

of protection to all miners at the Bailey Mine as would be provided by the existing standard.

Dated: December 20, 2010.

**Patricia W. Silvey,**

*Director, Office of Standards, Regulations and Variances.*

[FR Doc. 2010-32355 Filed 12-23-10; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4510-43-P**

## NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

### Earth Sciences Proposal Review Panel; Notice of Meeting

In accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92-463, as amended), the National Science Foundation announces the following meeting.

*Name:* Proposal Review Panel in Earth Sciences (1569).

*Date and Time:* January 13, 2011, 8:30 a.m.–5 p.m.; January 14, 2011, 8:30 a.m.–4 p.m.

*Place:* UNAVCO, Inc. Headquarters, 67350 Nautilus Drive, Boulder, CO 80301-5554.

*Type of Meeting:* Part Open.

*Contact Person:* Mr. Russell Kelz, Program Director, Instrumentation & Facilities Program, Division of Earth Sciences, Room 785, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Blvd., Arlington, VA 22230; Telephone: (703) 292-8558.

*Purpose of Meeting:* To carry out review of UNAVCO, Inc. management and leadership as stipulated in cooperative agreement EAR-0735156.

### Agenda

#### *Closed:*

January 13, 2011—8:30 a.m.–9:30 a.m.: organization meeting, introductions, review of charge to review panel, discussion of COI.

January 13, 2011—1 p.m.–5 p.m.: panel discussion, write up of summary of findings and recommendations.

January 14, 2011—8:30 a.m.–3:30 p.m.: complete panel summary and recommendations.

#### *Open:*

January 13, 2011—9:30 a.m.–12:00 p.m.: Presentation by UNAVCO, Inc. management and Q&A between panel and UNAVCO, Inc.

January 14, 2011—3:30 a.m.–4 p.m.: Presentation of panel draft findings to NSF/EAR/IF Program.

*Reason for Closing:* During the closed sessions, the panel will be reviewing information of a proprietary or confidential nature, including technical information, financial data such as salaries, and personal information that could harm individuals if they are

disclosed. If discussions were open to the public, these matters that are exempt under 5 U.S.C. 552b(c), (4) and (6) of the Government in the Sunshine Act would be improperly disclosed.

Dated: December 21, 2010,

**Susanne Bolton,**

*Committee Management Officer.*

[FR Doc. 2010-32408 Filed 12-23-10; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7555-01-P**

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[NRC-2010-0322]

### Agency Information Collection Activities: Submission for the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Review; Comment Request

**AGENCY:** U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC).

**ACTION:** Notice of the OMB review of information collection and solicitation of public comment.

**SUMMARY:** The NRC has recently submitted to OMB for review the following proposal for the collection of information under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. chapter 35). The NRC hereby informs potential respondents that an agency may not conduct or sponsor, and that a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number. The NRC published a **Federal Register** Notice with a 60-day comment period on this information collection on October 18, 2010.

1. *Type of submission, new, revision, or extension:* Extension.

2. *The title of the information collection:* 10 CFR part 70, "Domestic Licensing of Special Nuclear Material."

3. *Current OMB approval number:* 3150-0009.

4. *The form number if applicable:* N/A.

5. *How often the collection is required:* Required reports are collected and evaluated on a continuing basis as events occur. Applications for new licenses and amendments may be submitted at any time. Generally, renewal applications are submitted every ten years and for major fuel cycle facilities updates of the safety demonstration section are submitted every two years. Nuclear material control and accounting information is submitted in accordance with specified instructions.

6. *Who will be required or asked to report:* Applicants for and holders of specific NRC licenses to receive title to,

own, acquire, deliver, receive, possess, use, or initially transfer special nuclear material.

7. *An estimate of the number of annual responses:* 1,256 (655 responses + 601 recordkeepers).

8. *The estimated number of annual respondents:* 372.

9. *An estimate of the total number of hours needed annually to complete the requirement or request:* 89,465 hours (81,785 reporting + 7,700 recordkeeping) or an average of 125 hours per response (81,765 reporting burden hours/655 responses) and an average of 13 hours per recordkeeper (7,700 recordkeeping burden hours/601 recordkeepers).

10. *Abstract:* 10 CFR part 70 establishes requirements for licenses to own, acquire, receive, possess, use, and transfer special nuclear material. The information in the applications, reports, and records is used by NRC to make licensing and other regulatory determinations concerning the use of special nuclear material.

Submit, by February 25, 2011, comments that address the following questions:

A copy of the final supporting statement may be viewed free of charge at the NRC Public Document Room, One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Room O-1 F21, Rockville, MD 20852. OMB clearance requests are available at the NRC worldwide Web site: <http://www.nrc.gov/public-involve/doc-comment/omb/index.html>. The document will be available on the NRC home page site for 60 days after the signature date of this notice.

Comments and questions should be directed to the OMB reviewer listed below by January 26, 2011. Comments received after this date will be considered if it is practical to do so, but assurance of consideration cannot be given to comments received after this date.

Christine J. Kymn, Desk Officer, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs (3150-0009), NEOB-10202, Office of Management and Budget, Washington, DC 20503.

Comments can also be e-mailed to [Christine.J.Kymn@omb.eop.gov](mailto:Christine.J.Kymn@omb.eop.gov) or submitted by telephone at 202-395-4638.

The NRC Clearance Officer is Tremaine Donnell, 301-415-6258.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 20th day of December, 2010.

**Tremaine Donnell,**

*NRC Clearance Officer, Office of Information Services.*

[FR Doc. 2010-32423 Filed 12-23-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-341]

### **Detroit Edison Company; FERMI 2; 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 50, appendix E, Section IV.F.2.b, for conducting a biennial emergency preparedness exercise for Facility Operating License No. NFP-43, issued to Detroit Edison Company (the licensee), for operation of 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 is in accordance with the licensee's application dated August 3, 2010, as supplemented by letters dated October 22, 2010, and November 15, 2010. Following a telephone conference with the NRC staff on September 17, 2010, the licensee determined the postponement of the exercise into calendar year 2011 to be an acceptable option to the licensee's original request for crediting the response to a tornado event on June 6, 2010, in place of the 2010 exercise.

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

Detroit Edison's Fermi 2 biennial evaluated exercise was scheduled to be conducted on June 8, 2010. However, on June 6, 2010 at 0217 hours, a tornado warning was issued for Monroe County due to a storm front moving through southeast Michigan. At 0238 hours, a tornado swept across the Fermi 2 property. At 0253 hours, the Shift Manager declared an Unusual Event based on reports of storm damage within the protected area, including loss of both 345kV lines for Division 2 of offsite power supply, and the loss of two out of three 120kV lines for Division 1 of offsite power supply.

Review of the actions that occurred during the June 6, 2010 actual event supplemented by the drills, exercises, and other training activities conducted since the previous biennial exercise, provides evidence that Fermi 2 has regularly exercised its emergency response strategies and personnel in coordination with the offsite authorities as required by regulations. In addition, due to a refueling outage during the fourth quarter of 2010, an alternative to schedule and conduct a biennial exercise in 2010 was ruled out by the licensee.

The proposed action would exempt Fermi 2 from the requirements of conducting a biennial emergency preparedness exercise in the calendar year 2010 and postpone it into the calendar year 2011. Granting an exemption from the requirement of conducting the biennial exercise will not pose an undue risk to public health and safety and will ensure that focus is maintained on plant safety and security.

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

The NRC staff has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that the proposed action is an exemption from the requirements of conducting a biennial emergency preparedness exercise. Whether or not the exercise is conducted would have no effect on the environment since any outdoor activity during an exercise is limited to minimal use of roads and highways. The staff has concluded that the changes would not significantly affect plant safety. 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.

There are no federal permits, licenses, approvals and other entitlements which must be obtained in connection with the proposed action. The proposed action is not subject to any environmental quality standards or requirements imposed by Federal, State, regional, or local agencies having responsibility for environmental protection.

The details of the 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.

The proposed action will not significantly increase the probability or consequences of accidents. No changes are being made in the types of effluents that may be released offsite. There is no significant increase in the amount of any effluent released offsite. 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, the proposed action does not have any foreseeable impacts to land, air, or water resources, including impacts to biota. In addition, there are no known socioeconomic or environmental justice impacts associated with such proposed action. Therefore, there are no significant non-radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

Accordingly, the NRC 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 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 November 22, 2010, the 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.