

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:* NRC Survey of Public Response to Emergencies.
2. *Current OMB approval number:* 3150-XXXX (New Collection).
3. *How often the collection is required:* This is a one-time collection.
4. *Who is required or asked to report:* Members of the public that reside within 10 mile Emergency Planning Zones of nuclear power plant.
5. *The estimated number of annual respondents:* This is a one-time collection of 800 completed surveys.
6. *The number of hours needed annually to complete the requirement or request:*

One-time event. 277 hours ((completed surveys 800 x .333 hrs per response = 267 hrs) + (uncompleted surveys 120 x .083 hrs per response = 10 hrs)).

7. *Abstract:* As part of NRC's effort to review and improve emergency response program areas, a telephone survey will be conducted to assess the satisfaction of the public with existing protective action strategies, the effectiveness in which these strategies are conveyed to the public, and the public response to the possibility of modifying protection action strategies. The survey will produce statistical descriptions of customer satisfaction and acceptance of emergency response planning and protective actions. The response to the surveys will be used by the NRC in the development of new or modified protective action strategies including the types of strategies implemented and the means for which the information on protective actions may be disseminated to the public. The response may also support quality improvement in the existing emergency planning information in other areas indirectly related to protective actions.

Submit, by July 2, 2007, 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, Margaret A. Janney, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, T-5 F52, Washington, DC 20555-0001, by telephone at 301-415-7245, or by Internet electronic mail to INFOCOLLECTS@NRC.GOV.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 26th day of April, 2007.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Margaret A. Janney,
NRC Clearance Officer, Office of Information Services.

[FR Doc. E7-8438 Filed 5-2-07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Agency Information Collection Activities: Proposed Collection; 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 35, "Medical Use of Byproduct Material".
2. *Current OMB approval number:* 3150-0010.
3. *How often the collection is required:* Reports of medical events, doses to an embryo/fetus or nursing child, or leaking sources are reportable on occurrence. A certifying entity desiring to be recognized by the NRC must submit a one-time request for recognition.

4. *Who is required or asked to report:* Physicians and medical institutions holding an NRC license authorizing the administration of byproduct material or radiation therefrom to humans for medical use.

5. *The number of annual respondents:* 8,751.

6. *The number of hours needed annually to complete the requirement or request:* 987,764 hours.

7. *Abstract:* 10 CFR Part 35, "Medical Use of Byproduct Material," contains NRC's requirements and provisions for the medical use of byproduct material and for issuance of specific licenses authorizing the medical use of this material. These requirements and provisions provide for the radiation safety of workers, the general public, patients, and human research subjects. 10 CFR Part 35 contains mandatory requirements that apply to NRC licensees authorized to administer byproduct material or radiation therefrom to humans for medical use. The information in the required reports and records is used by the NRC to ensure that public health and safety is protected, and that the possession and use of byproduct material is in compliance with the license and regulatory requirements.

Submit, by July 2, 2007, 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 requirement may be directed to the NRC Clearance Officer, Margaret A. Janney (T-5 F52), U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, by telephone at 301-415-7245, or by Internet electronic mail to INFOCOLLECTS@NRC.GOV.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 26th day of April, 2007.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Margaret A. Janney,

NRC Clearance Officer, Office of Information Services.

[FR Doc. E7-8439 Filed 5-2-07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-354]

PSEG Nuclear LLC; Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating License, Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity for a Hearing

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC or the Commission) is considering issuance of an amendment to Facility Operating License No. NPF-57 issued to PSEG Nuclear (the licensee) for operation of the Hope Creek Generating Station (Hope Creek) located in Salem County, New Jersey.

The proposed amendment would increase the authorized maximum power level from 3339 megawatts thermal (MWt) to 3840 MWt, an increase of approximately 15 percent.

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.

The Commission has made a proposed determination that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration. Under the Commission's regulations in Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations (10 CFR), Section 50.92, this means that operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; or (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

1. Does the proposed change involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

The CPPU [Constant Pressure Power Uprate] analyses, which were performed

at or above CPPU power levels, included a review and evaluation of the structures, systems, and components (SSCs) that could be affected by the proposed change. The proposed amendment does not change the design function or operation of the affected SSCs.

Plant specific analyses were performed in the following areas: Reactor Core and Reactor Internals (e.g., steam dryer), Reactor Coolant System and associated systems, Containment, Emergency Core Cooling Systems, Control and Instrumentation Systems, Electrical Systems, Balance of Plant Systems, and Radwaste Systems. The results of the analyses, which included evaluating the increase in the likelihood of an SSC malfunction, concluded that the SSCs are capable of performing their design functions at CPPU conditions.

Comprehensive evaluations were performed on the steam dryer and other reactor internals for both operational and structural performance. Predicted steam dryer peak and alternating stress ratios remain within allowable levels. The existing margins to steam dryer alternating stress limits and the steam dryer monitoring program during power ascension provide assurance that steam dryer integrity will be maintained.

Vibration evaluations at CPPU conditions were performed on the Reactor Internal components and Reactor Coolant and associated system piping. These included the Main Steam, Feedwater and Reactor Recirculation systems piping and supports. The results of the vibration analyses demonstrate that operation at CPPU conditions will not result in any detrimental effects. System values will remain within allowable American Society of Mechanical Engineers Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code (ASME Code) limits. In addition, the ASME Code and regulatory guidelines require vibration test data be taken on high-energy piping during initial CPPU startup. The vibration start-up test program will validate the vibration analyses that were performed, demonstrating adequate performance of the SSCs.

Engineered Safety Features (ESF) were evaluated at CPPU conditions using NRC-approved methods. The Emergency Core Cooling Systems (ECCS) were evaluated to ensure they are capable of performing their design function during loss-of-coolant accidents (LOCA). Adequate net positive suction head is maintained without reliance on post-accident containment pressure. CPPU does not result in an increase or decrease in the available water sources, and does not result in any change in the maximum

nominal reactor operating pressure. The CPPU evaluations demonstrate that the ECCS performance satisfy the requirements of 10 CFR 50.46 and 10 CFR [Part] 50 Appendix K.

Balance-of-plant (BOP) systems and equipment were also evaluated for CPPU operation. The resulting evaluations demonstrate adequate performance with limited modifications that were or will be made to BOP components.

These analyses, which included evaluating the increased likelihood of an SSC malfunction, confirm acceptable performance of plant SSCs under CPPU conditions. On this basis, PSEG concludes that there is no significant change in the ability of the SSCs to preclude or mitigate the consequences of accidents.

The probability (frequency of occurrence) of postulated Design Basis Accidents (DBA), and other Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (UFSAR) evaluated accidents, occurring is not affected by the increased power level, and Hope Creek continues to comply with the regulatory and design basis criteria established for plant equipment. The changes in consequences of hypothetical accidents, which are assumed to occur at 102% of the CPPU RTP [Rated Thermal Power], compared to those previously evaluated, are in all cases insignificant. The CPPU accident evaluations do not exceed any of the NRC-approved acceptance limits. The spectrum of hypothetical accidents and transients has been investigated, and is shown to meet the plant's currently licensed regulatory criteria. Consequently, there is no significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The impact of CPPU on the radiological consequences of postulated DBAs, operational transients and other UFSAR accidents was evaluated. The magnitude of the potential consequences is dependent upon the quantity of fission products released to the environment, the atmospheric dispersion factors and the dose exposure pathways. The atmospheric dispersion factors and the dose exposure pathways are not changed by CPPU operation. The only factor which could influence the magnitude of the consequences is the quantity of activity released to the environment. For CPPU, the Control Rod Drop Accident (CRDA), Loss-of-Coolant Accident (LOCA), Fuel Handling Accident (FHA), Main Steamline Break Accident (MSLBA) and instrument line break accident (ILBA) were reanalyzed.