

Signed in Washington, DC this 13th day of May, 2004.

Terry Sullivan,

Acting Chief, Branch of Construction Wage Determinations.

[FR Doc. 04-11272 Filed 5-20-04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-27-M

scheduling priorities of the key participants.

R. Andrew Falcon,

Advisory Committee Management Officer, National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

[FR Doc. 04-11459 Filed 5-20-04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7510-01-P

accommodate the scheduling priorities of the key participants.

R. Andrew Falcon,

Advisory Committee Management Officer, National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

[FR Doc. 04-11577 Filed 5-20-04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7510-01-P

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

[Notice 04-069]

NASA Advisory Council, Education Advisory Committee; Meeting

AGENCY: National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

ACTION: Notice of Meeting.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act, Public Law 92-463, as amended, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration announces a meeting of the NASA Advisory Council, Education Advisory Committee.

DATES: Thursday, June 24, 2004, Noon to 5:45 p.m.; Friday, June 25, 2004, 8:30 a.m. to Noon.

ADDRESSES: Hilton Houston NASA Clear Lake, 3000 NASA Road 1, Houston, TX 77058.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Mei Mei Peng, Code N, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, DC, 20546, (202) 358-1614.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The meeting will be open to the public up to the seating capacity of the room. The agenda for the meeting is as follows:

—Introduction by Dr. William Harvey, Chairman of the NASA Education Advisory Committee

—Comments by Dr. Adena Williams Loston, Associate Administrator for Education

—Presentation on the Impact of the Educator Astronaut Program on Elementary and Secondary Education by Ms. Barbara Morgan, Educator Astronaut

—Updates in relation to recommendations from the February 2004 Education Advisory Committee Meeting

—Open discussion and a review of action items from the February 2004 Education Advisory Committee Meeting

Persons with disabilities who require assistance should indicate this. It is imperative that the meeting be held on this date to accommodate the

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

[Notice 04-070]

NASA Advisory Council; Meeting

AGENCY: National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

ACTION: Notice of meeting.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act, Public Law 92-463, as amended, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration announces a meeting of the NASA Advisory Council (NAC).

DATES: Tuesday, June 8, 2004, 8 a.m. to 3:30 p.m.; and Wednesday, June 9, 2004, 8 a.m. to 3 p.m.

ADDRESSES: National Aeronautics and Space Administration, 300 E Street, SW., Washington, DC 20546, MIC 6.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Kathy Dakon, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, DC 20546, 202/358-0732.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The meeting will be open to the public up to the seating capacity of the room. The agenda for the meeting is as follows:

- Vision for Space Exploration Systems
- NASA Office of Exploration
- Update on Return to Flight
- Information Technology Working Group Activities

Attendees will be requested to sign a register and to comply with NASA security requirements, including the presentation of a valid picture ID, before receiving an access badge. Foreign nationals attending this meeting will be required to provide the following information: Full name; gender; date/place of birth; citizenship; visa/green card information (number, type, expiration date); employer/affiliation information (name of institution, address, county, phone); and title/position of attendee. To expedite admittance, attendees can provide identifying information in advance by contacting Ms. Marla K. King via e-mail at marla.k.king@nasa.gov or by telephone at (202) 358-1148. Persons with disabilities who require assistance should indicate this. It is imperative that the meeting be held on this date to

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 21, Report of Defects and Noncompliance.
2. *Current OMB approval number:* 3150-0035.

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

4. *Who is required or asked to report:* All directors and responsible officers of firms and organizations building, operating, or owning NRC licensed facilities as well as directors and responsible officers of firms and organizations supplying basic components and safety related design, analysis, testing, inspection, and consulting services of NRC licensed facilities or activities.

5. *The number of annual respondents:* 36 respondents.

6. *The number of hours needed annually to complete the requirement or request:* 7,790 hours (5,112 for reporting and 2,678 for recordkeeping) and total of 142 hours per each response and 74 hours per each recordkeeper.

7. *Abstract:* 10 CFR part 21 implements section 206 of the Energy Reorganization Act of 1974, as amended. It requires directors and responsible officers of firms and organizations building, operating, owning, or supplying basic components to NRC licensed facilities or activities to report defects and noncompliance that could create a substantial safety hazard at NRC licensed facilities or activities.

Organizations subject to 10 CFR part 21 are also required to maintain such records as may be required to assure compliance with this regulation.

The NRC staff reviews 10 CFR part 21 reports to determine whether the reported defects in basic components and related services and failure to comply at NRC licensed facilities or activities are potentially generic safety problems.

Submit, by July 20, 2004, 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 (T-5 F52), U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, by telephone at 301-415-7233, or by Internet electronic mail to INFOCOLLECTS@NRC.GOV.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 17th day of May 2004.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Brenda Jo. Shelton,

NRC Clearance Officer, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 04-11509 Filed 5-20-04; 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, 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-20 issued to Nuclear Management Company, LLC, (the licensee) for operation of the Palisades Plant located in Van Buren County, Michigan.

The proposed amendment would replace existing License condition 2.C.(5) and its corresponding table, with a new license condition stating that performance of Technical Specification surveillance requirement 3.1.4.3 is not required for control rod drive 19 only, until the next refueling outage, but no later than September 30, 2004.

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:

Nuclear Management Company, LLC (NMC) has evaluated whether or not a significant hazards consideration is involved with the proposed amendment by focusing on the three standards set forth in 10 CFR 50.92, "Issuance of Amendment," as discussed below:

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

Response: No.

The proposed license amendment deletes outdated information from the operating license and adds a license condition to delay

testing of one control rod from the Palisades Technical Specification surveillance requirement for partial movement every 92 days. The proposed License Condition does not affect or create any accident initiators or precursors. As such, the proposed license condition does not increase the probability of an accident.

The proposed license amendment does not significantly increase the consequences of an accident. The safety analyses assume full-length control rod insertion, except the most reactive rod, upon reactor trip. The proposed surveillance requirement (SR) extension request does not increase the allowed outage time of any required operable structures, systems, or components (SSCs), and does not reduce the requirement to know that the deferred SR could be met at all times.

Deferral of testing does not, by itself, increase the potential that the testing would not be met. The ability to move a full-length control rod by its drive mechanism is not an initial assumption used in the safety analyses. Control rod drop times are verified during performance of a surveillance that is normally performed during refueling outages. NMC has determined that control rod drive (CRD) seal leakage does not increase the likelihood of an untrippable control rod. Therefore, the assumptions of the safety analyses will be maintained, and the consequences of an accident will not be increased significantly.

Deleting the existing license condition 2.C.(5) and Table 2.C.(5) is administrative, since the provision has expired, and has no impact on plant operation or equipment.

Therefore, operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed License Condition would not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

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

Response: No.

The proposed license condition does not involve a physical alteration of any SSC or change the way any SSC is operated. The proposed license condition does not involve operation of any required SSCs in a manner or configuration different from those previously recognized or evaluated. No new failure mechanisms will be introduced by the SR deferral being requested.

Deleting the existing license condition 2.C.(5) and Table 2.C.(5) is administrative, since the provision has expired, and has no impact on plant operation or equipment.

Therefore, the proposed amendment does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

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

Response: No.

The safety analyses assume full-length control rod insertion, except the most reactive rod, upon reactor trip. The proposed License Condition does not, by itself, introduce a failure mechanism. Past performance of the SR in question has demonstrated reliability in passing the deferred SR. The proposed license condition