associated with a transformation effort for your pro bono program:

- The estimated total project cost. This includes the estimate for the Pro Bono Innovation Fund requested amount and other in-kind or cash contributions to support the project. Your narrative should provide a breakdown of the major project expenses including, but not limited to, personnel, project expenses, contracts or sub-grants, etc., and how each expense supports the transformation effort to improve your pro bono program.
- For expenses related to personnel, please indicate how many and which positions will be fully or partially funded by the proposed grant.
- For contracts, please describe whether you intend to use consultants, implement new technology systems, conduct business process analysis, etc. and how this supports improvements to your pro bono program.

3. Sustainability Grants

The LOI Narrative for Sustainability Grants should respond to the following questions.

a. Justification for Sustaining the Pro Bono Innovation Project. Please describe why you are seeking a Sustainability Grant. In your response, please discuss the following:

- The impact of the Pro Bono Innovation Fund project to date, supported by data and analysis as to whether the goals of the project were achieved.
- Evidence of ongoing client need and how you intend to make the project part of your core legal services.
- The level of engagement of pro bono volunteers/private bar and the best practices in pro bono delivery that can be replicated by others.
- How ongoing program evaluation and data collection will be incorporated into the project.

b. Project Staff and Management Support. Please briefly identify and describe the project team and project partners. In your response, please include the following:

- The project staff that will be responsible for the sustainability phase of the project. Please include any additional staff, descriptions of new responsibilities for existing project staff and/or organizational changes that will be made.
- The role of your organization’s executive management in the decision to seek this Sustainability Grant and recent examples of your organization’s track record turning “new” or special projects into core legal services.

c. Budget and Strategy to Reduce PBIF Funding. Please describe what you would like the Sustainability Grant to fund. In your response, please be sure to provide the following information:

- Estimated total project cost. This includes the estimate for the Pro Bono Innovation Fund requested amount and other in-kind or cash contributions to support the project. Your narrative should provide a breakdown of the major project expenses including, but not limited to, personnel, project expenses, etc., and how each expense supports the project design.
- A narrative proposing how you plan to reduce the Pro Bono Innovation Fund contribution to the project for the grant term. LSC is not setting a specific percentage of required match for Sustainability Grant applicants, but will assess the two-year budget from the applicant’s previously funded project with the grant amount proposed in the Sustainability LOI. LSC’s expectation is that applicants will propose a meaningful shift from Pro Bono Innovation Fund support to other sources of support during the grant term.
- A narrative discussing the potential sources of funding that have been or will be cultivated. If the project has already received new financial support, please provide the source and amount committed and further describe the plans for ensuring continued financial support.

Dated: December 4, 2019.

Stefanie Davis,
Senior Assistant General Counsel.
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NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 040–08903; NRC–2019–0186]

Homestake Mining Company of California; Grants Reclamation Project

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

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

SUMMARY: The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is issuing an environmental assessment (EA) and a finding of no significant impact (FONSI) regarding a request from Homestake Mining Company (HMC) of California for approval of an amendment to HMC Radioactive Materials License SUA–1471 to add zeolite water treatment systems. HMC is authorized to manage a groundwater restoration program to restore the concentrations of the constituents of concern to the acceptable groundwater standards at its Grants Reclamation Project site in Milan, New Mexico, under NRC License SUA–1471, issued originally in 1988.

DATES: The EA referenced in this document is available on December 10, 2019.

ADDRESSES: Please refer to Docket ID NRC–2019–0186 when contacting the NRC about the availability of

Contact Person: Dr. Christopher Davis, Program Director, Division of Astronomical Sciences, Suite W 9136, National Science Foundation, 2415 Eisenhower Avenue, Alexandria, VA 22314; Telephone: 703–292–4910.

Purpose of Meeting: To provide advice and recommendations to the National Science Foundation (NSF), the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) and the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) on issues within the field of astronomy and astrophysics that are of mutual interest and concern to the agencies.

Agenda: To hear presentations of current programming by representatives from NSF, NASA, DOE and other agencies relevant to astronomy and astrophysics; to discuss current and potential areas of cooperation between the agencies; to formulate recommendations for continued and new areas of cooperation and mechanisms for achieving them. Discuss the Committee’s draft annual report due 15 March 2020.

Dated: December 5, 2019.

Crystal Robinson.
Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 2019–26585 Filed 12–9–19; 8:45 am]
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I. Introduction

By letter dated December 11, 2017 (ADAMS Package Accession No. ML17361A006), Homestake Mining Company of California (HMC) or the licensee) requested NRC approval of HMC’s license amendment to modify its License No. SUA–1471, Condition 35. The request includes the addition of a zeolite water treatment system for the removal of low levels of uranium from contaminated groundwater as part of the approved groundwater corrective action program (CAP) at the Grants Reclamation Projects site. The CAP is authorized under NRC License No. SUA–1471, Condition 35.C and is implemented using an adaptive, ongoing strategy that includes monitoring, water management, water treatment, and source control. The Grants Reclamation Project site is located near Milan, New Mexico and is owned and operated by HMC. The NRC staff has prepared an EA (ADAMS Accession No. ML19263C623) as part of its review of this proposed action in accordance with the requirements in part 51 of title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations (10 CFR), “Environmental Protection Regulations for Domestic Licensing and Related Regulatory Functions” and associated staff guidance. The NRC has concluded that the proposed action will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment.

II. Summary of the Environmental Assessment

Description of the Proposed Action

The proposed action is to review and approve the request for modification of the CAP by amending License No. SUA–1471, Condition 35, to add the 300 gpm and 1200 gpm zeolite water treatment systems to increase the water treatment capacity. Pilot testing of the zeolite water treatment systems was performed by the licensee to verify the effectiveness of the treatment system in order to accelerate the groundwater restoration. As part of the pilot test, the 300 gpm and 1200 gpm zeolite treatment systems were installed and are currently in use.

Need for the Proposed Action

By letter dated December 11, 2017, the licensee notified the NRC of its proposal to formally add zeolite groundwater treatment systems to its CAP. Expanded groundwater treatment capacity is needed to accelerate groundwater restoration at the Grants site. Use of the zeolite water treatment system, in addition to reverse osmosis, will allow HMC to meet its NRC-mandated water remediation goals.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The NRC staff evaluated the potential environmental impacts associated with the proposed action and has performed its environmental review in accordance with the requirements in 10 CFR part 51 and associated staff guidance. As detailed in the EA, the staff reviewed relevant information submitted by the licensee and consulted with the New Mexico State Historic Preservation Office (NMSHPO), the Hopi of Arizona, Navajo Nation, Pueblo of Acoma, Pueblo of Isleta, Pueblo of Laguna, and Pueblo of Zuni. The NRC staff, with the assistance of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) Information for Planning and Consultation (IPAC) project planning tool, determined that the listed species and/or critical habitat would not be adversely affected by the proposed action. Additionally, a draft EA was shared with New Mexico Environment Department (NMED).

During the pilot study, HMC constructed the 300 gpm and 1200 gpm zeolite systems in a previously and highly disturbed area within the licensed site boundary, and no further activities involving land disturbance are planned. Therefore, the NRC staff considers that there would be no impacts on the following resources areas: land use, geology and soils, water resources, ecology, meteorology, climate, air quality, noise, transportation, waste management, visual and scenic resources, and socioeconomic resources.

The NRC staff evaluated the radiological impacts on workers and the public. The staff found that the radiological doses to workers would be within the dose limits specified in 10 CFR 20.1201, “Occupational dose limits to adults,” and that radiological doses to the public would be indistinguishable when compared to background radiation.

The NRC staff also evaluated the cumulative impacts by identifying past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions at the Grants site, and the incremental impacts of HMC’s proposed action. The staff determined that the proposed action would not significantly contribute to cumulative impacts. The staff also determined that the proposed action would not affect federally listed endangered or threatened species or their critical habitats, if present.

Environmental Impacts of the Alternatives to the Proposed Action

The NRC staff considered a no-action alternative for this EA. Under the no-action alternative, the NRC staff could deny HMC’s request to add the zeolite water system at its Grants site. However, because HMC is using the zeolite system under a pilot test, the NRC considers the environmental impacts of this alternative to be similar to those of the proposed action. Therefore, staff concluded that denying the addition of the zeolite systems to HMC’s license is not a reasonable alternative.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In August 2018, the NRC staff accessed the USFWS IPaC online project planning tool and determined that, while there was potential for some threatened or endangered species to be present in the general area, there is no critical habitat at the project location. Therefore, the NRC has determined that further consultations with the USFWS is required under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act. By letter dated
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In July 2019, the NRC provided the NMED with the opportunity to review the draft EA (ADAMS Accession No. ML19196A071) and requested NMED input. On August 12, 2019 the NMED responded by email (ADAMS Accession No. ML19225B308) that they had reviewed the draft EA with one comment and no other concerns with the NRC’s EA findings. The NRC addressed NMED’s comment in the final EA (ADAMS Accession Number ML19263C623).

III. Finding of No Significant Impact

In accordance with the requirements in 10 CFR part 51, the NRC staff has concluded that the proposed action will not significantly affect the quality of the human environment. Therefore, the staff finds, pursuant to 10 CFR 51.31, that preparation of an environmental impact statement is not required for the proposed action, and that a FONSI is appropriate.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 4th day of December 2019.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Cinthya I. Roman-Cuevas,

NRC’s public reference staff at 1–800–397–4209, 301–415–4737, or by email to pdr.resource@nrc.gov. The ADAMS accession number for each document referenced (if it is available in ADAMS) is provided in the document.


Supplementary Information: Notice is hereby given that the NRC has issued Subsequent Renewed Facility Operating License Nos. DPR–31 and DPR–41 to Florida Power & Light Company (FPL or licensee), the operator of Turkey Point Nuclear Generating Unit Nos. 3 and 4 (Turkey Point). Subsequent Renewed Facility Operating License No. DPR–31 authorizes operation of Turkey Point Unit 3 through July 19, 2052, by the licensee at reactor core power levels not in excess of 2,644 megawatts thermal, in accordance with the provisions of the Turkey Point 3 operating license and technical specifications. Subsequent Renewed Facility Operating License No. DPR–41 authorizes operation of Turkey Point Unit 4 through April 10, 2053, by the licensee at reactor core power levels not in excess of 2,644 megawatts thermal, in accordance with the provisions of the Turkey Point 4 operating license and technical specifications. The NRC’s ROD that