proposed rule would also require persons organizing a non-governmental expedition to provide expedition members with information on their environmental protection obligations under the Antarctic Conservation Act. The notice of proposed rule stated that the rule was not subject to the Paperwork Reduction Act because of the small number of U.S. operators subject to the rule. Based upon comments received on the proposed rule and the slight increase in applicable tour operators, NSF has determined that it will issue this information collection notice to satisfy the requirements of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, prior to issuing the final rule.

Expected Respondents. Respondents may include non-profit organizations and small and large businesses. The majority of respondents are anticipated to be U.S. tour operators, currently estimated to number twelve.

Burden on the Public. The Foundation estimates that a one-time paperwork and recordkeeping burden of 40 hours or less, at a cost of $500 to $1400 per respondent, will result from the emergency response plan requirement contained in the proposed rule. Presently, all respondents have been providing expedition members with a copy of the Guidance for Visitors to the Antarctic (prepared and adopted at the Eighteenth Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting as Recommendation XVIII–1). Because this Antarctic Treaty System document satisfies the environmental protection information requirements of the proposed rule, no additional burden shall result from the environmental information requirements in the proposed rule.

Dated: April 18, 2001.

Lawrence Rudolph,

General Counsel.

[FR Doc. 01–13768 Filed 5–31–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555–01–M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Agency Information Collection Activities: Submission for the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Review; Comment Request

AGENCY: U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC).

ACTION: Notice of the OMB review of information collection and solicitation of public comment.

SUMMARY: The NRC has recently submitted to OMB for review the following proposal for the collection of information under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35). The NRC hereby informs potential respondents that an agency may not conduct or sponsor, and that a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number.

1. *Type of submission, new, revision, or extension:* Extension.

2. *The title of the information collection:* 10 CFR Part 19, ''Notices, Instructions, and Reports to Workers: Inspection and Investigations''.

3. *The form number if applicable:* N/A.

4. *How often the collection is required:* As necessary in order that adequate and timely reports of radiation exposure be made to individuals involved in NRC-licensed activities.

5. *Who is required or asked to report:* Licensees authorized to receive, possess, use, or transfer material licensed by the NRC.

6. *The estimated number of annual responses:* 395,221.

7. *The number of annual respondents:* 6000.

8. *The number of hours needed annually to complete the requirement or request:* 43,037 reporting hours.

9. *An indication of whether section 3507(d), Pub. L. 104–13 applies:* Not applicable.

10. *Abstract:* Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Part 19, requires licensees to advise workers on an annual basis of any radiation exposure they may have received as a result of NRC-licensed activities or when certain conditions are met. These conditions apply during termination of the worker's employment, at the request of a worker, former worker, or when the worker's employer (the NRC licensee) must report radiation exposure information on the worker to the NRC. Part 19 also establishes requirements for instructions by licensees to individuals participating in licensed activities and options available to these individuals in connection with Commission inspections of licensees to ascertain compliance with the provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, Title II of the Energy Reorganization Act of 1974, and regulations, orders and licenses thereunder regarding radiological working conditions.

The worker should be informed of the radiation dose he or she receives because: (a) that information is needed by both a new employer and the individual when the employee changes jobs in the nuclear industry; (b) the individual needs to know the radiation dose received as a result of an accident or incident (if this dose is in excess of the 10 CFR Part 20 limits) so that he or she can seek counseling about future work involving radiation, medical attention, or both, as desired; and (c) since long-term exposure to radiation may be an adverse health factor, the individual needs to know whether the accumulated dose is being controlled within NRC limits. The worker also needs to know about health risks from occupational exposure to radioactive materials or radiation, precautions or procedures to minimize exposure, worker responsibilities and options to report any licensee conditions which may lead to or cause a violation of Commission regulations, and individual radiation exposure reports which are available to him.

A copy of the final supporting statement may be viewed free of charge at the NRC Public Document Room, One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Room O–1 F23, Rockville, MD 20852. OMB clearance requests are available at the NRC worldwide web site: http://www.nrc.gov/NRC/PUBLIC/OMB/index.html. The document will be available on the NRC home page site for 60 days after the signature date of this notice.

Comments and questions should be directed to the OMB reviewer listed below by July 2, 2001. Comments received after this date will be considered if it is practical to do so, but assurance of consideration cannot be given to comments received after this date.

Amy Farrell, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs (3150–0044), NEOB–10202, Office of Management and Budget, Washington, DC 20503.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 24th day of May , 2001.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Brenda Jo. Shelton,

NRC Clearance Officer, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 01–13742 Filed 5–31–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50–255]

Nuclear Management Company, LLC; Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating License and Opportunity for a Hearing

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an amendment to Facility Operating License No. DPR–

20, held by Nuclear Management Company, LLC (the licensee), for operation of the Palisades Plant located in Van Buren County, Michigan.

The proposed amendment would change the limiting conditions for operation (LCOs), surveillance requirements (SRs), and design features in the Technical Specifications (TSs) to provide more flexible fuel loading constraints for the Palisades fuel storage racks and accommodate future core designs. The changes affect TS Sections 3.7.15, ''Spent Fuel Pool (SFP) Boron Concentration,'' 3.7.16, ''Spent Fuel Assembly Storage,'' and 4.3, ''Design Features—Fuel Storage.'' Allowed uranium enrichments for storage would be increased. Enrichment limits for new fuel storage racks (currently limited to fuel assemblies having a maximum average planar uranium-235 (U-235) enrichment of 4.20 weight percent) would be increased to allow storage of 24 unirradiated fuel assemblies having a maximum planar average U-235 enrichment of 4.95 weight percent, subject to proposed loading pattern constraints (e.g., the center row being empty if stored fuel exceeds 4.05 percent U-235 enrichments). Similarly, the new fuel storage racks could contain 36 unirradiated fuel assemblies having a maximum planar average U-235 enrichment of 4.05 weight percent, subject to similar proposed loading pattern constraints not necessarily requiring the center row to be empty. Region I fuel storage racks (currently limited to a maximum enrichment of 4.40 weight percent) would be changed to allow storage of unirradiated or irradiated fuel up to 4.95 weight percent enrichment on the basis of revised criticality analyses that assume no credit for soluble boron in the pool under normal conditions, but which take credit for 1350 ppm of soluble boron under accident conditions. Enrichment requirements for Region II fuel storage racks (currently limited to 3.27 weight percent) would be changed to allow storage of unirradiated fuel up to 1.14 weight percent and irradiated fuel of equivalent reactivity up to 4.6 weight percent initial enrichment on the basis of criticality analyses that take credit for 850 ppm of soluble boron in the pool under normal conditions and 1350 ppm of soluble boron under accident conditions. The TSs (e.g., proposed Table 3.7.16–1) for allowable enrichments for fuel storage in Region II of the spent fuel pool or the north tilt pit would continue to be based upon a combination of initial enrichment and burnup, but the proposed change would also add decay time to this combination. The existing limitations that Region I spent fuel racks may contain only ''new or partially spent'' fuel assemblies, and that Region II spent fuel racks may contain only ''partially spent'' fuel assemblies, would be changed to ''new or irradiated fuel assemblies which meet the initial enrichment, burnup, and decay time requirements of [the proposed revision to] Table 3.7.16–1.'' The existing requirements that fuel assemblies in new or Region I fuel storage racks must contain ''216 rods which are either UO_2, $Gd_2O_3UO_2$, or solid metal'' would be deleted. TS 3.7.15 would continue to require that the spent fuel pool boron concentration be equal to or greater than 1720 ppm whenever fuel is stored in the spent fuel pool, and be verified weekly; however, the optional Action statement A.2.2 to immediately initiate action to perform a spent fuel pool verification when the concentration is not within limits would be deleted (as would a related portion of the applicability statement regarding verification). The licensee also included changes to the associated TS Bases.

Before issuance of the proposed license amendment, the Commission will have made findings required by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act) and the Commission's regulations.

By July 2, 2001, the licensee may file a request for a hearing with respect to issuance of the amendment to the subject facility operating license and any person whose interest may be affected by this proceeding and who wishes to participate as a party in the proceeding must file a written request for a hearing and a petition for leave to intervene. Requests for a hearing and a petition for leave to intervene shall be filed in accordance with the Commission's ''Rules of Practice for Domestic Licensing Proceedings'' in 10 CFR part 2. Interested persons should consult a current copy of 10 CFR 2.714 which is available at the Commission's Public Document Room, located at One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland and accessible electronically through the ADAMS Public Electronic Reading Room link at the NRC Web site (http://www.nrc.gov). If a request for a hearing or petition for leave to intervene is filed by the above date, the Commission or an Atomic Safety and Licensing Board, designated by the Commission or by the Chairman of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, will rule on the request and/or petition; and the Secretary or the designated Atomic Safety and Licensing Board will issue a notice of hearing or an appropriate order.

As required by 10 CFR 2.714, a petition for leave to intervene shall set forth with particularity the interest of the petitioner in the proceeding, and how that interest may be affected by the results of the proceeding. The petition should specifically explain the reasons why intervention should be permitted with particular reference to the following factors: (1) The nature of the petitioner's right under the Act to be made a party to the proceeding; (2) the nature and extent of the petitioner's property, financial, or other interest in the proceeding; and (3) the possible effect of any order which may be entered in the proceeding on the petitioner's interest. The petition should also identify the specific aspect(s) of the subject matter of the proceeding as to which petitioner wishes to intervene. Any person who has filed a petition for leave to intervene or who has been admitted as a party may amend the petition without requesting leave of the Board up to 15 days prior to the first prehearing conference scheduled in the proceeding, but such an amended petition must satisfy the specificity requirements described above.

Not later than 15 days prior to the first prehearing conference scheduled in the proceeding, a petitioner shall file a supplement to the petition to intervene which must include a list of the contentions which are sought to be litigated in the matter. Each contention must consist of a specific statement of the issue of law or fact to be raised or controverted. In addition, the petitioner shall provide a brief explanation of the bases of the contention and a concise statement of the alleged facts or expert opinion which support the contention and on which the petitioner intends to rely in proving the contention at the hearing. The petitioner must also provide references to those specific sources and documents of which the petitioner is aware and on which the petitioner intends to rely to establish those facts or expert opinion. Petitioner must provide sufficient information to show that a genuine dispute exists with the applicant on a material issue of law or fact. Contentions shall be limited to matters within the scope of the amendment under consideration. The contention must be one which, if proven, would entitle the petitioner to relief. A petitioner who fails to file such a supplement which satisfies these requirements with respect to at least one contention will not be permitted to participate as a party.

Those permitted to intervene become parties to the proceeding, subject to any limitations in the order granting leave to intervene, and have the opportunity to

participate fully in the conduct of the hearing, including the opportunity to present evidence and cross-examine witnesses.

A request for a hearing or a petition for leave to intervene must be filed with the Secretary of the Commission, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001, Attention: Rulemakings and Adjudications Staff, or may be delivered to the Commission's Public Document Room, located at One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland, by the above date. A copy of the petition should also be sent to the Office of the General Counsel, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001, and to Arunas T. Udrys, Esquire, Consumers Energy Company, 212 West Michigan Avenue, Jackson, MI 49201, attorney for the licensee.

Nontimely filings of petitions for leave to intervene, amended petitions, supplemental petitions and/or requests for hearing will not be entertained absent a determination by the Commission, the presiding officer or the presiding Atomic Safety and Licensing Board that the petition and/or request should be granted based upon a balancing of the factors specified in 10 CFR 2.714(a)(1)(i)–(v) and 2.714(d).

If a request for a hearing is received, the Commission's staff may issue the amendment after it completes its technical review and prior to the completion of any required hearing if it publishes a further notice for public comment of its proposed finding of no significant hazards consideration in accordance with 10 CFR 50.91 and 50.92.

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendment dated March 2, 2001, as supplemented by letter dated March 29, 2001, which are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, located at One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland, and accessible electronically through the ADAMS Public Electronic Reading Room link at the NRC Web site (http://www.nrc.gov).

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 24th day of May 2001.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Darl S. Hood,

Senior Project Manager, Section I, Project Directorate III, Division of Licensing Project Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 01–13740 Filed 5–31–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50–272 and 50–311]

PSEG Nuclear LLC; Salem Nuclear Generating Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2; Exemption

1.0 Background

PSEG Nuclear LLC (PSEG or the licensee) is the holder of Facility Operating License Nos. DPR–70 and DPR–75 that authorize operation of the Salem Nuclear Generating Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2. The licenses provide, among other things, that the facility is subject to all rules, regulations, and orders of the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC, the Commission) now or hereafter in effect.

The facility consists of two pressurized water reactors located at the licensee's site on the southern end of Artificial Island in Lower Alloways Creek Township, Salem County, New Jersey. Salem, New Jersey, is located approximately 7.5 miles northeast of the site.

2.0 Purpose

Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations (10 CFR) Part 50, Appendix G requires that pressure-temperature (P–T) limits be established for reactor pressure vessels (RPVs) during normal operating and hydrostatic or leak rate testing conditions. Specifically, 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix G states that ''[t]he appropriate requirements on * * * the pressure-temperature limits and minimum permissible temperature must be met for all conditions.'' Appendix G to 10 CFR Part 50 also specifies that the requirements for these limits are the American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME) Code, Section XI, Appendix G Limits. In Generic Letter 88–11, the NRC staff advised licensees that the staff would use Regulatory Guide (RG) 1.99, Revision 2, to review P–T limit curves. RG 1.99, Revision 2, provides guidance for implementing 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix G, and contains conservative methodologies for determining the increase in transition temperature and the decrease in upper-shelf energy (USE) resulting from neutron radiation.

In order to address provisions of amendments to the Technical Specifications (TS) P–T limit curves, the licensee requested in its application dated November 10, 2000, that the staff exempt, as permitted by 10 CFR 50.60(b), Salem, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, from application of specific requirements of 10 CFR 50.60(a) and 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix G, and substitute use of ASME Code Case N–640. Code Case N–640 provides an alternate reference fracture toughness methodology for reactor vessel materials for use in determining the P–T limits. The proposed action is in accordance with PSEG's application for exemption contained in its November 10, 2000, letter, as supplemented by letters dated March 28 and April 2, 2001. The proposed action is needed to support PSEG's license amendment request to increase thermal power levels by 1.4% submitted under the same application (the final revision of the proposed P–T limit curves was submitted by the licensee by letter dated March 28, 2001). The proposed license amendment will, in part, revise the P–T limits for heatup, cooldown, core criticality, and hydrostatic/leak test limitations for the reactor coolant system (RCS) to 32 effective full power years (EFPYs).

Code Case N–640

The licensee has proposed an exemption to allow the use of Code Case N–640, in conjunction with ASME Section XI, Appendix G, 10 CFR 50.60(a), and 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix G, to determine the P–T limits, and stated that this proposed alternative meets the underlying intent of the NRC's regulations.

Standard Review Plan (NUREG–0800) Section 5.3.2 provides an acceptable method for determining the P–T limit curves for ferritic materials in the beltline of the RPV based on the linear elastic fracture mechanics (LEFM) methodology of Appendix G to Section XI of the Code. The basic parameter of this methodology is the stress intensity factor K_I, which is a function of the stress state and flaw configuration. Appendix G requires a safety factor of 2.0 on stress intensities resulting from reactor pressure during normal and transient operating conditions, and a safety factor of 1.5 on the same stresses for hydrostatic testing curves. The methods of Appendix G postulate the existence of a sharp surface flaw in the RPV that is normal to the direction of the maximum stress. This flaw is postulated to have a depth that is equal to 1/4 of the RPV beltline thickness and a length equal to 1.5 times the RPV beltline thickness. The critical locations in the RPV beltline region for calculating heatup and cooldown P–T curves are the 1/4 thickness (1/4T) and 3/4 thickness (3/4T) locations, which correspond to the maximum depth of the postulated inside surface and outside surface defects, respectively.

The methodology provided in Appendix G to Section XI of the ASME Code requires that licensees determine