

of employers maintaining or contributing to multiemployer plans); three members shall be representatives appointed from the general public (one of whom shall be a person representing those receiving benefits from a pension plan); and there shall be one representative each from the fields of insurance, corporate trust, actuarial counseling, investment counseling, investment management, and accounting.

The Advisory Council will report to the Secretary of Labor. It will function solely as an advisory body and in compliance with the provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, and its charter will be filed under the Act. For further information, contact Larry I. Good, Executive Secretary, Advisory Council on Employee Welfare and Pension Benefit Plans, U.S. Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20210, telephone (202) 693-8668.

Signed at Washington, DC this 27th day of November, 2018.

Preston Rutledge,

Assistant Secretary, Employee Benefits Security Administration.

[FR Doc. 2018-26261 Filed 12-3-18; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-29-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[NRC-2018-0001]

Sunshine Act Meetings

TIME AND DATE: Weeks of December 3, 10, 17, 24, 31, 2018, January 7, 2019.

PLACE: Commissioners' Conference Room, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland.

STATUS: Public and Closed.

MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED:

Week of December 3, 2018

Monday, December 3, 2018

10:00 a.m. Briefing on Equal Employment Opportunity, Affirmative Employment, and Small Business (Public); (Contact: Larniece McKoy Moore: 301-415-1942)

This meeting will be webcast live at the Web address—<http://www.nrc.gov/>.

Thursday, December 6, 2018

10:00 a.m. Meeting with Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards (Public); (Contact: Mark Banks: 301-415-3718)

This meeting will be webcast live at the Web address—<http://www.nrc.gov/>.

Week of December 10, 2018—Tentative

There are no meetings scheduled for the week of December 10, 2018.

Week of December 17, 2018—Tentative

There are no meetings scheduled for the week of December 17, 2018.

Week of December 24, 2018—Tentative

There are no meetings scheduled for the week of December 24, 2018.

Week of December 31, 2018—Tentative

There are no meetings scheduled for the week of December 31, 2018.

Week of January 7, 2019—Tentative

There are no meetings scheduled for the week of January 7, 2019.

CONTACT PERSON FOR MORE INFORMATION:

For more information or to verify the status of meetings, contact Denise McGovern at 301-415-0681 or via email at Denise.McGovern@nrc.gov. The schedule for Commission meetings is subject to change on short notice.

The NRC Commission Meeting Schedule can be found on the internet at: <http://www.nrc.gov/public-involve/public-meetings/schedule.html>.

The NRC provides reasonable accommodation to individuals with disabilities where appropriate. If you need a reasonable accommodation to participate in these public meetings, or need this meeting notice or the transcript or other information from the public meetings in another format (e.g., braille, large print), please notify Kimberly Meyer-Chambers, NRC Disability Program Manager, at 301-287-0739, by videophone at 240-428-3217, or by email at Kimberly.Meyer-Chambers@nrc.gov. Determinations on requests for reasonable accommodation will be made on a case-by-case basis.

Members of the public may request to receive this information electronically. If you would like to be added to the distribution, please contact the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Office of the Secretary, Washington, DC 20555 (301-415-1969), or by email at Wendy.Moore@nrc.gov or Diane.Garvin@nrc.gov.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 30th day of November 2018.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Denise L. McGovern,

Policy Coordinator, Office of the Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2018-26454 Filed 11-30-18; 4:15 pm]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[NRC-2018-0267]

Applications and Amendments to Facility Operating Licenses and Combined Licenses Involving Proposed No Significant Hazards Considerations and Containing Sensitive Unclassified Non-Safeguards Information and Order Imposing Procedures for Access to Sensitive Unclassified Non-Safeguards Information

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: License amendment request; notice of opportunity to comment, request a hearing, and petition for leave to intervene; order imposing procedures.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) received and is considering approval of four amendment requests. The amendment requests are for North Anna Power Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2; Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 1; H. B. Robinson Steam Electric Plant Unit No. 2; and Virgil C. Summer Nuclear Station, Unit No. 1. For each amendment request, the NRC proposes to determine that they involve no significant hazards consideration. Because each amendment request contains sensitive unclassified non-safeguards information (SUNSI) an order imposes procedures to obtain access to SUNSI for contention preparation.

DATES: Comments must be filed by January 3, 2019. A request for a hearing must be filed by February 4, 2019. Any potential party as defined in section 2.4 of title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR), who believes access to SUNSI is necessary to respond to this notice must request document access by December 14, 2018.

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

- *Federal Rulemaking Website:* Go to <http://www.regulations.gov> and search for Docket ID NRC-2018-0267. Address questions about Docket IDs in *Regulations.gov* to Jennifer Borges; telephone: 301-287-9127; email: Jennifer.Borges@nrc.gov. For technical questions, contact the individual listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section of this document.

- *Mail comments to:* May Ma, Office of Administration, Mail Stop: TWFN-7-A60M, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001.

For additional direction on obtaining information and submitting comments, see "Obtaining Information and Submitting Comments" in the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section of this document.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Lynn Ronewicz, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001; telephone: 301-415-1927, email: Lynn.Ronewicz@nrc.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Obtaining Information and Submitting Comments

A. Obtaining Information

Please refer to Docket ID NRC-2018-0267, facility name, unit number(s), plant docket number, application date, and subject when contacting the NRC about the availability of information for this action. You may obtain publicly-available information related to this action by any of the following methods:

- *Federal Rulemaking Website:* Go to <http://www.regulations.gov> and search for Docket ID NRC-2018-0267.
- *NRC's Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS):* You may obtain publicly-available documents online in the ADAMS Public Documents collection at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html>. To begin the search, select "Begin Web-based ADAMS Search." For problems with ADAMS, please contact the NRC's Public Document Room (PDR) reference staff at 1-800-397-4209, 301-415-4737, or by email to pdr.resource@nrc.gov. The ADAMS accession number for each document referenced (if it is available in ADAMS) is provided the first time that it is mentioned in this document.

- *NRC's PDR:* You may examine and purchase copies of public documents at the NRC's PDR, Room O1-F21, One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland 20852.

B. Submitting Comments

Please include Docket ID NRC-2018-0267, facility name, unit number(s), plant docket number, application date, and subject in your comment submission.

The NRC cautions you not to include identifying or contact information that you do not want to be publicly disclosed in your comment submission. The NRC will post all comment submissions at <http://www.regulations.gov> as well as enter the comment submissions into ADAMS. The NRC does not routinely edit comment submissions to remove identifying or contact information.

If you are requesting or aggregating comments from other persons for submission to the NRC, then you should inform those persons not to include identifying or contact information that they do not want to be publicly disclosed in their comment submission. Your request should state that the NRC does not routinely edit comment submissions to remove such information before making the comment submissions available to the public or entering the comment into ADAMS.

II. Background

Pursuant to Section 189a.(2) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), the NRC is publishing this notice. The Act requires the Commission to publish notice of any amendments issued, or proposed to be issued and grants the Commission the authority to issue and make immediately effective any amendment to an operating license or combined license, as applicable, upon a determination by the Commission that such amendment involves no significant hazards consideration, notwithstanding the pendency before the Commission of a request for a hearing from any person.

This notice includes notices of amendments containing SUNSI.

III. Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendments to Facility Operating Licenses and Combined Licenses, Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity for a Hearing

The Commission has made a proposed determination that the following amendment requests involve no significant hazards consideration. Under the Commission's regulations in 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. The basis for this proposed determination for each amendment request is shown below.

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 if 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. If the Commission takes action prior to the expiration of either the comment period or the notice period, it will publish a notice of issuance in the **Federal Register**. If the Commission makes 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.

A. Opportunity To Request a Hearing and Petition for Leave To Intervene

Within 60 days after the date of publication of this notice, any persons (petitioner) whose interest may be affected by this action may file a request for a hearing and petition for leave to intervene (petition) with respect to the action. Petitions shall be filed in accordance with the Commission's "Agency Rules of Practice and Procedure" in 10 CFR part 2. Interested persons should consult a current copy of 10 CFR 2.309. The NRC's regulations are accessible electronically from the NRC Library on the NRC's website at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/doc-collections/cfr/>. Alternatively, a copy of the regulations is available at the NRC's Public Document Room, located at One White Flint North, Room O1-F21, 11555 Rockville Pike (First Floor), Rockville, Maryland 20852. If a petition is filed, the Commission or a presiding officer will rule on the petition and, if appropriate, a notice of a hearing will be issued.

As required by 10 CFR 2.309(d) the petition should specifically explain the reasons why intervention should be permitted with particular reference to the following general requirements for standing: (1) The name, address, and telephone number of the petitioner; (2) the nature of the petitioner's right under the Act to be made a party to the proceeding; (3) the nature and extent of the petitioner's property, financial, or other interest in the proceeding; and (4) the possible effect of any decision or order which may be entered in the proceeding on the petitioner's interest.

In accordance with 10 CFR 2.309(f), the petition must also set forth the

specific contentions which the petitioner seeks to have litigated in the proceeding. Each contention must consist of a specific statement of the issue of law or fact to be raised or controverted. In addition, the petitioner must provide a brief explanation of the bases for the contention and a concise statement of the alleged facts or expert opinion which support the contention and on which the petitioner intends to rely in proving the contention at the hearing. The petitioner must also provide references to the specific sources and documents on which the petitioner intends to rely to support its position on the issue. The petition must include sufficient information to show that a genuine dispute exists with the applicant or licensee on a material issue of law or fact. Contentions must be limited to matters within the scope of the proceeding. The contention must be one which, if proven, would entitle the petitioner to relief. A petitioner who fails to satisfy the requirements at 10 CFR 2.309(f) with respect to at least one contention will not be permitted to participate as a party.

Those permitted to intervene become parties to the proceeding, subject to any limitations in the order granting leave to intervene. Parties have the opportunity to participate fully in the conduct of the hearing with respect to resolution of that party's admitted contentions, including the opportunity to present evidence, consistent with the NRC's regulations, policies, and procedures.

Petitions must be filed no later than 60 days from the date of publication of this notice. Petitions and motions for leave to file new or amended contentions that are filed after the deadline will not be entertained absent a determination by the presiding officer that the filing demonstrates good cause by satisfying the three factors in 10 CFR 2.309(c)(1)(i) through (iii). The petition must be filed in accordance with the filing instructions in the "Electronic Submissions (E-Filing)" section of this document.

If a hearing is requested, and the Commission has not made a final determination on the issue of no significant hazards consideration, the Commission will make a final determination on the issue of no significant hazards consideration. The final determination will serve to establish when the hearing is held. If the final determination is that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration, the Commission may issue the amendment and make it immediately effective, notwithstanding the request for a hearing. Any hearing would take place

after issuance of the amendment. If the final determination is that the amendment request involves a significant hazards consideration, then any hearing held would take place before the issuance of the amendment unless the Commission finds an imminent danger to the health or safety of the public, in which case it will issue an appropriate order or rule under 10 CFR part 2.

A State, local governmental body, Federally-recognized Indian Tribe, or agency thereof, may submit a petition to the Commission to participate as a party under 10 CFR 2.309(h)(1). The petition should state the nature and extent of the petitioner's interest in the proceeding. The petition should be submitted to the Commission no later than 60 days from the date of publication of this notice. The petition must be filed in accordance with the filing instructions in the "Electronic Submissions (E-Filing)" section of this document, and should meet the requirements for petitions set forth in this section, except that under 10 CFR 2.309(h)(2) a State, local governmental body, or Federally-recognized Indian Tribe, or agency thereof does not need to address the standing requirements in 10 CFR 2.309(d) if the facility is located within its boundaries. Alternatively, a State, local governmental body, Federally-recognized Indian Tribe, or agency thereof may participate as a non-party under 10 CFR 2.315(c).

If a hearing is granted, any person who is not a party to the proceeding and is not affiliated with or represented by a party may, at the discretion of the presiding officer, be permitted to make a limited appearance pursuant to the provisions of 10 CFR 2.315(a). A person making a limited appearance may make an oral or written statement of his or her position on the issues but may not otherwise participate in the proceeding. A limited appearance may be made at any session of the hearing or at any prehearing conference, subject to the limits and conditions as may be imposed by the presiding officer. Details regarding the opportunity to make a limited appearance will be provided by the presiding officer if such sessions are scheduled.

B. Electronic Submissions (E-Filing)

All documents filed in NRC adjudicatory proceedings, including a request for hearing and petition for leave to intervene (petition), any motion or other document filed in the proceeding prior to the submission of a request for hearing or petition to intervene, and documents filed by interested governmental entities that

request to participate under 10 CFR 2.315(c), must be filed in accordance with the NRC's E-Filing rule (72 FR 49139; August 28, 2007, as amended at 77 FR 46562; August 3, 2012). The E-Filing process requires participants to submit and serve all adjudicatory documents over the internet, or in some cases to mail copies on electronic storage media. Detailed guidance on making electronic submissions may be found in the Guidance for Electronic Submissions to the NRC and on the NRC website at <http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/e-submittals.html>. Participants may not submit paper copies of their filings unless they seek an exemption in accordance with the procedures described below.

To comply with the procedural requirements of E-Filing, at least 10 days prior to the filing deadline, the participant should contact the Office of the Secretary by email at hearing.docket@nrc.gov, or by telephone at 301-415-1677, to (1) request a digital identification (ID) certificate, which allows the participant (or its counsel or representative) to digitally sign submissions and access the E-Filing system for any proceeding in which it is participating; and (2) advise the Secretary that the participant will be submitting a petition or other adjudicatory document (even in instances in which the participant, or its counsel or representative, already holds an NRC-issued digital ID certificate). Based upon this information, the Secretary will establish an electronic docket for the hearing in this proceeding if the Secretary has not already established an electronic docket.

Information about applying for a digital ID certificate is available on the NRC's public website at <http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/e-submittals/getting-started.html>. Once a participant has obtained a digital ID certificate and a docket has been created, the participant can then submit adjudicatory documents. Submissions must be in Portable Document Format (PDF). Additional guidance on PDF submissions is available on the NRC's public website at <http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/electronic-sub-ref-mat.html>. A filing is considered complete at the time the document is submitted through the NRC's E-Filing system. To be timely, an electronic filing must be submitted to the E-Filing system no later than 11:59 p.m. Eastern Time on the due date. Upon receipt of a transmission, the E-Filing system time-stamps the document and sends the submitter an email notice confirming receipt of the document. The E-Filing system also distributes an email notice that provides access to the

document to the NRC's Office of the General Counsel and any others who have advised the Office of the Secretary that they wish to participate in the proceeding, so that the filer need not serve the document on those participants separately. Therefore, applicants and other participants (or their counsel or representative) must apply for and receive a digital ID certificate before adjudicatory documents are filed so that they can obtain access to the documents via the E-Filing system.

A person filing electronically using the NRC's adjudicatory E-Filing system may seek assistance by contacting the NRC's Electronic Filing Help Desk through the "Contact Us" link located on the NRC's public website at <http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/e-submittals.html>, by email to MSHD.Resource@nrc.gov, or by a toll-free call at 1-866-672-7640. The NRC Electronic Filing Help Desk is available between 9 a.m. and 6 p.m., Eastern Time, Monday through Friday, excluding government holidays.

Participants who believe that they have a good cause for not submitting documents electronically must file an exemption request, in accordance with 10 CFR 2.302(g), with their initial paper filing stating why there is good cause for not filing electronically and requesting authorization to continue to submit documents in paper format. Such filings must be submitted by: (1) First class mail addressed to the Office of the Secretary of the Commission, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, Attention: Rulemaking and Adjudications Staff; or (2) courier, express mail, or expedited delivery service to the Office of the Secretary, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland 20852, Attention: Rulemaking and Adjudications Staff. Participants filing adjudicatory documents in this manner are responsible for serving the document on all other participants. Filing is considered complete by first-class mail as of the time of deposit in the mail, or by courier, express mail, or expedited delivery service upon depositing the document with the provider of the service. A presiding officer, having granted an exemption request from using E-Filing, may require a participant or party to use E-Filing if the presiding officer subsequently determines that the reason for granting the exemption from use of E-Filing no longer exists.

Documents submitted in adjudicatory proceedings will appear in the NRC's electronic hearing docket which is available to the public at <https://adams.nrc.gov/ehd>, unless excluded

pursuant to an order of the Commission or the presiding officer. If you do not have an NRC-issued digital ID certificate as described above, click cancel when the link requests certificates and you will be automatically directed to the NRC's electronic hearing dockets where you will be able to access any publicly available documents in a particular hearing docket. Participants are requested not to include personal privacy information, such as social security numbers, home addresses, or personal phone numbers in their filings, unless an NRC regulation or other law requires submission of such information. For example, in some instances, individuals provide home addresses in order to demonstrate proximity to a facility or site. With respect to copyrighted works, except for limited excerpts that serve the purpose of the adjudicatory filings and would constitute a Fair Use application, participants are requested not to include copyrighted materials in their submission.

South Carolina Electric & Gas Company, South Carolina Public Service Authority, Docket No. 50-395, Virgil C. Summer Nuclear Station, Unit No. 1, Fairfield County, South Carolina

Date of amendment request: August 29, 2018. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML18242A658.

Description of amendment request: This amendment request contains sensitive unclassified non-safeguards information (SUNSI). The amendment would revise license conditions and approve changes to plant modifications evaluated using fire probabilistic risk assessment methods and approaches that have been accepted previously in Amendment No. 199 or that have been accepted for another nuclear power plant station and approve performance-based alternatives for Chapter 3, National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) 805 (10 CFR 50.48(c)(2)(vii)), specifically, NFPA 805, Section 3.3.4, "Insulation Materials," and NFPA 805, Section 3.3.5.1, "Wiring above Suspended Ceilings."

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: 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 purpose of this amendment is to provide updated information associated with the modifications that were described and committed to in the VCSNS [Virgil C. Summer Nuclear Station] License Amendment Request and subsequently approved by the NRC. This amendment also provides updated information related to Nuclear Safety Compliance Strategies (including recovery actions). The NRC considers that NFPA 805 provides an acceptable methodology and performance criteria for licensees to identify fire protection requirements that are an acceptable alternative to the 10 CFR part 50, Appendix R, fire protection features (69 FR 33536; June 16, 2004).

Operation of VCSNS in accordance with the proposed amendment does not result in a significant increase in the probability or consequences of accidents previously evaluated. The proposed amendment does not affect accident initiators or precursors as described in the VCSNS Safety Analysis Report (SAR), nor does it adversely alter design assumptions, conditions, or configurations of the facility, and it does not adversely impact the ability of structures, systems, or components (SSCs) to perform their intended function to mitigate the consequences of accidents described and evaluated in the SAR. The proposed amendment does not adversely alter safety-related systems nor affect the way in which safety-related systems perform their functions as required by the accident analysis. The SSCs required to safely shut down the reactor and to maintain it in a safe shutdown condition will remain capable of performing the associated design functions.

Therefore, this change does 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.

Implementation of the new risk-informed, performance-based fire protection licensing basis, with the revised modifications and Nuclear Safety Compliance Strategies complies with the requirements in 10 CFR 50.48(a) and 10 CFR 50.48(c), as well as the guidance contained in RG [Regulatory Guide] 1.205, and does not result in new or different kinds of accidents. The requirements in NFPA 805 address only fire protection and the impacts of fire effects on the plant have been evaluated. The proposed amendment does not involve new failure mechanisms or malfunctions that could initiate a new or different kind of accident beyond those already analyzed in the SAR.

Therefore, this change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from an accident previously evaluated.

3. Does the proposed change involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety?

Response: No.

The proposed amendment has been evaluated to ensure that risk and safety margins are maintained within acceptable limits. The risk evaluations for plant changes

in relation to the potential for reducing a safety margin, were measured quantitatively for acceptability using the delta risk (*i.e.*, change in core damage frequency and change in large early release frequency) criteria from Section 5.3.5, “Acceptance Criteria,” of Nuclear Energy Institute 04–02, “Guidance for Implementing a Risk-Informed, Performance-based Fire Protection Program under 10 CFR 50.48(c),” as well as the guidance contained in RG 1.205. Engineering analyses, which may include engineering evaluations, probabilistic safety assessments, and fire modeling calculations, have been performed to demonstrate that the performance-based methods of NFPA 805 do not result in a significant reduction in the margin of safety.

Therefore, this 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.

Attorney for licensee: Kathryn M. Sutton, Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP, 1111 Pennsylvania Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20004.

NRC Branch Chief: Michael T. Markley.

Duke Energy Progress, LLC, Docket No. 50–400, Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 1 (Shearon Harris or HNP), Wake and Chatham Counties, North Carolina

Duke Energy Progress, LLC, Docket No. 50–261, H. B. Robinson Steam Electric Plant Unit No. 2 (Robinson or RNP), Darlington County, South Carolina

Date of amendment request: October 19, 2017, as supplemented by letters dated June 5, 2018; October 15, 2018; and November 6, 2018. Publicly-available versions are in ADAMS under Accession Nos. ML17292A040, ML18156A209, ML18288A276, and ML18310A131, respectively.

Description of amendment request: The supplement dated June 5, 2018, contains sensitive unclassified non-safeguards information (SUNSI). The NRC staff previously made a proposed determination that the license amendment request dated October 19, 2017, involves no significant hazards consideration (83 FR 166; January 2, 2018). Subsequently, by letter dated November 6, 2018, the licensee provided additional information that expanded the scope of the amendment request as originally noticed. Accordingly, this notice supersedes the previous notice in its entirety. The proposed amendment request consists of five changes that would revise the

Technical Specifications (TSs) to support the allowance of Duke Energy to self-perform core reload design and safety analyses. These changes would (1) add the NRC-approved COPERNIC Topical Report (TR) to the list of TRs for Shearon Harris and Robinson and revise the peak fuel centerline temperature equation in Robinson TS 2.1.1.2 and Shearon Harris TS 2.1.1.b to be the equation used by COPERNIC; (2) relocate several TS parameters to the Core Operating Limits Reports for Shearon Harris and Robinson; (3) revise the Robinson TS moderator temperature coefficient maximum upper limit; (4) revise the Sharon Harris TS definition of shutdown margin consistent with Technical Specifications Task Force (TSTF) Traveler TSTF–248, Revision 0 (ADAMS Accession No. ML040611010), “Revise Shutdown Margin Definition for Stuck Rod Exception”; and (5) revise the Robinson and Shearon Harris power distribution limits limiting condition for operation actions and surveillance requirements, as well as the Robinson Reactor Protection System Instrumentation Table 3.3.1–1 to allow operation of a reactor core designed using the DPC–NE–2011–P [proprietary], “Nuclear Design Methodology Report for Core Operating Limits of Westinghouse Reactors,” methodology. (A redacted version, designated as DPC–NE–2011, is publicly-available under ADAMS Accession No. ML16125A420.)

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: 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.

COPERNIC

The proposed change adds a topical report for an NRC-reviewed and approved fuel performance code to the list of topical reports in RNP and HNP Technical Specifications (TS), which is administrative in nature and has no impact on a plant configuration or system performance relied upon to mitigate the consequences of an accident. The list of topical reports in the TS used to develop the core operating limits does not impact either the initiation of an accident or the mitigation of its consequences.

The proposed change also revises a limit on peak fuel centerline temperature in the RNP and HNP TS that is based on a NRC reviewed and approved fuel performance code, and does not require a physical change to plant systems, structures, or components. Plant operations and analysis will continue

to be in accordance with the licensing basis. The peak fuel centerline temperature limit provides protection to the fuel and is consistent with the safety analysis.

Relocate TS Parameters to the COLR

The proposed change relocates certain cycle-specific core operating limits from the RNP and HNP TS to the Core Operating Limits Report (COLR). The cycle-specific values must be calculated using the NRC approved methodologies listed in the COLR section of the TS. Because the parameter limits are determined using the NRC methodologies, they will continue to be within the limit assumed in the accident analysis. As a result, neither the probability nor the consequences of any accident previously evaluated will be affected.

RNP MTC TS Change

The proposed change revises the RNP Technical Specification maximum upper Moderator Temperature Coefficient (MTC) limit. Revision of the MTC limit does not affect the performance of any equipment used to mitigate the consequences of an analyzed accident. There is no impact on the source term or pathways assumed in accidents previously assumed. No analysis assumptions are violated and there are no adverse effects on the factors that contribute to offsite or onsite dose as the result of an accident.

HNP TSTF–248

The proposed change revises the HNP Technical Specification definition of Shutdown Margin (SDM) consistent with existing NRC-approved definition. The proposed revision to the SDM definition will result in analytical flexibility for determining SDM. Revision of the SDM definition does not affect the performance of any equipment used to mitigate the consequences of an analyzed accident. There is no impact on the source term or pathways assumed in accidents previously assumed. No analysis assumptions are violated and there are no adverse effects on the factors that contribute to offsite or onsite dose as the result of an accident.

DPC–NE–2011–P TS Changes

The proposed change revises the RNP and HNP TS to allow operation of a reactor core designed using the DPC–NE–2011–P methodology. The DPC–NE–2011–P methodology has already been approved by the NRC for use at RNP and HNP. Revision of the TS to align with the NRC-approved methodology does not affect the performance of any equipment used to mitigate the consequences of an analyzed accident. There is no impact on the source term or pathways assumed in accidents previously assumed. No analysis assumptions are violated and there are no adverse effects on the factors that contribute to offsite or onsite dose as the result of an accident.

Therefore, the proposed changes do 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.

COPERNIC

The proposed change adds a topical report for an NRC-reviewed and approved fuel performance code to the list of topical reports in HNP and RNP TS, which is administrative in nature and has no impact on a plant configuration or on system performance. The proposed change updates the list of NRC-approved topical reports used to develop the core operating limits. There is no change to the parameters within which the plant is normally operated. The possibility of a new or different kind of accident is not created.

The proposed change also revises a limit on peak fuel centerline temperature in the RNP and HNP TS that is based on a NRC reviewed and approved fuel performance code, and does not require physical changes to plant systems, structures, or components. Specifying peak fuel centerline temperature ensures that the fuel design limits are met. Operations and analysis will continue to be in compliance with NRC regulations. Revising the peak fuel centerline temperature limit does not affect any accident initiators that would create a new accident.

Relocate TS Parameters to the COLR

The proposed change relocates certain cycle-specific core operating limits from the RNP and HNP TS to the COLR. No new or different accidents result from utilizing the proposed change. The changes do not involve a physical alteration of the plant (*i.e.*, no new or different type of equipment will be installed) or a change in the methods governing normal plant operation. In addition, the changes do not impose any new or different requirements or eliminate any existing requirements. The changes do not alter assumptions made in the safety analyses. The proposed changes are consistent with the safety analyses assumptions and current plant operating practice.

RNP MTC TS Change

The proposed change revises the RNP Technical Specification maximum upper MTC limit. The proposed change does not physically alter the plant; that is, no new or different type of equipment will be installed. Therefore the proposed change could also not initiate an equipment malfunction that would result in a new or different type of accident from any previously evaluated. This change does not create new failure modes or mechanisms which are not identifiable during testing, and no new accident precursors are generated.

HNP TSTF-248

Revising the HNP Technical Specification definition of SDM would not require revision to any SDM boron calculations. Rather, it would afford the analytical flexibility for determining SDM for a particular circumstance. The proposed change does not physically alter the plant; that is, no new or different type of equipment will be installed. Therefore the proposed change could also not initiate an equipment malfunction that would result in a new or different type of

accident from any previously evaluated. This change does not create new failure modes or mechanisms which are not identifiable during testing, and no new accident precursors are generated.

DPC-NE-2011-P TS Changes

The proposed change revises the RNP and HNP TS to allow operation of a reactor core designed using the DPC-NE-2011-P methodology. The DPC-NE-2011-P methodology has already been approved by the NRC for use at RNP and HNP. The proposed change does not physically alter the plant, that is, no new or different type of equipment will be installed. Therefore the proposed change could also not initiate an equipment malfunction that would result in a new or different type of accident from any previously evaluated. Operating the reactor in accordance with the NRC-approved methodology will ensure that the core will operate within safe limits. This change does not create new failure modes or mechanisms which are not identifiable during testing, and no new accident precursors are generated.

Therefore, the proposed changes do 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.

Margin of safety is related to the confidence in the ability of the fission product barriers to perform their design functions during and following an accident. These barriers include the fuel cladding, the reactor coolant system, and the containment system.

COPERNIC

The proposed change adds a topical report for an NRC-reviewed and approved fuel performance code to the list of topical reports in HNP and RNP TS, which is administrative in nature and does not amend the cycle specific parameters presently required by the TS. The individual TS continue to require operation of the plant within the bounds of the limits specified in the COLR. The proposed change to the list of analytical methods referenced in the COLR does not impact the margin of safety.

The proposed change also revises a limit on peak fuel centerline temperature in the RNP and HNP TS that is based on a NRC reviewed and approved fuel performance code, and does not require physical changes to plant systems, structures, or components. Plant operations and analysis will continue to be in accordance with the licensing basis. Revising the peak fuel centerline temperature limit defined by the NRC reviewed and approved fuel performance code will continue to ensure that applicable design and safety limits are satisfied such that the fission product barriers will continue to perform their design functions and thereby margin of safety is not reduced.

Relocate TS Parameters to the COLR

The proposed change relocates certain cycle-specific core operating limits from the RNP and HNP TS to the COLR. This change will have no effect on the margin of safety. The relocated cycle-specific parameters will

continue to be calculated using NRC-approved methodologies and will provide the same margin of safety as the values currently located in the TS.

RNP MTC TS Change

The proposed change revises the RNP Technical Specification maximum upper MTC limit. The MTC limit change does not impact the reliability of the fission product barriers to function.

Radiological dose to plant operators or to the public will not be impacted as a result of the proposed change. The current Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (UFSAR) Chapter 15 analyses of record remain bounding with the proposed change to the maximum upper MTC limit. Therefore, all of the applicable acceptance criteria continue to be met for each of the analyses with the revised maximum upper MTC limit.

HNP TSTF-248

The proposed revision to the HNP Technical Specification definition of SDM does not impact the reliability of the fission product barriers to function. Radiological dose to plant operators or to the public will not be impacted as a result of the proposed change. Adequate SDM will continue to be ensured for all operational conditions.

DPC-NE-2011-P TS Changes

The proposed change revises the RNP and HNP TS to allow operation of a reactor core designed using the DPC-NE-2011-P methodology. As a portion of the overall Duke Energy methodology for cycle reload safety analyses, DPC-NE-2011-P has already been approved by the NRC for use at RNP and HNP. The proposed change will continue to ensure that applicable design and safety limits are satisfied such that the fission product barriers will continue to perform their design functions. Operation of the reactor in accordance with the DPC-NE-2011-P methodology will ensure the margin of safety is not reduced.

Therefore, the proposed changes do 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.

Attorney for licensee: Kathryn B. Nolan, Deputy General Counsel, Duke Energy Corporation, 550 South Tryon Street, Mail Code DEC45A, Charlotte, NC 28202.

NRC Branch Chief: Undine Shoop.

Virginia Electric and Power Company, Docket Nos. 50-338 and 50-339, North Anna Power Station (North Anna), Units No. 1 and No. 2, Louisa County, Virginia

Date of amendment request: July 12, 2018. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Package Accession No. ML18198A133.

Description of amendment request:

This amendment request contains sensitive unclassified non-safeguards information (SUNSI). The amendments would revise the Technical Specification (TS) requirements to add Framatome Topical Report EMF-2328(P)(A), Revision 0, "PWR Small Break [loss-of-coolant accident] LOCA Evaluation Model, S-RELAP5 Based," as supplemented by the North Anna-specific application report ANP-3467P, Revision 0, "North Anna Fuel-Vendor Independent Small Break LOCA Analysis Licensing Report," to the list of methodologies approved for reference in the Core Operating Limits Report (COLR) in TS 5.6.5.b at North Anna, Unit Nos. 1 and 2. Framatome Topical Report EMF-2328(P)(A), as supplemented by the North Anna-specific application report, replaces two existing COLR references for the current Westinghouse Small Break LOCA Evaluation Model. The amendments would also remove one obsolete COLR reference in TS 5.6.5.b that supported use of the Advanced Mark-BW (AMBW) fuel product, since the AMBW fuel product is not planned to be used in future North Anna cores.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: 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 amendment involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

The proposed change to TS 5.6.5.b permits the use of an NRC-approved methodology for analysis of the Small Break Loss of Coolant Accident (SBLOCA) to determine if North Anna Power Station (NAPS) Units 1 and 2 continue to meet the applicable design and safety analysis acceptance criteria. The proposed change to the list of NRC-approved methodologies in TS 5.6.5.b has no direct impact upon plant operation or configuration. The list of methodologies in TS 5.6.5.b does not impact either the initiation of an accident or the mitigation of its consequences.

The results of the revised SBLOCA transient analysis and existing pre-transient oxidation limits demonstrate that NAPS Units 1 and 2 continue to satisfy the 10 CFR 50.46(b)(1-3) Emergency Core Cooling System performance acceptance criteria using an NRC-approved evaluation model.

Therefore, the proposed change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. Does the proposed amendment create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

The proposed change will not create the possibility of a new or different accident due to credible new failure mechanisms, malfunctions, or accident initiators not previously considered. There is no change to the parameters within which the plant is normally operated, and thus, the possibility of a new or different type of accident is not created.

Therefore, the proposed change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

3. Does the proposed amendment involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety?

Response: No.

No design basis or safety limits are exceeded or altered by this change. Approved methodologies have been used to ensure that the plant continues to meet applicable design criteria and safety analysis acceptance criteria.

Therefore, the proposed 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.

Attorney for licensee: Lillian M. Cuoco, Senior Counsel, Dominion Resources Services, Inc., 120 Tredegar Street, RS-2, Richmond, VA 23219.

Branch Chief: Undine Shoop.

Order Imposing Procedures for Access to Sensitive Unclassified Non-Safeguards Information for Contention Preparation

South Carolina Electric & Gas Company, South Carolina Public Service Authority, Docket No. 50-395, Virgil C. Summer Nuclear Station, Unit No. 1, Fairfield County, South Carolina

Duke Energy Progress, LLC, Docket No. 50-400, Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 1, Wake and Chatham Counties, North Carolina

Duke Energy Progress, LLC, Docket No. 50-261, H. B. Robinson Steam Electric Plant Unit No. 2, Darlington County, South Carolina

Virginia Electric and Power Company, Docket Nos. 50-338 and 50-339, North Anna Power Station, Units No. 1 and No. 2, Louisa County, Virginia

A. This Order contains instructions regarding how potential parties to this proceeding may request access to documents containing Sensitive Unclassified Non-Safeguards Information (SUNSI).

B. Within 10 days after publication of this notice of hearing and opportunity to

petition for leave to intervene, any potential party who believes access to SUNSI is necessary to respond to this notice may request access to SUNSI. A "potential party" is any person who intends to participate as a party by demonstrating standing and filing an admissible contention under 10 CFR 2.309. Requests for access to SUNSI submitted later than 10 days after publication of this notice will not be considered absent a showing of good cause for the late filing, addressing why the request could not have been filed earlier.

C. The requester shall submit a letter requesting permission to access SUNSI to the Office of the Secretary, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, Attention: Rulemakings and Adjudications Staff, and provide a copy to the Deputy General Counsel for Hearings and Administration, Office of the General Counsel, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001. The expedited delivery or courier mail address for both offices is: U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland 20852. The email address for the Office of the Secretary and the Office of the General Counsel are *Hearing.Docket@nrc.gov* and *RidsOgcMailCenter.Resource@nrc.gov*, respectively.¹ The request must include the following information:

(1) A description of the licensing action with a citation to this **Federal Register** notice;

(2) The name and address of the potential party and a description of the potential party's particularized interest that could be harmed by the action identified in C.(1); and

(3) The identity of the individual or entity requesting access to SUNSI and the requester's basis for the need for the information in order to meaningfully participate in this adjudicatory proceeding. In particular, the request must explain why publicly available versions of the information requested would not be sufficient to provide the basis and specificity for a proffered contention.

D. Based on an evaluation of the information submitted under paragraph C.(3) the NRC staff will determine within 10 days of receipt of the request whether:

(1) There is a reasonable basis to believe the petitioner is likely to

¹ While a request for hearing or petition to intervene in this proceeding must comply with the filing requirements of the NRC's "E-Filing Rule," the initial request to access SUNSI under these procedures should be submitted as described in this paragraph.

establish standing to participate in this NRC proceeding; and

(2) The requestor has established a legitimate need for access to SUNSI.

E. If the NRC staff determines that the requestor satisfies both D.(1) and D.(2) above, the NRC staff will notify the requestor in writing that access to SUNSI has been granted. The written notification will contain instructions on how the requestor may obtain copies of the requested documents, and any other conditions that may apply to access to those documents. These conditions may include, but are not limited to, the signing of a Non-Disclosure Agreement or Affidavit, or Protective Order² setting forth terms and conditions to prevent the unauthorized or inadvertent disclosure of SUNSI by each individual who will be granted access to SUNSI.

F. Filing of Contentions. Any contentions in these proceedings that are based upon the information received as a result of the request made for SUNSI must be filed by the requestor no later than 25 days after receipt of (or access to) that information. However, if more than 25 days remain between the petitioner's receipt of (or access to) the information and the deadline for filing all other contentions (as established in the notice of hearing or opportunity for hearing), the petitioner may file its SUNSI contentions by that later deadline.

G. Review of Denials of Access.

(1) If the request for access to SUNSI is denied by the NRC staff after a determination on standing and requisite need, the NRC staff shall immediately notify the requestor in writing, briefly stating the reason or reasons for the denial.

(2) The requester may challenge the NRC staff's adverse determination by filing a challenge within 5 days of receipt of that determination with: (a) The presiding officer designated in this proceeding; (b) if no presiding officer has been appointed, the Chief Administrative Judge, or if he or she is unavailable, another administrative judge, or an Administrative Law Judge with jurisdiction pursuant to 10 CFR 2.318(a); or (c) if another officer has been designated to rule on information access issues, with that officer.

(3) Further appeals of decisions under this paragraph must be made pursuant to 10 CFR 2.311.

H. Review of Grants of Access. A party other than the requester may challenge an NRC staff determination granting access to SUNSI whose release would harm that party's interest independent of the proceeding. Such a challenge must be filed within 5 days of the notification by the NRC staff of its grant of access and must be filed with: (a) The presiding officer designated in this proceeding; (b) if no presiding officer has been appointed, the Chief Administrative Judge, or if he or she is unavailable, another administrative

judge, or an Administrative Law Judge with jurisdiction pursuant to 10 CFR 2.318(a); or (c) if another officer has been designated to rule on information access issues, with that officer.

If challenges to the NRC staff determinations are filed, these procedures give way to the normal process for litigating disputes concerning access to information. The availability of interlocutory review by the Commission of orders ruling on such NRC staff determinations (whether granting or denying access) is governed by 10 CFR 2.311.³

I. The Commission expects that the NRC staff and presiding officers (and any other reviewing officers) will consider and resolve requests for access to SUNSI, and motions for protective orders, in a timely fashion in order to minimize any unnecessary delays in identifying those petitioners who have standing and who have propounded contentions meeting the specificity and basis requirements in 10 CFR part 2. The attachment to this Order summarizes the general target schedule for processing and resolving requests under these procedures.

It is so ordered.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, on November 16, 2018.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Annette L. Vietti-Cook,
Secretary of the Commission.

ATTACHMENT 1—GENERAL TARGET SCHEDULE FOR PROCESSING AND RESOLVING REQUESTS FOR ACCESS TO SENSITIVE UNCLASSIFIED NON-SAFEGUARDS INFORMATION IN THIS PROCEEDING

Day	Event/activity
0	Publication of Federal Register notice of hearing and opportunity to petition for leave to intervene, including order with instructions for access requests.
10	Deadline for submitting requests for access to Sensitive Unclassified Non-Safeguards Information (SUNSI) with information: Supporting the standing of a potential party identified by name and address; describing the need for the information in order for the potential party to participate meaningfully in an adjudicatory proceeding.
60	Deadline for submitting petition for intervention containing: (i) Demonstration of standing; and (ii) all contentions whose formulation does not require access to SUNSI (+25 Answers to petition for intervention; +7 petitioner/requestor reply).
20	U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff informs the requester of the staff's determination whether the request for access provides a reasonable basis to believe standing can be established and shows need for SUNSI. (NRC staff also informs any party to the proceeding whose interest independent of the proceeding would be harmed by the release of the information.) If NRC staff makes the finding of need for SUNSI and likelihood of standing, NRC staff begins document processing (preparation of redactions or review of redacted documents).
25	If NRC staff finds no "need" or no likelihood of standing, the deadline for petitioner/requester to file a motion seeking a ruling to reverse the NRC staff's denial of access; NRC staff files copy of access determination with the presiding officer (or Chief Administrative Judge or other designated officer, as appropriate). If NRC staff finds "need" for SUNSI, the deadline for any party to the proceeding whose interest independent of the proceeding would be harmed by the release of the information to file a motion seeking a ruling to reverse the NRC staff's grant of access.
30	Deadline for NRC staff reply to motions to reverse NRC staff determination(s).
40	(Receipt +30) If NRC staff finds standing and need for SUNSI, deadline for NRC staff to complete information processing and file motion for Protective Order and draft Non-Disclosure Affidavit. Deadline for applicant/licensee to file Non-Disclosure Agreement for SUNSI.

² Any motion for Protective Order or draft Non-Disclosure Affidavit or Agreement for SUNSI must be filed with the presiding officer or the Chief Administrative Judge if the presiding officer has not

yet been designated, within 30 days of the deadline for the receipt of the written access request.

³ Requesters should note that the filing requirements of the NRC's E-Filing Rule (72 FR 49139; August 28, 2007, as amended at 77 FR

46562; August 3, 2012) apply to appeals of NRC staff determinations (because they must be served on a presiding officer or the Commission, as applicable), but not to the initial SUNSI request submitted to the NRC staff under these procedures.

ATTACHMENT 1—GENERAL TARGET SCHEDULE FOR PROCESSING AND RESOLVING REQUESTS FOR ACCESS TO SENSITIVE UNCLASSIFIED NON-SAFEGUARDS INFORMATION IN THIS PROCEEDING—Continued

Day	Event/activity
A	If access granted: Issuance of presiding officer or other designated officer decision on motion for protective order for access to sensitive information (including schedule for providing access and submission of contentions) or decision reversing a final adverse determination by the NRC staff.
A + 3	Deadline for filing executed Non-Disclosure Affidavits. Access provided to SUNSI consistent with decision issuing the protective order.
A + 28	Deadline for submission of contentions whose development depends upon access to SUNSI. However, if more than 25 days remain between the petitioner's receipt of (or access to) the information and the deadline for filing all other contentions (as established in the notice of opportunity to request a hearing and petition for leave to intervene), the petitioner may file its SUNSI contentions by that later deadline.
A + 53	(Contention receipt +25) Answers to contentions whose development depends upon access to SUNSI.
A + 60	(Answer receipt +7) Petitioner/Intervenor reply to answers.
>A + 60	Decision on contention admission.

[FR Doc. 2018-25452 Filed 12-3-18; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[NRC-2018-0134]

Fuel Cycle Safety, Safeguards, and Environmental Review Interim Staff Guidance**AGENCY:** Nuclear Regulatory Commission.**ACTION:** Interim staff guidance; withdrawal.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is announcing the withdrawal of several Interim Staff Guidance (ISG) documents associated with fuel cycle facilities. These documents are being withdrawn because the guidance contained in the documents have since been incorporated into NUREG-1520, "Standard Review Plan for Fuel Cycle Facilities License Applications."

DATES: The withdrawal of the Fuel Cycle Safety, Safeguards, and Environmental Review ISG documents were issued on December 4, 2018.

ADDRESSES: Please refer to Docket ID NRC-2018-0134 when contacting the NRC about the availability of information regarding this document. You may obtain publicly-available information related to this document using any of the following methods:

- *Federal Rulemaking Website:* Go to <http://www.regulations.gov> and search for Docket ID NRC-2018-0134. Address questions about NRC dockets in *Regulations.gov* to Jennifer Borges; telephone: 301-287-9127; email: Jennifer.Borges@nrc.gov. For technical questions, contact the individual listed

in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section of this document.

- *NRC's Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS):* You may obtain publicly-available documents online in the ADAMS Public Documents collection at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html>. To begin the search, select "Begin Web-based ADAMS Search." For problems with ADAMS, please contact the NRC's Public Document Room (PDR) reference staff at 1-800-397-4209, 301-415-4737, or by email to pdr.resource@nrc.gov. The ADAMS accession number for each document referenced (if it is available in ADAMS) is provided the first time that it is mentioned in this document. In addition, for the convenience of the reader, the ADAMS accession numbers are provided in a table in the "Availability of Documents" section of this document.

- *NRC's PDR:* You may examine and purchase copies of public documents at the NRC's PDR, Room O1-F21, One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland 20852.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jennifer Fisher, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001; telephone: 301-415-1456, email: Jennifer.Fisher@nrc.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**I. Background**

The NRC is withdrawing select Fuel Cycle Safety, Safeguards, and Environmental Review ISG documents because the content was incorporated in NUREG-1520, "Standard Review Plan for Fuel Cycle Facilities License Applications" (ADAMS Accession No. ML15176A258). The content in NUREG-1520 supersedes the original

ISG and therefore these documents are being withdrawn. In some instances, the ISG was incorporated in its entirety and at other times only sections that were still relevant at the date of publish were included. The following ISG documents are being withdrawn:

FCSS-ISG-01, "Qualitative Criteria for Evaluation of Likelihood" (ADAMS Accession No. ML051520236), was incorporated in NUREG-1520, Chapter 3, Appendix B, "Qualitative Criteria for Evaluation of Likelihood."

FCSS-ISG-03, "Nuclear Criticality Safety Performance Requirements and Double Contingency Principle" (ADAMS Accession No. ML050690302), was incorporated in NUREG-1520, Chapter 5, Appendix A, "Nuclear Criticality Performance Requirements and Double-Contingency Principle."

FCSS-ISG-05, "Additional Reporting Requirements of 10 CFR 70.74" (ADAMS Accession No. ML053630228), is superseded by NUREG-1520, Chapter 5, Section 5.4.1, "Nuclear Criticality Safety; Acceptance Criteria; Regulatory Requirements."

FCSS-ISG-08, "Natural Phenomena Hazards" (ADAMS Accession No. ML052650305), was incorporated into NUREG-1520, Chapter 3, Appendix D, "Natural Phenomena Hazards."

FCSS-ISG-09, "Initiating Event Frequencies" (ADAMS Accession No. ML051520323), was incorporated into NUREG-1520, Chapter 3, Appendix C, "Initiating Event Frequency."

FCSS-ISG-10, "Justification for Minimum Margin of Subcriticality for Safety" (ADAMS Accession No. ML061650370), was incorporated into NUREG-1520, Chapter 5, Appendix B, "Justification for Minimum Margin of Subcriticality for Safety."

II. Availability of Documents