

temporary item). Master files of an electronic information system used to track administrative forms.

Dated: November 12, 2010.

**Michael J. Kurtz,**

*Assistant Archivist for Records Services—  
Washington, DC.*

[FR Doc. 2010-29233 Filed 11-17-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7515-01-P

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-341; NRC-2010-0357;  
FERMI, Unit 2]

### **Detroit Edison Company; Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact**

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is considering issuance of an exemption from Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR) part 20 Appendix G, Section III.E, for Facility Operating License No. NFP-43, issued to Detroit Edison Company (DECo, the licensee), for operation of Fermi, Unit 2 (Fermi-2) located in Monroe County, Michigan. Therefore, as required by 10 CFR 51.21, the NRC performed an environmental assessment. Based on the results of the environmental assessment, the NRC is issuing a finding of no significant impact.

### **Environmental Assessment**

#### *Identification of the Proposed Action*

The proposed action would grant an exemption to extend the time period that can elapse during shipments of low-level radioactive waste before the licensee is required to investigate and file a report with the NRC. Specifically, the exemption would extend the time period for the licensee to receive acknowledgment that the low-level radioactive waste shipment has been received by the intended recipient from 20 days to 35 days.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application for an exemption dated February 5, 2010. The licensee has requested an exemption from certain control and tracking requirements in 10 CFR part 20, Appendix G, Section III.E, which require the licensee to investigate, and file a report with the NRC, if shipments of low-level radioactive waste are not acknowledged by the intended recipient within 20 days after transfer to the shipper.

#### *The Need for the Proposed Action*

DECo anticipates the increased use of rail as the method to ship radioactive

waste. The licensee has experience with rail shipments from the Fermi-1 decommissioning project. Those rail shipments typically took more than 20 days to reach their destination in Clive, Utah. On April 26, 2010, the NRC granted a similar exemption extending the time period from 20 days to 35 days for radioactive shipments from Fermi-1 based on historical data submitted in support of that exemption request.

The licensee believes, and the NRC staff agrees, that the need to investigate, trace, and report to the NRC on the shipment of low-level waste packages not reaching their destination within 20 days does not serve the underlying purpose of the rule. The Commission finds that the underlying purpose of the Appendix G timing provision at issue is to investigate a late shipment that may be lost, misdirected or diverted. Furthermore, by extending the elapsed time for receipt acknowledgement to 35 days before requiring investigations and reporting, a reasonable upper limit on shipment duration (based on historical analysis) is still maintained if a breakdown of normal tracking systems were to occur. Therefore, the NRC staff finds that granting an exemption to extend the time period from 20 days to 35 days for mixed-mode or truck/rail or rail shipments of low-level radioactive waste will not result in an undue hazard to life or property.

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

The NRC has completed its environmental assessment of the proposed action and concludes that the proposed action is procedural and administrative in nature. The staff has concluded that the changes would not significantly affect plant safety and would not have a significant adverse effect on the probability of an accident occurring. The proposed action would not result in an increased radiological hazard beyond those previously analyzed in the Updated Safety Analysis Report. There will be no change to radioactive effluents that affect radiation exposures to plant workers and members of the public. No changes will be made to plant buildings or the site property. Therefore, no changes or different types of radiological impacts are expected as a result of the proposed changes.

The proposed action does not result in changes to land use or water use, or result in changes to the quality or quantity of non-radiological effluents. No changes to the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System permit are needed. No effects on the aquatic or terrestrial habitat in the vicinity of the

plant, or to threatened, endangered, or protected species under the Endangered Species Act, or impacts to essential fish habitat covered by the Magnuson-Stevens Act are expected. There are no impacts to the air or ambient air quality. There are no impacts to historical and cultural resources. There would be no noticeable effect on socioeconomic conditions in the region. Therefore, no changes or different types of non-radiological environmental impacts are expected as a result of the proposed action. Accordingly, the NRC concludes that there are no significant environmental impacts associated with the proposed action. The details of the NRC staff's safety evaluation will be provided in the exemption issued as part of the letter to the licensee approving the exemption to the regulation, if granted.

#### *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 application would result in no change in current environmental impacts. The environmental impacts of the proposed action and the alternative action are similar.

#### *Alternative Use of Resources*

The action does not involve the use of any different resources than those previously considered in the Final Environmental Statement for the Enrico Fermi Atomic Power Plant, Unit 2, NUREG-0769, dated August 1981, as supplemented with Addendum No. 1 in March 1982.

#### *Agencies and Persons Consulted*

In accordance with its stated policy, on September 21, 2010, the NRC staff consulted with the State official, Mr. Ken Yale, of the Michigan Department of Natural Resources and Environment regarding the environmental impact of the proposed action. The State official had no comments.

### **Finding of No Significant Impact**

On the basis of the environmental assessment, the NRC concludes that the proposed action will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment. Accordingly, the NRC has determined not to prepare an environmental impact statement for the proposed action.

For further details with respect to the proposed action, see the licensee's letter dated February 5, 2010 (Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS) Accession No.

ML100430349). Documents may be examined, and/or copied for a fee, at the NRC's Public Document Room (PDR), located at One White Flint North, Public File Area O1 F21, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland. Publicly available records will be accessible electronically from the ADAMS Public Electronic Reading Room on the Internet at the NRC Web site, <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html>. Persons who do not have access to ADAMS or who encounter problems in accessing the documents located in ADAMS should contact the NRC PDR Reference staff by telephone at 1-800-397-4209 or 301-415-4737, or send an e-mail to [pdr.resource@nrc.gov](mailto:pdr.resource@nrc.gov).

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 3rd day of November, 2010.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Mahesh L. Chawla,**

*Project Manager, Plant Licensing Branch III-1, Division of Operating Reactor Licensing, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 2010-29114 Filed 11-17-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-255; NRC-2010-0356]

### Palisades Nuclear Plant; Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating License, Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity for a Hearing

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC, the Commission) is considering issuance of an amendment to Facility Operating License No. DPR-20 issued to Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc. (the licensee) for operation of the Palisades Nuclear Plant (PNP) located in Van Buren County, Michigan.

The proposed amendment would revise Section 2.E. of the PNP Renewed Facility Operating License. The change would remove the name of the former operator of the plant in the title of the PNP physical security plan and replace it with Entergy Nuclear. The change would also remove the security plan revision number and the date the plan was submitted to the NRC.

Before issuance of the proposed license amendment, the Commission will have made findings required by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), and the Commission's regulations.

The Commission has made a proposed determination that the amendment request involves 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. 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.

The proposed license amendment corrects the out-of-date title, removes the revision number, and removes the submittal date of the Palisades Nuclear Plant (PNP) physical security plan in section 2.E. of the Renewed Facility Operating License. The proposed amendment does not involve operation of plant structures, systems, or components (SSC) in a manner or configuration different from those previously recognized or evaluated.

The proposed change in section 2.E. of the Renewed Facility Operating License is administrative and has no impact on plant operation or equipment.

Therefore, operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would 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 license amendment does not involve a physical alteration of any SSC or change the way any SSC is operated. The proposed license amendment does not involve operation of any SSC in a manner or configuration different from those previously recognized or evaluated.

The proposed change in section 2.E. of the Renewed Facility Operating License is administrative and has no impact on plant operation or equipment.

Therefore, the proposed Renewed Facility Operating License change does 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.

The proposed modification of section 2.E. of the Renewed Facility Operating License is administrative and has no impact on plant operation or equipment or on any margins of safety.

Therefore, the proposed TS 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.

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.

*Addresses:* You may submit comments by any one of the following methods. Please include Docket ID NRC-2010-0356 in the subject line of your comments. Comments submitted in writing or in electronic form will be posted on the NRC Web site and on the Federal Rulemaking Web site [Regulations.gov](http://www.Regulations.gov). Because your comments will not be edited to remove any identifying or contact information, the NRC cautions you against including any information in your submission that you do not want to be publicly disclosed.

The NRC requests that any party soliciting or aggregating comments received from other persons for submission to the NRC inform those persons that the NRC will not edit their comments to remove any identifying or contact information, and therefore, they should not include any information in