

Worker data element as a separate date item. Gender specific data will no longer be available from the Current Employment Statistics program. However, data on the total number of employees will continue to be collected.

The present CES hours and earnings series, which apply only to production and non-supervisory workers, are seriously limited in scope. This limits their value as overall economic indicators. Expanding the concept of hours and earnings to cover all employees, and adding a series on gross monthly earnings will be especially beneficial to the Bureau of Economic Analysis for derivation of personal income estimates, and also for the BLS productivity estimates. Both personal income and productivity estimates use the current production/non-supervisory worker-based CES series as a proxy for all employee hours and earnings data. The production worker series will be dropped only after the new series are

well established and acceptable to BLS and its users, including having sufficient data observations to allow for seasonal adjustment.

An additional motivation for change is the difficulty of collecting hours and earnings information from respondents using the current CES production/non-supervisory worker definitions. Many respondents' payroll records do not allow them to readily identify workers according to CES definitions. Interviews with respondents and large payroll processing firms indicate that all employee payroll would be more reportable.

The decision to eliminate collection of a separate women workers data item is based on several factors: (1) Respondent burden; (2) an assessment of the relative number of users of this series; and (3) the availability of these data from other sources such as the Current Population Survey (which provides a large body of other related demographic information). Because this

data series does not have a large number of users and there is an alternative source for these data, the BLS believes that the respondent burden to continue collection of these data is not justified, especially considering the increase in burden associated with collecting the new data elements which have more wide-ranging uses.

**IV. Current Action**

Office of Management and Budget Clearance is being sought for the Report on Employment, Payroll, and Hours (BLS-790).

*Type of Review:* Revision of a currently approved collection.

*Agency:* Bureau of Labor Statistics.

*Title:* Report on Employment, Payroll, and Hours (BLS-790).

*OMB Number:* 1220-0011.

*Affected Public:* State or local governments; Businesses or other for-profit; Non-profit institutions; Small businesses or organizations.

Form	Number of respondents	Minutes per report	Frequency of response	Annual responses	Annual burden hours
A—Natural Resources and Mining .....	1,400	10	12	16,800	2,800
B—Construction .....	12,800	10	12	153,600	25,600
C—Manufacturing .....	18,000	10	12	216,000	36,000
E—Service Providing Industries .....	153,300	10	12	1,839,600	306,600
G—Public Administration .....	56,700	5	12	680,400	56,700
S—Education .....	4,000	5	12	48,000	4,000
F1, F2, F3 Fax Forms .....	36,400	10	12	436,800	72,800
Total .....	282,600	.....	.....	3,391,200	504,500

*Total Burden Cost (capital/startup):* \$0.

*Total Burden Cost (operating/maintenance):* \$0.

Comments submitted in response to this notice will be summarized and/or included in the request for Office of Management and Budget approval of the information collection request; they also will become a matter of public record.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 13th day of December 2004.

**Cathy Kazanowski,**

*Chief, Division of Management Systems, Bureau of Labor Statistics.*

[FR Doc. E4-3731 Filed 12-21-04; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4510-24-P**

**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 pending NRC action to submit an information collection request to OMB and solicitation of public comment.

**SUMMARY:** The NRC is preparing a submittal to OMB for review of continued approval of information collections under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35).

Information pertaining to the requirement to be submitted:

1. *The Title of the Information Collection:* 10 CFR Part 72, Licensing Requirements for the Independent Storage of Spent Nuclear Fuel and High-Level Radioactive Waste.

2. *Current OMB Approval Number:* 3150-0132.

3. *How Often the Collection is Required:* Required reports are collected and evaluated on a continuing basis as events occur; submittal of reports varies from less than one per year under some rule sections to up to an average of about 100 per year under other rule sections. Applications for new licenses, certificates of compliance (CoCs), and amendments may be submitted at anytime; applications for renewal of licenses are required every 20 years for an Independent Spent Fuel Storage Installation (ISFSI) or Certificate of Compliance (CoC) and every 40 years for a Monitored Retrievable Storage (MRS) facility.

4. *Who is Required or Asked to Report:* Certificate holders of casks for the storage of spent fuel, licensees and applicants for a license to possess power reactor spent fuel and other radioactive materials associated with spent fuel storage in an ISFSI, and the Department of Energy for licenses to receive, transfer, package and possess power

reactor spent fuel, high-level waste, and other radioactive materials associated with spent fuel and high-level waste storage in an MRS.

5. *The Estimated Number of Annual Respondents:* 50.

6. *The Number of Hours Needed Annually to Complete the Requirement or Request:* 25,551 (22,781 hours for reporting [71 hours per response plus 2,770 hours for recordkeeping 55 hours per recordkeeper]).

7. *Abstract:* 10 CFR part 72 establishes mandatory requirements, procedures, and criteria for the issuance of licenses to receive, transfer, and possess power reactor spent fuel and other radioactive materials associated with spent fuel storage in an ISFSI, and requirements for the issuance of licenses to the Department of Energy to receive, transfer, package, and possess power reactor spent fuel and high-level radioactive waste, and other associated radioactive materials, in an MRS. The information in the applications, reports and records is used by NRC to make licensing and other regulatory determinations.

Submit, by February 22, 2005, comments that address the following questions:

1. Is the proposed collection of information necessary for the NRC to properly perform its functions? Does the information have practical utility?

2. Is the burden estimate accurate?

3. Is there a way to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected?

4. How can the burden of the information collection be minimized, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology?

A copy of the draft supporting statement may be viewed free of charge at the NRC Public Document Room, One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Room O-1 F21, Rockville, MD 20852. OMB clearance requests are available at the NRC worldwide Web site: <http://www.nrc.gov/public-involve/doc-comment/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 about the information collection requirements may be directed to the NRC Clearance Officer, Brenda Jo. Shelton, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, T-5 F52, Washington, DC 20555-0001, by telephone at 301-415-7233, or by Internet electronic mail to [INFOCOLLECTS@NRC.GOV](mailto:INFOCOLLECTS@NRC.GOV).

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 15th day of December 2004.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Brenda Jo. Shelton,**

*NRC Clearance Officer, Office of the Chief Information Officer.*

[FR Doc. 04-27945 Filed 12-21-04; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7590-01-P**

## **NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

**[Docket No. 50-219]**

### **Amergen Energy Company, LLC; Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact**

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is considering issuance of an exemption from certain requirements of Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations (10 CFR), Subsection 2.109(b), for Facility Operating License No. DPR-16, which authorizes operation of the Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station (OCNGS), a boiling-water reactor facility, located in Ocean County, New Jersey. Therefore, as required by 10 CFR 51.21, the NRC is issuing this environmental assessment and finding of no significant impact.

#### **Environmental Assessment**

##### *Identification of the Proposed Action*

Subsection 109(b) of 10 CFR part 2 states, "If the licensee of a nuclear power plant licensed under 10 CFR 50.21(b) or 50.22 files a sufficient application for renewal of an operating license at least 5 years prior to the expiration of the existing license, the existing license will not be deemed to have expired until the application has been finally determined." This requirement for license renewal applications was established in December 1991 in conjunction with the publication of the final license renewal rule, 10 CFR part 54, "Requirements for Renewal of Operating Licenses for Nuclear Power Plants" (56 FR 64943).

AmerGen's application requested an exemption from the timing requirements of 10 CFR 2.109(b), for submittal of the OCNGS license renewal application. The exemption would allow the submittal of the renewal application with less than 5 years remaining prior to expiration of the operating license while maintaining the protection of the timely renewal provision in 10 CFR 2.109(b).

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application for exemption dated August 10, 2004.

##### *The Need for the Proposed Action*

AmerGen stated that the OCGNS license renewal application would be

submitted in July 2005 and that application of the 5-year term in 10 CFR 2.109(b) for filing a license renewal application is not necessary in this situation to achieve the purpose of the regulation. The July 2005 filing date, which is approximately 44 months before expiration of the existing license in April 2009, according to AmerGen will provide the NRC staff with ample time in which to perform a full and adequate review.

The licensee proposed an exemption from the requirements of 10 CFR 2.109(b), to allow submittal of the license renewal application with less than 5 years remaining prior to expiration of the operating license, while maintaining the protection of the timely renewal provision in 10 CFR 2.109(b).

##### *Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action*

The NRC has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that the pursuant to 10 CFR 50.12(a), the proposed exemption is authorized by law, will not endanger life or property or common defense and security, and is, otherwise, in the public interest. In addition, special circumstances exist to justify the proposed exemption. The details of the staff's evaluation will be provided in the exemption that will be issued as part of the letter to the licensee approving the exemption to the regulation.

The proposed action will not significantly increase the probability or consequences of accidents. No changes are being made in the types of effluents that may be released offsite. There is no significant increase in the amount of any effluent release offsite. There is no significant increase in occupational or public radiation exposure. Therefore, there are no significant radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

With regard to potential non-radiological impacts, the proposed action does not have a potential to affect any historic sites. It does not affect non-radiological plant effluents and has no other environmental impact. Therefore, there are no significant non-radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

Accordingly, the NRC staff concludes that there are no significant environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

##### *Environmental Impacts of the Alternatives to the Proposed Action*

As an alternative to the proposed action, the NRC staff considered denial of the proposed action (*i.e.*, the "no-