

a requirement that each procurement action, above a reasonable level, be fully documented by maintaining the bids received and the approvals given. This would include written justification for sole source purchases above a certain level. *Response:* In response to this comment a new No. 12 has been added to Appendix D, incorporating the suggestion.

Another LSC OIG comment questioned what “properly executed” means in Appendix VII E (Legal Consultants/Contract Services.) *Response:* In response to this comment we have changed No. 2. in Legal Consultants/Contract Services from “Are contracts written so that the services to be rendered are clearly defined and properly executed?” to the following three sentences: “Are contracts written so that the services to be rendered are clearly defined?”; “Are contracts properly signed by authorized persons?” and “Have all contract terms and modifications been complied with?”

An LSC OIG comment suggested adding to Appendix VII G1 No. 7 that the check should be marked as void or defaced in a manner that would prevent future use of the check. *Response:* In response to this comment Appendix VII G1 No. 7 has been changed to include the recommended language.

An LSC OIG comment pointed out that there was no reference in Appendix VII H (Controls Over Cash Receipts) to cash received from an individual while in the office, as opposed to receiving money through the mail. *Response:* In response to this comment, we have added new Nos. 8–12 in Appendix VII H, to include the questions addressing cash received from an individual while in the office.

The LSC OIG also commented that No. 15 should provide that the client is entitled to a receipt for cash provided and that if a receipt is not provided that the client should see a supervisor. *Response:* In response to this comment Appendix VII H No. 15 was changed to include the recommended language.

A comment received from the Legal Aid and Defender Association, Detroit, Michigan, questions the segregation of duties guidelines found in Appendix VII, Section J (Segregation of Duties). There is a fear that if duties were assigned to staff outside the accounting department, this staff person may have access to confidential information. *Response:* Appendix VII J contains guidelines for the management of a recipient’s financial systems. The objective of Section J is to provide the maximum safeguards possible under the circumstances. Accounting duties should be segregated to ensure that no

individual simultaneously has both the physical control and the record keeping responsibility for any asset, including, but not limited to, cash, client deposits, supplies and property. Duties must be segregated so that no individual can initiate, execute, and record a transaction without a second independent individual being involved in the process. In response to this comment and to clarify the inquiry, we have changed the question to: “Are checks, after being signed, controlled and mailed out by an individual who does not have any other payables duties?”

An LSC OIG comment suggested that Appendix VII K (Petty Cash Controls) be changed to add procedures regarding access to and physical control over the petty cash box during and after work hours. *Response:* In response to this comment a new No. 14 has been added to Appendix VII K to include language regarding access to and physical control over the petty cash box during and after work hours.

Dated: July 13, 2010.

Victor M. Fortuno,

President, Legal Services Corporation.

[FR Doc. 2010-17737 Filed 7-21-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7050-01-P

NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS ADMINISTRATION

Advisory Committee on Presidential Library-Foundation Partnerships.

AGENCY: National Archives and Records Administration.

ACTION: Renewal of Advisory Committee on Presidential Library-Foundation Partnerships.

SUMMARY: This notice is published in accordance with the provisions of section 9(a)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92-463, 5 U.S.C., App.) and advises of the renewal of the National Archives and Records Administration’s (NARA) Advisory Committee on Presidential Library-Foundation Partnerships. In accordance with Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A-135, OMB approved the inclusion of the Advisory Committee on Presidential Library-Foundation Partnerships in NARA’s ceiling of discretionary advisory committees.

NARA has determined that the renewal of the Advisory Committee is in the public interest due to the expertise and valuable advice the Committee members provide on issues affecting the functioning of existing Presidential

libraries and library programs and the development of future Presidential libraries. NARA will use the Committee’s recommendations in its implementation of strategies for the efficient operation of the Presidential libraries.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: NARA’s Committee Management Officer is Mary Ann Hadyka. She can be reached at 301-837-1782.

Dated: July 16, 2010.

David S. Ferriero,

Archivist of the United States.

[FR Doc. 2010-17997 Filed 7-21-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7515-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-461; NRC-2010-0252]

Exelon Generation Company, LLC; Clinton Power Station; Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is considering changes to the Emergency Plan, pursuant to 10 CFR 50.54, “Conditions of licenses,” paragraph (q), for Facility Operating License No. NPF-62, issued to Exelon Generation Company, LLC (the licensee), for operation of the Clinton Power Station, located in Clinton, Illinois. In accordance with 10 CFR 51.21, the NRC prepared an environmental assessment documenting its finding. The NRC concluded that the proposed action will have no significant environmental impact.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed action is NRC approval of a licensee’s request to revise the staffing requirements for the Exelon Nuclear Radiological Emergency Plan Annex for Clinton Station, Table B-1, “Minimum Staffing Requirements for the On-Shift Clinton Station Emergency Response Organization (ERO),” to allow an increase in the Non-Licensed Operator (NLO) staffing from two to four, allow in-plant protective actions to be performed by personnel assigned other functions, and replace a Mechanical Maintenance person with a NLO. The regulation at 10 CFR 50.54(q) states that, “The nuclear power reactor licensee may make changes to these plans without Commission approval only if the changes do not decrease the effectiveness of the plans.” The licensee concluded that the proposed action constituted a decrease in the plant’s

effectiveness and has requested NRC's approval of the proposed action.

The Need for the Proposed Action

The proposed action is needed to allow an increase in NLO staffing from two to four, allow in-plant protective actions to be performed by personnel assigned other functions, and replace a Mechanical Maintenance person with a NLO. According to the licensee, increasing the number of NLO staffing improves the response of site personnel whose emergency plan role is to assist with operator and maintenance response to the emergency event and provides an increased number of personnel for repair and corrective actions.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The NRC has completed its environmental assessment of the proposed changes to the Clinton Power Station Emergency Plan. 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 effect radiation exposures to plant workers and members of the public. The proposed action is an administrative change related to plant personnel work assignments. 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 action.

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 staff's safety evaluation will be provided as part of the letter to the licensee approving issuance of the license amendment.

Environmental Impacts of the Alternatives to the Purposed Action

As an alternative to the proposed actions, the staff considered denial of the proposed actions (i.e., the "no-action" alternative). Denial of the license amendment request would result in no change in current environmental impacts. The environmental impacts of the proposed license amendment and the "no action" alternative are similar.

Alternative Use of Resources

The action does not involve the use of any different resources than those considered in the Final Environmental Statement for the Clinton Power Station, Docket No. 50-461, issued in May, 1982.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on July 7, 2010, the staff consulted with the Illinois State official, Mr. Frank Niziolek of the Illinois Emergency Management Agency, 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 April 2, 2010 (ML100950124). Documents may be examined, and/or copied for a fee, at the NRC's Public Document Room (PDR), located at One White Flint North, 1555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland 20852. Publicly available records will be accessible electronically from the Agencywide Document Access and Management System (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@nrc.gov.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 14th day of July 2010.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Nicholas DiFrancesco,

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

[FR Doc. 2010-17992 Filed 7-21-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[NRC-2010-0255]

Office of New Reactors; Proposed Revision 1 to Standard Review Plan; Section 13.5.1.1 on Administrative Procedures—General

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC).

ACTION: Solicitation of public comment.

SUMMARY: The NRC is soliciting public comment on NUREG-0800, "Standard Review Plan for the Review of Safety Analysis Reports for Nuclear Power Plants," on a proposed Revision 1 to Standard Review Plan (SRP), Section 13.5.1.1 on "Administrative Procedures—General," (Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS) Accession No. ML101340264). The Office of New Reactors (NRO) is revising SRP Section 13.5.1.1 (Enclosure 1), which updates the initial issuance of this section, dated March 2007, to reflect the changes as shown in the description of changes (ADAMS Accession No. ML101340272). The previous version of this SRP section was published in March 2007 as initial issuance (ADAMS Accession No. ML070550029).

The NRC staff issues notices to facilitate timely implementation of the current staff guidance and to facilitate activities associated with the review of amendment applications and review of design certification and combined license applications for NRO. The NRC staff intends to incorporate the final approved guidance into the next revision of NUREG-0800, SRP Section 13.5.1.1, Revision 1 and Regulatory Guide 1.206, "Combined License Applications for Nuclear Power Plants (LWR Edition)," June 2007.

DATES: Comments must be filed no later than 30 days from the date of publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**. Comments received after this date will be considered, if it is practical to do so, but the Commission is able to ensure consideration only for comments received on or before this date.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments by any one of the following methods.