

The Material Modification of Consent Decree changes the performances standard for the work that will be done pursuant to the Consent Decree. In addition, the Material Modification of Consent Decree provides that defendant Wolin-Levin, Inc. establish a \$300,000 letter of credit to guarantee certain of its obligation under the modified Consent Decree.

The Department of Justice will receive for a period of thirty (30) days from the date of this publication, comments relating to the Material Modification of Consent Decree. Comments should be addressed to the Assistant Attorney General, Environmental and Natural Resources Division, P.O. Box 7611, Department of Justice, Washington, DC 20044-7611, and should refer to *United States v. Wolin-Levin, Inc.*, D.J. Ref. 90-11-2-06829/1.

The Consent Decree may be examined at the Office of the United States Attorney, Jonathan Haile, Assistant U.S. Attorney, 5th Floor, 219 S. Dearborn St., Chicago, Illinois 60604. During the public comment period, the Consent Decree may also be examined on the following Department of Justice Website, <http://www.usdoj.gov/enrd/open.html>. A copy of the Consent Decree may also be obtained by mail from Consent Decree Library, P.O. Box 76121, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC 20044-7611, or by faxing or e-mailing a request to Tonia Fleetwood ([tonia.fleetwood@usdoj.gov](mailto:tonia.fleetwood@usdoj.gov)), fax no. (202) 616-6584, phone confirmation number (202) 514-1547. In requesting a copy, please enclose a check in the amount of \$12.00 (48 pages at 48 cents per page reproduction cost) payable to the U.S. Treasury.

**Ellen Mahan,**

*Assistant Section Chief, Environmental Enforcement Section, Environmental and Natural Resources Division.*

[FR Doc. 03-21922 Filed 8-26-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-15-M

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 70-143]

### Nuclear Fuel Services, Inc.; Correction of Amendment 39 Authorizing Operations in the Uranyl Nitrate Building

**ACTION:** Notice of availability; Corrected Amendment 39 to Materials License SNM-124.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Mary Adams, Fuel Cycle and Safety Branch, Office of Nuclear Materials,

Safety and Safeguards, 11554 Rockville Pike, Rockville, MD 20852; telephone (301) 415-7249; or by e-mail at [mta@nrc.gov](mailto:mta@nrc.gov).

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Amendment 39 to Materials License SNM-124 was issued on July 7, 2003. Safety Condition S-1 in Amendment 39 failed to reference the supplement to the Nuclear Fuel Services (NFS) license application dated April 16, 2003. NRC staff used the commitments in this supplement as the basis for approving management measures for items relied on for safety at the Uranyl Nitrate Building. Safety Condition S-1 has been corrected to add the date of April 16, 2003.

The corrected Amendment 39 is available electronically for public inspection and copying for a fee in the NRC Public Document Room, One White Flint North Building, 11555 Rockville, MD 20852, or from the Publicly Available Records (PARS) component of NRC's Agency-wide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS) under accession number ML031890762. ADAMS is accessible from the NRC Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html> (the Public Electronic Reading Room). If you do not have access to ADAMS, or if there are problems accessing the documents located in ADAMS, contact the NRC Public Document Room Reference staff at 1(800) 397-4209 or by e-mail at [pdr@nrc.gov](mailto:pdr@nrc.gov).

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

For the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Mary T. Adams,**

*Project Manager, Fuel Cycle Facilities Branch, Division of Fuel Cycle Safety and Safeguards, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.*

[FR Doc. 03-21881 Filed 8-26-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50-272 and 50-311]

### PSEG Nuclear, LLC, Salem Nuclear Generating Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2; Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is considering the issuance of amendments to Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-70 and DPR-75, issued to PSEG Nuclear, LLC (the licensee), for operation of the Salem Nuclear Generating Station (Salem),

Unit Nos. 1 and 2, located in Salem County, New Jersey. Therefore, as required by Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations (10 CFR) Section 51.21, the NRC is issuing this environmental assessment and finding of no significant impact.

#### Environmental Assessment

**Identification of the Proposed Action:** The proposed action would allow the licensee to make an editorial change to the Salem Technical Specifications (TSs) by revising the description of the P-7 permissive interlock defined in TS Table 3.3-1, "Reactor Trip System Instrumentation," in accordance with the licensee's application dated April 10, 2003.

**The Need for the Proposed Action:** The proposed action would revise the description of the P-7 permissive interlock defined in TS Table 3.3-1 due to changes in the design of the high pressure turbine. As part of this design change, the pressure taps for transmitters PT505 and PT506 will be relocated. Consequently, the description for the "Turbine impulse chamber pressure" will be changed to "Turbine steam line inlet pressure." The proposed action is considered an editorial change.

**Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action:** The NRC has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes, as set forth below, that there are no significant environmental impacts associated with the administrative and editorial changes to the Salem TSs.

The proposed action will not significantly increase the probability or consequences of accidents, no changes are being made in the types of effluents that may be released offsite, and there is no significant increase in occupational or public radiation exposure. Therefore, there are no significant radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

With regard to potential nonradiological impacts, the proposed action does not have a potential to affect any historic sites. It does not affect nonradiological plant effluents and has no other environmental impact. Therefore, there are no significant nonradiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

Accordingly, the NRC concludes that there are no significant environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

**Environmental Impacts of the Alternatives to the Proposed Action:** As an alternative to the proposed action, the staff considered denial of the