

APPENDIX

[14 TAA petitions instituted between 10/3/11 and 10/7/11]

TA-W	Subject Firm (petitioners)	Location	Date of institution	Date of petition
80486	Lattice Semiconductor (Workers)	Bethlehem, PA	10/03/11	09/22/11
80487	Stimson Lumber Company (Workers)	Colville, WA	10/03/11	09/27/11
80488	Plexus Services Corp. (Company)	Nampa, ID	10/03/11	09/30/11
80489	Citi Group (State/One-Stop)	Elk Grove Village, IL	10/03/11	09/30/11
80490	Novartis Pharmaceuticals (State/One-Stop)	East Hanover, NJ	10/04/11	10/03/11
80491	Staffmark (Workers)	Poplar Bluff, MO	10/04/11	09/30/11
80492	Rock-Tenn-Milwaukee Folding Plant (Union)	Milwaukee, WI	10/05/11	10/04/11
80493	Molded Fiber Glass Companies (MFG Texas) (State/One-Stop).	Gainesville, TX	10/05/11	10/04/11
80494	Anthelio Healthcare Solutions Inc. (State/One-Stop)	Dallas, TX	10/05/11	10/04/11
80495	BCI—The Newark Group, Inc. (State/One-Stop)	Fitchburg, MA	10/06/11	10/05/11
80496	Ben-Mar Hosiery (Company)	Ft. Payne, AL	10/07/11	10/05/11
80497	Southwoods, LLC (Company)	Manning, SC	10/07/11	10/06/11
80498	InterMetro Industries (Company)	Fostoria, OH	10/07/11	10/05/11
80499	Standard Insurance Company (Workers)	Portland, OR	10/07/11	09/26/11

[FR Doc. 2011-27704 Filed 10-25-11; 8:45 am]  
 BILLING CODE 4510-FN-P

**NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

[Docket No. 50-302; NRC-2011-0248]

**Florida Power Corporation; Notice of Withdrawal of Application for Amendment to Facility Operating License**

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC or the Commission) has granted the request of Florida Power Corporation (the licensee) to withdraw its March 24, 2011, application for proposed amendment to Facility Operating License No. DPR-72 for the Crystal River Unit 3 Nuclear Generating Plant located in Citrus County, Florida.

The proposed amendment would have modified the facility technical specifications to adopt Technical Specification Task Force (TSTF), Improved Standard Technical Specifications Change Traveler, TSTF-248, Revision 0, "Revise Shutdown Margin Definition for Stuck Rod Exception." The proposed amendment would have revised the definition of shutdown margin to include a provision allowing an exception to the highest reactivity worth stuck control rod penalty if there are two independent means of confirming that all control rods are fully inserted in the reactor core.

The Commission had previously issued a Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment published in the **Federal Register** on June 28, 2011 (76 FR 37848). However, by letter dated September 7, 2011, the licensee withdrew the proposed change.

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendment dated March 24, 2011, and the licensee's letter dated September 7, 2011, which withdrew the application for license amendment. Documents may be examined, and/or copied for a fee, at the NRC's Public Document Room (PDR), located at One White Flint North, Public File Area O1 F21, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland. Publicly available documents created or received at the NRC are accessible electronically through the Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS) in the NRC Library at <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 by e-mail to [pdr.resource@nrc.gov](mailto:pdr.resource@nrc.gov).

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 17th day of October 2011.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Farideh E. Saba,**  
*Senior Project Manager, Plant Licensing Branch II-2, Division of Operating Reactor Licensing, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 2011-27689 Filed 10-25-11; 8:45 am]  
 BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

**NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

[NRC-2011-0249]

**Appointments to Performance Review Boards for Senior Executive Service**

**AGENCY:** U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**ACTION:** Appointment to Performance Review Boards for Senior Executive Service.

**SUMMARY:** The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) has announced the following appointments to the NRC Performance Review Boards.

The following individuals are appointed as members of the NRC Performance Review Board (PRB) responsible for making recommendations to the appointing and awarding authorities on performance appraisal ratings and performance awards for Senior Executives and Senior Level employees:

Darren B. Ash, Deputy Executive Director for Corporate Management, Office of the Executive Director for Operations.

R.W. Borchardt, Executive Director for Operations.

Stephen G. Burns, General Counsel.  
 James E. Dyer, Chief Financial Officer.  
 Kathryn O. Greene, Director, Office of Administration.

Catherine Haney, Director, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.  
 Eric J. Leeds, Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

Victor M. McCree, Regional Administrator, Region II.

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

Martin J. Virgilio, Deputy Executive Director for Reactor and Preparedness Programs, Office of the Executive Director for Operations.

Michael F. Weber, Deputy Executive Director for Materials, Waste, Research, State, Tribal, and Compliance Programs, Office of the Executive Director for Operations.

James T. Wiggins, Director, Office of Nuclear Security and Incident Response.

The following individuals will serve as members of the NRC PRB Panel that was established to review appraisals and make recommendations to the appointing and awarding authorities for NRC PRB members:

Marvin L. Itzkowitz, Associate General Counsel for Hearings, Enforcement, and Administration, Office of the General Counsel.

Michael R. Johnson, Director, Office of New Reactors.

Mark A. Satorius, Director, Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs.

All appointments are made pursuant to Section 4314 of Chapter 43 of Title 5 of the United States Code.

**DATES:** *Effective Date:* October 26, 2011.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Secretary, Executive Resources Board, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, (301) 492-2076.

Dated at Bethesda, Maryland, this 18th day of October, 2011.

For the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Miriam L. Cohen,**

*Secretary, Executive Resources Board.*

[FR Doc. 2011-27688 Filed 10-25-11; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7590-01-P**

## **NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

[Docket No. 50-261; NRC-2011-0247]

### **Carolina Power & Light Company, H.B. Robinson Steam Electric Plant, Unit No. 2; Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact**

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is considering issuance of an exemption pursuant to Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR) 50.46, "Acceptance criteria for emergency core cooling systems for light-water nuclear power reactors," and 10 CFR part 50, appendix k, "ECCS [Emergency Core Cooling System] Evaluation Models," to allow for the use of M5 alloy fuel rod cladding for Facility Operating License No. DPR-23, issued to Carolina Power & Light Company (the licensee), for operation of the H. B. Robinson Steam Electric Plant, Unit 2 (HBRSEP), located in Darlington County, South Carolina. In accordance with 10 CFR 51.21, "Criteria for and identification of licensing and regulatory actions requiring environmental assessments," the NRC staff prepared an environmental assessment documenting its finding. The NRC staff concluded that the proposed action will have no significant environmental impact.

## **Environmental Assessment**

### *Identification of the Proposed Action*

The proposed action would exempt the licensee from certain requirements of 10 CFR 50.46 and appendix K to 10 CFR part 50. Specifically, 10 CFR 50.46, paragraph (a)(1)(i) provides requirements for reactors containing uranium oxide fuel pellets clad in either zircaloy or ZIRLO. Additionally, appendix K to 10 CFR part 50 specifies the use of zircaloy or ZIRLO fuel cladding when doing calculations for energy release, cladding oxidation, and hydrogen generation after a postulated loss-of-coolant accident. Therefore, both of these regulations either state that either zircaloy or ZIRLO is used as the fuel rod cladding material. The proposed exemption would allow the licensee use of M5 cladding fuel assemblies into the core of HBRSEP, Unit 2. The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application dated October 19, 2010.

### *The Need for the Proposed Action*

The proposed exemption is needed to allow the licensee to allow for the use of M5 alloy fuel rod cladding at HBRSEP, Unit No. 2. The licensee has requested an exemption from the requirements of 10 CFR 50.46 and 10 CFR part 50, appendix K to allow for loading of M5 cladding fuel assemblies, in lieu of zircaloy or ZIRLO, into the core during Refueling Outage 27 that is currently scheduled to begin on October 29, 2011.

### *Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action*

The NRC has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that there are no environmental impacts associated with the proposed exemption. The details of the NRC staff's safety evaluation will be provided in the exemption that, if approved by the NRC, will be issued as part of the letter to the licensee approving the exemption to the regulation.

The proposed action will not significantly increase the probability or consequences of accidents. No changes are being made in the types of effluents that may be released offsite. There is no significant increase in the amount of any effluent released offsite. There is no significant increase in occupational or public radiation exposure. Therefore, there are no significant radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

With regard to potential nonradiological impacts, the proposed action does not result in changes to land use or water use, or result in changes to

the quality or quantity of nonradiological 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. In addition, there are also no known socioeconomic or environmental justice impacts associated with such proposed action. Therefore, there are no significant nonradiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

Accordingly, the NRC concludes that there are no significant environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

### *Environmental Impacts of the Alternatives to the Proposed Action*

As an alternative to the proposed action, the NRC staff considered denial of the proposed action (*i.e.*, the "no action" alternative). Denial of the exemption request would result in no change in current environmental impacts. If the proposed action was denied, the licensee would have to comply with the ECCS rules in 10 CFR 50.46 and appendix K to 10 CFR part 50 regarding use of M5 cladding into the HBRSEP, Unit 2 core during the upcoming refueling outage. This would cause unnecessary burden on the licensee, without a significant benefit in environmental impacts. The environmental impacts of the proposed exemption 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 HBRSEP, dated April 1975, as supplemented through the "Generic Environmental Impact Statement for License Renewal of Nuclear Plants: H.B. Robinson Steam Electric Plant, Unit 2—Final Report (NUREG-1437, Supplement 13)."

### *Agencies and Persons Consulted*

In accordance with its stated policy, on October 17, 2011, the NRC staff consulted with the South Carolina State official, Mark Yeager of the South Carolina Bureau of Land and Waste Management, regarding the environmental impact of the proposed action. The State official had no comments.