part 52 to allow the licensee to depart from Tier 1 information. With the requested amendment, the licensee proposed changes to COL Appendix C and plant-specific DCD Tier 1 to consolidate a number of Inspections, Tests, Analyses, and Acceptance Criteria (ITAAC) to improve the efficiency of the ITAAC completion and closure process. SNC also requested related exemptions from the Commission’s regulations.

Part of the justification for granting the exemption was provided by the review of the amendment. Because the exemption is necessary in order to issue the requested license amendment, the NRC granted the exemption and issued the amendment concurrently, rather than in sequence. This included issuing a combined safety evaluation containing the NRC staff’s review of both the exemption request and the license amendment. The exemption met all applicable regulatory criteria set forth in §§ 50.12, 52.7, and section VIII.A.4 of appendix D to 10 CFR part 52. The license amendment was found to be acceptable as well. The combined safety evaluation is available in ADAMS under Accession No. ML17216A065.

Identical exemption documents (except for referenced unit numbers and license numbers) were issued to the licensee for VEGP Units 3 and 4 (COLs NPF–91 and NPF–92). The exemption documents for VEGP Units 3 and 4 can be found in ADAMS under Accession Nos. ML17216A070 and ML17216A069, respectively. The exemption is reproduced (with the exception of abbreviated titles and additional citations) in Section II of this document. The amendment documents for COLs NPF–91 and NPF–92 are available in ADAMS under Accession Nos. ML17216A072 and ML17216A071, respectively. A summary of the amendment documents is provided in Section III of this document.

II. Exemption

Reproduced below is the exemption document issued to VEGP Units 3 and Unit 4. It makes reference to the combined safety evaluation that provides the reasoning for the findings made by the NRC (and listed under item 1) in order to grant the exemption:


For the reasons set forth in Section 3.1 of the NRC staff’s Safety Evaluation, which can be found at ADAMS Accession No. ML17216A065, the Commission finds that

A. the exemption is authorized by law;
B. the exemption presents no undue risk to public health and safety;
C. the exemption is consistent with the common defense and security;
D. special circumstances are present in that the application of the rule in this circumstance is not necessary to serve the underlying purpose of the rule;
E. the special circumstances outweigh any decrease in safety that may result from the reduction in standardization caused by the exemption; and
F. the exemption will not result in a significant decrease in the level of safety otherwise provided by the design.

2. Accordingly, the licensee is granted an exemption from the certified DCD Tier 1 information, with corresponding changes to Appendix C of the Facility Combined License as described in the licensee’s request dated March 2, 2017, as supplemented by letter dated July 28, 2017. This exemption is related to, and necessary for, the granting of License Amendment No. 85 and 84, respectively, which is being issued concurrently with this exemption.

3. As explained in Section 6.0 of the NRC staff’s Safety Evaluation (ADAMS Accession No. ML17216A065), this exemption meets the eligibility criteria for categorical exclusion set forth in 10 CFR 51.22(c)(9). Therefore, pursuant to 10 CFR 51.22(b), no environmental impact statement or environmental assessment need be prepared for these amendments.

IV. Conclusion

Using the reasons set forth in the combined safety evaluation, the staff granted the exemption and issued the amendment that the licensee requested on March 2, 2017, as supplemented by letter dated July 28, 2017.

The exemption and amendment were issued on August 24, 2017, as part of a combined package to the licensee (ADAMS Accession No. ML17216A064).

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 7th day of December, 2017.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Jennifer L. Dixon-Herrity,
Chief, Licensing Branch 4, Division of New Reactor Licensing, Office of New Reactors.

[FR Doc. 2017–26807 Filed 12–12–17; 8:45 am]
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POSTAL REGULATORY COMMISSION
[Docket No. CP2018–79]

New Postal Product

AGENCY: Postal Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Commission is noticing a recent Postal Service filing for the Commission’s consideration concerning a negotiated service agreement. This notice informs the public of the filing, invites public comment, and takes other administrative steps.

DATES: Comments are due: December 15, 2017.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments electronically via the Commission’s Filing Online system at http://www.prc.gov. Those who cannot submit comments electronically should contact
the person identified in the FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT section by telephone for advice on filing alternatives.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: David A. Trissell, General Counsel, at 202–789–6820.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

II. Docketed Proceeding(s)

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Kyle R. Abigian, Senior Counsel, at (202) 551–6857 or Holly L. Hunter-Goci, Assistant Chief Counsel, at (202) 551–6825 (Division of Investment Management, Chief Counsel’s Office).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The following is a summary of the application. The complete application may be obtained via the Commission’s website at http://www.sec.gov/rules/iareleases.shtml or by calling (202) 551–8090.

Applicant’s Representations

1. Applicant is a financial services firm registered with the Commission as an investment adviser pursuant to the Advisers Act. Applicant provides discretionary investment advisory services to a wide variety of investors. Applicant is a wholly-owned subsidiary of PNC Bank, National Association (the “Bank”), and the Bank is a wholly-owned subsidiary of PNC Financial Services Group, Inc. (“PNC”).

2. Certain Ohio government entities have established separately managed accounts to which the Adviser provides investment advisory services (each such government entity, a “Client” and collectively, the “Clients”). Each Client is a “government entity” within the meaning of Rule 206(4)–5(f)(5).

3. The individual who made the campaign contribution (the “Contributor”) that triggered the two-year contribution ban (the “Contribution”) is a dual-hatted employee of the Bank and the Adviser. In his role as a business development officer of both the Adviser and the Bank, he solicited and continues to solicit business for the Adviser and the Bank from private corporate and non-profit entities in Pennsylvania, West Virginia, California and Texas. The Contributor...