person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number.

The NRC published a Federal Register notice with a 60-day comment period on this information collection on November 19, 2014, 79 FR 68917.


2. OMB approval number: 3150–0016

3. Type of submission: Extension with burden revision

4. The form number if applicable: Not applicable

5. How often the collection is required or requested: Reports are submitted as events occur. General license registration requests may be submitted at any time. Changes to the information on the registration may be submitted as they occur.

6. Who will be required or asked to respond: Persons receiving, possessing, using, or transferring devices containing byproduct material.

7. The estimated number of annual respondents: 138,429 (10,929 responses + 127,500 recordkeepers)

8. The estimated number of annual respondents: 10,929 (971 NRC licensee respondents + 9,958 Agreement State licensee responses).

9. An estimate of the total number of hours needed annually to comply with the information collection requirement or request: 36,186 hours (4,843 hours for NRC licenses + 31,343 hours for Agreement State licenses).

10. Abstract: Part 31 of Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations (10 CFR), establishes general licenses for the possession and use of byproduct material in certain devices. General licensees are required to keep testing records and submit event reports identified in Part 31, which assist the NRC in determining with reasonable assurance that devices are operated safely and without radiological hazard to users or the public.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 7th day of April, 2015.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Tremaine Donnell,
NRC Clearance Officer, Office of Information Services.

[FR Doc. 2015–08381 Filed 4–10–15; 8:45 am]


SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Notice is hereby given that the Deputy Director, Nuclear Reactor Regulation, has issued a final director’s decision (ADAMS Accession No. ML15054A365), on a petition filed by the petitioner on March 5, 2014 (ADAMS Accession No. ML14071A006), as supplemented on April 8, May 21, and September 3, 2014 (ADAMS Accession Nos. ML14143A212, ML14142A101, and ML14259A135, respectively). The petitioner requested a number of actions be taken by the NRC and the licensee for equipment failures at PNP. As the basis for the request, the petitioner stated that there have been recent plant events and equipment failures at PNP, such as parts of the primary coolant pump (PCP) impeller breaking off and lodging in the reactor vessel (RV) and flaws in the control rod drive mechanisms (CRDMs). The petitioner requested immediate action to prevent the PCPs from restarting due to a piece of PCP impeller that was lodged between the RV and the flow skirt and due to flawed CRDMs.

By email dated March 19, 2014 (ADAMS Accession No. ML14083A680), the NRC staff denied the petitioner’s request for immediate action to prevent PNP from restarting, based on the following factors:

1. The NRC performed an in-depth independent review of the licensee’s analysis and concluded that the impeller piece did not pose a threat to safe operation of the reactor and RV.

2. The licensee replaced all of the CRDM housings prior to plant startup.

By teleconference on April 8, 2014, and again on September 3, 2014, the petitioner addressed the Petition Review Board (PRB). The meeting provided the petitioner with an opportunity to provide additional information and to clarify issues cited in the petition. The transcripts of these meetings were treated as supplements to the petition and are available in ADAMS, as previously noted.

In the agency’s letter dated September 25, 2014 (ADAMS Accession No. ML14237A726), the NRC accepted the following specific issues of the petition for review under Section 2.206 of Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations (10 CFR):

1. Request for PCP to open every PCP for inspection and clear up all flaws.

2. Request for PCP to replace the PCPs with others designed for their intended duty.

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50–255; NRC–2014–0216]

Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc.; Palisades Nuclear Plant

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Director’s decision under 10 CFR 2.206; issuance.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) has issued a final director’s decision with regard to a petition dated March 5, 2014, as supplemented on April 8, May 21, and September 3, 2014, filed by Mr. Michael Mulligan (the petitioner), requesting that the NRC take action with regard to Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc. (ENO or the licensee) at Palisades Nuclear Plant (PNP). The petitioner’s requests and the final director’s decision are included in the SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION section of this document.

DATES: April 13, 2015.

ADDRESSES: Please refer to Docket ID NRC–2014–0216 when contacting the NRC for review under Section 2.206 of Title 25, 2014 (ADAMS Accession No. ML14143A212, ML14142A101, and ML14259A135, respectively). The petitioner requested a number of actions be taken by the NRC and the licensee for equipment failures at PNP. As the basis for the request, the petitioner stated that there have been recent plant events and equipment failures at PNP, such as parts of the primary coolant pump (PCP) impeller breaking off and lodging in the reactor vessel (RV) and flaws in the control rod drive mechanisms (CRDMs). The petitioner requested immediate action to prevent the PCPs from restarting due to a piece of PCP impeller that was lodged between the RV and the flow skirt and due to flawed CRDMs.

By email dated March 19, 2014 (ADAMS Accession No. ML14083A680), the NRC staff denied the petitioner’s request for immediate action to prevent PNP from restarting, based on the following factors:

1. The NRC performed an in-depth independent review of the licensee’s analysis and concluded that the impeller piece did not pose a threat to safe operation of the reactor and RV.

2. The licensee replaced all of the CRDM housings prior to plant startup.

By teleconference on April 8, 2014, and again on September 3, 2014, the petitioner addressed the Petition Review Board (PRB). The meeting provided the petitioner with an opportunity to provide additional information and to clarify issues cited in the petition. The transcripts of these meetings were treated as supplements to the petition and are available in ADAMS, as previously noted.

In the agency’s letter dated September 25, 2014 (ADAMS Accession No. ML14237A726), the NRC accepted the following specific issues of the petition for review under Section 2.206 of Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations (10 CFR):

1. Request for PCP to open every PCP for inspection and clear up all flaws.

2. Request for PCP to replace the PCPs with others designed for their intended duty.
3. Request an Office of the Inspector General (OIG) inspection on why different NRC regions have different analysis criteria for similar PCP events.
4. Request a $10 million fine over these events.
5. Request for PNP to return to yellow or red status and for the NRC to intensify its monitoring of PNP.

The NRC sent a copy of the proposed director’s decision to the petitioner and the licensee for comment on January 23, 2015 (ADAMS Accession Nos. ML14338A435 and ML14338A431). The petitioner and the licensee were asked to provide comments within 15 days on any part of the proposed director’s decision that was considered to be erroneous or any issues in the petition that were not addressed. Comments were received from the petitioner and are addressed in an attachment to the final director’s decision.

The Deputy Director of the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation denied the petitioner’s requests for the following actions:
1. Request for PNP to open every PCP for inspection and clear up all flaws.
2. Request for PNP to replace the PCPs with others designed for their intended duty.
3. Request a $10 million fine over these events.
4. Request for PNP to return to yellow or red status and for the NRC to intensify its monitoring of PNP.

The reasons for this decision are explained in the final director’s decision DD–15–03, under 10 CFR 2.206 of the Commission’s regulations. The petitioner’s request for an OIG inspection on why different NRC regions have different analysis criteria for similar PCP events has been forwarded to the OIG. The NRC found no basis for taking the requested enforcement-related actions against PNP; thus, the NRC denies the petition. NRC staff did not find that the continued operation of PNP would adversely affect public health and safety. The NRC determined that the licensee’s actions to date are adequate and there is reasonable assurance that the operation of the PNP will not endanger the health and safety of the public. For the performance deficiencies and inspection findings that the NRC has identified at PNP, the agency will continue to monitor the progress of the licensee’s completion of corrective actions through planned inspections consistent with the NRC’s ongoing reactor oversight process.

Consistent with 10 CFR 2.206(c), the NRC staff will file a copy of this final director’s decision with the Secretary of the Commission for the Commission to review. As provided for in 10 CFR 2.206(c)(1), the final director’s decision will constitute the Commission’s final action within 25 days of the date of the decision unless the Commission, on its own motion, chooses to review the decision within that time.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland this 6th day of April 2015.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Jennifer Uhle,
Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 2015–08409 Filed 4–10–15; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[NRC–2014–0245]

Information Collection: Standards for Protection Against Radiation

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Notice of submission to the Office of Management and Budget; request for comment.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) has recently submitted a request for renewal of an existing collection of information to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review. The information collection is entitled, “Standards for Protection Against Radiation.”

DATES: Submit comments by May 13, 2015.


FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:
Tremaine Donnell, NRC Clearance Officer, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001; telephone: (301) 415–6258; email: INFOCOLLECTS.Resource@nrc.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Obtaining Information and Submitting Comments

A. Obtaining Information

Please refer to Docket ID NRC–2014–0245 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:

- 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 “ADAMS Public Documents” and then 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 supporting statement is available in ADAMS under Accession No. ML15036A316.

- 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.

- NRC’s Clearance Officer: A copy of the collection of information and related instructions may be obtained without charge by contacting the NRC’s Clearance Officer, Tremaine Donnell, Office of Information Services, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001; telephone: (301) 415–6258; email: INFOCOLLECTS.Resource@NRC.GOV.

B. Submitting Comments

The NRC cautions you not to include identifying or contact information in comment submissions that you do not want to be publicly disclosed in your comment submission. All comment submissions are posted at http://www.regulations.gov and entered into ADAMS. Comment submissions are not routinely edited to remove identifying or contact information. If you are requesting or aggregating comments from other persons for submission to the OMB, 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 comment submissions are not routinely edited to remove such information before making the comment submissions available to the public or entering the comment into ADAMS.

II. Background

Under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35), the NRC recently submitted a request for renewal of an existing collection of information to OMB for review entitled, “Standards for Protection Against Radiation.” The NRC hereby informs potential respondents that an agency may not conduct or sponsor, and that a person is not...