

exemptions and transitional rules. Furthermore, the fact that a transaction is subject to an administrative or statutory exemption is not dispositive of whether the transaction is in fact a prohibited transaction; and

(4) The proposed exemptions, if granted, will be subject to the express condition that the material facts and representations contained in each application are true and complete, and that each application accurately describes all material terms of the transaction which is the subject of the exemption.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 8th day of February, 2001.

Ivan Strasfeld,

*Director of Exemption Determinations,
Pension and Welfare Benefits Administration,
U.S. Department of Labor.*

[FR Doc. 01-3688 Filed 2-14-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-29-P

NATIONAL EDUCATION GOALS PANEL

Meeting

AGENCY: National Education Goals Panel.

ACTION: Notice of meeting.

SUMMARY: This notice sets forth the date and location of a forthcoming meeting of the National Education Goals Panel (NEGP). This notice also describes the functions of the Panel.

DATE AND TIME: Saturday, February 24, 2001 from 9:30 a.m. to 11 a.m.

ADDRESSES: National Press Club, 529 14th Street, NW., Holeman Lounge, 13th Floor, Washington, DC 20005.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Emily Wurtz, Acting Executive Director, 1255 22nd Street, NW., Suite 502, Washington, DC 20037, Telephone: (202) 724-0015.

SUMMARY: The National Education Goals Panel was established to monitor, measure and report state and national progress toward achieving the eight National Education Goals, and report to the states and the Nation on the progress.

Agenda Items: The agenda items will focus upon recommendations made by NEGP's Measuring Success Task Force. Governor John R. McKernan, Task Force Chair, will report recommendations of new data in student academic achievement, adult literacy, teacher education and professional development, and early childhood education. In addition, the incoming NEGP Chair, Governor Frank O'Bannon,

will announce upcoming Panel initiatives for 2001.

Dated: February 9, 2001.

Emily Wurtz,

*Acting Executive Director, National
Education Goals Panel.*

[FR Doc. 01-3798 Filed 2-14-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4010-01-M

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 of continued approval of information collections under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35).

Information pertaining to the requirement to be submitted:

1. *The title of the information collection:* 10 CFR Part 25—Access Authorization for Licensee Personnel.
2. *Current OMB approval number:* 3150-0046.
3. *How often the collection is required:* On occasion.
4. *Who is required or asked to report:* NRC-regulated facilities and other organizations requiring access to NRC-classified information.
5. *The number of annual respondents:* 20.

6. *The number of hours needed annually to complete the requirement or request:* 257 hours (197 hours reporting and 60 hours recordkeeping) or approximately .5 hours per response.

7. *Abstract:* NRC-regulated facilities and other organizations are required to provide information and maintain records to ensure that an adequate level of protection is provided NRC-classified information and material.

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-1F23, 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 to this notice.

Comments and questions should be directed to the OMB reviewer listed below by March 19, 2001. 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.

Amy Farrell, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs (3150-0046), NEOB-10202, Office of Management and Budget, Washington, DC 20503.

Comments can also be submitted by telephone at (202) 395-7318.

The NRC Clearance Officer is Brenda Jo. Shelton, 301-415-7233.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 7th day of February, 2001.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Brenda Jo. Shelton,

*NRC Clearance Officer, Office of the Chief
Information Officer.*

[FR Doc. 01-3828 Filed 2-14-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-305]

Nuclear Management Company, LLC; Kewaunee Nuclear Power Plant Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is considering issuance of an amendment to Facility Operating License No. DPR-43, issued to Nuclear Management Company, LLC (NMC or the licensee) for operation of the Kewaunee Nuclear Power Plant (KNPP), located in Kewaunee County, Wisconsin.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed action would revise Technical Specification (TS) Section 1.0, "Definitions," to incorporate a line item improvement to provide additional clarification on channel calibration; TS Section 6.4, "Training," to remove the title of director for the KNPP training program and relocate the title reference to the Operational Quality Assurance Program Description (OQAPD); TS Section 6.10, "Record Retention," to revise the off-site review committee title; and correct typographical errors in the TS Table of Contents.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application for amendment dated November 10, 2000.

The Need for the Proposed Action

The proposed action would provide clarity to the TSs and remove an

unnecessary NRC and licensee burden with no change in safety when titles are changed.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The NRC has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that the changes to the TSs are administrative in nature.

The proposed action will not significantly 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 nonradiological impacts, the proposed action does not involve 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.

Alternatives to the Proposed Action

As an alternative to the proposed action, the staff considered denial of the proposed action (i.e., the "no action" alternative). Denial of the application would result in no change in current environmental impacts. The environmental impacts of the proposed action and the alternative action are similar.

Alternative Use of Resources

This action does not involve the use of any resources not previously considered in the Final Environmental Statement for Kewaunee.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on January 29, 2001, the staff consulted with the Wisconsin State official, Ms. S. Jenkins, 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 NRC 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 application dated November 10, 2000, which is available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, One White Flint Building, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, MD. 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 9th day of February 2001.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

John G. Lamb,

Project Manager, Section 1, Project Directorate III, Division of Licensing Project Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 01-3824 Filed 2-14-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-263]

Nuclear Management Company, LLC; Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating License, Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity for a Hearing

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an amendment to Facility Operating License No. DPR-22, issued to Nuclear Management Company, LLC (NMC, or the licensee), for operation of the Monticello Nuclear Generating Plant located in Wright County, Minnesota.

The proposed amendment would remove the inservice inspection (ISI) requirements of Section XI of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME) *Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code* (the Code) from the Monticello Technical Specifications (TSs) and relocate them to a licensee-controlled program.

NMC is requesting that this license amendment request be processed in an exigent manner in accordance with 10 CFR 50.91(a)(6) because the plant is currently operating under a Notice of Enforcement Discretion (NOED) with respect to TS 3.15.A.1. In accordance with NRC procedures described in NRC Inspection Manual, Part 9900, Operations—Notices of Enforcement Discretion, dated December 12, 2000, NMC applied for this license amendment within 2 working days after the NRC staff issued the NOED on January 30, 2001. The NRC staff will

process this amendment in an exigent manner, in order to minimize the time the plant is operated under the NOED.

In its application, NMC explained why it could not have foreseen the need for this amendment. Compliance with the current wording of TS 3.15.A requires full compliance with the Code as a condition for considering Section XI-required equipment operable. Application of TS 3.15.A requires declaring equipment inoperable and following the specified limiting conditions for operation when a Code non-compliance is discovered. This may require an unnecessary plant shutdown when the equipment is fully operable in all other respects. This exigent situation occurred because the potential for TS 3.15.A.1 to cause unnecessary operational evolutions was not previously recognized. Code nonconformances were recently identified during the course of inspections conducted by NRC staff. TS 3.15.A.1 directs that affected components be declared inoperable without regard for actual impact on operability. The need for a license amendment that would allow such nonconformances to be evaluated for their affect on equipment operability, thus preventing unnecessary operational evolutions, was subsequently identified. As a result, the need for a license amendment was determined to be unavoidable and not created by a failure to make a timely application for a license amendment.

The staff has determined that the licensee used its best efforts to make a timely application for the proposed changes and that exigent circumstances do exist and were not the result of any intentional delay on the part of the licensee.

Before issuance of the proposed license amendment, the Commission will have made findings required by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act) and the Commission's regulations.

Pursuant to 10 CFR 50.91(a)(6) for amendments to be granted under exigent circumstances, the NRC staff must determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration. Under the Commission's regulations in 10 CFR 50.92, this means that operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; or (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. As required by 10 CFR