

consideration for future modifications to the public notice response process.

(4) The respondent also urged the RUS to regularly update the minimum acceptable level of broadband service.

*Agency response:* The minimum acceptable level of broadband service is designed to change with the ever-increasing bandwidth requirements that the public requires. The Agency has implemented procedures in 7 CFR 1738.2 that allow the definition of broadband service to be updated any time an application window is opened through a notice in the **Federal Register** or required by statute.

*Respondent 2:* The respondent, an industry association, provided three specific comments as part of their response.

(1) The respondent reminded the Agency it must comply with requirements applicable to all broadband funding to include notice and challenge, reporting and Agency coordination.

*Agency response:* The Agency acknowledges this comment and will continue to follow the regulations and processes it has in place for its existing broadband lending programs.

(2) The respondent requested that RUS clarify that an area is only eligible for funding if there is no broadband service available, whether fixed or mobile, that reaches the designated speeds.

*Agency response:* Section 1980.1207(b) states that if RUS determines that the minimum acceptable level of broadband service is available in the proposed retail service area after review of information submitted from service providers, if any, and all available data on broadband availability, the Awarding Agency shall not approve the use of funds for such purpose. The Agency feels this section addresses the respondents comment and no changes are needed.

(3) The respondent encouraged RUS to adopt new rules for all of its broadband funding programs through notice and comment rulemaking procedures.

*Agency response:* The Agency will continue to follow all rulemaking procedures as applicable.

*Respondent 3:* The respondent, an industry association, encouraged careful precision when multiplying the number of programs supporting broadband. The respondent encourages USDA and the FCC programs to work in concert stating that Section 6210 funds should be used in concert with USF to deploy the fastest, most reliable networks possible. The respondent noted “as more RD programs support broadband network

deployment under Sec 6210, it will remain essential to use the additional funds to supplement the work of existing programs instead of supporting an additional ISP in a rural area that will not even support one provider on its own.” The respondent suggests that the rule “include a provision indicating that, for an area where FCC data indicate that a provider is receiving High-Cost USF support and is subject to the corresponding obligation to deploy a network that will deliver 25/3 Mbps or greater service, no other provider will be eligible to obtain funds pursuant to Section 6210 in that specific area.”

*Agency response:* The Agency is committed to continuing to work with the FCC and other federal partners to ensure that their programs and RUS’ programs are complementary of each other, not duplicative.

*Respondent 4:* The respondent, an industry association, provided a resolution that outlines the challenges that rural organizations and businesses have in identifying and accessing federal broadband resources. The resolution also provided generalized recommendations to Congress and federal agencies concerning adopting higher broadband speeds as the standard, strengthening local partnerships and coordination, addressing application barriers for businesses, local governments, cooperatives and Tribes; allocating designated portions of available funding to support projects on tribal lands and to leverage community anchor institutions to spur connectivity.

*Agency response:* Respondent four comments were more general and not specifically related to suggested changes for this final rule. The Agency appreciates the respondent’s commitment to Rural America and to maintaining positive local and federal relationships.

*Respondent 5,* a university student, suggested the Agency increase the funding amount from 10 percent to 15 percent.

*Agency response:* Section 6210 of the 2018 Farm Bill specifically states 10 percent. An increase of this percentage would require a statutory change.

*Respondent 6,* an individual, petitioned USDA to consider three changes:

(1) To define the minimum acceptable level of broadband service from 25MB down and 3MB up to 50MB down and 10MP up speeds.

*Agency response:* As stated in an earlier response, the minimum acceptable level of broadband service is designed to change with the ever-increasing bandwidth requirements that

the public requires and to comply with statutory requirements. The Agency has implemented procedures in 7 CFR 1738.2 that allow the definition of broadband speeds to be updated any time an application window is opened through a notice in the **Federal Register**.

(2) Consider a temporary interest rate reduction on loans for organizations that provide broadband services to families engaged in distance education at a reduced cost.

*Agency response:* Section 6210 of the 2018 Farm Bill does not include a provision for an interest rate reduction when implementing this special broadband authority.

(3) Increase the percentage organizations can spend on broadband and smart utility facilities from 10 percent to 15 percent.

*Agency response:* As stated in a previous response, Section 6210 of the 2018 Farm Bill specifically limits such assistance to 10 percent. An increase of this percentage would require a statutory change.

*Respondent 7,* an individual, offered his support of USDA establishing the authority authorized by section 6210 of the Agricultural Improvement Act of 2018.

*Agency response:* The Agency appreciates the respondent’s comments and support of this final rule.

*Respondent 8,* a non-profit organization, did not offer comments specific to the rule. Instead, they outlined the importance of accurate broadband mapping data and their proposed solution to help with this undertaking.

*Agency response:* The Agency appreciates the respondent’s efforts to improve broadband mapping data and their commitment to Rural America.

The Agency evaluated the responsive comments and based on analysis, confirms the final rule without change.

**Farah Ahmad,**

*Deputy Under Secretary for Rural Development.*

[FR Doc. 2023-23070 Filed 10-18-23; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3410-15-P**

---

## **NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

### **10 CFR Part 140**

**[NRC-2023-0130]**

**RIN 3150-AL02**

### **Increase in the Maximum Amount of Primary Nuclear Liability Insurance**

**AGENCY:** Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is amending its regulations to increase the required amount of primary nuclear liability insurance from \$450 million to \$500 million for each nuclear reactor that is licensed to operate, is designed for the production of electrical energy, and has a rated capacity of 100,000 electrical kilowatts or more. This change complies with the provision in the Price-Anderson Amendments Act of 1988 that states the amount of primary financial protection required of licensees by the NRC shall be the maximum amount available at reasonable cost and on reasonable terms from private sources.

**DATES:** This final rule is effective on January 1, 2024.

**ADDRESSES:** Please refer to Docket ID NRC–2023–0130 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 <https://www.regulations.gov> and search for Docket ID NRC–2023–0130. Address questions about NRC dockets to Dawn Forder; telephone: 301–415–3407; email: [Dawn.Forder@nrc.gov](mailto:Dawn.Forder@nrc.gov). For technical questions, contact the individuals 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 <https://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, at 301–415–4737, or by email to [PDR.Resource@nrc.gov](mailto: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 the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section.

- *NRC's PDR:* You may examine and purchase copies of public documents, by appointment, at the NRC's PDR, Room P1 B35, One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland 20852. To make an appointment to visit the PDR, please send an email to [PDR.Resource@nrc.gov](mailto:PDR.Resource@nrc.gov) or call 1–800–397–4209 or 301–415–4737, between 8 a.m. and 4 p.m. eastern time, Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Stewart Schneider, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, telephone: 301–415–4123, email: [Stewart.Schneider@nrc.gov](mailto:Stewart.Schneider@nrc.gov) and Mable Henderson, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, telephone: 301–415–3760, email: [Mable.Henderson@nrc.gov](mailto:Mable.Henderson@nrc.gov). Both are employees of the NRC.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**Table of Contents**

- I. Discussion
- II. Rulemaking Procedure
- III. Section-by-Section Analysis
- IV. Regulatory Flexibility Certification
- V. Regulatory Analysis
- VI. Backfitting and Issue Finality
- VII. Plain Writing
- VIII. National Environmental Policy
- IX. Paperwork Reduction Act
- X. Congressional Review Act

**I. Discussion**

The NRC's regulations in part 140 of title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR), “Financial Protection Requirements and Indemnity Agreements,” provide requirements and procedures for implementing the financial protection requirements for certain licensees and other persons under the Price-Anderson Amendments Act of 1988 (Pub. L. 100–408) (Price-Anderson Act), incorporated as Section 170 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (AEA). The Price-Anderson Act amended § 170b.(1) to state that for facilities designed for producing substantial amounts of electricity and having a rated capacity of 100,000 electrical kilowatts or more (henceforth referred to as large operating reactors), “the amount of primary financial protection required shall be the maximum amount available at reasonable cost and on reasonable terms from private sources.” This requirement of the Price-Anderson Act is implemented in the NRC's regulations at § 140.11 “Amounts of financial protection for certain reactors.” Section 140.11(a)(4) refers to the current dollar amount of the maximum amount liability insurance from private sources of \$450 million. Therefore, § 140.11(a)(4) currently requires large operating reactors to have and maintain primary nuclear liability insurance in the amount of \$450 million.

In a letter dated July 14, 2023, American Nuclear Insurers (ANI), the underwriter of American nuclear liability policies, acting on behalf of its member companies, notified the NRC that it will be increasing “its maximum available primary nuclear liability limit from \$450 million to \$500 million, effective on January 1, 2024” (ADAMS Accession No. ML23212A986). The ANI

makes such adjustments on a non-periodic basis. The last such adjustment was made in 2017, and the NRC revised § 140.11 to reflect the increased maximum available amount of primary nuclear liability insurance (81 FR 96347; December 30, 2016).

To implement this adjustment, in accordance with the Price-Anderson Act, the NRC is revising 10 CFR part 140 to require large operating reactors to have and maintain \$500 million in primary financial protection.

The NRC is not currently revising the appendices in § 140.91, § 140.92, or § 140.93 that provide general forms of liability policies and indemnity agreements that were determined to be acceptable to the Commission. These appendices include historical insurance providers and protection amounts for primary liability insurance that are no longer in use (for example, values of \$124 million and \$36 million from the 1979 final rule (44 FR 20632; April 6, 1979) and values of \$200 million, \$155 million, and \$45 million from the 1989 final rule (54 FR 24157; June 6, 1989)). However, these appendices continue to provide relevant general forms of policies and agreements.

**II. Rulemaking Procedure**

This final rule is being issued without prior public notice or opportunity for public comments. The Administrative Procedure Act (5 U.S.C. 553(b)(B)) does not require an agency to use the public notice and comment process “when the agency for good cause finds (and incorporates the finding and a brief statement of reasons therefore in the rules issued) that notice and public procedure thereon are impracticable, unnecessary, or contrary to the public interest.” In this instance, the NRC finds, for good cause, that solicitation of public comment on this final rule is unnecessary because the Price-Anderson Act requires a non-discretionary adjustment in the maximum amount required for primary nuclear liability insurance. Requesting public comment on this non-discretionary adjustment, which is required by statute, would not result in a change to the adjusted amount.

**III. Section-by-Section Analysis**

The following paragraph describes the specific changes that are reflected in this final rule.

*§ 140.11 Amounts of Financial Protection for Certain Reactors*

In paragraph (a)(4), this final rule removes “\$450,000,000” and replaces it with the increased maximum amount of

primary nuclear liability insurance of “\$500,000,000”.

#### IV. Regulatory Flexibility Certification

The Regulatory Flexibility Act does not apply to regulations for which a Federal agency is not required by law, including the rulemaking provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. 553(b), to publish a general notice of proposed rulemaking (5 U.S.C. 604). As discussed in this document under Section II, “Rulemaking Procedure,” the NRC is not publishing this final rule for notice and comment. Accordingly, the NRC has determined that the requirements of the Regulatory Flexibility Act do not apply to this final rule.

#### V. Regulatory Analysis

A regulatory analysis was not prepared for this final rule because the change in the maximum amount of nuclear liability insurance is mandated by the Price-Anderson Act. This final rule does not involve an exercise of Commission discretion.

#### VI. Backfitting and Issue Finality

The NRC has not prepared a backfit analysis for this final rule. This final rule does not involve any provision that would impose a backfit, nor is it inconsistent with any issue finality provision, as those terms are defined in 10 CFR chapter I. These mandatory adjustments are non-discretionary, required by statute, and do not represent any change in position by the NRC with respect to the design, construction, or operation of a licensed facility.

#### VII. Plain Writing

The Plain Writing Act of 2010 (Pub. L. 111–274) requires Federal agencies to write documents in a clear, concise, and well-organized manner. The NRC has written this document to be consistent with the Plain Writing Act as well as the Presidential Memorandum, “Plain Language in Government Writing,” published June 10, 1998 (63 FR 31885).

#### VIII. National Environmental Policy Act

The NRC has determined that this final rule is the type of action described in categorical exclusion 10 CFR 51.22(c)(1). Therefore, neither an environmental impact statement nor an environmental assessment has been prepared for this final rule.

#### IX. Paperwork Reduction Act

This final rule does not contain any new or amended collections of information subject to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501

*et seq.*). Existing collections of information were approved by the Office of Management and Budget, approval number 3150–0039.

#### Public Protection Notification

The NRC may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless the document requesting or requiring the collection displays a currently valid OMB control number.

#### X. Congressional Review Act

This final rule is a rule as defined in the Congressional Review Act (5 U.S.C. 801–808). However, the Office of Management and Budget has not found it to be a major rule as defined in the Congressional Review Act.

#### List of Subjects in 10 CFR Part 140

Criminal penalties, Extraordinary nuclear occurrence, Insurance, Intergovernmental relations, Nuclear materials, Nuclear power plants and reactors, Penalties, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

For the reasons set out in the preamble and under the authority of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended; the Energy Reorganization Act of 1974, as amended; and 5 U.S.C. 552 and 553, the NRC is adopting the following amendments to 10 CFR part 140.

#### PART 140—FINANCIAL PROTECTION REQUIREMENTS AND INDEMNITY AGREEMENTS

■ 1. The authority citation for part 140 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** Atomic Energy Act of 1954, secs. 161, 170, 223, 234 (42 U.S.C. 2201, 2210, 2273, 2282); Energy Reorganization Act of 1974, secs. 201, 202 (42 U.S.C. 5841, 5842); 44 U.S.C. 3504 note.

#### § 140.11 [Amended]

■ 2. In § 140.11, amend paragraph (a)(4) by removing the number “\$450,000,000” and adding in its place the number “\$500,000,000”.

Dated: September 29, 2023.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Scott A. Morris,**

*Acting Executive Director for Operations.*

[FR Doc. 2023–23062 Filed 10–18–23; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7590–01–P**

#### DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

#### 10 CFR Parts 429 and 431

[EERE–2017–BT–STD–0048]

RIN 1904–AF27

#### Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for Dedicated Purpose Pool Pump Motors

#### Correction

In rule document 2023–20343, appearing on pages 66966 through 67041 in the issue of Thursday, September 28, 2023, make the following correction:

#### § 431.482 Materials incorporated by reference. [Corrected]

■ On page 67041, in the second column, the 26th line from the bottom of the page “following paragraphs of this section:” should read “following paragraphs of this section.”.

[FR Doc. C2–2023–20343 Filed 10–18–23; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 0099–10–D**

#### DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

#### Federal Aviation Administration

#### 14 CFR Part 71

[Docket No. FAA–2023–1325; Airspace Docket No. 23–AGL–17]

RIN 2120–AA66

#### Amendment of VOR Federal Airway V–36 and Establishment of RNAV Route T–675; Northcentral United States

**AGENCY:** Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

**ACTION:** Final rule, delay of effective date.

**SUMMARY:** This action changes the effective date of a final rule published in the **Federal Register** on September 22, 2023, amending Very High Frequency Omnidirectional Range (VOR) Federal airway V–36 and establishing Canadian Area Navigation (RNAV) route T–675 in the northcentral United States (U.S.). The FAA is delaying the effective date to coincide with the expected completion of the associated aeronautical data requirements for establishing all segments of Canadian RNAV route T–675 within U.S. airspace and to adopt the rule amendments concurrently.

**DATES:** The effective date of the final rule published on September 22, 2023 (88 FR 65311) is delayed from November 30, 2023, to March 21, 2024. The Director of the Federal Register