

detailed data for communications, utilities, ADP, and office equipment. The data in each file cover four fiscal years: the year just completed, the current year, the next year, and the budget request year. A Portable Document Format version of each file may be printed from www.ows/doleta.gov/ by clicking on the "News" link or the scrolling RJM article under the News section; this will link to a site where the user can select the files. Please contact Tim Felegie at (202) 693-2934 for a paper copy of the files or for help in using the site.

State agencies would submit a narrative justification to explain

incremental changes from the previous year to the budget request year that are not related to a PCI request. Examples include personal services or personnel benefit increases and changes to minutes per unit (MPU) value.

State agencies would have an opportunity to submit PCI requests for certain types of investments: program performance improvements, capital projects for facilities and technology, and law changes. State agencies would incorporate the PCI request into the RJM data file and the funding increase could be expressed as an increase in MPU value, an increase in non-workload-related staff years, or an increase in

NPS. The funding increase could be requested for a single year or spread over multiple years. ETA would evaluate these requests on how they address performance and capital improvements, impact on customer service, and cost benefit/cost avoidance.

ETA would load the Excel® file data into a database for array and analysis.

Type of Review: New.

Agency: Employment and Training Administration.

Title: Resource Justification Model.

Affected Public: State Government.

Cite/reference	Total respondents	Frequency	Total responses	Average time per response (hours)	Burden (hours)
RJM 1 ser	53	Annually	53	41	2,173
RJM 2 ser	53	Annually	53	30	1,590
RJM 3 ser	53	Annually	53	6	318
RJM 4 ser	53	Annually	53	12	636
RJM 5 ser	53	Annually	53	12	636
RJM 6 ser	53	Annually	53	7	371
Narrative	53	Annually	53	11	583
PCI	53	Annually	53	114	6,042
Totals	424	12,349

Total Burden Cost (capital/startup): \$500,000 (based on variable cost per State—negligible for some States and up to \$60,000 for others).

Total Burden Cost (operating/maintaining): \$375,028.

Comments submitted in response to this comment request will be summarized and/or included in the request for Office of Management and Budget approval of the information collection request; they will also become a matter of public record.

Dated: June 11, 2001.

Grace A. Kilbane,

Administrator, Office of Workforce Security.

[FR Doc. 01-15360 Filed 6-18-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50-334 and 50-412]

Firstenergy Nuclear Operating Company, et al.; Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendments to Facility Operating Licenses and Opportunity for a Hearing

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of amendments to Facility Operating License (OL) Nos.

DPR-66 and NPF-73, issued to FirstEnergy Nuclear Operating Company, et al. (FENOC, the licensee), for operation of the Beaver Valley Power Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2 (BVPS-1 and 2), located in Shippingport, Pennsylvania.

The proposed amendments would change the OLs and technical specifications for BVPS-1 and 2 to reflect an increase in the licensed core power level for each unit to 2689 megawatts (thermal), approximately 1.4 percent greater than the current level.

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

By July 19, 2001, the licensee may file a request for a hearing with respect to issuance of the amendments to the subject facility operating licenses and any person whose interest may be affected by this proceeding and who wishes to participate as a party in the proceeding must file a written request for a hearing and petitions for leave to intervene. Requests for a hearing and a petition for leave to intervene shall be filed in accordance with the Commission's "Rules of Practice for Domestic Licensing Proceedings" in 10 CFR part 2. Interested persons should consult a current copy of 10 CFR 2.714,

which is available at the Commission's Public Document Room, located at One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland, and is accessible electronically through the Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS) Public Electronic Reading Room link at the NRC Web site (<http://www.nrc.gov>). If a request for a hearing or petition for leave to intervene is filed by the above date, the Commission or an Atomic Safety and Licensing Board (Board), designated by the Commission or by the Chairman of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, will rule on the request and/or petition; and the Secretary or the designated Board will issue a notice of hearing or an appropriate order.

As required by 10 CFR 2.714, a petition for leave to intervene shall set forth with particularity the interest of the petitioner in the proceeding, and how that interest may be affected by the results of the proceeding. The petition must specifically explain the reasons why intervention should be permitted with particular reference to the following factors: (1) The nature of the petitioner's right under the Act to be made a party to the proceeding; (2) the nature and extent of the petitioner's property, financial, or other interest in the proceeding; and (3) the possible effect of any order that may be entered

in the proceeding on the petitioner's interest. The petition must also identify the specific aspect(s) of the subject matter of the proceeding as to which petitioner wishes to intervene. Any person who has filed a petition for leave to intervene or who has been admitted as a party may amend the petition without requesting leave of the Board up to 15 days prior to the first prehearing conference scheduled in the proceeding, but such an amended petition must satisfy the specificity requirements described above.

Not later than 15 days prior to the first prehearing conference scheduled in the proceeding, a petitioner shall file a supplement to the petition to intervene that must include a list of the contentions that the petitioner seeks to have litigated in the hearing. Each contention must consist of a specific statement of the issue of law or fact to be raised or controverted. In addition, the petitioner shall provide a brief explanation of the bases of the contention and a concise statement of the alleged facts or expert opinion that support the contention and on which the petitioner intends to rely in proving the contention at the hearing. The petitioner must also provide references to those specific sources and documents of which the petitioner is aware and on which the petitioner intends to rely to establish those facts or expert opinion. The petitioner must provide sufficient information to show that a genuine dispute exists with the applicant on a material issue of law or fact. Contentions shall be limited to matters within the scope of the amendments under consideration. The contention must be one that, if proven, would entitle the petitioner to relief. A petitioner who fails to file such a supplement that satisfies these requirements with respect to at least one contention will not be permitted to participate as a party.

Those permitted to intervene become parties to the proceeding, subject to any limitations in the order granting leave to intervene, and have the opportunity to participate fully in the conduct of the hearing, including the opportunity to present evidence and cross-examine witnesses.

Requests for a hearing and petitions for leave to intervene must be filed with the Secretary of the Commission, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, Attention: Rulemakings and Adjudications Staff, or may be delivered to the Commission's Public Document Room, located at One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland, by the above date. A copy of the petition

should also be sent to the Office of the General Counsel, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, and to Mary O'Reilly, Attorney, FirstEnergy Legal Department, FirstEnergy Corporation, 76 S. Main Street, Akron, OH 44308, attorney for the licensee.

Nontimely filings of petitions for leave to intervene, amended petitions, supplemental petitions and/or requests for a hearing will not be entertained absent a determination by the Commission, the presiding officer, or the presiding Atomic Safety and Licensing Board that the petition and/or request should be granted based upon a balancing of the factors specified in 10 CFR 2.714(a)(1)(i)-(v) and 2.714(d).

If a request for a hearing is received, the Commission's staff may issue the amendments after it completes its technical review and prior to the completion of any required hearing if it publishes a further notice for public comment of its proposed finding of no significant hazards consideration in accordance with 10 CFR 50.91 and 50.92.

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendments dated January 18, 2001 (ADAMS Accession No. ML010230096), as supplemented by letters dated February 20 (ADAMS Accession No. ML010540305) and April 12, 2001 (ADAMS Accession No. ML011130105), which are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, located at One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland, and accessible electronically through the ADAMS Public Electronic Reading Room link at the NRC Web site (<http://www.nrc.gov>). If there are problems accessing the document located in ADAMS, contact the PDB Reference staff at 1-800-397-4209 or 301-415-4737, or send an e-mail to pdr@nrc.gov.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 31st day of May 2001.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Lawrence J. Burkhardt,

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

[FR Doc. 01-15371 Filed 6-18-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50-361 and 50-362]

Southern California Edison; San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station, Unit Nos. 2 and 3; Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is considering issuance of an amendment to Facility Operating Licenses Nos. NPF-10 and NPF-15, issued to Southern California Edison Company (SCE or the licensee), for operation of the San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station (SONGS), Units Nos. 2 and 3, located in San Diego County, California.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of Proposed Action

The proposed action would amend the facility license and the technical specifications for SONGS Units 2 and 3, to allow SCE to increase the maximum reactor core power level for each unit from 3390 megawatts thermal (MWt) to 3448 MWt, which is an increase of 1.42 percent of rated core thermal power for SONGS Units 2 and 3.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application for amendment dated April 3, 2001, and supplemented April 23, May 11, May 25, and May 31, 2001.

The Need for the Proposed Action

The proposed action would permit an increase in the licensed core thermal power from 3390 MWt to 3448 MWt and is needed to allow an increase in the net electrical output of SONGS Units 2 and 3 and, thus, provide additional electrical power to service domestic and commercial areas of the licensee's grid.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

In support of its request for the proposed power uprate, SCE evaluated the radiological effects of the proposed action, and specifically evaluated its radioactive waste management systems including system/component activity inventories and activity releases associated with the liquid, gaseous, and solid waste management systems, as well as the process and effluent radiological monitoring and sampling systems. In addition, SCE evaluated the non-radiological effects of the proposed action. Based on its review of the licensee's evaluation of the environmental impacts, the NRC staff concludes that the proposed increase in power would not result in a significant