http://www.nrc.gov/NRC/ADAMS/index.html. Any questions with respect to this action should be referred to Tom McLaughlin, Decommissioning Branch, Division of Waste Management, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001.

Telephone: (301) 415–5869. Fax: (301) 415–5398.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 21st day of October 2003.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Tom McLaughlin,

Project Manager, Facilities Decommissioning Section, Decommissioning Branch, Division of Waste Management, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.

[FR Doc. 03–27134 Filed 10–27–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 030–30249]

Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact Related to Materials License No. 42–26928–01, Core Laboratories, Inc. (dba Protechnics) of Houston, TX, License Amendment Request for Approval of an Alternate Disposal Method

I. Introduction

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is issuing a license amendment for a proposal made by Core Laboratories, Inc. (dba ProTechnics) of Houston, Texas. Core Laboratories requested an amendment to Materials License No. 42–26928–01 to allow an additional disposal alternative pursuant to 10 CFR 20.2002 to inject well returns containing radioactive tracer material into Class II disposal wells that have been approved to accept non-hazardous oil and gas waste by State agencies. An Environmental Assessment (EA) was performed by the NRC staff in support of its review of the license amendment request, in accordance with the requirements of 10 CFR part 51. The conclusion of the EA is a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI).

II. Environmental Assessment

Related to the Core Laboratories, Inc. Request for an Alternate Disposal Method to Inject Well-Logging Waste into Class II Disposal Wells.

Summary: The NRC considered a license amendment request for approval for an alternate disposal method for well-logging waste produced under NRC Byproduct Materials License No. 42–26928–01. Core Laboratories, Inc. (dba ProTechnics) requested NRC approval to allow fracturing sand well returns containing residual material to be injected into Class II disposal wells. These Class II wells would have been approved under permits to accept non-hazardous oil and gas waste by State agencies. Approval of this license amendment request is based upon the NRC's review and evaluation of the merits of the licensee's proposal, current alternatives, and waste disposal regulations in 10 CFR part 20. The NRC staff has evaluated the licensee's proposal and has developed an EA in accordance with the requirements of 10 CFR part 51.

1.0 Introduction

Core Laboratories, Inc., is based in Houston, Texas, and conducts well-logging operations with radioactive materials in oil and natural gas fields worldwide. Core Laboratories is licensed to conduct tracer operations where the NRC has jurisdiction and in Agreement States including Louisiana, Texas, Colorado, Utah, California, Oklahoma, and New Mexico. Core Laboratories performs over 3,000 well-logging fracturing jobs a year in the United States using various radioactive tracer materials with half-lives of less than 120 days. In general, Core Laboratories injects three radioactive materials during its tracer operations: Iridium-192, scandium-46, and antimony-124. The longest half-life of these materials is 84 days. Core Laboratories procedures require that 1,000 pounds of sand be mixed with every 0.4 millicuries of tracer material prior to injection into a well.

Core Laboratories is authorized to use only well-logging beads patented as a Zero-Wash product. Zero-Wash is a well-logging bead that is insoluble (*i.e.*, the radioactivity will not migrate or leach into groundwater). These waste materials are not classified as hazardous or mixed waste by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) regulations. The purpose of the tracer material is to enhance the performance of the oil well fracturing procedures. Using the information provided by the tracer material, the well operator can maximize the production from the well. Approximately 10 percent of the fracturing jobs result in the backflow of injected tracer material to the surface. This phenomena is called sandout or well-logging returns. The amount of the well-logging returns can range from a few gallons (20 pounds) to a tanker truck load (50,000 pounds). The concentration of radioactive material in the well-logging returns is low because the tracer material is mixed into fracturing sand prior to being injected into the well.

Currently, Core Laboratories is allowed to hold radioactive material with a half-life of less than 120 days for decay-in-storage before unrestricted disposal. Under this authorization, the well-logging returns are transported by truck to a storage facility that is distant (sometimes 30 miles or more) from the original tracer injection point. Additionally, the sandout waste may be shipped to an approved waste site for burial. On December 18, 1995, the NRC approved Core Laboratories' generic 10 CFR 20.2002 onsite disposal request for burying radioactive wastes from well-logging sandouts, flowbacks, or any other form into shallow earthen pits at the well site pursuant to 10 CFR 20.2002.

On August 23, 2000, Core Laboratories requested a license amendment to allow fracturing sand well returns to be injected in Class II disposal wells. All the sandout well-logging returns containing tracer radioactive materials would be recovered and contained in Class II disposal wells that met the State's and EPA's regulations. Core Laboratories proposes to dispose of material into Class II wells with radioactivity concentrations that are less than 30 percent of the levels in 10 CFR part 20, appendix B, table 2, column 2. These radioactive concentrations are not radioactive waste as defined in the EPA regulation 40 CFR 144.3. Class II disposal wells are described in part in EPA regulations under 40 CFR 144.6 as "Wells which inject fluids which are brought to the surface in connection with natural gas storage operations, or conventional oil or natural gas production." Some of the EPA requirements imposed on Class II disposal well operators are found in 40 CFR 144.28 and address compliance with the Safe Drinking Water Act, 24-hour reporting of noncompliance, well plugging and abandonment planning, financial assurance, well casing and cementing, operating and monitoring requirements, records retention, and change of ownership and operational control.

2.0 Proposed Action

The proposed action is to issue a license amendment to Byproduct Materials License No. 42–26928–01 for approval of an alternate disposal method for well-logging waste produced as a result of fracturing sand well-logging operations. The licensee seeks approval to allow fracturing sand well returns to be injected into Class II disposal wells that have been approved

displays a currently valid OMB control number.

1. *Type of submission, new, revision, or extension: Revision.*

2. *The title of the information collection:* Part 61—Licensing Requirements for Land Disposal of Radioactive Waste (3150–0135).

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

4. *How often the collection is required:* Applications for licenses are submitted as needed. Other reports are submitted annually and as other events require.

5. *Who is required or asked to report:* Applicants for and holders of an NRC license for land disposal of low-level radioactive waste, and all generators, collectors, and processors of low-level waste intended for disposal at a low-level waste facility.

6. *The number of annual responses:* 12 (9 reports and 3 recordkeepers).

7. *The estimated number of annual respondents:* 3.

8. *The number of hours needed annually to complete the requirement or request:* 4,059 hours (42 hours for reporting plus 4,017 hours for recordkeeping) or approximately 1,353 hours per respondent.

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

10. *Abstract:* Part 61 establishes the procedures, criteria, and license terms and conditions for the land disposal of low-level radioactive waste. Reporting and recordkeeping requirements are mandatory or, in the case of application submittals, are required to obtain a benefit. The information collected in the applications, reports, and records is evaluated by the NRC to ensure that the licensee's or applicant's physical plant, equipment, organization, training, experience, procedures, and plans provide an adequate level of protection of public health and safety, common defense and security, and the environment.

A copy of the final supporting statement may be viewed free of charge at the NRC Public Document Room located at One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, MD. OMB clearance requests are available at the NRC worldwide web site (http://www.nrc.gov/NRC/PUBLIC/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 March 7, 2002. 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.

Bryon Allen, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs (3150–0135), 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 30th day of January 2002.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Brenda Jo. Shelton,

NRC Clearance Officer, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 02–2733 Filed 2–4–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

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:* Revision.

2. *The title of the information collection:* 10 CFR part 73—Physical Protection of Plants and Materials.

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

4. *How often the collection is required:* On occasion. Required reports are submitted and evaluated as events occur.

5. *Who will be required or asked to report:* Persons who possess, use, import, export, transport, or deliver to a carrier for transport, special nuclear material.

6. *An estimate of the number of responses:* 77,734.

7. *The estimated number of annual respondents:* 103.

8. *An estimate of the total number of hours needed annually to complete the requirement or request:* The industry total burden is 364,805 hours annually (45,835 hours for reporting and 318,970 hours for recordkeeping).

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

10. *Abstract:* NRC regulations in 10 CFR part 73 prescribe requirements for establishment and maintenance of a physical protection system with capabilities for protection of special nuclear material at fixed sites and in transit and of plants in which special nuclear material is used. The information in the reports and records is used by the NRC staff to ensure that the health and safety of the public is protected and that licensee possession and use of special nuclear material is in compliance with license and regulatory requirements.

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 F23, Rockville, MD 20852. OMB clearance requests are available at the NRC worldwide web site: *http://www.nrc.gov/NRC/PUBLIC/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 March 7, 2002. 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. Bryon Allen, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs (3150–0002), 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 30th day of January 2002.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Brenda Jo. Shelton,

NRC Clearance Officer, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 02–2737 Filed 2–4–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[License Number 42–26928–01]

Environmental Assessment, Finding of No Significant Impact, and Notice of Opportunity for a Hearing

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission is considering authorizing

Core Laboratories, Inc., an exemption to use radioactive markers containing quantities exceeding the limits listed in 10 CFR 30.71 as pipe collar markers in oil and gas wells.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

Core Laboratories, Inc. is licensed by the NRC to conduct well logging operations. They have requested, in letters dated July 14, 1997 and February 4, 1998, that the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) grant them an exemption from 10 CFR 39.47 to use radioactive markers containing quantities exceeding the limits listed in 10 CFR 30.71 as pipe collar markers in oil and gas wells. 10 CFR 39.47 specifies that licensees may only use radioactive markers if the individual markers contain quantities not exceeding the quantities listed in 10 CFR 30.71. Core Laboratories requested authorization to use iridium-192, scandium-46, antimony-124, cesium-137, and cobalt-60 markers with activities up to 50 microcuries, as pipe collar markers. 10 CFR 30.71 limits iridium-192, scandium-46, antimony-124, and cesium-137 to 10 microcuries and cobalt-60 to 1 microcurie.

The markers Core Laboratories requested authorization to use are either installed directly into the collars or are placed onto the collar threads and secured between the pipe casing joints and, therefore, are not easily removable. Once installed in a well, the casing and collars are cemented into place. The Supplementary Information section of the proposed rulemaking concerning radioactive markers notes that the reason limiting the activity to those specified in 10 CFR 30.71 was necessary, is "because it is impracticable for the licensee that installs the radioactive marker to recover the marker when the well owner or operator removes the casings from the well at a later date." In its correspondence to NRC, Core Laboratories describes agreements it will have with the well owner/operator, and procedures it will follow to ensure the markers are recovered should the casing and collars be removed prior to a specified date.

Need for the Proposed Action

The exemption is needed so that Core Laboratories, Inc. can carry out its business of logging wells in the oil and gas industry. The higher activity markers allow for more accurate pipe collar location measurements when logging certain oil and gas wells.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

There will be no significant environmental impact from the proposed action due to the fact that no material is being released into the environment and all of the material is wholly contained within the pipe collars and will be recovered should the casing and collars be removed from the wells.

During operations, the radiation dose will not be significantly greater than occurs normally because of the low activities involved. Compensatory safety measures will be in place at all times when placing or removing the markers into the pipe casing collars and will ensure the markers will be recovered should the casing and collars be removed from the wells.

Alternatives to the Proposed Action

As required by section 102(2)(E) of NEPA (42 USC 4322(2)(E)), possible alternatives to the final action have been considered. The only alternative is to deny the exemption. This option would not produce a gain in protecting the human environment, and would force Core Laboratories, Inc. to only use the lower activity markers specified in the regulation. This may result in Core Laboratories, Inc. having to depend on less accurate pipe collar location measurements when logging oil and gas wells.

Alternative Use of Resources

No alternative use of resources was considered due to the reasons stated above.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

No other agencies or persons were contacted regarding this proposed action.

Identification of Sources Used

Letters from Core Laboratories, Inc. to U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Region IV, dated July 14, 1997 and February 4, 1998.

Finding of No Significant Impact

Based on the above environmental assessment, the Commission has concluded that environmental impacts that would be created by the proposed action would not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment and does not warrant the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement. Accordingly, it has been determined that a Finding of No Significant Impact is appropriate.

The licensee's letters dated July 14, 1997 and February 4, 1998, are available for inspection and copying for a fee in the Region IV Public Document Room, 611 Ryan Plaza Drive, Suite 400, Arlington, TX 76011–8064. The documents may also be viewed in the Agency-wide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS) located on the NRC web site at *www.nrc.gov.*

Opportunity for a Hearing

Any person whose interest may be affected by the issuance of this action may file a request for a hearing. Any request for hearing must be filed with the Office of the Secretary, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, within 30 days of the publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**; be served on the NRC staff (Executive Director for Operations, One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland 20852), and on the licensee (Core Laboratories, Inc., 9830 Rosprim, Houston, TX 77040); and must comply with the requirements for requesting a hearing set forth in the Commission's regulations, 10 CFR part 2, subpart L, "Information Hearing Procedures for Adjudications in Materials Licensing Proceedings."

These requirements, which the request must address in detail, are:

1. The interest of the requestor in the proceeding;

2. How that interest may be affected by the results of the proceeding (including the reasons why the requestor should be permitted a hearing);

3. The requestor's areas of concern about the licensing activity that is the subject matter of the proceeding; and

4. The circumstances establishing that the request for hearing is timely—that is, filed within 30 days of the date of this notice.

In addressing how the requestor's interest may be affected by the proceeding, the request should describe the nature of the requestor's right under the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, to be made a party to the proceeding; the nature and extent of the requestor's property, financial, or other (*i.e.*, health, safety) interest in the proceeding; and the possible effect of any order that may be entered in the proceeding upon the requestor's interest.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 29th day of January, 2002.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

John W. N. Hickey,

Chief, Material Safety and Inspection Branch, Division of Industrial and Medical Nuclear Safety, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.

[FR Doc. 02–2734 Filed 2–4–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

under permits to accept non-hazardous oil and gas waste by State agencies. These wells have been approved for the disposal of non-hazardous oil field waste materials including naturally occurring radioactive material (NORM). This method of disposal would be used as an alternative to existing methods of disposal authorized by the NRC in the current license.

3.0 Purpose and Need for the Proposed Action

The purpose of the proposed action is to allow the licensee an additional disposal alternative due to the fact that some locations where the tracer operations are conducted do not allow shallow pits to be used for well waste disposals. This proposed action would allow the continued use of tracer materials in those areas and allow the efficient production of oil and gas, thereby reducing the cost of recovery to the well operators. The NRC is fulfilling its responsibility under the Atomic Energy Act to make a decision for the proposed action that ensures protection of the public health and safety and the environment.

4.0 Alternative to the Proposed Action

The only alternative to the proposed action of allowing the alternative disposal in Class II disposal wells is no action. The no-action alternative would be to allow the licensee to maintain waste as discussed above as authorized in the current NRC license.

5.0 The Affected Environment and Environmental Impacts

The NRC staff has reviewed the proposed action and the alternatives and examined their impacts.

5.1 Proposed Action

The proposed action would authorize the use of state approved Class II disposal wells already permitted and in operation where materials are injected below the water table. The depth of Class II disposal wells range from 5,000 to 15,000 feet which is well below usable groundwater. Because this disposal method would use existing approved structures, there would be no significant impact to historic and cultural resources, ecological resources, land use or visual resources. In addition, due to the design of the patented Zero-Wash product (no wash off of radioactive material), the crush strength of the Zero-Wash product (*i.e.*, greater than 10,000 psi), and the design of these Class II wells, the waste would not contaminate groundwater and would not migrate from the formation where injected. Because the proposed action will only use pre-existing Class II disposal wells, there would be no increased air emissions or noise, and there would be no significant impacts on local or regional business conditions, populations or demographics. During the permitting process for Class II disposal wells, potential socioeconomic and environmental impacts are investigated as part of the National Environmental Policy Act process. In general, Class II disposal wells are not located in populated or business areas.

If approved, Core Laboratories' generic 10 CFR 20.2002 waste disposal authorization would contain the following provisions: (1) A requirement to assure that the radioactive concentration of waste would be less than 1,000 picocuries/gram (pCi/g); (2) the half-life of the radioactive material being disposed would be less than 120 days and include only the following tracers: Sodium-24, chromium-51, rubidium-86, iodine-131, xenon-133, scandium-46, zirconium-95, antimony-124, and iridium-192; and (3) Core Laboratories would maintain a written agreement with the Class II disposal well owner or operator to control access to the well until the radioactivity has decayed to unrestricted release levels.

Increased radiation exposure to the general public from transporting waste containing residual tracer material to the disposal site would be negligible. There are two routes of exposure possible, external and internal. The internal exposure would be from ingestion of the material. The particle size is such that it is not respirable. The material is not soluble in the body thereby reducing the resident time in the body. At the concentrations expected, an individual would need to ingest 200 pounds of the material to receive one-tenth of the regulatory annual limit of intake specified in 10 CFR part 20, appendix B. The maximum radiation exposure level, at a distance of 1-foot from a vehicle transporting this waste, would be on the order of 0.1 mR/hr. The radiation level in the cab of the transport vehicle would be on the order of 0.004 mR/hr. Using an average transport time of 1-hour and assuming the same driver was used for all of the expected disposals (10 per year), the exposure to the driver of the vehicle would be 0.04 mR. Due to its low radiation level and radioactive concentration, an accident causing the release of the waste returns from the transport vehicle would result in little exposure to workers or members of the public during the subsequent cleanup efforts.

Tracer injection operations at the disposal wells are automated to minimize the time required for personnel to be in the immediate area of the injected material. Assuming an injection time of 4 hours per disposal, and an individual within 1-foot of the radioactive material during the injection operation, the total exposure per year would not be expected to exceed 4 mR from this operation. The disposal site would be surveyed to meet the NRC criteria for unrestricted use in accordance with 10 CFR part 20 after the sandout material is injected into a Class II disposal well.

Radioactive material as defined by Department of Transportation regulation 49 CFR 173.403 is material that exceeds a concentration of 2,000 pCi/g. The residual radioactive material concentrations being shipped are below this limit. There would be no increase in the number of transport vehicles on the highways due to this proposed aspect of well-logging operations. The current practice of transporting well-logging returns to a decay-in-storage facility or shallow disposal pit requires that at least one transport vehicle be used. Procedures would be in place to handle any emergency situation arising from any incident involving the handling or transportation of this material.

Overall, the environmental impacts resulting from the release of this material into Class II disposal wells are expected to be insignificant. The NRC staff concluded that the State's and EPA's requirements for permitting the operation of Class II disposal wells were stringent and thoroughly covered any radiological or non-radiological environmental concern. There are no additional activities which would result in cumulative impacts to the environment.

5.2 Alternative

When compared to the Class II disposal well proposal, the no-action alternative would result in increased risk of exposing occupational workers and the members of the public to radioactive material. Core Laboratories' use of shallow earthen pits and decay-in-storage facilities requires additional handling of the radioactive material and increases the potential for individuals to access radioactive material. Core Laboratories would continue use of shallow earthen pits, transporting the sandout material to the new pits, covering the disposal pits with at least 2 feet of soil, and marking the disposal sites in order to control access to the public. Additionally, Core Laboratories would continue to maintain sandout material in leased decay-in-storage facilities. In addition to radiological

impacts, non-radiological impacts to land use, soils, visual resources, transportation, water resources, noise, air quality, cultural resources, threatened and endangered species could occur because Core Laboratories would continue decay-in-storage before unrestricted disposal or burial in shallow earthen pits. Additionally, the cost of storage facilities and the cost for burial at an approved disposal site are not economical considering the fact that there are no costs associated with disposals at Class II wells.

6.0 Agencies and Persons Consulted

The NRC staff has prepared this EA with input from the Alaska Oil & Gas Conservation Commission (AOGCC) and the Texas Bureau of Radiation Control (TBRC) regarding permitting of Class II disposal wells and Zero-Wash product.

Because the proposed action is entirely within existing Class II wells, the NRC has concluded that there is no potential to affect threatened or endangered species or historic resources. Therefore, consultation with the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service and State Historic Preservation Officers is not necessary.

The NRC staff provided a draft of this EA to the following states for review and comment: Alaska (ML031540273), California (ML031540246), Colorado (ML031540327), Louisiana (ML031540301), New Mexico (ML031540339), Oklahoma (ML031540221), Texas (ML031540332), Utah (ML031540352), and Wyoming (ML031540355). This EA has been revised to reflect the States' input where appropriate.

7.0 Conclusions

The NRC staff concluded that the proposed action complies with 10 CFR part 20 and 10 CFR part 30. Pursuant to 10 CFR part 51, the NRC staff has prepared this EA in support of the proposed license amendment for approval to allow fracturing sand well returns to be injected in Class II disposal wells that have been approved under permits to accept non-hazardous oil and gas waste by State agencies. On the basis of this EA, the NRC has concluded that the environmental impacts from the proposed action would not have any significant effect on the quality of the human environment; therefore, an environmental impact statement for the proposed action is not warranted.

8.0 List of Preparers

This EA was prepared by Louis C. Carson II, Senior Health Physicist, Nuclear Materials Licensing Branch, Division of Nuclear Materials Safety, Region IV, and reviewed by Jack E. Whitten, Chief, Materials Licensing Branch, Division of Nuclear Materials Safety.

9.0 List of References

1. NRC, "Radiological Criteria for License Termination," 10 CFR part 20, subpart E, 62FR39088, July 21, 1997.

2. NRC, "Waste Disposal," 10 CFR part 20, subpart K, 56FR23403, May 21, 1991.

3. NRC, "Consolidated NMSS Decommissioning Guidance," NUREG–1757, Volume 1, September 2002.

4. NRC, "Environmental Review Guidance for Licensing Actions Associated with NMSS Programs," NUREG–1748, September 2003.

5. Alaska Oil & Gas Conservation Commission (AOGCC) and the letter dated January 11, 2002, from the AOGCC to Marathon Oil Company.

6. ProTechnics Division of Core Laboratories Texas Bureau of Radiation Control License No. L03835, Amendment No. 37, expiration date August 31, 2005.

7. Utah Department of Environmental Quality letter to the NRC dated June 30, 2003 (ML032660184).

8. Colorado Department of Health letter to the NRC dated July 1, 2003 (ML031900577).

9. Texas Department of Health letter to the NRC dated July 17, 2003 (ML032060480).

III. Finding of No Significant Impact

Pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) and the Commission's regulations in 10 CFR part 51, the Commission has determined that there will not be a significant effect on the quality of the environment resulting from the approval of Core Laboratories' requested amendment for an additional disposal alternative pursuant to 10 CFR 20.2002 to inject well returns containing radioactive tracer material into Class II disposal wells that have been approved to accept non-hazardous oil and gas waste by State agencies. Accordingly, the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement is not required for the proposed amendment to Materials License No. 42–26928–01, which would add the alternative disposal method to the license. This determination is based on the foregoing EA performed in accordance with the procedures and criteria in 10 CFR part 51.

IV. Further Information

The licensee's request for the proposed action (ADAMS Accession No: ML003758270) and the NRC's complete Environmental Assessment (ADAMS Accession No.: ML032680636), and other related documents to this proposed action are available for public inspection and copying for a fee at NRC's Public Document Room at NRC Headquarters, One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland 20852. These documents, along with most others referenced in the EA, are available electronically for public review in the NRC Public Document Room or from the Publicly Available Records (PARS) component of NRC's document system (ADAMS). ADAMS is accessible from the NRC Web site at *http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html* (the Public Electronic Reading Room).

Any questions with respect to this action should be referred to Louis C. Carson II, Nuclear Materials Licensing Branch, Division of Nuclear Materials Safety, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Region IV, Arlington, Texas 76011–4005. Telephone: (817) 860–8221.

Dated at Arlington, Texas, this 20th day of October 2003.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Jack E. Whitten,

Chief, Nuclear Materials Licensing Branch, Division of Nuclear Materials Safety, Region IV.

[FR Doc. 03–27132 Filed 10–27–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 030–33944]

Notice of Finding of No Significant Impact and Availability of Environmental Assessment for License Amendment of Materials License No. 37–30247–01, White Eagle Toxicology Laboratories, Inc.

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Notice of availability of environmental assessment and finding of no significant impact.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Kathy Dolce Modes, Nuclear Materials Safety Branch 2, Division of Nuclear Materials Safety, Region I, 475 Allendale Road, King of Prussia, Pennsylvania, 19406; telephone (610) 337–5251; fax (610) 337–5269; or by e-mail: *KAD@nrc.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Introduction

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is considering the issuance of a license amendment to