

## Summary of Totals for the Recommended Alternatives

Areas of Decommissioning	Recommended Alternatives	Total Costs (2017 dollars)	
		7% NPV	3% NPV
Level of PSDAR Review by NRC	Rulemaking	\$ (377,000)	\$ (376,000)
Maintaining the Decommissioning Options	Guidance	\$ (220,000)	\$ (212,000)
Timeframe Associated with Decommissioning	Guidance	\$ (227,000)	\$ (218,000)
Role of External Stakeholders in Decommissioning	Guidance	\$ (239,000)	\$ (239,000)
Clarification Spent Fuel Management	Rulemaking	\$ (320,000)	\$ (324,000)
Record Retention Requirements	Guidance	\$ 851,000	\$ 963,000
Transportation Investigation, Tracing and Reporting Requirements	Guidance	\$ 615,000	\$ 698,000
Emergency Preparedness	Rulemaking	\$ 6,148,000	\$ 14,513,000
Physical Security	Rulemaking	\$ 340,000	\$ 1,850,000
Cyber Security	Rulemaking	\$ (200,000)	\$ (208,000)
Fitness for Duty, Drugs & Alcohol	Guidance	\$ 5,809,000	\$ 13,377,000
Fitness for Duty, Fatigue	Status Quo	\$ -	\$ -
Minimum Staffing and Training Requirements NLO/CFH	Rulemaking	\$ 265,000	\$ 829,000
Decommissioning Trust Fund	Rulemaking	\$ 71,000	\$ 1,032,000
Offsite & Onsite Financial Protection	Rulemaking	\$ 264,000	\$ 870,000
Backfit Protection	Rulemaking	\$ (216,000)	\$ (224,000)
Aging Management	Guidance	\$ (25,000)	\$ (25,000)
<b>Total:</b>		\$ 12,540,000	\$ 32,305,000
<b>Nonmonetary Benefits</b>			
<b>Regulatory Efficiency:</b> These alternatives would enable the NRC to better maintain and administer regulatory activities over the decommissioning process and ensure that the requirements for decommissioning power reactors are clear and appropriate.			
<b>Safety and Security:</b> These alternatives would continue to provide reasonable assurance of adequate protection of the public health and safety, and common defense and security at nuclear power reactor sites that have started decommissioning.			

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 1st day of February 2018.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Patricia K. Holahan,**

*Director, Division of Rulemaking, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.*

[FR Doc. 2018-02402 Filed 2-6-18; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

## DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

### 10 CFR Part 430

[EERE-2017-BT-STD-0062]

#### Energy Conservation Program: Procedures, Interpretations, and Policies for Consideration of New or Revised Energy Conservation Standards for Consumer Products

**AGENCY:** Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy.

**ACTION:** Notice of comment period extension.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Energy (DOE) published, on December 18, 2017, a Request for Information (RFI) seeking comments from interested parties to assist DOE in identifying potential modifications to its "Process Rule" for the development of appliance standards.

The comment period for the RFI ends on February 16, 2018. Through this notice, DOE extends the comment period until March 2, 2018.

**DATES:** The comment period for the RFI published in the **Federal Register** on December 18, 2017 (82 FR 59992) is extended to March 2, 2018. Written comments and information are requested on or before March 2, 2018.

**ADDRESSES:** Interested persons are encouraged to submit comments by any of the following methods:

- *Federal eRulemaking Portal:* <http://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the instructions for submitting comments.

- *Email:* [Regulatory.Review@hq.doe.gov](mailto:Regulatory.Review@hq.doe.gov). Include "Process Rule RFI" in the subject line of the message.

- *Postal Mail:* U.S. Department of Energy, Office of General Counsel, 1000 Independence Avenue SW, Room 6A245, Washington, DC 20585

*Docket:* The docket for this activity, which includes **Federal Register** notices, comments, and other supporting documents/materials, is available for review at <http://www.regulations.gov>. All documents in the docket are listed in the <http://www.regulations.gov> index. However, some documents listed in the index, such as those containing information

that is exempt from public disclosure, may not be publicly available.

The docket web page can be found at <https://www.regulations.gov/docket?D=EERE-2017-BT-STD-0062>.

The docket web page will contain simple instructions on how to access all documents, including public comments, in the docket.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Caitlin Davis, U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, 1000 Independence Avenue SW, Washington, DC 20585. Email: [Regulatory.Review@hq.doe.gov](mailto:Regulatory.Review@hq.doe.gov). Telephone: 202-586-6803.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** As part of its implementation of, "Reducing Regulation and Controlling Regulatory Costs," (January 30, 2017) and, "Enforcing the Regulatory Reform Agenda," (February 24, 2017), the Department of Energy (DOE) published a Request for Information (RFI), on December 18, 2017 (82 FR 59992), seeking comments from interested parties to assist DOE in identifying potential modifications to its "Process Rule" for the development of appliance standards, in an effort to achieve meaningful burden reduction while continuing to achieve the Department's statutory obligations in the development

of appliance standards. DOE also held a public meeting to receive input from interested parties on potential improvements to the “Process Rule”. The comment period for the RFI was previously February 16, 2018. At the public meeting, DOE received several requests to extend the comment period to give interested parties sufficient opportunity to provide comments and information on this topic. In addition, in a joint letter dated January 29, 2018, the Air Conditioning, Heating & Refrigeration Institute, Association of Home Appliance Manufacturers, and National Electrical Manufacturers Association together offered DOE support in its efforts to improve the Process Rule and requested that the comment period for the RFI be extended. (EERE–2017–STD–0062–0017)

The Department intends to move forward expeditiously with further actions to improve the “Process Rule”. Given the importance to DOE of receiving public input on means to make such improvements, however, DOE grants those requests and extends the comment period for an additional two weeks, until March 2, 2018.

#### Approval of the Office of the Secretary

The Secretary of Energy has approved the publication of this document.

Issued in Washington, DC, on January 31, 2018.

**Daniel R Simmons,**

*Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy.*

[FR Doc. 2018–02440 Filed 2–6–18; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450–01–P

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Part 52

[EPA–R09–OAR–2017–0177; FRL–9974–10–Region 9]

#### Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality State Implementation Plans; California; Interstate Transport Requirements for Ozone, Fine Particulate Matter, and Sulfur Dioxide

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is proposing to approve a State Implementation Plan (SIP) submission from the State of California regarding certain interstate transport requirements of the Clean Air Act (CAA or “Act”). This submission addresses

the 2008 ozone national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS), the 2006 fine particulate matter (PM<sub>2.5</sub>) and 2012 PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS, and the 2010 sulfur dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>) NAAQS. The interstate transport requirements under the CAA consist of several elements; this proposal pertains only to significant contribution to nonattainment and interference with maintenance of the NAAQS in other states. We are taking comments on this proposal and plan to follow with a final action.

**DATES:** Any comments must arrive by March 9, 2018.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA–R09–OAR–2017–0177 at <http://www.regulations.gov>, or via email to Rory Mays at [mays.rory@epa.gov](mailto:mays.rory@epa.gov). For comments submitted at *Regulations.gov*, follow the online instructions for submitting comments. Once submitted, comments cannot be edited or removed from *Regulations.gov*. For either manner of submission, the EPA may publish any comment received to its public docket. Do not submit electronically any information you consider to be Confidential Business Information (CBI) or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Multimedia submissions (audio, video, *etc.*) must be accompanied by a written comment. The written comment is considered the official comment and should include discussion of all points you wish to make. The EPA will generally not consider comments or comment contents located outside of the primary submission (*i.e.*, on the Web, cloud, or other file sharing system). For additional submission methods, please contact the person identified in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section. For the full EPA public comment policy, information about CBI or multimedia submissions, and general guidance on making effective comments, please visit <https://www.epa.gov/dockets/commenting-epa-dockets>.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Rory Mays, Air Planning Office (AIR–2), EPA Region IX, (415) 972–3227, [mays.rory@epa.gov](mailto:mays.rory@epa.gov).

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Throughout this document, “we”, “us” and “our” refer to the EPA.

#### Table of Contents

- I. Background
  - A. Interstate Transport
  - B. California’s Submission
- II. Interstate Transport Evaluation
  - A. The EPA’s General Evaluation Approach
  - B. Evaluation for the 2008 8-Hour Ozone NAAQS
  - C. Evaluation for the 2006 PM<sub>2.5</sub> and 2012 PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS

- D. Evaluation for the 2010 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS
- III. Proposed Action
- IV. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

#### I. Background

Section 110(a)(1) of the CAA requires states to submit SIPs meeting the applicable requirements of section 110(a)(2) within three years after promulgation of a new or revised NAAQS or within such shorter period as the EPA may prescribe. Section 110(a)(2) requires states to address structural SIP elements such as requirements for monitoring, basic program requirements, and legal authority that are designed to provide for implementation, maintenance, and enforcement of the NAAQS. The EPA refers to the SIP submissions required by these provisions as “infrastructure SIP” submissions. Section 110(a) imposes the obligation upon states to make a SIP submission to the EPA for a new or revised NAAQS, but the contents of individual state submissions may vary depending upon the facts and circumstances. This proposed rule pertains to the infrastructure SIP requirements for interstate transport of air pollution.

#### A. Interstate Transport

Section 110(a)(2)(D)(i) of the CAA requires SIPs to include provisions prohibiting any source or other type of emissions activity in one state from emitting any air pollutant in amounts that will contribute significantly to nonattainment, or interfere with maintenance, of the NAAQS, or interfere with measures required to prevent significant deterioration of air quality or to protect visibility in any other state. This proposed rule addresses the two requirements under section 110(a)(2)(D)(i)(I), which we refer to as prong 1 (significant contribution to nonattainment of the NAAQS in any other state) and prong 2 (interference with maintenance of the NAAQS in any other state).<sup>1</sup> The EPA refers to SIP revisions addressing the requirements of section 110(a)(2)(D)(i)(I) as “good

<sup>1</sup> The remaining interstate and international transport requirements of CAA section 110(a)(2)(D) for the 2008 ozone, 2006 PM<sub>2.5</sub>, 2012 PM<sub>2.5</sub>, and 2010 SO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS for California have been addressed in prior State submissions and EPA rulemakings. 81 FR 18766 (April 1, 2016). Specifically, this includes the section 110(a)(2)(D)(i)(II) requirements relating to interference with measures required to be included in the applicable implementation plan for any other state under part C to prevent significant deterioration of air quality (prong 3) or to protect visibility (prong 4), and the section 110(a)(2)(D)(ii) requirements relating to interstate and international pollution abatement.