

Signed at Washington, DC, this 9th day of October 2014.

**Kimberley D. Hill,**

*Chief, Division of Management Systems,  
Bureau of Labor Statistics.*

[FR Doc. 2014-25341 Filed 10-23-14; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4510-24-P**

## **NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES**

### **National Endowment for the Arts**

#### **President's Committee on the Arts and the Humanities: Meeting #70**

**AGENCY:** National Endowment for the Arts, National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities.

**ACTION:** Notice of meeting.

**SUMMARY:** Pursuant to section 10(a)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92-463), as amended, notice is hereby given that the 70th meeting of the President's Committee on the Arts and the Humanities (PCAH) will be held in the Monument Room, Occidental Hotel, 1475 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20004. Ending time is approximate.

**DATES:** November 10, 2014 from 10:00 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Lindsey Clark of the President's Committee at (202) 682-5409 or [lclark@pcah.gov](mailto:lclark@pcah.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The meeting, on Monday, November 10th, will begin with welcome, introductions, and announcements. This will be followed by reports on Committee Programs, including the National Arts and Humanities Youth Program (NAHY), National Student Poets Program, Turnaround Arts, Film Forward Initiative, and a summary of the past year and priorities going forward. There also will be reports from the President's Committee partners—the Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS), National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) and National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH), as well as other Partner updates. The meeting will adjourn after closing remarks.

The President's Committee on the Arts and the Humanities was created by Executive Order in 1982, which currently states that the "Committee shall advise, provide recommendations to, and assist the President, the National Endowment for the Arts, the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the Institute of Museum and Library Services on matters relating to the arts and the humanities."

Any interested persons may attend as observers, on a space available basis, but seating is limited. Therefore, for this meeting, individuals wishing to attend are advised to contact Lindsey Clark of the President's Committee seven (7) days in advance of the meeting at (202) 682-5409 or write to the Committee at Constitution Center, 400 7th St. SW., Washington, DC 20506. Further information with reference to this meeting can also be obtained from Ms. Clark at [lclark@pcah.gov](mailto:lclark@pcah.gov).

If you need special accommodations due to a disability, please contact the Office of AccessAbility, National Endowment for the Arts, Constitution Center, 400 7th St. SW., Washington, DC 20506, (202) 682-5532, TDY-TDD (202) 682-5496, at least seven (7) days prior to the meeting.

Dated: October 20, 2014.

**Kathy Plowitz-Worden,**

*Panel Coordinator, Panel Operations,  
National Endowment for the Arts.*

[FR Doc. 2014-25282 Filed 10-23-14; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7537-01-P**

## **NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

**[Docket No. 50-409; NRC-2014-0225]**

### **Humboldt Bay Power Plant, Unit No. 3**

**AGENCY:** U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**ACTION:** Environmental assessment and finding of no significant impact; issuance.

**SUMMARY:** The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is considering issuance of an exemption from certain emergency planning (EP) requirements for License No. DPR-7 held by Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E, the licensee) for the possession of the Humboldt Bay Power Plant, Unit 3. PG&E is requesting the exemptions from specific emergency planning requirements by letter dated August 14, 2012.

**ADDRESSES:** Please refer to Docket ID NRC-2014-0225 when contacting the NRC about the availability of information regarding this document. You may obtain publicly-available information related to this document using any of the following methods:

- *NRC's Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS):* You may obtain publicly available documents online in the ADAMS Public Documents collection at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html>. To begin the search, select "ADAMS Public Documents" and then

select "Begin Web-based ADAMS Search." For problems with ADAMS, please contact the NRC's Public Document Room (PDR) reference staff at 1-800-397-4209, 301-415-4737, or by email to [pdr.resource@nrc.gov](mailto:pdr.resource@nrc.gov). The ADAMS accession number for each document referenced in this document (if that document is available in ADAMS) is provided the first time that a document is referenced.

- *NRC's PDR:* You may examine and purchase copies of public documents at the NRC's PDR, Room O1-F21, One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland 20852.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** John Hickman, Office of Nuclear Materials Safety and Safeguards, telephone: 301-415-3017, email: [John.Hickman@nrc.gov](mailto:John.Hickman@nrc.gov); U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001.

### **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

#### **I. Introduction**

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff is considering a request dated August 14, 2012 (ADAMS Accession No. ML12236A327), by PG&E requesting exemptions from specific emergency planning requirements of part 50 of Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR) for the Humboldt Bay Power Plant, Unit 3 and Independent Spent Fuel Storage Installation (ISFSI). The licensee's request was prompted by changes the NRC made to its EP regulations on November 3, 1980 by publishing a final rule (45 FR 55402) amending the EP requirements for production and utilization facilities. This Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed exemption has been developed in accordance with the requirements of 10 CFR 51.21.

#### **II. Environmental Assessment**

##### *Identification of Proposed Action*

The proposed action would exempt Humboldt Bay, a 10 CFR part 50 licensee, from certain 10 CFR part 50 emergency planning (EP) requirements because Humboldt Bay is permanently shut-down with the fuel now stored in dry concrete and steel casks at the Humboldt Bay ISFSI.

##### *Need for Proposed Action*

Humboldt Bay Power Plant (HBPP) Unit 3 was issued an operating license on August 28, 1962. On July 2, 1976, HBPP Unit 3 was shut down for annual refueling and to conduct seismic modifications. The unit was never restarted. In 1983, updated economic analyses indicated that restarting Unit 3

would probably not be cost-effective, and in June 1983, PG&E announced its intention to decommission the unit. On July 16, 1985, the NRC issued Amendment No. 19 to the HBPP Unit 3 Operating License to change the status to possess-but-not-operate (ADAMS Legacy Library Accession No. 8507260045). In December of 2008, the transfer of spent fuel from the fuel storage pool to the dry-cask ISFSI was completed, and the decontamination and dismantlement phase of HBPP Unit 3 decommissioning commenced (ADAMS Accession Number ML090440322). Active decommissioning is currently underway.

On November 23, 2011, the NRC issued a final rule in the **Federal Register** (FR) modifying or adding EP requirements in Section 50.47, Section 50.54, and Appendix E of 10 CFR Part 50 (76 FR 72560). The EP Final Rule was effective on December 23, 2011, with specific implementation dates for each of the rule changes, varying from the effective date of the Final Rule through December 31, 2015. The EP Final Rule codified certain voluntary protective measures contained in NRC Bulletin 2005-02, "Emergency Preparedness and Response Actions for Security-Based Events," and generically applicable requirements similar to those previously imposed by NRC Order EA-02-026, "Order for Interim Safeguards and Security Compensatory Measures," dated February 25, 2002. In addition, the EP Final Rule amended other licensee emergency plan requirements to: (1) Enhance the ability of licensees in preparing and in taking certain protective actions in the event of a radiological emergency; (2) address, in part, security issues identified after the terrorist events of September 11, 2001; (3) clarify regulations to effect consistent emergency plan implementation among licensees; and (4) modify certain EP requirements to be more effective and efficient. However, the EP Final Rule was only an enhancement to the NRC's regulations and was not necessary for adequate protection. On page 72563 of the **Federal Register** notice for the EP Final Rule, the Commission "determined that the existing regulatory structure ensures adequate protection of public health and safety and common defense and security."

The licensee claims that the proposed action is needed because the final rule imposed requirements on HBPP that are not necessary to meet the underlying purpose of the regulations in view of the greatly reduced offsite radiological consequences associated with the

current plant status as permanently shut down and with the spent nuclear fuel stored in an ISFSI. The EP program at this facility met the EP requirements in 10 CFR Part 50 that were in effect before December 23, 2011, subject to any license amendments or exemptions modifying the EP requirements for the licensee. Thus, compliance with the EP requirements in effect before the effective date of the EP Final Rule demonstrated reasonable assurance that adequate protective measures could be taken in the event of a radiological emergency.

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

The NRC staff evaluated the environmental impacts of the proposed action and concludes that exempting the facility from the emergency planning requirements will not have any adverse environmental impacts. The NRC has determined that no credible events at the HBPP ISFSI would result in doses to the public beyond the owner-controlled area boundary that would exceed the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Protective Action Guides at the site boundary. The staff also has concluded that the HBPP Emergency Plan, with the exemptions described in its safety evaluation (ADAMS Accession No. ML13016A210), provides for an acceptable level of emergency preparedness at the HBPP facility in its shutdown and defueled condition, and also provides reasonable assurance that adequate protective measures can and will be taken in the event of a radiological emergency at the HBPP facility. Additionally, the proposed action will involve no construction or major renovation of any buildings or structures, no ground disturbing activities, no alteration to land or neither air quality, nor any effect on historic and cultural resources. The proposed action will not significantly increase the probability or consequences of accidents, no changes are being made in the types of any effluents that may be released offsite, and there is no significant increase in occupational or public radiation exposure. Therefore, there are no significant radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

With regard to potential non-radiological impacts, there will be no construction or renovation of buildings or structures, or any ground-disturbing activities associated with the exemptions. In addition, the proposed action does not affect non-radiological plant effluents and has no other environmental impact. Finally, there will be no impact on historic sites.

Therefore, there are no significant non-radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

Accordingly, the NRC staff concludes 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 NRC staff considered denial of the proposed action (i.e., the "no-action" alternative). Denial of the exemption request would result in no change in current environmental impacts because there will be no construction or major renovation of any buildings or structures, nor any ground disturbing activities associated. Thus the environmental impacts of the proposed action and no-action alternative are similar. Therefore, the no-action alternative is not further considered.

#### *Conclusion*

The NRC staff has concluded that the proposed action will not significantly impact the quality of the human environment, and that the proposed action is the preferred alternative.

#### *Agencies and Persons Consulted*

The NRC contacted the California Radiologic Health Branch in the State Department of Health Services concerning this request. There were no comments, concerns or objections from the State official.

The NRC staff has determined that the proposed action is of a procedural nature, and will not affect listed species or critical habitat. Therefore, no further consultation is required under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act. The NRC staff has also determined that the proposed action is not the type of activity that has the potential to cause effects on historic properties. Therefore, no further consultation is required under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

### **III. Finding of No Significant Impact**

The NRC staff has prepared this EA as part of its review of the proposed action. On the basis of this EA, the NRC finds that there are no significant environmental impacts from the proposed action, and that preparation of an environmental impact statement is not warranted. Accordingly, the NRC has determined that a Finding of No Significant Impact is appropriate. For further details with respect to the proposed action, see the licensee's letter dated August 14, 2012.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 14th day of October, 2014.

For The Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Andrew Persinko,**

*Deputy Director, Decommissioning and Uranium Recovery Licensing Directorate, Division of Waste Management and Environmental Protection, Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs.*

[FR Doc. 2014-25345 Filed 10-23-14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

**NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

[Docket Nos.: 50-282, 50-306 and 72-10; NRC-2014-0236]

**Northern States Power Company; Prairie Island Nuclear Generating Plant; Independent Spent Fuel Storage Installation**

**AGENCY:** Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**ACTION:** Environmental assessment and finding of no significant impact; issuance.

**SUMMARY:** The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is considering issuance of an exemption for special nuclear materials (SNM) license number SNM-2506 issued initially in July 1993 and held by Northern States Power Company, a Minnesota corporation (NSPM or the licensee) doing business as Xcel Energy, for the operation of the Prairie Island Nuclear Generating Plant (PINGP) independent spent fuel storage installation (ISFSI).

**ADDRESSES:** Please refer to Docket ID NRC-2014-0236 when contacting the NRC about the availability of information regarding this document. You may obtain publicly-available information related to this document using any of the following methods:

- *Federal Rulemaking Web site:* Go to <http://www.regulations.gov> and search for Docket ID NRC-2014-0236. Address questions about NRC dockets to Carol Gallagher; telephone: 301-287-3422; email: [Carol.Gallagher@nrc.gov](mailto:Carol.Gallagher@nrc.gov).

- *NRC's Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS):* You may obtain publicly available documents online in the ADAMS Public Documents collection at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html>. To begin the search, select "ADAMS Public Documents" and then select "Begin Web-based ADAMS Search." For problems with ADAMS, please contact the NRC's Public Document Room (PDR) reference staff at 1-800-397-4209, 301-415-4737, or by email to [pdr.resource@nrc.gov](mailto:pdr.resource@nrc.gov). The

ADAMS accession number for each document referenced in this document (if that document is available in ADAMS) is provided the first time that a document is referenced. The request for exemption dated July 11, 2013, is available under ADAMS accession no. ML13193A088.

- *NRC's PDR:* You may examine and purchase copies of public documents at the NRC's PDR, Room O1-F21, One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland 20852.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Pamela Longmire, Ph.D., Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001; telephone: 301-287-0829; email:

[Pamela.Longmire@nrc.gov](mailto:Pamela.Longmire@nrc.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**I. Introduction**

The NRC is considering issuance of an exemption for license number SNM-2506 held by NSPM pursuant to section 73.5 of Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR), "Specific exemptions," from specific portions of the requirements of 10 CFR 73.51, "Requirements for the physical protection of stored spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste," for the Prairie Island Independent Spent Fuel Storage Installation (ISFSI). Based on the results of the EA that follows, the NRC has determined not to prepare an environmental impact statement for the exemption, and is issuing a finding of no significant impact.

**II. Environmental Assessment**

*Background*

The licensee possesses a specific license under 10 CFR Part 72, for the storage of spent fuel in an ISFSI. The licensee is subject to 10 CFR 73.51(d)(3), which provides in part that "[t]he perimeter of the protected area must be subject to continual surveillance and be protected by an active intrusion alarm system which is capable of detecting penetrations through the isolation zone and that is monitored in a continually staffed primary alarm station and in one additional continually staffed location. The primary alarm station must be located within the protected area; have bullet-resisting walls, doors, ceiling and floor; and the interior of the station must not be visible from outside the protected area. A timely means for assessment of alarms must also be provided. Regarding alarm monitoring, the redundant location need only provide a summary indication that an alarm has been generated."

*Description of the Proposed Action*

In a letter dated May 16, 2013 (ADAMS accession no. ML13140A105), NSPM requests an exemption from the requirement in 10 CFR 73.51(d)(3). The proposed exemption request pertains to the location of the primary alarm station. In the preparation of this EA, the staff used guidance in NUREG-1748, "Environmental Review Guidance for Licensing Actions Associated with NMSS Programs" (ADAMS accession no. ML032450279).

*Need for the Proposed Action*

NSPM seeks relief from a provision of 10 CFR 73.51(d)(3) with regard to the location of the primary alarm station. NSPM maintains that the proposed exemption facilitates effective security activities at both the Prairie Island power station and the ISFSI, in that the exemption would provide uniformity and consistency in managing security at the collocated sites.

*Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action*

The NRC staff evaluated the exemption request in greater detail in its safety evaluation report (SER). The SER is withheld from public disclosure in accordance with 10 CFR 2.390 because it contains security information.

The NRC has determined that issuance of the proposed exemption will have no significant environmental impact. Additionally, the NRC has concluded that the Prairie Island physical security plan, should the Commission issue the requested exemption, will continue to provide high assurance that activities involving spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste do not constitute an unreasonable risk to public health and safety, pursuant to 10 CFR 73.51(b)(1).

The proposed action will not have any environmental impact. It will not increase the probability or consequences of accidents. No changes are being made in the types or quantities of effluents that may be released offsite, and there is no significant increase in occupational or public radiation exposure. Therefore, there are no significant radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action. The proposed action does not affect non-radiological effluents and has no other environmental impacts. Thus, there are no significant non-radiological impacts associated with the proposed action. Therefore, the proposed action will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment. Based on these findings, the NRC concludes that there are no significant