney—Corporate Matters, 688 WCB, Detroit Edison Company, One Energy Plaza, Detroit, Michigan 48226.

*NRC Branch Chief:* Robert J. Pascarelli.

**Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc. (ENO), Docket No. 50–255, Palisades Nuclear Plant (PNP), Van Buren County, Michigan**

*Date of amendment request:* July 26, 2010.

*Description of amendment request:* This amendment request contains sensitive unclassified non-safeguards information (SUNSI). The proposed amendment includes three parts: The proposed PNP Cyber Security Plan, an implementation schedule, and a proposed sentence to be added to the Renewed Facility Operating License Physical Protection license condition for ENO to fully implement and maintain in effect all provisions of the Commission-approved PNP Cyber Security Plan as required by Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations (10 CFR) Section 73.54. **Federal Register** notice dated March 27, 2009 (74 FR 13926), issued the final rule that amended 10 CFR Part 73. The regulations in 10 CFR 73.54, "Protection of digital computer and communication systems and networks," establish the requirements for a Cyber Security Program. This regulation specifically requires each licensee currently licensed to operate a nuclear power plant under part 50 to submit a Cyber Security Plan that satisfies the requirements of the Rule. The regulation also requires that each submittal include a proposed implementation schedule, and the implementation of the licensee's Cyber Security Program must be consistent with the approved schedule. The background for this application is addressed by the NRC's Notice of Availability, published on March 27, 2009 (74 FR 13926).

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

Response: No.

As required by 10 CFR 73.54 ENO has submitted a Cyber Security Plan for NRC review and approval for PNP. The PNP Cyber Security Plan does not alter accident analysis assumptions, add any initiators, or affect the function of the plant systems or the manner in which systems are operated, maintained, modified, tested, or inspected. The PNP Cyber Security Plan does not require any plant modifications which affect the performance capability of the structures, systems, and components relied upon to

mitigate the consequences of postulated accidents. The PNP Cyber Security Plan is designed to achieve high assurance that the systems within the scope of the 10 CFR 73.54 Rule are protected from cyber attacks and has no impact on the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The second part of the proposed change is an implementation schedule, and the third part adds a sentence to the Renewed Facility Operating License for Physical Protection. Both of these changes are administrative in nature and do not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. Does the proposed change create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

As required by 10 CFR 73.54 ENO has submitted a Cyber Security Plan for NRC review and approval for PNP. The PNP Cyber Security Plan does not alter accident analysis assumptions, add any initiators, or affect the function of plant systems or the manner in which systems are operated, maintained, modified, tested, or inspected. The PNP Cyber Security Plan does not require any plant modifications which affect the performance capability of the structures, systems, and components relied upon to mitigate the consequences of postulated accidents. The PNP Cyber Security Plan is designed to achieve high assurance that the systems within the scope of the 10 CFR 73.54 Rule are protected from cyber attacks and does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

The second part of the proposed change is an implementation schedule, and the third part adds a sentence to the Renewed Facility Operating License condition for Physical Protection. Both of these changes are administrative in nature and do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

3. Does the proposed change involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety?

Response: No.

As required by 10 CFR 73.54 ENO has submitted a Cyber Security Plan for NRC review and approval for PNP. Plant safety margins are established through limiting conditions for operation, limiting safety system settings, and safety limits specified in the Technical Specifications. Because there is no change to these established safety margins as result of the implementation of the PNP Cyber Security Plan, the proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The second part of the proposed change is an implementation schedule, and the third part adds a sentence to the Renewed Facility Operating License condition for Physical Protection. Both of these changes are administrative in nature and 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 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:* Mr. William Dennis, Assistant General Counsel, Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc., 440 Hamilton Ave., White Plains, NY 10601.  
*NRC Branch Chief:* Robert J. Pascarella.

**Florida Power and Light Company, et al., Docket Nos. 50-250 and 50-251, Turkey Point, Units 3 and 4, Florida City, Florida**

*Date of amendment request:* July 28, 2010.

*Description of amendment request:* This amendment request contains sensitive unclassified non-safeguards information (SUNSI). The proposed amendment includes three parts: The proposed Turkey Point Nuclear Generating Station Cyber Security Plan, an Implementation Schedule, and a proposed sentence to be added to the existing renewed facility operating licenses Physical Protection license condition to require Florida Power and Light Company to fully implement and maintain in effect all provisions of the Commission approved cyber security plan as required by amended 10 CFR Part 73. The proposed Cyber Security Plan was submitted in accordance with Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations*, Section 73.54, "Protection of digital computer and communication systems and networks."

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

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

Response: No

The proposed amendment incorporates a new requirement in the Facility Operating License to implement and maintain a Cyber Security Plan as part of the facility's overall program for physical protection. Inclusion of the Cyber Security Plan in the Facility Operating License itself does not involve any modifications to the safety-related structures, systems or components (SSCs). Rather, the Cyber Security Plan describes how the requirements of 10 CFR 73.54 are to be implemented to identify, evaluate, and mitigate cyber attacks up to and including the design basis cyber attack threat, thereby achieving high assurance that the facility's digital computer and communications systems and networks are protected from cyber attacks. The Cyber Security Plan will not alter previously evaluated Final Safety Analysis Report (FSAR) design basis accident

analysis assumptions, add any accident initiators, or affect the function of the plant safety-related SSCs as to how they are operated, maintained, modified, tested, or inspected.

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

2. Does the proposed change create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated?

Response: No

The proposed amendment provides assurance that safety-related SSCs are protected from cyber attacks. Implementation of 10 CFR 73.54 and the inclusion of a plan in the Facility Operating License do not result in the need for any new or different FSAR design basis accident analysis, and no new equipment failure modes are created. It does not introduce new equipment that could create a new or different kind of accident, and no new equipment failure modes are created. As a result, no new accident scenarios, failure mechanisms, or limiting single failures are introduced as a result of this proposed amendment.

Therefore, the proposed amendment does not create a possibility for an accident of a new or different type than those previously evaluated.

3. Does the proposed amendment involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety?

Response: No.

The margin of safety is associated with the confidence in the ability of the fission product barriers (i.e., fuel cladding, reactor coolant pressure boundary, and containment structure) to limit the level of radiation to the public. The proposed amendment would not alter the way any safety-related SSC functions and would not alter the way the plant is operated. The amendment provides assurance that safety-related SSCs are protected from cyber attacks. The proposed amendment would not introduce any new uncertainties or change any existing uncertainties associated with any safety limit. The proposed amendment would have no impact on the structural integrity of the fuel cladding, reactor coolant pressure boundary, or containment structure. Based on the above considerations, the proposed amendment would not degrade the confidence in the ability of the fission product barriers to limit the level of radiation to the public.

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 requests involve no significant hazards consideration.

*Attorney for licensee:* M.S. Ross, Attorney, Florida Power and Light, P.O. Box 14000, Juno Beach, Florida 33408-0420.

*NRC Branch Chief:* Douglas A. Broadus.

**Tennessee Valley Authority, Docket Nos. 50–259, 50–260, and 50–296, Browns Ferry Nuclear Plant, Units 1, 2, and 3, Limestone County, Alabama**

*Date of amendment request:*

November 23, 2009, as supplemented on December 18, 2009, July 23, 2010, and October 1, 2010 (TS–470).

*Description of amendment request:*

This amendment request contains sensitive unclassified non-safeguards information (SUNSI). The **Federal Register** notice on March 27, 2009 (74 FR 13926), issued the final rule that amended Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR), Part 73, “Physical Protection of Plants and Materials.” Specifically, the regulations in 10 CFR 73.54, “Protection of digital computer and communication systems and networks,” establish the requirements for a cyber security program to protect digital computer and communication systems and networks against cyber attacks. The proposed amendment includes the proposed Cyber Security Plan, its implementation schedule, and a revised Physical Protection license condition for Browns Ferry Nuclear Plant, Units 1, 2, and 3, to fully implement and maintain in effect all provisions of the NRC-approved Cyber Security Plan as required by 10 CFR 73.54.

*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:

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

Neither the proposed additional license condition nor the Cyber Security Plan directly impacts the physical configuration or function of plant structures, systems, or components (SSCs). Likewise, they do not change the manner in which SSCs are operated, maintained, modified, tested, or inspected. Neither the proposed additional license condition nor the Cyber Security Plan introduces any initiator of any accident previously evaluated. Any modifications to the physical configuration or function of SSCs or the manner in which SSCs are operated, maintained, modified, tested, or inspected that might result from the implementation of the Cyber Security Plan will be fully evaluated by existing regulatory processes (e.g., 10 CFR 50.59) prior to their implementation to ensure that they do not result in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

Therefore, it is concluded that this amendment does not involve a significant

increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

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

This proposed amendment is intended to provide high assurance that safety-related SSCs are protected from cyber attacks. Inclusion of the additional condition in the Facility Operating License to implement the Cyber Security Plan does not directly alter the plant configuration, require new plant equipment to be installed, alter or create new accident analysis assumptions, add any initiators, or affect the function of plant systems or the manner in which systems are operated, maintained, modified, tested, or inspected.

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

**Criterion 3—The Proposed Amendment Does Not Involve a Significant Reduction in a Margin of Safety**

The proposed amendment does not involve any physical changes to plant or alter the manner in which plant systems are operated, maintained, modified, tested, or inspected. The proposed change does not alter the manner in which safety limits, limiting safety system settings or limiting conditions for operation are determined. The safety analysis acceptance criteria are not affected by this change. The proposed change will not result in plant operation in a configuration outside the design basis. The proposed change does not adversely affect systems that respond to safely shutdown the plant and to maintain the plant in a safe shutdown condition. Adding a license condition to require implementation of Cyber Security Plan will not reduce a margin of safety because the requirements of the Plan are designed to provide high assurance that safety-related SSCs are protected from cyber attacks.

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

*Attorney for licensee:* General Counsel, Tennessee Valley Authority, 400 West Summit Hill Drive, 6A West Tower, Knoxville, Tennessee 37902.

*NRC Branch Chief:* Douglas A. Broadus.

**Tennessee Valley Authority, Docket Nos. 50–327 and 50–328, Sequoyah Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2, Hamilton County, Tennessee**

*Date of amendment request:*

November 23, 2009, as supplemented on December 11, 2009, December 18, 2009, July 23, 2010, and October 1, 2010 (TS 09–06).

*Description of amendment request:*

This amendment request contains sensitive unclassified non-safeguards information (SUNSI). The **Federal Register** notice on March 27, 2009 (74 FR 13926), issued the final rule that amended Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR), Part 73, “Physical Protection of Plants and Materials.” Specifically, the regulations in 10 CFR 73.54, “Protection of digital computer and communication systems and networks” establish the requirements for a cyber security program to protect digital computer and communication systems and networks against cyber attacks. The proposed amendment includes the proposed Cyber Security Plan, its implementation schedule, and a revised Physical Protection license condition for Sequoyah Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2, to fully implement and maintain in effect all provisions of the NRC-approved Cyber Security Plan as required by 10 CFR 73.54.

*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:

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

Neither the proposed additional license condition nor the Cyber Security Plan directly impacts the physical configuration or function of plant structures, systems, or components (SSCs). Likewise, they do not change the manner in which SSCs are operated, maintained, modified, tested, or inspected. Neither the proposed additional license condition nor the Cyber Security Plan introduces any initiator of any accident previously evaluated. Any modifications to the physical configuration or function of SSCs or the manner in which SSCs are operated, maintained, modified, tested, or inspected that might result from the implementation of the Cyber Security Plan will be fully evaluated by existing regulatory processes (e.g., 10 CFR 50.59) prior to their implementation to ensure that they do not result in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

Therefore, it is concluded that this amendment does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

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

This proposed amendment is intended to provide high assurance that safety-related SSCs are protected from cyber attacks. Inclusion of the additional condition in the Facility Operating License to implement the Cyber Security Plan does not directly alter

the plant configuration, require new plant equipment to be installed, alter or create new accident analysis assumptions, add any initiators, or affect the function of plant systems or the manner in which systems are operated, maintained, modified, tested, or inspected.

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

**Criterion 3—The Proposed Amendment Does Not Involve a Significant Reduction in a Margin of Safety**

The proposed amendment does not involve any physical changes to plant or alter the manner in which plant systems are operated, maintained, modified, tested, or inspected. The proposed change does not alter the manner in which safety limits, limiting safety system settings or limiting conditions for operation are determined. The safety analysis acceptance criteria are not affected by this change. The proposed change will not result in plant operation in a configuration outside the design basis. The proposed change does not adversely affect systems that respond to safely shutdown the plant and to maintain the plant in a safe shutdown condition. Adding a license condition to require implementation of Cyber Security Plan will not reduce a margin of safety because the requirements of the Plan are designed to provide high assurance that safety-related SSCs are protected from cyber attacks.

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

*Attorney for licensee:* General Counsel, Tennessee Valley Authority, 400 West Summit Hill Drive, 6A West Tower, Knoxville, Tennessee 37902.

*NRC Branch Chief:* Douglas A. Broaddus.

**Virginia Electric and Power Company, Docket Nos. 50-338 and 50-339, North Anna Power Station (NAPS), Units 1 and 2, Louisa County, Virginia**

*Date of amendment request:* July 12, 2010, as supplemented by a letter dated August 5, 2010.

*Description of amendment request:* This amendment request contains sensitive unclassified non-safeguards information (SUNSI). The licensee proposed an amendment to the Facility Operating Licenses (FOL) for NAPS Units 1 and 2. In the same amendment request letter, sent under Dominion Resources Services, Inc., letterhead, Millstone Power Station Units 2 and 3; Kewaunee Power Station; and Surry Units 1 and 2, submitted amendment requests pertaining to their Cyber Security Plans. This notice only

addresses the application as it pertains to NAPS Units 1 and 2. The licensee requested NRC approval of the NAPS Units 1 and 2 Cyber Security Plan, provided a proposed implementation schedule, and proposed to add a sentence to License Condition 2.E, "Physical Protection," of NAPS Units 1 and 2, Facility Operating License NPF-4 and NPF-7 that would affirm when the licensee would fully implement and maintain in effect all provisions of the Cyber Security Plan.

*Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:* As required by Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations (10 CFR) Part 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration (NSHC). The NRC staff reviewed the licensee's NSHC analysis against the standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c). The NRC staff's review is presented below.

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

Response: No.

The Plan establishes the licensing basis for the Cyber Security Program for the sites. The Plan establishes how to achieve high assurance that specified nuclear power plant digital computer and communication systems, networks and functions are adequately protected against cyber attacks up to and including the design basis threat.

Part one of the proposed changes is designed to achieve high assurance that the systems are protected from cyber attacks. The Plan describes how plant modifications that involve digital computer systems are reviewed to provide high assurance of adequate protection against cyber attacks, up to and including the design basis threat. The proposed change does not alter accident analysis assumptions, add any initiators, or affect the function of plant systems or the manner in which systems are operated, maintained, modified, tested, or inspected. The first part of the proposed change is designed to achieve high assurance that the systems within the scope of the requirement are protected from cyber attacks and has no impact on the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated. The proposed change implements a Cyber Security Plan as a requirement not previously formally addressed. As such, the proposed Plan provides a significant enhancement to cyber security where no requirement existed before.

The second part of the proposed changes adds a sentence to the existing facility license conditions for Physical Protection. These changes are administrative and have no impact on the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

Therefore, it is concluded that these changes do not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. Does the proposed change create the possibility of a new or different kind of

accident from any accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

This proposed amendment provides assurance that safety-related structures, systems and components (SSCs) are protected from cyber attacks. Implementation of 10 CFR 73.54 and the inclusion of a plan in the FOL do not result in the need of any new or different design basis accident analysis. It does not introduce new equipment that could create a new or different kind of accident, and no new equipment failure modes are created. As a result, no new accident scenarios, failure mechanisms, or limiting single failures are introduced as a result of this proposed amendment.

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

3. Does the proposed change involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety?

Response: No.

The margin of safety is associated with the confidence in the ability of the fission product barriers (i.e., fuel cladding, reactor coolant pressure boundary, and containment structure) to limit the level of radiation to the public. The proposed amendment would not alter the way any safety-related SSC functions and would not alter the way the plant is operated. The amendment provides assurance that safety-related SSCs are protected from cyber attacks. The proposed amendment would not introduce any new uncertainties or change any existing uncertainties associated with any safety limit. The proposed amendment would have no impact on the structural integrity of the fuel cladding, reactor coolant pressure boundary, or containment structure. Based on the above considerations, the proposed amendment would not degrade the confidence in the ability of the fission product barriers to limit the level of radiation to the public.

Therefore, the proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

Based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

*Attorney for licensee:* Lillian M. Cuoco, Senior Counsel, Dominion Resources Services, Inc., 120 Tredegar Street, RS-2, Richmond, VA 23219.

*NRC Branch Chief:* Gloria Kulesa.

**Virginia Electric and Power Company, Docket Nos. 50-280 and 50-281, Surry Power Station (Surry), Units 1 and 2, Surry County, Virginia**

*Date of amendment request:* July 12, 2010, as supplemented by a letter dated August 5, 2010.

*Description of amendment request:* This amendment request contains sensitive unclassified non-safeguards

information (SUNSI). The licensee proposed an amendment to the Facility Operating Licenses (FOL) for Surry Units 1 and 2. In the same amendment request letter, sent under Dominion Resources Services, Inc., letterhead, Millstone Power Station Units 2 and 3; Kewaunee Power Station; and Surry Units 1 and 2, and North Anna Units 1 and 2, submitted amendment requests pertaining to their Cyber Security Plans. This notice only addresses the application as it pertains to Surry Units 1 and 2. The licensee requested NRC approval of the Surry Units 1 and 2 Cyber Security Plan, provided a proposed implementation schedule, and proposed to add a sentence to License Condition 3.J, "Physical Protection," of Surry Units 1 and 2, Facility Operating License DPR-32 and DPR-37 that would affirm when the licensee would fully implement and maintain in effect all provisions of the Cyber Security Plan.

*Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:* As required by Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations (10 CFR) 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration (NSHC). The NRC staff reviewed the licensee's NSHC analysis against the standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c). The NRC staff's review is presented below.

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

Response: No.

The Plan establishes the licensing basis for the Cyber Security Program for the sites. The Plan establishes how to achieve high assurance that specified nuclear power plant digital computer and communication systems, networks and functions are adequately protected against cyber attacks up to and including the design basis threat.

Part one of the proposed changes is designed to achieve high assurance that the systems are protected from cyber attacks. The Plan describes how plant modifications that involve digital computer systems are reviewed to provide high assurance of adequate protection against cyber attacks, up to and including the design basis threat. The proposed change does not alter accident analysis assumptions, add any initiators, or affect the function of plant systems or the manner in which systems are operated, maintained, modified, tested, or inspected. The first part of the proposed change is designed to achieve high assurance that the systems within the scope of the requirement are protected from cyber attacks and has no impact on the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated. The proposed change implements a Cyber Security Plan as a requirement not previously formally addressed. As such, the proposed Plan provides a significant enhancement to

cyber security where no requirement existed before.

The second part of the proposed changes adds a sentence to the existing facility license conditions for Physical Protection. These changes are administrative and have no impact on the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

Therefore, it is concluded that these changes do not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. Does the proposed change create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

This proposed amendment provides assurance that safety-related structures, systems and components (SSCs) are protected from cyber attacks. Implementation of 10 CFR 73.54 and the inclusion of a plan in the FOL do not result in the need of any new or different design basis accident analysis. It does not introduce new equipment that could create a new or different kind of accident, and no new equipment failure modes are created. As a result, no new accident scenarios, failure mechanisms, or limiting single failures are introduced as a result of this proposed amendment.

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

3. Does the proposed change involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety?

Response: No.

The margin of safety is associated with the confidence in the ability of the fission product barriers (i.e., fuel cladding, reactor coolant pressure boundary, and containment structure) to limit the level of radiation to the public. The proposed amendment would not alter the way any safety-related SSC functions and would not alter the way the plant is operated. The amendment provides assurance that safety-related SSCs are protected from cyber attacks. The proposed amendment would not introduce any new uncertainties or change any existing uncertainties associated with any safety limit. The proposed amendment would have no impact on the structural integrity of the fuel cladding, reactor coolant pressure boundary, or containment structure. Based on the above considerations, the proposed amendment would not degrade the confidence in the ability of the fission product barriers to limit the level of radiation to the public.

Therefore, the proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

Based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

*Attorney for licensee:* Lillian M. Cuoco, Senior Counsel, Dominion Resources Services, Inc., 120 Tredegar Street, RS-2, Richmond, VA 23219.

*NRC Branch Chief:* Gloria Kulesa.

### **Order Imposing Procedures for Access to Sensitive Unclassified Non-Safeguards Information for Contention Preparation**

*Detroit Edison Company, Docket No. 50-341, Fermi 2, Monroe County, Michigan*

*Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc., Docket No. 50-255, Palisades Nuclear Plant, Van Buren County, Michigan*

*Florida Power and Light Company, et al., Docket Nos. 50-250 and 50-251, Turkey Point, Units 3 and 4, Florida City, Florida*

*Tennessee Valley Authority, Docket Nos. 50-259, 50-260, and 50-296, Browns Ferry Nuclear Plant, Units 1, 2, and 3, Limestone County, Alabama*

*Tennessee Valley Authority, Docket Nos. 50-327 and 50-328, Sequoyah Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2, Hamilton County, Tennessee*

*Virginia Electric and Power Company, Docket Nos. 50-338 and 50-339, North Anna Power Station, Units 1 and 2, Louisa County, Virginia*

*Virginia Electric and Power Company, Docket Nos. 50-280 and 50-281, Surry Power Station, Units 1 and 2, Surry County, Virginia*

A. This Order contains instructions regarding how potential parties to this proceeding may request access to documents containing Sensitive Unclassified Non-Safeguards Information (SUNSI).

B. Within 10 days after publication of this notice of hearing and opportunity to petition for leave to intervene, any potential party who believes access to SUNSI is necessary to respond to this notice may request such access. A "potential party" is any person who intends to participate as a party by demonstrating standing and filing an admissible contention under Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations (10 CFR) 2.309. Requests for access to SUNSI submitted later than 10 days after publication will not be considered absent a showing of good cause for the late filing, addressing why the request could not have been filed earlier.

C. The requestor shall submit a letter requesting permission to access SUNSI to the Office of the Secretary, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC or the Commission), Washington, DC 20555-0001, Attention: Rulemakings and Adjudications Staff, and provide a copy to the Associate General Counsel for Hearings, Enforcement and Administration, Office of the General Counsel, Washington, DC 20555-0001.



The expedited delivery or courier mail address for both offices is: U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland 20852. The e-mail address for the Office of the Secretary and the Office of the General Counsel are *Hearing.Docket@nrc.gov* and *OGCmailcenter@nrc.gov*, respectively.<sup>1</sup> The request must include the following information:

- (1) A description of the licensing action with a citation to this **Federal Register** notice;
- (2) The name and address of the potential party and a description of the potential party's particularized interest that could be harmed by the action identified in C.(1);
- (3) The identity of the individual or entity requesting access to SUNSI and the requestor's basis for the need for the information in order to meaningfully participate in this adjudicatory proceeding. In particular, the request must explain why publicly-available versions of the information requested would not be sufficient to provide the basis and specificity for a proffered contention;

D. Based on an evaluation of the information submitted under paragraph C.(3) the NRC staff will determine within 10 days of receipt of the request whether:

- (1) There is a reasonable basis to believe the petitioner is likely to establish standing to participate in this NRC proceeding; and
- (2) The requestor has established a legitimate need for access to SUNSI.

E. If the NRC staff determines that the requestor satisfies both D.(1) and D.(2) above, the NRC staff will notify the requestor in writing that access to SUNSI has been granted. The written notification will contain instructions on how the requestor may obtain copies of

the requested documents, and any other conditions that may apply to access those documents. These conditions may include, but are not limited to, the signing of a Non-Disclosure Agreement or Affidavit, or Protective Order<sup>2</sup> setting forth terms and conditions to prevent the unauthorized or inadvertent disclosure of SUNSI by each individual who will be granted access to SUNSI.

F. Filing of Contentions. Any contentions in these proceedings that are based upon the information received as a result of the request made for SUNSI must be filed by the requestor no later than 25 days after the requestor is granted access to that information. However, if more than 25 days remain between the date the petitioner is granted access to the information and the deadline for filing all other contentions (as established in the notice of hearing or opportunity for hearing), the petitioner may file its SUNSI contentions by that later deadline.

G. Review of Denials of Access.

(1) If the request for access to SUNSI is denied by the NRC staff either after a determination on standing and need for access, or after a determination on trustworthiness and reliability, the NRC staff shall immediately notify the requestor in writing, briefly stating the reason or reasons for the denial.

(2) The requestor may challenge the NRC staff's adverse determination by filing a challenge within 5 days of receipt of that determination with: (a) the presiding officer designated in this proceeding; (b) if no presiding officer has been appointed, the Chief Administrative Judge, or if he or she is unavailable, another administrative judge, or an administrative law judge with jurisdiction pursuant to 10 CFR 2.318(a); or (c) if another officer has been designated to rule on information access issues, with that officer.

H. Review of Grants of Access. A party other than the requestor may challenge an NRC staff determination granting access to SUNSI whose release would harm that party's interest independent of the proceeding. Such a challenge must be filed with the Chief Administrative Judge within 5 days of the notification by the NRC staff of its grant of access.

If challenges to the NRC staff determinations are filed, these procedures give way to the normal process for litigating disputes concerning access to information. The availability of interlocutory review by the Commission of orders ruling on such NRC staff determinations (whether granting or denying access) is governed by 10 CFR 2.311.<sup>3</sup>

I. The Commission expects that the NRC staff and presiding officers (and any other reviewing officers) will consider and resolve requests for access to SUNSI, and motions for protective orders, in a timely fashion in order to minimize any unnecessary delays in identifying those petitioners who have standing and who have propounded contentions meeting the specificity and basis requirements in 10 CFR part 2. Attachment 1 to this Order summarizes the general target schedule for processing and resolving requests under these procedures.

*It Is So Ordered.*

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 1st day of December 2010.

For the Commission.  
**Annette L. Vietti-Cook,**  
*Secretary of the Commission.*

**ATTACHMENT 1—General Target Schedule for Processing and Resolving Requests for Access to Sensitive Unclassified Non-Safeguards Information in this Proceeding**

Day	Event/Activity
0 .....	Publication of FEDERAL REGISTER notice of hearing and opportunity to petition for leave to intervene, including order with instructions for access requests.
10 .....	Deadline for submitting requests for access to Sensitive Unclassified Non-Safeguards Information (SUNSI) with information: supporting the standing of a potential party identified by name and address; describing the need for the information in order for the potential party to participate meaningfully in an adjudicatory proceeding.
60 .....	Deadline for submitting petition for intervention containing: (i) Demonstration of standing; (ii) all contentions whose formulation does not require access to SUNSI (+25 Answers to petition for intervention; +7 requestor/petitioner reply).

<sup>1</sup> While a request for hearing or petition to intervene in this proceeding must comply with the filing requirements of the NRC's "E-Filing Rule," the initial request to access SUNSI under these procedures should be submitted as described in this paragraph.

<sup>2</sup> Any motion for Protective Order or draft Non-Disclosure Affidavit or Agreement for SUNSI must be filed with the presiding officer or the Chief Administrative Judge if the presiding officer has not yet been designated, within 30 days of the deadline for the receipt of the written access request.

<sup>3</sup> Requestors should note that the filing requirements of the NRC's E-Filing Rule (72 FR 49139; August 28, 2007) apply to appeals of NRC staff determinations (because they must be served on a presiding officer or the Commission, as applicable), but not to the initial SUNSI request submitted to the NRC staff under these procedures.

Day	Event/Activity
20 .....	Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff informs the requestor of the staff's determination whether the request for access provides a reasonable basis to believe standing can be established and shows need for SUNSI. (NRC staff also informs any party to the proceeding whose interest independent of the proceeding would be harmed by the release of the information.) If NRC staff makes the finding of need for SUNSI and likelihood of standing, NRC staff begins document processing (preparation of redactions or review of redacted documents).
25 .....	If NRC staff finds no "need" or no likelihood of standing, the deadline for requestor/petitioner to file a motion seeking a ruling to reverse the NRC staff's denial of access; NRC staff files copy of access determination with the presiding officer (or Chief Administrative Judge or other designated officer, as appropriate). If NRC staff finds "need" for SUNSI, the deadline for any party to the proceeding whose interest independent of the proceeding would be harmed by the release of the information to file a motion seeking a ruling to reverse the NRC staff's grant of access.
30 .....	Deadline for NRC staff reply to motions to reverse NRC staff determination(s).
40 .....	(Receipt +30) If NRC staff finds standing and need for SUNSI, deadline for NRC staff to complete information processing and file motion for Protective Order and draft Non-Disclosure Affidavit. Deadline for applicant/licensee to file Non-Disclosure Agreement for SUNSI.
A .....	If access granted: Issuance of presiding officer or other designated officer decision on motion for protective order for access to sensitive information (including schedule for providing access and submission of contentions) or decision reversing a final adverse determination by the NRC staff.
A + 3 .....	Deadline for filing executed Non-Disclosure Affidavits. Access provided to SUNSI consistent with decision issuing the protective order.
A + 28 .....	Deadline for submission of contentions whose development depends upon access to SUNSI. However, if more than 25 days remain between the petitioner's receipt of (or access to) the information and the deadline for filing all other contentions (as established in the notice of hearing or opportunity for hearing), the petitioner may file its SUNSI contentions by that later deadline.
A + 53 .....	(Contention receipt +25) Answers to contentions whose development depends upon access to SUNSI.
A + 60 .....	(Answer receipt +7) Petitioner/Intervenor reply to answers.
>A + 60 .....	Decision on contention admission.

[FR Doc. 2010-30481 Filed 12-6-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 040-08502, 040-09073, 030-38260; NRC-2010-0300]

### Notice of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission Consent to Indirect Change of Control and Issuance of License Amendment to Materials License SUA-1341, SUA-1596, and 49-29384-01

**AGENCY:** Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice of approval of indirect change of control and issuance of license amendment.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Ron C. Linton, Project Manager, Uranium Recovery Licensing Branch, Decommissioning and Uranium Recovery Licensing Directorate, Division of Waste Management and Environmental Protection, Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555. Telephone: (301) 415-7777; fax number: (301) 415-5369; e-mail: ron.linton@nrc.gov.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Pursuant to 10 CFR 2.106, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is providing notice of NRC consent to the indirect change of control and issuance of license

amendments to Materials License Numbers SUA-1341, SUA-1569, and 49-29384-01. Materials License SUA-1341 authorizes Uranium One USA, Inc., to possess uranium and byproduct material at its Irigaray and Christensen Ranch in situ recovery (ISR) project in Johnson and Campbell Counties, Wyoming. The project is currently in operating status, but is not producing uranium at this time. Materials License SUA-1569 authorizes Uranium One Americas, Inc., to possess uranium and byproduct material at its Moore Ranch ISR Project in Campbell County, Wyoming. The project was licensed on September 30, 2010, and is not producing uranium at this time. Materials License 49-29384-01 authorizes Uranium One Americas, Inc. to possess byproduct material—specifically, sealed source of hydrogen-3—in an amount not to exceed three (3) Curies (Ci) per source and 12 Ci in total for well logging.

By letter dated July 20, 2010, Uranium One, Inc., Uranium One USA, Inc. and Uranium One Americas, Inc. (collectively, "Uranium One") submitted an application and license amendment request for approval of an indirect change of control of Uranium One USA, Inc.'s Materials License SUA-1341 for its Irigaray and Christensen Ranch Project (Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS) accession number ML102090404). The July 20, 2010 submittal also referenced Uranium One's materials license applications for Moore Ranch Project

(Docket No. 40-9073), Jab & Antelope Project (Docket No. 40-9079), and the Ludeman Project (Docket No. 40-9095) as being affected by the change of control. Subsequently, Materials License SUA-1596 was issued to Uranium One Americas, Inc. for its Moore Ranch Project on September 30, 2010. In a separate submittal dated June 23, 2010 (ML102100530), Uranium One submitted notification of an indirect change of control regarding its Materials License 49-29384-01. NRC has determined that the application constitutes a request for a license transfer and is collectively treating the July 20, 2010, and June 23, 2010, submittals as an application for the change of control of NRC licenses SUA-1341, SUA-1596 and 49-29384-01.

The indirect change of control is a result of a share purchase transaction, wherein JSC Atomredmetzoloto (ARMZ) (a Russian corporation) and its wholly owned subsidiaries Effective Energy N.V. (a Dutch limited liability company) and Uranium Mining Company (a Russian corporation), will acquire no less than 51 percent of Uranium One, Inc.'s (a Canadian Corporation) common shares. Uranium One, Inc. is the parent company of Uranium One USA, Inc. (a Delaware corporation) and Uranium One Americas, Inc. (a Nevada corporation), both NRC licensees. ARMZ is owned by JSC Atomenergoprom and JSC Atomenergoprom's wholly owned subsidiary JSC TVEL. JSC Atomenergoprom is a wholly owned