sign language interpreters, must inform the Commission in advance of those needs. Subject to 29 CFR 2706.150(a)(3) and 2706.160(d).

CONTACT PERSON FOR MORE INFO: Jean Ellen, (202) 434–9950, (202) 708–9300 for TDD Relay, 1–800–877–8339 for toll free.

Iean H. Ellen.

Chief Docket Clerk.

[FR Doc. 03–18112 Filed 7–14–03; 1:20 pm] BILLING CODE 6735–01–M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Documents Containing Reporting or Recordkeeping Requirements: Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Review

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).

- 1. Type of submission, new, revision, or extension: Revision.
- 2. The title of the information collection: Proposed Rule to Update 10 CFR part 52, "Early Site Permits; Standard Design Certifications; and Combined Licenses for Nuclear Power Plants."
- 3. The form number if applicable: N/A.
- 4. How often the collection is required: One occasion and every 10 to 20 years for applications for renewal.
- 5. Who will be required or asked to report: Designers of commercial nuclear power plants, electric power companies, and any person eligible under the Atomic Energy Act to apply for a construction permit for a nuclear power plant.
- 6. An estimate of the number of responses: 0.
- 7. The estimated number of annual respondents: 0.
- 8. An estimate of the total number of hours needed annually to complete the requirement or request: 3,429 hours, however, no combined license applications are anticipated during the next three years.
- 9. An indication of whether Section 3507(d), Pub. L. 104–13 applies: N/A.
- 10. Abstract: The NRC is proposing to reorganize 10 CFR part 52 to establish

a separate subpart for each of the seven licensing processes currently described in 10 CFR part 52 (early site permits, early site reviews, standard design certification, standard design approvals, combined licenses, manufacturing licenses, and duplicate design licenses). The purpose of this reorganization is to clarify that each licensing process has equal standing. In addition, several subparts would be reserved for future licensing processes. No substantive changes are intended by the incorporation of current Appendices M, N, O, and Q into the new subparts in 10 CFR part 52.

The NRC is also proposing to retitle 10 CFR part 52 as "Additional Licensing Processes for Nuclear Power Plants," to clarify that the licensing processes in 10 CFR part 52 are in addition to and supplement the two-step licensing process in 10 CFR part 50 and the license renewal process in 10 CFR part 54, and are not limited to the early site permit, standard design certification, and combined license processes as the current title implies.

Submit, by August 15, 2003, 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 submittal 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. The proposed rule indicated in "The title of the information collection" is or has been published in the Federal Register within several days of the publication date of this Federal Register Notice. The OMB clearance package and rule are available at the NRC worldwide Web site: http://www.nrc.gov/public-involve/ doc-comment/0mb/index.html for 60 days after the signature date of this notice and are also available at the rule forum site, http://ruleforum.llnl.gov.

Comments and questions should be directed to the OMB reviewer by August 15, 2003: Bryon Allen, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs (3150–0151), NEOB–10202, Office of Management and Budget, Washington, DC 20503.

Comments can also be submitted by telephone at (202) 395–3087.

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

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 10th day of July 2003.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Brenda Jo. Shelton,

NRC Clearance Officer, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 03–17961 Filed 7–15–03; 8:45 am] **BILLING CODE 7590–01–P**

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-311]

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 (the Commission or the
NRC) is considering issuance of an
amendment to Facility Operating
License No. DPR-75 issued to PSEG
Nuclear, LLC (PSEG or the licensee) for
operation of the Salem Nuclear
Generating Station (Salem), Unit No. 2,
located in Salem County, New Jersey.

The proposed amendment would revise License Condition 2.C.10, "Fire Protection," to reflect changes to the Salem post-fire Safe Shutdown (SSD) strategy for Fire Areas 2–FA–AB–64B, 2–FA–AB–84C, and 2–FA–AB–84B. The proposed changes were submitted as a result of PSEG's re-analysis of post-fire SSD capability and recent plant modifications implemented in response to resolution of Electrical Raceway Fire Barrier System issues at Salem.

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