

Estimate of Burden: task 1–10 hours. Task 2–2 hours.

Respondents: Individuals and not-for-profit organizations.

Number of Respondents: There are approximately 260 recipients and plans call for contacting 50% of them.

Estimated Number of Responses per Survey: One.

Comments: Comments are invited on (a) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Agency, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the Agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information on respondents; including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

Dated: June 7, 2005.

Suzanne H. Plimpton,

Reports Clearance Officer, National Science Foundation.

[FR Doc. 05–11606 Filed 6–10–05; 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:* Notice of Enforcement Discretion (NOEDs) for Operating Power

Reactors and Gaseous Diffusion Plants (GDP).

3. *The form number if applicable:* Not applicable.

4. *How often the collection is required:* On occasion.

5. *Who will be required or asked to report:* Nuclear power reactor licensees and gaseous diffusion plant certificate holders.

6. *An estimate of the number of annual responses:* 26.

7. *The estimated number of annual respondents:* 11.

8. *An estimate of the total number of hours needed annually to complete the requirement or request:* 1,991 hours (1810 reporting [121 hours per response] and 181 recordkeeping [16.45 hours per recordkeeper]).

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

10. *Abstract:* The NRC's Enforcement Policy addresses circumstances in which the NRC may exercise enforcement discretion. A specific type of enforcement discretion is designated as a Notice of Enforcement Discretion (NOED) and relates to circumstances which may arise where a nuclear power plant licensee's compliance with a Technical Specification Limiting Condition for Operation or with other license conditions would involve an unnecessary plant transient or shutdown, or performance of testing, inspection, or system realignment that is inappropriate for the specific plant conditions, or unnecessary delays in plant startup without a corresponding health and safety benefit. Similarly, for a gaseous diffusion plant, circumstances may arise where compliance with a Technical Safety Requirement or other condition would unnecessarily call for a total plant shutdown, or, notwithstanding that a safety, safeguards or security feature was degraded or inoperable, compliance would unnecessarily place the plant in a transient or condition where those features could be required.

A licensee or certificate holder seeking the issuance of an NOED must provide a written justification, in accordance with guidance provided in NRC Inspection Manual, Part 9900, which documents the safety basis for the request and provides whatever other information the NRC staff deems necessary to decide whether or not to exercise discretion.

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 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 should be directed to the OMB reviewer listed below by July 13, 2005. 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. John A. Asalone, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs (3150–0136), NEOB–10202, Office of Management and Budget, Washington, DC 20503.

Comments can also be e-mailed to John_A._Asalone@omb.eop.gov or submitted by telephone at (202) 395–4650.

The NRC Clearance Officer is Brenda Jo. Shelton, 301–415–7233.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 6th day of June, 2005.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Brenda Jo. Shelton,

NRC Clearance Officer, Office of Information Services.

[FR Doc. E5–3054 Filed 6–10–05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50–325 and 50–324]

Carolina Power & Light Company, Brunswick Steam Electric Plant, Units 1 and 2; Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendments to Facility Operating Licenses, Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity for a Hearing

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of amendments to Facility Operating License No. DPR–71 and Facility Operating License No. DPR–62 issued to Carolina Power & Light Company (the licensee), for operation of the Brunswick Steam Electric Plant, Units 1 and 2, located in Brunswick County, North Carolina.

The proposed changes replace the existing requirement of Technical Specification (TS) 3.4.5, “RCS [Reactor Coolant System] Leakage Detection Instrumentation,” Required Action D.1, to enter Limiting Condition for Operation (LCO) 3.0.3 if required leakage detection systems are inoperable with the requirement to be in Mode 3 within 12 hours and Mode 4 within 36 hours.

The reason for the exigency is to fulfill the NRC's requirement for the request for exigent processing of the proposed amendments as indicated in NRC Inspection Manual Part 9900, "Operations—Notices of Enforcement Discretion [NOEDs]," following NRC's granting of a verbal NOED on May 12, 2005 (documented in a letter to the NRC on May 13, 2005).

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

Pursuant to 10 CFR 50.91(a)(6) for amendments to be granted under exigent circumstances, the NRC staff must determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration. Under the Commission's regulations in 10 CFR 50.92, this means that operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendments 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 proposed change replaces the existing requirement of TS 3.4.5, Required Action D.1 to enter LCO 3.0.3 if required leakage detection systems are inoperable with the requirement to be in Mode 3 within 12 hours and Mode 4 within 36 hours. This is accomplished by deleting Condition D and including the "all required leakage detection systems inoperable" statement in Condition C.

The proposed change does not involve physical changes to any plant structure, system, or component. As a result, no new failure modes of the RCS leakage detection systems are being introduced. Additionally, the RCS leakage detection systems have no impact on any initiating event frequency. Therefore, the proposed change cannot increase * * * the probability [of an accident] previously evaluated.

The consequences of a previously analyzed accident are dependent on the initial conditions assumed for the analysis, the behavior of the fuel during the analyzed accident, the availability and successful functioning of the equipment assumed to operate in response to the analyzed event, and the setpoints at which these actions are initiated. The RCS leakage detection systems do not perform an accident mitigating

function. ECCS [emergency core cooling system], RPS [reactor protection system], and primary and secondary containment isolation actuations all occur based on high drywell pressure and/or low vessel water level. The proposed change has no impact on any setpoints or functions related to these actuations. Therefore, the proposed change cannot increase * * * the consequences [of an accident] previously evaluated.

2. Does the proposed change create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

The proposed change eliminates the unnecessarily restrictive shutdown requirements of entering LCO 3.0.3 when all TS required leakage detection systems are inoperable. No installed equipment is being operated in a different manner. There is no alteration to the parameters within which the plant is normally operated or in the setpoints that initiate protective or mitigative actions. As a result no new failure modes are being introduced. Therefore, the proposed change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

3. Does the proposed change involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety?

Response: No.

The proposed change maintains the existing level of safety by imposing shutdown requirements that are as conservative as those currently imposed by TS 3.4.4 for actual RCS operational leakage in excess of TS requirements. The net effect of this change is to allow a unit to operate for five additional hours in Mode 1 with no operable TS required leakage detection systems, while exiting the Mode of Applicability for RCS leakage detection instrumentation one hour earlier (i.e., 36 hours to be in Mode 4 versus 37 hours per the existing TS 3.4.5, Required Action D.1). Elimination of the intermediate 7 hours to Mode 2 requirement, imposed by LCO 3.0.3, allows the unit to reach the Mode 3 from full power conditions in an orderly manner and without challenging plant safety systems. Therefore, the proposed change does not result in a significant reduction in the margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment requests involve no significant hazards consideration.

The Commission is seeking public comments on this proposed determination. Any comments received within 14 days after the date of publication of this notice will be considered in making any final determination.

Normally, the Commission will not issue the amendments until the expiration of the 14-day notice period. However, should circumstances change during the notice period, such that

failure to act in a timely way would result, for example, in derating or shutdown of the facility, the Commission may issue the license amendment before the expiration of the 14-day notice period, provided that its final determination is that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration. The final determination will consider all public and State comments received. Should the Commission take this action, it will publish in the **Federal Register** a notice of issuance. The Commission expects that the need to take this action will occur very infrequently.

Written comments may be submitted by mail to the Chief, Rules and Directives Branch, Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, and should cite the publication date and page number of this **Federal Register** notice. Written comments may also be delivered to Room 6D59, Two White Flint North, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland, from 7:30 a.m. to 4:15 p.m. Federal workdays. Documents may be examined, and/or copied for a fee, at the NRC's Public Document Room, located at One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland.

The filing of requests for hearing and petitions for leave to intervene is discussed below.

Within 60 days after the date of publication of this notice, 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 2.309, which is available at the Commission's PDR, located at One White Flint North, Public File Area 01F21, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland. Publicly available records will be accessible from the Agencywide Documents Access and Management System's (ADAMS) Public Electronic Reading Room on the Internet at the NRC Web site, <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/doc-collections/cfr/>. If a request for a hearing or petition for leave to intervene is filed by the above date, the Commission or a presiding officer designated by the Commission or

by the Chief Administrative Judge of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, will rule on the request and/or petition; and the Secretary or the Chief Administrative Judge of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board will issue a notice of a hearing or an appropriate order.

As required by 10 CFR 2.309, 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 general requirements: (1) The name, address and telephone number of the requestor or petitioner; (2) the nature of the requestor's/petitioner's right under the Act to be made a party to the proceeding; (3) the nature and extent of the requestor's/petitioner's property, financial, or other interest in the proceeding; and (4) the possible effect of any decision or order which may be entered in the proceeding on the requestor's/petitioner's interest. The petition must also identify the specific contentions which the petitioner/requestor seeks to have litigated at the proceeding.

Each contention must consist of a specific statement of the issue of law or fact to be raised or controverted. In addition, the petitioner/requestor shall provide a brief explanation of the bases for 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/requestor must also provide references to those specific sources and documents of which the petitioner/requestor is aware and on which the petitioner/requestor intends to rely to establish those facts or expert opinion. The petitioner/requestor 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/requestor to relief. A petitioner/requestor who fails to satisfy 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.

If a hearing is requested, the Commission will make a final determination on the issue of no significant hazards consideration. The final determination will serve to decide when the hearing is held. If the final determination is that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration, the Commission may issue the amendment and make it immediately effective, notwithstanding the request for a hearing. Any hearing held would take place after issuance of the amendment. If the final determination is that the amendment request involves a significant hazards consideration, any hearing held would take place before the issuance of any amendment.

Nontimely requests and/or petitions and contentions will not be entertained absent a determination by the Commission or the presiding officer of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board that the petition, request and/or the contentions should be granted based on a balancing of the factors specified in 10 CFR 2.309(a)(1)(i)-(viii).

A request for a hearing or a petition for leave to intervene must be filed by: (1) First class mail addressed to the Office of the Secretary of the Commission, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, Attention: Rulemaking and Adjudications Staff; (2) courier, express mail, and expedited delivery services: Office of the Secretary, Sixteenth Floor, One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland, 20852, Attention: Rulemaking and Adjudications Staff; (3) e-mail addressed to the Office of the Secretary, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, HEARINGDOCKET@NRC.GOV; or (4) facsimile transmission addressed to the Office of the Secretary, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC, Attention: Rulemakings and Adjudications Staff at (301) 415-1101, verification number is (301) 415-1966. A copy of the request for hearing and petition for leave to intervene should also be sent to the Office of the General Counsel, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, and it is requested that copies be transmitted either by means of facsimile transmission to 301-415-3725 or by e-mail to OGCMailCenter@nrc.gov. A copy of the request for hearing and petition for leave to intervene should also be sent to David T. Conley, Associate General Counsel II—Legal Department, Progress Energy Service Company, LLC, Post Office Box 1551, Raleigh, North Carolina 27602, attorney for the licensee.

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendment dated May 17, 2005, which is available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room (PDR), located at One White Flint North, Public File Area O1 F21, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland. Publicly available records will be accessible electronically from the Agencywide Documents Access and Management System's (ADAMS) Public Electronic Reading Room on the Internet at the NRC Web site <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html>. Persons who do not have access to ADAMS or who encounter problems in accessing the documents located in ADAMS, should contact the NRC PDR Reference staff by telephone at 1-800-397-4209, 301-415-4737, or by e-mail to pdr@nrc.gov.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 7th day of June 2005. For The Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Brenda L. Mozafari,

Senior Project Manager, Section 2, Project Directorate II, Division of Licensing Project Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. E5-3050 Filed 6-10-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-333]

Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc., James A. Fitzpatrick Nuclear Power Plant; 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 (the Commission) is considering issuance of an amendment to Facility Operating License No. DPR-59, issued to Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc., (the licensee) for operation of the James A. FitzPatrick Nuclear Power Plant (JAFNPP) located in Oswego County, New York.

The proposed amendment would revise the Technical Specifications (TSs) related to the safety-related battery systems. The revision is based on TS Task Force (TSTF) Change Traveler TSTF-360, Revision 1, "Direct Current (DC) Electrical Rewrite," and would revise TSs for inoperable battery chargers, provide alternative testing criteria for battery charger testing, and revise TSs for battery cell monitoring.

The licensee has requested that this proposed license amendment be processed per Title 10 of the Code of