Appendix C—Serving Out-of-School Youth in a School-to-Work Framework

*Threshold Criteria*

Partnerships

1. There is strong support for the existing initiative and for the school-to-work concept from appropriate OSY/STW stakeholders—such as secondary schools, parents, young people, employers, community-based organizations, labor, post-secondary institutions, Private Industry Councils, government agencies—as well as strategies for maintaining their support and involvement. In particular, a strong leadership role played by CBOs as stakeholders in the STW initiative should be demonstrated.

2. Collaborative agreements exist among a variety of institutions, such as those serving out-of-school youth (i.e., CBOs, Job Corps), employers, public schools, post-secondary and secondary schools, etc.

3. Employers play strong and active roles in the planning and governance of the existing initiative, and provide a range of services for the out-of-school youth component, such as providing a variety of worksite learning experiences, developing assessment criteria, and participating in career exposure activities.

4. Resources from a variety of sources (e.g., STW, federal categorical, State and local education funds, private sector) are systematically used in an integrated manner, to effectively address the work and learning needs of out-of-school youth.

5. A realistic and coherent strategy is in place to coordinate with the statewide School-to-Work system, as well as any existing local School-to-Work systems.

Programmatic

1. There is a strong community-wide partnership that is committed to preparing young people for the world of work and/or further educational and occupational training by providing appropriate activities and services which reflect the fact that youth learn best by learning in context and being actively engaged in their own learning.

2. Ongoing professional development is provided for worksite and ''school-based'' staff to ensure understanding of STW components and the provision of high quality services for out-of-school youth.

3. A system of organized school-based learning, work-based learning, and connecting activities is present in the existing out-of-school youth initiative, and is responsive to the cultural diversity of the youth it services.

4. Work-Based Learning activities include the following:

(a) A variety of different types of high quality work experiences and on-the-job training is available, depending upon the individual needs of the out-of-school youth.

(b) Adult worksite mentors are utilized.

(c) Learning is organized around an appropriate system of career pathways that offer students exposure to all aspects of an industry and are consistent with emerging industry and State standards for mastery of academic competencies and occupational skills.

5. School-Based Learning activities include:

(a) A commitment to high academic standards for all out-of-school youth participants is evident.

(b) A range of educational learning environments is available to meet the needs of out-of-school youth (e.g., alternative education).

(c) Workplace basics and learning in applied context are incorporated into curricula.

(d) Opportunities for post-secondary education and for further occupational/job training are available (e.g., dual enrollment option so that students can earn both high school and college credits simultaneously).

6. Connecting Activities include:

(a) A range of strategies that serve to effectively connect school-based and work-based learning activities, including dedicated staff that serve as school-based, work-based liaisons/coordinators.

(b) The conduct of outreach and public relations for all stakeholders involved in out-of-school youth activities, such as:

- Parents.
- Youth.
- Community-Based Organizations.
- Local elected officials.
- School Boards/School Administrators.

(c) Linkages between human resource service organizations and academic institutions to meet the needs of individual youth (e.g., pregnant and parenting teens).

(d) The provision of transportation and other support services specific to the needs of out-of-school youth.

(e) Strategies that develop the interpersonal skills of students, such as personal responsibility, teamwork, and conflict resolution.

7. Effective strategies are in place for recruiting, retaining, and serving out-of-school youth in the school-to-work framework.

Measurement

1. Evidence of specific goals and objectives and outcomes (or progress indicators) as they relate to the provision of services to out-of-school youth in a school-to-work framework.

2. The ability to implement and adjust improvement plans based on the continuous measurement of progress of the goals, objectives and outcomes, as indicated above.

3. The use of various types of ''assessment tools'' that would measure not only student mastery of skills, but also whether the student is able to integrate, apply and perform the learned knowledge, skills and abilities in real life situations, and that would serve as predictors of readiness for a variety of work, community college, advanced training and other real life situations.

[FR Doc. 96–19191 Filed 7–26–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–M

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

**[Docket Nos. 50–254 and 50–265]**

## Commonwealth Edison Company and MidAmerican Energy Company Quad Cities Nuclear Power Station, Units 1 and 2; Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering approval under 10 CFR 50.80 of the transfer of control of the licenses to the extent affected by the corporate restructuring of MidAmerican Energy Company (MidAmerican, the licensee), a holder of Facility Operating License Nos. DPR–29 and DPR–30, issued to Commonwealth Edison Company (ComEd) for operation and MidAmerican for possession of the Quad Cities Nuclear Power Station, Units 1 and 2, located in Rock Island County, Illinois.

Environmental Assessment

*Identification of the Proposed Action*

The proposed action would consent to the transfer of control of the licenses, with respect to MidAmerican's 25 percent ownership in Quad Cities, Units 1 and 2, to the extent affected by a corporate restructuring creating MidAmerican Energy Holdings Company (Holdings). ComEd alone is licensed to operate Quad Cities, Units 1 and 2. MidAmerican would continue to remain the minority owner and possession-only licensee of the facility. The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application dated April 4, 1996.

*The Need for the Proposed Action*

The proposed action is required to the extent transfer of control of the licenses is affected by the corporate restructuring discussed above. MidAmerican has stated in its application that restructuring will provide flexibility afforded by the typical holding company structure and better position the company to operate in the increasingly competitive energy marketplace and take advantage of new growth opportunities.

*Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action*

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed restructuring and concludes that there will be no changes to Quad Cities, Units 1 and 2, or the environment as a result of this action. The transfer of control of the licenses to the extent affected by MidAmerican's restructuring will not affect the numbers, qualifications, or

organizational affiliation of the personnel who operate the facility, in that ComEd will remain the holder of the operating licenses and continue to be responsible for the operation of Quad Cities, Units 1 and 2.

The Commission has evaluated the environmental impact of the proposed action and has determined that the probability or consequences of accidents would not be increased by the proposed action, and that post-accident radiological releases would not be greater than previously determined. Further, the Commission has determined that the proposed action would not affect routine radiological plant effluents and would not increase occupational radiological exposure. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

With regard to potential non-radiological impacts, the proposed action would not affect nonradiological plant effluents and would have no other environmental impact. Therefore, the Commission concludes that there are no significant nonradiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

*Alternative to the Proposed Action*

Since the Commission has concluded that the environmental effects of the proposed action are not significant, any alternative with equal or greater environmental impact need not be evaluated.

The principal alternative would be to deny the requested approval. Denial of the application would result in no change in current environmental impacts. The environmental impacts of the proposed action and the alternative actions are identical.

*Alternative Use of Resources*

This action does not involve the use of resources not previously considered in the Final Environmental Statement Related to Operation of Quad Cities Nuclear Power Station, Units 1 and 2, dated September 1972.

*Agencies and Persons Consulted*

In accordance with its stated policy, on July 3, 1996, the staff consulted with the Illinois State official, Mr. Frank Niziolek, Head, Reactor Safety Section, Division of Engineering, Illinois Department of Nuclear Safety, regarding the environmental impact of the proposed action. The State official had no comments.

Finding of No Significant Impact

Based upon the foregoing environmental assessment, the Commission concludes that the proposed action will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment. Accordingly, the Commission has determined not to prepare an environmental impact statement for the proposed action relating to MidAmerican's ownership of Quad Cities, Units 1 and 2.

For further details with respect to this action, see the request for approval dated April 4, 1996, which is available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, and at the local public document room located at the Dixon Public Library, 221 Hennepin Avenue, Dixon, Illinois 61021.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 23rd day of July 1996.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Robert A. Capra,

*Director, Project Directorate III–2, Division of Reactor Projects—III/IV, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 96–19182 Filed 7–26–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

---

**[Docket No. 50–458]**

## Entergy Operations, Inc.; River Bend Station; Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an amendment to Facility Operating License No. NPF–47, issued to Entergy Operations, Inc., (the licensee), for operation of the River Bend Station, located in West Feliciana Parish, Louisiana.

Environmental Assessment

*Identification of the Proposed Action*

The proposed action would revise the Facility Operating License No. NPF–47 and Appendix C to the license to reflect the name change from Gulf States Utilities Company to Entergy Gulf States, Inc.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application for amendment dated May 20, 1996.

*The Need for the Proposed Action*

The proposed action is to correct the name in the license to reflect the change which occurred on April 22, 1996. The name change was made by the licensee to improve customer identification by establishing the name Entergy in the region that it serves.

*Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action*

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed changes to the license. We agree with the licensee that the name change will not impact the existing ownership of the River Bend Station (RBS) or the existing entitlement to power and will not alter the existing antitrust license conditions applicable to Gulf States Utilities Company (GSU) or GSU's ability to comply with these conditions or with any of its other obligations or responsibilities. As stated by the licensee, ''The corporate existence continues uninterrupted and all legal characteristics remain the same. Thus, there is no change in the state of incorporation, registered agent, registered office, directors, officers, rights or liabilities of the company. Nor is there a change in the function of the Company or the way in which it does business. GSU's financial responsibility for RBS and its sources of funds to support the facility will remain the same.'' Therefore, the change will not increase the probability or consequences of accidents, no changes are being made in the types of any effluent that may be released offsite, and there is no significant increase in the allowable individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

With regard to potential nonradiological impacts, the proposed action does not affect nonradiological plant effluent and has no other environmental impact. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant nonradiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

*Alternatives to the Proposed Action*

Since the Commission has concluded there is no measurable environmental impact associated with the proposed action, any alternatives with equal or greater environmental impact need not be evaluated. As an alternative to the proposed action, the staff considered denial of the proposed action. 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.