

*Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours:* 2,120 hours.

*Total Annual Burden Cost for Respondents:* \$86,517 (approximately \$1,633 per SWA). This is an established data collection for which no changes are proposed; there are no startup costs.

Comments submitted in response to this request will be summarized and/or included in the request for Office of Management and Budget approval of the information collection request; they will also become a matter of public record.

Dated: February 10, 2011.

**Jane Oates,**

*Assistant Secretary, Employment and Training Administration.*

[FR Doc. 2011-3469 Filed 2-15-11; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4510-FT-P**

## NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

### National Science Board; Sunshine Act Meetings; Impromptu Notice of Change (Addition of Agenda Item)

The National Science Board's (NSB) Audit & Oversight (A&O) Committee, pursuant to NSF regulations (45 CFR part 614), the NSF Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1862n-5), and the Government in the Sunshine Act (5 U.S.C. 552b), hereby gives notice of an *Impromptu Change* in regard to the addition of an agenda item that will be discussed during the closed session of the A&O Committee meeting scheduled for February 16, 2011, at 9:15 a.m., as follows:

**ORIGINAL DATE AND TIME:** No change.

**SUBJECT MATTER (AGENDA ITEM ADDED):** 5 minute update on Cyber issues at NSF.

**STATUS:** No change.

**LOCATION:** No change.

**UPDATES AND POINT OF CONTACT:** Please refer to the National Science Board Web site <http://www.nsf.gov/nsb> for additional information and schedule updates (time, place, subject matter or status of meeting) may be found at <http://www.nsf.gov/nsb/notices/>. Point of contact for this meeting is: Jennie Moehlmann, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Blvd., Arlington, VA 22230. Telephone: (703) 292-7000.

**Daniel A. Lauretano,**

*Counsel to the National Science Board.*

[FR Doc. 2011-3585 Filed 2-14-11; 11:15 am]

**BILLING CODE 7555-01-P**

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[NRC-2009-0187]

### Notice of Availability of Final Environmental Impact Statement for the AREVA Enrichment Services LLC Proposed Eagle Rock Enrichment Facility in Bonneville County, ID

**AGENCY:** Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice of Availability of Final Environmental Impact Statement.

**SUMMARY:** Notice is hereby given that the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) has published the Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the AREVA Enrichment Services LLC (AES) Proposed Eagle Rock Enrichment Facility (EREF). On December 30, 2008, AES submitted a license application to the NRC that proposes the construction, operation, and decommissioning of a gas centrifuge-based uranium enrichment facility on a presently undeveloped site near Idaho Falls in Bonneville County, Idaho (the "proposed action"). This application is for a license to possess and use byproduct material, source material, and special nuclear material at the proposed uranium enrichment facility. The application included an Environmental Report (ER) regarding the proposed action.

AES subsequently submitted revisions to the license application on April 23, 2009 (Revision 1), and April 30, 2010 (Revision 2), which included ER Revision 1 and ER Revision 2, respectively. License application Revision 1 addresses the expansion of the proposed EREF to increase its production capacity from 3.3 million Separative Work Units (SWUs) per year to 6.6 million SWUs per year; and ER Revision 1 includes information on the environmental impacts of the proposed 6.6-million-SWU-per-year EREF. Revision 2 to the license application and the ER incorporates into Revision 1 additional information that AES previously provided the NRC in response to NRC staff requests for additional information for its safety and environmental reviews, as well as supplemental information on a proposed electrical transmission line required to power the proposed EREF.

On June 17, 2009, AES submitted a request for an exemption from certain NRC regulations so that it could commence certain preconstruction activities (e.g., site preparation) on the proposed EREF site prior to the NRC's decision on whether to grant or deny a license. On March 17, 2010, the NRC

granted an exemption authorizing AES to conduct the requested preconstruction activities.

The Final EIS is being issued as part of the NRC's process to decide whether to issue a license to AES, pursuant to Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR) parts 30, 40, and 70, to construct and operate the proposed uranium enrichment facility. Specifically, AES proposes to use gas centrifuge technology to enrich the uranium-235 isotope found in natural uranium to concentrations up to 5 percent by weight. The enriched uranium would be used to manufacture nuclear fuel for commercial nuclear power reactors. In the Final EIS, the NRC staff assessed the potential environmental impacts from the preconstruction, construction, operation, and decommissioning of the proposed EREF project.

The Final EIS was prepared in compliance with the *National Environmental Policy Act of 1969*, as amended (NEPA), and the NRC's regulations for implementing NEPA in 10 CFR part 51. The NRC staff assessed the impacts of the proposed action on land use, historic and cultural resources, visual and scenic resources, air quality, geology and soils, water resources, ecological resources, noise, transportation, public and occupational health, waste management, socioeconomic, and environmental justice. Additionally, the NRC staff analyzed and compared the benefits and costs of the proposed action. In preparing this Final EIS, the NRC staff also reviewed, considered, evaluated, and addressed the public comments received on the Draft EIS.

In addition to the proposed action, the NRC staff considered the no-action alternative and other alternatives. Under the no-action alternative, the NRC would deny AES's request to construct and operate a uranium enrichment facility at the EREF site. The no-action alternative serves as a baseline for comparison of the potential environmental impacts of the proposed action. Other alternatives the NRC staff considered but eliminated from further analysis include: (1) Alternative sites for the EREF; (2) alternative sources of enriched uranium; and (3) alternative technologies for uranium enrichment. These alternatives were eliminated from further analysis due to economic, environmental, national security, technological maturity, or other reasons. The Final EIS also discusses alternatives for the disposition of depleted uranium hexafluoride (UF<sub>6</sub>) resulting from enrichment operations over the lifetime of the proposed EREF.