# **Proposed Rules**

Federal Register

Vol. 87, No. 250

Friday, December 30, 2022

This section of the FEDERAL REGISTER contains notices to the public of the proposed issuance of rules and regulations. The purpose of these notices is to give interested persons an opportunity to participate in the rule making prior to the adoption of the final rules.

## OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

5 CFR Part 532

RIN 3206-AO49

Prevailing Rate Systems; Redefinition of Certain Appropriated Fund Federal Wage System Wage Areas

**AGENCY:** Office of Personnel

Management.

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Office of Personnel Management (OPM) is proposing a rule to redefine the geographic boundaries of the following appropriated fund Federal Wage System (FWS) wage areas for paysetting purposes: Hagerstown-Martinsburg-Chambersburg, MD; Richmond, VA; Roanoke, VA; and Washington, DC. The proposed rule would redefine the Shenandoah National Park portions of Albemarle, Augusta, Greene, Page, and Rockingham Counties, VA, to the Washington, DC, wage area. This change is based on a recent consensus recommendation of the Federal Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee (FPRAC).

**DATES:** Send comments on or before January 30, 2023.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments, identified by docket number and/or Regulatory Information Number (RIN) and title, by the following method:

• Federal Rulemaking Portal: http://www.regulations.gov. Follow the instructions for submitting comments.

All submissions received must include the agency name and docket number or RIN for this document. The general policy for comments and other submissions from members of the public is to make these submissions available for public viewing at <a href="http://www.regulations.gov">http://www.regulations.gov</a> as they are received without change, including any personal identifiers or contact information.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Ana Paunoiu, by telephone at (202) 606–

2858 or by email at *pay-leave-policy@* opm.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: OPM is proposing a rule to redefine the geographic boundaries of the following appropriated fund FWS wage areas: Hagerstown-Martinsburg-Chambersburg, MD; Richmond, VA; Roanoke, VA; and Washington, DC. This proposed rule would redefine the Shenandoah National Park portions of Albemarle, Augusta, Greene, Page, and Rockingham Counties, VA, to the Washington, DC, wage area. Shenandoah National Park would become consolidated under the Washington, DC, FWS wage area so that the installation would be defined to a single wage area. This change is based on a recent recommendation of FPRAC, the statutory national labor-management committee responsible for advising OPM on matters affecting the pay of FWS employees. From time to time, FPRAC reviews the boundaries of wage areas and provides OPM with recommendations for changes if the Committee finds that changes are warranted.

As provided by 5 CFR 532.211, this regulation allows consideration of the following criteria when defining wage area boundaries: distance, transportation facilities, and geographic features; commuting patterns; and similarities in overall population, employment, and the kinds and sizes of private industrial establishments.

The Shenandoah National Park (approximately 105 miles long) is currently split among four FWS areas. When the FWS was first established, most of Shenandoah National Park was in the Hagerstown-Martinsburg-Chambersburg wage area. Over time, as a result of changes in Office of Management and Budget defined metropolitan statistical areas, the wage area definitions for some counties that comprise the Shenandoah National Park have been changed by OPM based on recommendations of FPRAC.

Presently, portions of the Shenandoah National Park are defined to the Hagerstown-Martinsburg-Chambersburg, MD; Richmond, VA; Roanoke, VA; and Washington, DC, FWS wage areas as follows:

(1) The Shenandoah National Park portion of Albemarle and Greene Counties, VA, is defined to the Richmond wage area; (2) The Shenandoah National Park portion of Augusta County, VA, is defined to the Roanoke wage area;

(3) The Shenandoah National Park portion of Madison, Rappahannock, and Warren Counties, VA, is defined to the Washington, DC, wage area; and

(4) The Shenandoah National Park portion of Page and Rockingham Counties, VA, is defined to the Hagerstown-Martinsburg-Chambersburg,

MD, wage area.

Albemarle and Greene Counties, except for the Shenandoah National Park portions, continue to be appropriately defined to the Richmond, VA, wage area. Augusta County, except for the Shenandoah National Park portion, continues to be appropriately defined to the Roanoke, VA, wage area. Page and Rockingham Counties, except for the Shenandoah National Park portions, continue to be appropriately defined to the Hagerstown-Martinsburg-Chambersburg, MD, wage area. Madison, Rappahannock, and Warren Counties continue to be appropriately defined to the Washington, DC, wage

There are 14 FWS National Park Service (NPS) employees working in the Shenandoah National Park portion of Madison County and 17 FWS NPS employees working in the Shenandoah National Park portion of Page County. So that the FWS employees working at Shenandoah National Park are not split among four wage areas, OPM proposes that the Shenandoah National Park portions of Albemarle, Augusta, Greene, Page, and Rockingham Counties be redefined to the Washington, DC, wage area. Shenandoah National Park would then be entirely defined to the Washington, DC, wage area. This change would provide equal pay treatment for FWS employees working at Shenandoah National Park.

FPRAC, the national labormanagement committee responsible for advising OPM on matters concerning the pay of FWS employees, recommended this change by consensus. This change would be effective on the first day of the first applicable pay period beginning on or after 30 days following publication of the final regulations.

## **Regulatory Impact Analysis**

This action is not a "significant regulatory action" under the terms of Executive Order (E.O.) 12866 (58 FR 51735, October 4, 1993) and is therefore not subject to review under E.O. 12866 and 13563 (76 FR 3821, January 21, 2011).

#### Regulatory Flexibility Act

OPM certifies that this rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

#### Federalism

We have examined this rule in accordance with Executive Order 13132. Federalism, and have determined that this rule will not have any negative impact on the rights, roles and responsibilities of State, local, or tribal governments.

#### Civil Justice Reform

This regulation meets the applicable standard set forth in Executive Order

#### Unfunded Mandates Act of 1995

This rule will not result in the expenditure by State, local, and tribal governments, in the aggregate, or by the private sector, of \$100 million or more in any year and it will not significantly or uniquely affect small governments. Therefore, no actions were deemed necessary under the provisions of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of

#### **Paperwork Reduction Act**

This rule does not impose any new reporting or record-keeping requirements subject to the Paperwork Reduction Act.

#### List of Subjects in 5 CFR Part 532

Administrative practice and procedure, Freedom of information, Government employees, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Wages.

Office of Personnel Management.

#### Stephen Hickman,

Federal Register Liaison.

Accordingly, OPM is proposing to amend 5 CFR part 532 as follows:

## **PART 532—PREVAILING RATE SYSTEMS**

■ 1. The authority citation for part 532 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 5 U.S.C. 5343, 5346; § 532.707 also issued under 5 U.S.C. 552.

■ 2. In Appendix C to subpart B amend the table by revising the wage area listings for the District of Columbia and the States of Maryland and Virginia to read as follows:

## Appendix C to Subpart B of Part 532— Appropriated Fund Wage and Survey

## **Definitions of Wage and Wage Survey Areas**

#### **District of Columbia**

### Washington, DC

Survey Area

District of Columbia:

Washington, DC

Maryland:

Charles

Frederick

Montgomery

Prince George's

Virginia (cities):

Alexandria Fairfax

Falls Church

Manassas

Manassas Park

Virginia (counties):

Arlington Fairfax

Loudoun

Prince William

Area of Application. Survey area plus:

Maryland:

Calvert

St. Marv's

Virginia (city): Fredericksburg

Virginia (counties):

Albemarle (Only includes the Shenandoah

National Park portion)

Augusta (Only includes the Shenandoah

National Park portion)

Clarke

Culpeper

Fauquier

Greene (Only includes the Shenandoah

National Park portion)

King George

Madison

Page (Only includes the Shenandoah

National Park portion)

Rappahannock

Rockingham (Only includes the

Shenandoah National Park portion)

Spotsylvania

Stafford

Warren

West Virginia:

Jefferson

## Maryland

## **Baltimore**

Survey Area

Maryland (city):

Baltimore

Maryland (counties):

Anne Arundel

Baltimore

Carroll

Harford

Howard Area of Application. Survey area plus:

Maryland:

Queen Anne's

#### Hagerstown-Martinsburg-Chambersburg

Survey Area

Maryland:

Washington

Pennsylvania:

Franklin

West Virginia: Berkeley

Area of Application. Survey area plus:

Maryland:

Allegany

Garrett

Pennsylvania: Fulton

Virginia (cities):

Harrisonburg

Winchester

Virginia (counties):

Frederick

Page (Does not include the Shenandoah

National Park portion)

Rockingham (Does not include the

Shenandoah National Park portion)

Shenandoah

West Virginia:

Hampshire

Hardv

Mineral Morgan

#### Virginia

#### Norfolk-Portsmouth-Newport News-Hampton

Survey Area

Virginia (cities):

Chesapeake

Hampton

Newport News Norfolk

Poquoson

Portsmouth

Suffolk

Virginia Beach

Williamsburg

Virginia (counties):

Gloucester

James City

York North Carolina:

Currituck

Area of Application. Survey area plus:

Virginia (city):

Franklin

Virginia (counties):

Accomack

Isle of Wight

Mathews Northampton

Southampton

Surry

North Čarolina:

Camden

Chowan Gates

Pasquotank

Perquimans

Maryland:

Assateague Island part of Worcester

## Richmond

Survey Area

Virginia (cities):

Colonial Heights Hopewell Petersburg Richmond Virginia (counties): Charles City Chesterfield Dinwiddie

Dinwiddie
Goochland
Hanover
Henrico
New Kent

Prince George

 $Area\ of\ Application.\ Survey\ area\ plus:$ 

Virginia (cities): Charlottesville Emporia Virginia (counties):

Powhatan

Albemarle (Does not include the Shenandoah National Park portion)

Amelia Brunswick Buckingham Caroline Charlotte Cumberland Essex

Essex Fluvanna

Greene (Does not include the Shenandoah

National Park portion)

Greensville King and Queen King William Lancaster Louisa

Lunenberg Mecklenburg Middlesex Nelson

Northumberland

Nottoway Orange Prince Edward Richmond Sussex Westmoreland

## Roanoke

Survey Area

Virginia (cities):

Radford Roanoke Salem

Virginia (counties):

Botetourt Craig Montgomery Roanoke

Area of Application. Survey area plus:

Virginia (cities): Bedford

Buena Vista Clifton Forge Covington

Covington
Danville
Galax
Lexington
Lynchburg

Martinsville South Boston

Staunton Waynesboro Virginia (counties):

Alleghany

Amherst

Appomattox

Augusta (Does not include the Shenandoah National Park portion)

Bath
Bedford
Bland
Campbell
Carroll
Floyd
Franklin
Giles
Halifax
Henry
Patrick
Pittsburgh
Pulaski
Rockbridge

Wythe

[FR Doc. 2022–28318 Filed 12–29–22; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6325-39-P

# NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

#### 10 CFR Part 35

[Docket No. PRM-35-22; NRC-2020-0141]

### Reporting Nuclear Medicine Injection Extravasations as Medical Events

**AGENCY:** Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**ACTION:** Petition for rulemaking; consideration in the rulemaking process.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) will consider in its rulemaking process issues raised in a petition for rulemaking (PRM), PRM—35–22, submitted by Ronald K. Lattanze on behalf of Lucerno Dynamics, LLC. The petitioner requested that the NRC amend its regulations to require reporting of certain nuclear medicine injection extravasations as medical events

**DATES:** The docket for the petition for rulemaking, PRM-35-22, is closed on December 30, 2022.

ADDRESSES: Please refer to Docket ID NRC–2020–0141 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-2020-0141. Address questions about NRC dockets to Dawn Forder; telephone: 301-415-3407; or email: Dawn.Forder@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 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. For the convenience of the reader, instructions about obtaining materials referenced in this document are provided in the "Availability of Documents" section.

• NRC's PDR: You may examine and purchase copies of public documents, by appointment, at the NRC's Public Document Room (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 or call 1–800–397–4209 or 301–415–4737, between 8:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. (ET), Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Andrew Carrera, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001; telephone: 301–415–1078, email: *Andrew.Carrera@nrc.gov.* 

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

## **Table of Contents**

I. The Petition

A. Background

B. Issues Raised in the Petition

II. Public Comments on the Petition A. Overview of Public Comments

- B. Comments Received to Specific Questions in the Docketing Request for Comment
- C. NRC Response to Additional Public Comments

III. Reasons for Consideration IV. Availability of Documents V. Conclusion

#### I. The Petition

The NRC received and docketed a PRM (ADAMS Accession No. ML20157A266) dated May 18, 2020, filed by Ronald K. Lattanze on behalf of Lucerno Dynamics, LLC. On September 15, 2020, the NRC published a notice of docketing and request for public comment on the petition (85 FR 57148). The petitioner requested that the NRC amend its regulations in part 35 of title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR), "Medical Use of Byproduct Material," to require reporting of certain nuclear medicine injection extravasations as medical events. Extravasation is the infiltration of