your comments. Because of security-related problem there may be a significant delay in the receipt of comments by regular mail. Please contact the OSHA Docket Office at (202) 693–2350 for information about security procedures concerning the delivery of materials by express delivery, hand delivery and messenger service.

### II. Background

The Depart of Labor, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent (i.e., employer) burden, conducts a preclearance consultation program to provide the public with an opportunity to comment on proposed and continuing information-collection requirements in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (PRA-95) (44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(2)(A)). This program ensures that information is in the desired format, reporting burden (time and costs) is minimal, collection instruments are clearly understood, and OSHA's estimate of the informationcollection burden is correct. The Occupational Safety and Health Act of the 1970 (the Act) authorizes information collection by employers as necessary or appropriate for enforcement of the Act or for developing information regarding the causes and prevention of occupational injuries, illnesses, and accidents (29 U.S.C. 657). In this regard, the information collection requirements in the Benzene Standard provide protection for employees from the adverse health effects associated with exposure to Benzene.

#### III. Special Issues for Comment

OSHA has a particular interest in comments on the following issues:

- Whether the proposed informationcollection requirements are necessary for the proper performance of the Agency's functions, including whether the information is useful;
- The accuracy of OSHA's estimate of the burden (time and costs) for the information-collection requirements, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;
- The quality, utility, and clarity of the information collected; and
- Ways to minimize the burden on employers who must comply; for example, by using automated or other technological information-collection and transmission techniques.

## IV. Proposed Actions

OSHA is proposing to extend the information-collection requirements specified in the Benzene Standard. The information-collection requirements specified in the Benzene Standard protect employees from the adverse

health effects that may result from occupational exposure to benzene. The major information-collection requirements in the Standard include conducting employee exposure monitoring, notifying employees of their benzene exposures, implementing a written compliance program, implementing medical surveillance of employees, providing examining physicians with specific information, ensuring that employees receive a copy of their medical-surveillance results, maintaining employees' exposuremonitoring and medical-surveillance records for specific periods, and providing access to these records by OSHA, the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, the employee who is the subject of the records, the employee's representative, and other designated parties.

OSHA will summarize the comments submitted in response to this notice, and will include this summary in the request to OMB to extend the approval of the information collection requirements in the Benzene Standard (29 CFR 1910.1028).

Type of Review: Extension of a currently-approved information-collection requirement.

*Title:* Benzene Standard (29 CFR 1910.1028).

OMB Number: 1218-0129.

Affected Public: Business or other for-profit.

Number of Respondents: 13,498.

Frequency: On occasion.

Total Responses: 265,428.

Average Time Per Response: Time per response ranges from 5 minutes to maintain records to 2 hours to complete a referral medical examination.

Estimated Total Burden Hours: 125,195.

Estimated Cost (Operation and Maintenance): \$8,179,933.

# III. Authority and Signature

John L. Henshaw, Assistant Secretary of Labor for Occupational Safety and Health, directed the preparation of this notice. The authority for this notice is the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3506), and Secretary of Labor's Order No. 5–2002 (67 FR 65008).

Signed in Washington, DC on March 14, 2003.

# John L. Henshaw,

Assistant Secretary of Labor. [FR Doc. 03–6712 Filed 3–19–03; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 4510–26–M

# NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-146]

Saxton Nuclear Experimental Corporation and GPU Nuclear, Inc. Saxton Nuclear Experimental Facility; Notice of Issuance of Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory
Commission (NRC) is considering
issuance of an amendment for Amended
Facility License No. DPR-4, issued to
the Saxton Nuclear Experimental
Corporation (SNEC) and GPU Nuclear,
Inc. (the licensees), for the Saxton
Nuclear Experimental Facility. The
proposed action would approve the
SNEC Facility License Termination Plan
(LTP).

### **Description of Proposed Action**

The proposed action is NRC approval of the SNEC's LTP, which contains the radiation release criteria [i.e., derived concentration guideline levels (DCGLs)], and the description of the final status survey plan required by the NRC. NRC review and approval of the LTP will verify that the remainder of the decommissioning activities will be performed in accordance with NRC regulations.

The SNEC Facility is a deactivated pressurized-water nuclear reactor located on about 5,300 square meters (1.148 acres) less than a mile north of the Borough of Saxton in Liberty Township, Bedford County, Pennsylvania. The reactor was licensed to operate at 23.5 megawatt thermal (MWT).

The SNEC Facility was built from 1960 to 1962 and operated from 1962 to 1972. The Facility was placed in a SAFSTOR-equivalent status after its shutdown in 1972 when all the nuclear fuel was removed from the reactor and returned to the owner of the fuel, the Atomic Energy Commission. The control rod blades and superheated steam test loop were also shipped offsite. Following fuel removal, some equipment, tanks, and piping located outside of the reactor containment vessel (CV) were removed. From 1972 to 1974, the buildings and structures that supported reactor operations were partially decontaminated.

Radiological decontamination of reactor support structures and buildings was performed between 1987–1989 in preparation for demolition of these structures. This work included decontamination of the Control and Auxiliary Building, the Radioactive Waste Disposal Facility, the Yard Pipe

Tunnel, and the Filled Drum Storage Bunker, and removal of the Refueling Water Storage Tank. After the NRC accepted the final release radiological survey for this work, these structures were demolished in 1992.

In April of 1998, the NRC approved the final stage of decommissioning. In 1998, the large component structures: pressurizer, steam generator, and reactor vessel were removed and shipped to the Chem-Nuclear low-level waste disposal facility in Barnwell, South Carolina. The only remaining structure of the original facility is the CV. The Saxton Steam Generating Station basement and adjoining Intake/Discharge Tunnels and associated underground discharge piping have also been involved in decommissioning activities. This decommissioning is in preparation for release of the site for unrestricted use.

The licensees are proposing to decontaminate the site to meet the unrestricted release criteria [0.25 Sieverts per year (Sv/yr) (25 milliroentgen-equivalent-man per year (25 mrem/yr)) and residual radioactivity as low as reasonably achievable] per 10 CFR 20.1402.

# Summary of the Environmental Assessment

The NRC staff reviewed the licensees' application which included a Decommissioning Environmental Report. To document its review, the NRC staff has prepared an environmental assessment (EA) which discusses the SNEC Facility background; site description; current environmental conditions including land use, geology, water resources (surface water and groundwater) and waste management; examines the no action alternative to the proposed action; and presents the environmental impact of the proposed action including radiological, non-radiological and cumulative environmental impacts. The radiological and non-radiological impacts of the proposed action are reproduced from the EA below.

#### Radiological Impacts

At the time of license termination, the only source of exposure to members of the public would be any residual radioactivity within remaining buildings or within the site soils.

The derived concentration guideline levels (DCGLs) are concentration limits on the residual radioactivity that can be left in buildings and in soils, and still be in compliance with the dose limit of 0.25 Sv/yr (25 mrem/yr) as specified in 10 CFR part 20, subpart E. The manner in which the DCGLs are derived for the SNEC is documented in the LTP.

NRC would evaluate the adequacy of the DCGLs in providing protection for members of the public as the site is released for unrestricted use based on the approved LTP. The LTP would be bounded by the dose limit of 0.25 Sv/yr (25 mrem/yr) as specified in 10 CFR part 20, subpart E.

In deriving the soil DCGLs, a resident-farmer would be considered as the average member of the critical population group. The hypothetical resident farmer is assumed to build a house, draw water from a well, grow plant food and fodder, raise livestock, and catch fish from a pond all within or affected by residual radioactivity in the soil. The resident farmer scenario is considered to embody the greatest number of exposure pathways of any scenario envisioned.

The DCGLs for buildings assumes a light industrial worker as the average member of the critical group. The worker is assumed to be exposed to residual radioactivity remaining on the walls and floor of a remaining structure at the site as he goes about light industrial activities.

NRC would evaluate the appropriateness of the exposure scenarios postulated and the methodology used for deriving the DCGLs. NRC would only approve the LTP if the evaluation concluded that the potential radiation exposures caused by residual radionuclide concentrations have not been underestimated by the licensees and are protective of the general public.

The licensees would use a series of surveys and a final status survey to demonstrate compliance with 10 CFR part 20, subpart E, consistent with the Radiation Survey and Site Investigation process and the Data Quality Objectives (DQO) process. Planning for the final status survey involves an iterative process that requires appropriate site classification (on the basis of the potential residual radionuclide concentration levels relative to the DCGLs) and formal planning using the DQO process. The licensees have committed to an integrated design that would address the selection of appropriate survey and laboratory instrumentation and procedures, and that includes a statistically based measurement and sampling plan for collecting and evaluating the data needed for the final status survey. The staff has determined that the sampling strategy and survey data evaluation methodology presented in the LTP are adequate.

Based on the discussion above, there are no significant radiological

environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

#### **Non-Radiological Impacts**

The scope of the EA is limited to the adequacy of the DCGLs and the adequacy of the final status survey described in the LTP. The purposed action does not involve any historic sites. Therefore, there are no significant non-radiological impacts on the environmental resources.

#### **Finding of No Significant Impact**

On the basis of the EA, NRC concludes that the approval of the LTP will not cause any significant impacts on the human environment and is protective of human health. Accordingly, the NRC has determined not to prepare an environmental impact statement for the proposed action.

For further details with respect to the proposed action, see the licensees' letter dated February 2, 2000, as supplemented on June 23, August 11, September 18 and December 4, 2000, January 30, February 14, March 15 and 19, June 20, July 2 and September 4, 2001, and January 11 and 24, February 4, May 22 and 28, July 11, August 20, September 17, 23, 24, and 26, October 10, and December 16, 2002. Documents may be examined, and/or copied for a fee, at the NRC's Public Document Room (PDR), located at One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland. Publicly available records will be accessible electronically from the Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS) Public Electronic Reading Room on the Internet at the NRC Web site, http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/ adams.html. The EA can be found in ADAMS under accession number ML030350564. 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 or 301-415-4737, or by e-mail to pdr@nrc.gov. Single copies of the EA may be obtained from Alexander Adams, Jr., Senior Project Manager, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, M.S. O-12-G-13, Washington, DC 20555.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 13th day of March, 2003.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. **Patrick M. Madden**,

Chief, Research and Test Reactors Section, Operating Reactor Improvements Program, Division of Regulatory Improvement Programs, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 03-6731 Filed 3-19-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

### **COMMISSION ON OCEAN POLICY**

## **Public Meeting**

**AGENCY:** Commission on Ocean Policy.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy will hold a meeting to discuss the development of recommendations for a coordinated national ocean policy. This will be the fifteenth public Commission meeting.

**DATES:** The public meeting will be held Wednesday, April 2, 2003 from 1 p.m. to 6 p.m. and Thursday, April 3, 2003 from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m.

ADDRESSES: The meeting location is the Cafritz Conference Center, George Washington University, 800 21st Street, NW., Suite 204, Washington, DC 20052.

## FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Terry Schaff, U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy, 1120 20th Street, NW., Washington, DC 20036, 202–418–3442, schaff@oceancommission.gov.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** This meeting is being held pursuant to requirements under the Oceans Act of 2000 (Pub. L. 106-256, Section 3(e)(1)(E)). The agenda will include discussions of policy options, a public comment session, and any required administrative discussions and executive sessions. Members of the public are requested to submit their statements for the record electronically by Friday, March 28, 2003 to the meeting Point of Contact. The meeting agenda, including the specific time for the public comment period, and guidelines for making public comments will be posted on the Commission's Web site at http:// www.oceancommission.gov prior to the

Dated: March 14, 2003.

## Thomas R. Kitsos,

meeting.

Executive Director, U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy.

[FR Doc. 03-6679 Filed 3-19-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6820-WM-P

# SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 35-27658]

#### Filings Under the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935, as Amended ("Act")

March 14, 2003.

Notice is hereby given that the following filings have been made with the Commission pursuant to provisions of the Act and rules promulgated under the Act. All interested persons are referred to the application(s) and/or declaration(s) for complete statements of the proposed transaction(s) summarized below. The application(s) and/or declaration(s) and any amendment(s) is/ are available for public inspection through the Commission's Branch of Public Reference.

Interested persons wishing to comment or request a hearing on the application(s) and/or declaration(s) should submit their views in writing by April 8, 2003, to the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, Washington, DC 20549-0609, and serve a copy on the relevant applicant(s) and/ or declarant(s) at the address(es) specified below. Proof of service (by affidavit or, in the case of an attorney at law, by certificate) should be filed with the request. Any request for hearing should identify specifically the issues of facts or law that are disputed. A person who so requests will be notified of any hearing, if ordered, and will receive a copy of any notice or order issued in the matter. After April 8, 2003, the application(s) and/or declaration(s), as filed or as amended, may be granted and/or permitted to become effective.

#### Mississippi Power Company (70–10094)

Mississippi Power Company ("Mississippi"), 2992 West Beach, Gulfport, Mississippi 39501, a wholly owned electric utility subsidiary of the Southern Company ("Southern"), a registered holding company under the Act, has filed an application-declaration ("Application") under sections 6(a), 7, 9(a), 10, 12(c) and 12(d) of the Act and rule 54 under the Act.

Mississippi proposes to incur, from time to time or at any time on or before March 31, 2006 ("Authorization Period"), obligations in connection with the issuance and sale by public instrumentalities of one or more series of pollution control revenue bonds ("Revenue Bonds") in an aggregate principal amount of up to \$75,000,000. Mississippi further proposes to issue and sell, from time to time or at any time on or before the Authorization Period, one or more series of its senior

debentures, senior promissory notes or other senior debt instruments (individually, "Senior Note" and collectively, "Senior Notes"), one or more series of its first mortgage bonds and one or more series of its preferred stock in an aggregate amount of up to \$475,000,000 in any combination of issuance.

The Revenue Bonds will be issued for the benefit of Mississippi to finance or refinance the costs of certain air and water pollution control facilities and sewage and solid waste disposal facilities at one or more of Mississippi's electric generating plants or other facilities located in various counties. It is proposed that each such county or the otherwise appropriate public body or instrumentality ("County") will issue Revenue Bonds to finance or refinance the costs of the acquisition, construction, installation and equipping of said facilities at the plant or other facility located in its jurisdiction ("Project"). It is proposed that the Revenue Bonds will mature not more than 40 years from the first day of the month in which they are initially issued and may, if it is deemed advisable for purposes of the marketability of the Revenue Bonds, be entitled to the benefit of a mandatory redemption sinking fund calculated to retire a portion of the aggregate principal amount of the Revenue Bonds prior to maturity.

Mississippi proposes to enter into a Loan or Installment Sale Agreement with each County ("Agreement"), issuing such Revenue Bonds. Under the Agreement, the issuing County will loan to Mississippi the proceeds of the sale of the County's Revenue Bonds, and Mississippi may issue a non-negotiable promissory note ("Note"), or the County will undertake to purchase and sell the related Project to Mississippi. The proceeds from the sale of the Revenue Bonds will be deposited with a Trustee ("Trustee") under an indenture to be entered into between the County and the Trustee ("Trust Indenture"), under which the Revenue Bonds are to be issued and secured, and will be applied by Mississippi to payment of the cost of construction of the Project or to refund outstanding pollution control revenue obligations.

The Trust Indenture and the Agreement may give the holders of the Revenue Bonds the right, during such time as the Revenue Bonds bear interest at a fluctuating rate or otherwise, to require Mississippi to purchase the Revenue Bonds from time to time, and arrangements may be made for the remarketing of any such Revenue Bonds through a remarketing agent.