

byproduct material. The higher allowed exposure limit to these adult caregivers for minor patients allows for a more positive overall outcome and lower risk to the patient.

#### *Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action*

There will be no significant environmental impact or undue hazard to life or property from the proposed action due to the fact that no material is being released into the environment and all of the operations involving the byproduct material will follow normal operating procedures followed prior to the request for the exemption.

During operations, the radiation dose rates from the minor patient will not be different than occurs normally for the prescribed medical treatment. The doses to the adult caregiver could be higher than doses allowed for members of the public by 10 CFR 20.1301 as a result of the closer proximity to the minor patient necessary to allow participation in many of the daily tasks for the children during their isolation. The University indicated it will identify these caregivers and treat them as though they are radiation workers; they will receive the same training and monitoring as required of other radiation workers, including instructions in maintaining their doses as low as reasonably achievable. In addition, standard radiation protection practices of minimizing time, maximizing distance and use of shielding will be employed to the extent practicable.

#### *Alternatives to the Proposed Action*

As required by section 102(2)(E) of NEPA (42 U.S.C. 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 substantial gain in protecting the human environment. University employee caregivers would be providing the care that will be provided by the family adult caregiver. Allowing the family adult caregiver to perform some of the minor patient care tasks improves the outcome of the treatment.

#### *Alternative Use of Resources*

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

#### *Agencies and Persons Consulted*

NRC consulted the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Department of Environmental Protection, Bureau of Radiation Protection regarding this matter. The Commonwealth of

Pennsylvania has no objection to NRC approval of the proposed exemption request or the conclusions of this environmental assessment.

#### *Identification of Sources Used*

Letters from the University to NRC, Region I, dated March 15, 2002, and April 11, 2002.

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

The environmental impacts of the proposed action have been reviewed in accordance with the requirements set forth in 10 CFR part 51. Based on the foregoing environmental assessment, the Commission finds that the proposed action of granting the exemption from 10 CFR 20.1301 will not significantly impact the quality of the human environment. Accordingly, the Commission has determined that an environmental impact statement for the proposed exemption is not warranted.

**Further Information:** The request for an exemption was docketed under 10 CFR part 20, License Number 37-00118-07. For further details with respect to this action, see the exemption request letters dated March 15, 2002, and April 11, 2002. The NRC maintains an Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS) which provides text and image files of NRC's public documents. These documents may be accessed through the NRC Public Electronic Reading Room on the Internet at <http://nrc.gov/NRC/ADAMS/index.html>. If you do not have access to ADAMS or if there are problems in accessing documents located in ADAMS, contact the NRC Public Document Room Reference staff at 1-800-397-4209, (301) 415-4737, or by e-mail to [pdr@nrc.gov](mailto:pdr@nrc.gov).

Dated in Rockville, Maryland, this 12th day of December, 2002.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission,  
**Thomas H. Essig,**  
*Chief, Material Safety and Inspection Branch,  
Division of Industrial and Medical Nuclear  
Safety, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and  
Safeguards.*

[FR Doc. 02-32246 Filed 12-20-02; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7590-01-P**

## **NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

### **Memorandum of Understanding Between the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Regulatory Commission and the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Food and Drug Administration**

**AGENCY:** Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice of renewal of Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission and the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Food and Drug Administration (DHHS, FDA).

**SUMMARY:** The NRC and the DHHS, FDA, signed a MOU on August 26, 1993, which describes the roles of the FDA and NRC, and the coordination between the two agencies. The MOU was noticed in the **Federal Register** on September 8, 1993 (58 FR 47300). This notice announces the renewal of the MOU, with Minor Changes. The latest version of the MOU can be found on the NRC Web site (<http://www.nrc.gov/materials/medical.html>).

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION, CONTACT:**  
Thomas H. Essig, Office of Nuclear Materials Safety and Safeguards, MS T 8-F-5, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, Telephone (301) 415-7231.

Dated: December 13, 2002.

**Thomas H. Essig,**  
*Chief, Materials Safety and Inspection  
Branch, Division of Industrial and Medical  
Nuclear Safety, NMSS.*  
[FR Doc. 02-32245 Filed 12-20-02; 8:45 am]  
**BILLING CODE 7590-01-P**

## **NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

[Docket No. 40-8698]

### **Notice of Amendment Request and Consideration of Proposed Reclamation Plan for the Shootaring Canyon Uranium Project, Ticcaboo, Utah, and Opportunity to Provide Comments and to Request a Hearing**

#### **I. Introduction**

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) has received, by letter dated October 24, 2002, a request from Plateau Resources Limited (PRL) to (1) amend Source Materials License SUA-1371 for the Shootaring Canyon Uranium Project to change its status from "operational" to "reclamation;" and (2) review and approve PRL's proposed reclamation plan for this facility.

The uranium mill at Shootaring Canyon operated for only three months in 1982, generating a small amount of mill tailings (the byproduct material wastes produced by extraction of uranium from ore). The mill has been on standby status since that time and PRL has decided to permanently cease operational activities at Shootaring Canyon and initiate decommissioning and reclamation of the mill site. Consistent with this decision, PRL has