

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**  
Mary Rupp, Secretary of the Board,  
Telephone: 703-518-6304.

**Mary Rupp,**  
*Board Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 2010-5709 Filed 3-11-10; 4:15 pm]

**BILLING CODE P**

## NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

### Notice of Permits Issued Under the Antarctic Conservation Act of 1978

**AGENCY:** National Science Foundation.

**ACTION:** Notice of permits issued under the Antarctic Conservation of 1978, Public Law 95-541.

**SUMMARY:** The National Science Foundation (NSF) is required to publish notice of permits issued under the Antarctic Conservation Act of 1978. This is the required notice.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**  
Nadene G. Kennedy, Permit Office,  
Office of Polar Programs, Rm. 755,  
National Science Foundation, 4201  
Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, VA 22230.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** On February 8, 2010, the National Science Foundation published a notice in the *Federal Register* of permit applications received. A permit was issued on March 10, 2010 to: H. William Detrich, III, Permit No. 2010-023.

**Nadene G. Kennedy,**  
*Permit Officer.*

[FR Doc. 2010-5579 Filed 3-12-10; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7555-01-P**

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-346]

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

**AGENCY:** Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating License, Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity for a Hearing; Correction.

**SUMMARY:** This document corrects a notice appearing in the *Federal Register* on February 22, 2010 (75 FR 7628), which incorrectly stated a docket

number. This action is necessary to correct the docket number.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**  
Michael Mahoney, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001; telephone (301) 415-3867, e-mail *michael.mahoney@nrc.gov*.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** On page 7628, in the 3rd column under Nuclear Regulatory Commission, first line, it is corrected to read from "Docket No. 50-341" to "Docket No. 50-346."

Dated in Rockville, Maryland, this 5th day of March 2010.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Michael Mahoney,**  
*Project Manager, Plant Licensing Branch III-2, Division of Operating Reactor Licensing, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 2010-5559 Filed 3-12-10; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7590-01-P**

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-271; NRC-2010-0100]

### Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc.; Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is considering issuance of an exemption, pursuant to Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations (10 CFR) section 73.5, "Specific exemptions," from the implementation date for certain new requirements of 10 CFR part 73, "Physical protection of plants and materials," for Facility Operating License No. DPR-28, issued to Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc. (Entergy or the licensee), for operation of Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station (Vermont Yankee), located in Windham County, Vermont. Therefore, as required by 10 CFR 51.21, the NRC prepared an environmental assessment documenting its finding. The NRC concluded that the proposed actions will have no significant impact.

#### Environmental Assessment

##### Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed action would exempt Vermont Yankee from the required implementation date of March 31, 2010, for several new requirements of 10 CFR part 73. Specifically, Vermont Yankee would be granted an exemption from being in full compliance with certain new requirements contained in 10 CFR 73.55 by the March 31, 2010, deadline. Entergy has proposed an alternate full compliance implementation date of

September 20, 2010, approximately 5½ months beyond the date required by 10 CFR part 73. The proposed action, an extension of the schedule for completion of certain actions required by the revised 10 CFR part 73, does not involve any physical changes to the reactor, fuel, plant structures, water, or land at the Vermont Yankee site.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application dated January 21, 2010, as supplemented by letter dated February 17, 2010.

#### The Need for the Proposed Action

The proposed action is needed to provide the licensee with additional time to perform the required upgrades to the Vermont Yankee security system due to resource and logistical impacts and other factors.

The licensee has requested a scheduler exemption to the compliance date identified in 10 CFR 73.55(a)(1) to implement the specific requirements stated in 10 CFR 73.55(e)(7)(i)(B) and 10 CFR 73.55(i)(4)(i) for Vermont Yankee. The request for an exemption from March 31, 2010, implementation date to September 20, 2010, is based on completion of installation as well as testing and training of security personnel on the new features. This exemption will provide Vermont Yankee sufficient time for installation, testing, and training activities to be completed, considering initial permit delays, inclement winter weather construction delays and procurement delays.

#### Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The NRC has completed its environmental assessment of the proposed exemption. The staff has concluded that the proposed action to extend the implementation deadline 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 environmental assessment and finding of no significant impact made by the Commission in promulgating its revisions to 10 CFR part 73 as discussed in a *Federal Register* notice dated March 27, 2009 (74 FR 13967). There will be no change to radioactive effluents that affect radiation exposures to plant workers and members of the public. Therefore, no changes or different types of radiological impacts are expected as a result of the proposed exemption.