

Application of As Low As Reasonably Achievable (ALARA) is also a requirement. The results of the final survey will be used to demonstrate that the predicted dose to a member of the public from any residual activity does not exceed the 25 mrem per year dose limit.

All liquid waste that is generated during the decommissioning activities will be collected in barrels and disposed of in accordance with state and Federal guidelines. All decommissioning activities will be carried out within the Nuclear Engineering Laboratory's confinement boundary. Additional containment measures will be taken as necessary to minimize the spread of contamination within the confinement boundary. These measures will include wood framing covered with plastic and low volume water misting. Airborne releases of radioactive materials are not expected. Dust production will be minimized by low volume water mist at points where dust is produced.

Based on the review of the specific proposed activities associated with the dismantling and decontamination of the ISU facility, the staff has determined that the proposed action will not increase the probability or consequences of accidents, no changes are being made in the types of any effluents that may be released off site, 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 non-radiological impacts, the proposed action does not involve any historic sites. It does not affect non-radiological plant effluents and has no other environmental impact. Therefore, there are no significant non-radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

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

#### *Alternatives to the Proposed Action*

The four alternatives for disposition of the UTR-10 reactor are: DECON, SAFSTOR, ENTOMB, and no action. These alternatives are defined as follows:

DECON is the alternative in which the equipment, structures, and portions of the facility containing radioactive contaminants are removed or decontaminated to a level that permits the property to be released for unrestricted use after cessation of operations. SAFSTOR is the alternative in which the nuclear facility is placed and maintained in a condition that allows the nuclear facility to

be safely stored and subsequently decontaminated (deferred decontamination) to levels that permit release for unrestricted use. ENTOMB is the alternative in which radioactive contaminants are encased in a structurally long-lived material, such as concrete; the entombed structure is appropriately maintained; and continued surveillance is carried out until the radioactivity decays to a level permitting release of the property for unrestricted use. The no-action alternative would leave the facility in its present configuration. However, the regulations in 10 CFR 50.82(b) only allow a limited time for this condition to exist.

The radiological impacts of SAFSTOR would be less because of radioactive decay prior to DECON. The ENTOMB option would result in lower radiological exposure but continued use of resources. ISU has determined that the proposed action (DECON) is the most efficient use of the existing facility, since it proposes to use the space that will become available for other academic purposes. The SAFSTOR, ENTOMB, and no-action alternatives would entail continued surveillance and physical security measures to be in place and continued monitoring by licensee personnel.

#### *Alternative Use of Resources*

This action does not involve the use of any resources not previously considered in the Environmental Report submitted on January 4, 1999, and the Decommissioning Report submitted on January 6, 1999, for the UTR-10 reactor.

#### *Agencies and Persons Contacted*

In accordance with its stated policy, on March 7, 2000, the staff consulted with the Iowa State official, Donald A. Flater, Chief, Bureau of Radiological Health, Iowa Department of Public Health, regarding the environmental impact of the proposed action. The state official had no comments.

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

On the basis of the environmental assessment, the Commission concludes that the proposed action will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment. 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 licensee's letters dated January 4, and 6, 1999, which are available for public inspection at the NRC's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW, Washington, DC 20555. Publicly available records will be accessible electronically from the ADAMS Public Library component on

the NRC Web site, <http://www.nrc.gov> (the Electronic Reading Room).

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 26th day of April 2000.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Ledyard B. Marsh,**

*Branch Chief, Events Assessment, Generic Communications and Non-Power Reactors Branch, Division of Regulatory Improvement Programs, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 00-11103 Filed 5-3-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

## **OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION**

### **Agency Information Collection Request**

**AGENCY:** Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice; Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request.

**SUMMARY:** The Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission (OSHRC) submitted the following requirements to OMB for review and clearance under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1965, Pub. L. 104-13. Interested persons may obtain copies of the submissions by calling the OSHRC Clearance Officer listed. Send comments regarding this information collection to the OMB reviewer listed and to the OSHRC Clearance Officer, Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission, 1120 20th Street, N.W., Ninth Floor, Washington, DC 20036-3419.

**DATES:** Submit written comments on or before May 18, 2000.

#### **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

*OMB Number:* Not applicable, new submission.

*Form Number:* Not applicable.

*Type of Review:* Emergency—Approval requested by: 05/26/00.

*Title:* Evaluation of "Settlement Part" and Evaluation of "E-Z Trial".

*Description:* Information collection is required to evaluate the Review Commission's "Settlement Part" process. The Review Commission is also collecting information from key stakeholders to evaluate the "E-Z-Trial" program.

*Respondents:* Employers and/or their representatives, labor organizations and staff of the Office of the Solicitor of Labor who have been involved in cases with the Review Commission.

*Estimated Number of Responses:* 80.

*Estimated Burden Hours Per Response:* 30 minutes.

*Estimated Total Reporting Burden:* 130 hours.

**ADDRESSES:** Ledia Esther Bernal, OSHRC Clearance Officer, 202-606-5390, Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission, 1120 20th Street, N.W., Ninth Floor, Washington, DC 20036-3419, Stuart Shapiro, OMB Reviewer, (202) 395-7857, Office of Management and Budget, Room 10202, New Executive Office Building, Washington, DC 20503.

**Patricia A. Randle,**  
*Executive Director.*

[FR Doc. 00-11081 Filed 5-3-00; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7600-01-P**

## OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET

### Request for Agency and Public Comments

**AGENCY:** Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President.

**ACTION:** Request for agency and public comments.

**SUMMARY:** The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) publishes a request for agency and public comments on three proposed technical changes to the OMB Circular A-76 Revised Supplemental Handbook.

**DATES:** Agency and public comments on the proposed changes are due to OMB not later than June 19, 2000.

**ADDRESSES:** Address all comments to the Office of Federal Procurement Policy, NEOB Room 9013, Office of Management and Budget, 725 17th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20503, FAX Number (202) 395-5105.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mr. David C. Childs, Office of Federal Procurement Policy, Telephone No. (202) 395-6104.

**AVAILABILITY:** Copies of the OMB Circular A-76, its Revised Supplemental Handbook and currently applicable Transmittal Memoranda may be obtained at the OMB Home page. The online address (URL) is <http://www.whitehouse.gov/OMB/circulars/index.html#numerical>.

Interested parties are reminded that OMB Circular No. A-76, Transmittal Memoranda 1 through Transmittal Memorandum 14 are canceled. Transmittal Memorandum No. 15 provided the Revised Supplemental Handbook dated March 27, 1996 (**Federal Register**, April 1, 1996, pages 14338-14346) and remains in effect. Transmittal Memoranda No. 16, 17 and 18, which provided previous A-76 related Federal pay raise and inflation factor assumptions are canceled.

Transmittal Memorandum No. 19, to the extent that it provided last year's A-76 related Federal pay raise and inflation factor assumptions, is canceled. The standard retirement cost factors for the weighted average CSRS/FERS pension and Federal retiree health cost numbers and the post-retirement health costs also provided by Transmittal Memorandum No. 19, remain in effect. Transmittal 20, which implemented the Federal Activities Inventory Reform (FAIR) Act, remains in effect.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

1. In last year's Federal Activities Inventory Reform Act (FAIR) guidance (OMB Circular A-76 Transmittal Memorandum No. 20), OMB stated that the statutory 30-day and 28-day challenge and challenge response periods would be calendar days, while the 10-day appeal period would be working days. OMB is aware that the 30-day deadline for filing challenges was very difficult to meet in 1999. OMB therefore proposes to change, Appendix 2, paragraph g.3., of the Revised Supplemental Handbook to provide for 30-working days. It is likewise proposed that Appendix 2, paragraph g.4., be changed to reflect 28-working days.

2. When asked what, if any, other changes are needed to the Supplemental Handbook, the Department of Defense expressed only one concern—that Part 1, Chapter 3, paragraph K.1.e., which requires appellants to “demonstrate that the items appealed (in an A-76 cost comparison) individually or in aggregate, would reverse the tentative decision,” appears to be in conflict with the statement at Part 1, Chapter 3, paragraph K.7., that provides that sequential appeals are not authorized. It has been suggested that these two statements create an inappropriate standard for the initial winner of the tentative decision. We agree. All concerns regarding the conduct of a cost comparison should be brought forward to the appeal authority within the single appeal period. Therefore, to ensure that all relevant concerns with the conduct of a cost comparison are brought forward, it is proposed that Part 1, Chapter 3, paragraph K.1.e. be voided.

3. Recently, the General Accounting Office expressed concerns regarding the inclusion of Federal employees, whose jobs are included in an A-76 cost comparison study, as members of a related A-76 Source Selection Team. As a result, OMB has decided to strengthen its long standing policy limiting such participation, as a better business practice. Individuals who hold positions in an A-76 study should not be members of the Source Selection Team,

unless an exception is authorized by the head of the contracting activity.

Exceptions may be authorized only in compelling circumstances and, in such cases, the head of the contracting activity will provide a written statement of the reasons for the action. OMB has also been concerned that serving on a Source Selection Team develops certain important skills among the employees that the Government could be in greater risk of losing, if this “workforce investment” became subject to being outsourced. OMB has, therefore, determined that restrictions on source selection evaluation or advisory team membership should be clarified. OMB proposes to revise Part 1, Chapter 3 paragraph H. 3.b. of the Revised Supplemental Handbook as follows:

b. “The Government should establish a source selection evaluation or advisory team. Individuals who hold positions in the function under study should not be members of the team, unless an exception is authorized by the head of the contracting activity. Exceptions will be authorized only in compelling circumstances and, in such cases, the head of the contracting activity shall provide a written statement of the reasons for the action.”

**Sylvia M. Mathews,**  
*Deputy Director.*

Circular No. A-76 (Revised)

Transmittal Memorandum No. 22

To the Heads of Executive Departments and Agencies

Subject: Performance of Commercial Activities

This Transmittal Memorandum implements changes to the OMB Circular A-76 Revised Supplemental Handbook in furtherance of the requirements of the Federal Activities Inventory Reform Act (“The FAIR Act”), Public Law 105-270 and to clarify other issues of concern. The March 1996 Revised Supplemental Handbook was issued through Transmittal Memorandum 15, published in the April 1, 1996, **Federal Register** at pages 14338-14346. The March 1996 Revised Supplemental Handbook was further revised to implement the requirements of the FAIR Act on June 14, 1999, **Federal Register** at pages 33927-33935.

The Federal Activities Inventory Reform Act (FAIR) provides that there shall be a 30-day administrative challenge period available to interested parties who might wish to challenge and agency's decision to include or omit an activity from the list of potential commercial activities. As a part of OMB Circular A-76 Transmittal Memorandum No. 20, dated June 14,