3. Is there a way to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected?

4. How can the burden of the information collection be minimized, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology?

A copy of the draft 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, Maryland. OMB clearance requests are available at the NRC 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 of this notice.

Comments and questions about the information collection requirements may be directed to the NRC Clearance Officer, Brenda Jo. Shelton, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, T–6 E6, Washington, DC 20555–0001, by telephone at 301–415–7233, or by Internet electronic mail at *BJS1@NRC.GOV*.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 22nd day of May 2001.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Brenda Jo. Shelton,

NRC Clearance Officer, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 01–13492 Filed 5–29–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Documents Containing Reporting or Recordkeeping Requirements: Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Review

AGENCY: 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 the following proposal for the collection of information under the provisions of Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35).

1. *Type of submission, new, revision, or extension:* Revision.

2. *The title of the information collection:* Proposed Rule, 10 CFR part 50, Decommissioning Trust Provisions.

3. *The form number if applicable:* Not applicable.

4. *How often the collection is required:* Written notification to the NRC is required when a licensee needs to materially amend its trust agreement to make it consistent with the proposed rule and guidance, or when a license transfer is planned, or whenever a licensee intends to make a disbursement or payment (other than for ordinary administrative expenses) from the trust, escrow account, Government fund, or other account.

5. *Who will be required or asked to report:* Part 50 licensees.

6. *An estimate of the number of responses:* 166 responses (Approximately 110 licensees would need to revise their trust agreements, approximately 55 will make material changes to its trust agreement and 1 licensee will make an out of the ordinary disbursement.

7. *The estimated number of annual respondents:* Approximately 110 licensees per year.

8. *An estimate of the total number of hours needed annually to complete the requirement or request:* Approximately 3,788 hours

9. *An indication of whether Section 3507(d), Pub. L. 104–13 applies:* Applicable.

10. *Abstract:* The NRC is proposing to amend its regulations on decommissioning trust agreements to require that the trust provisions contain general terms and conditions that the NRC believes are required to ensure that funds in the trusts will be available for their intended purpose. The proposed amendment would require that the trust should be an external trust fund in the United States, established pursuant to a written agreement and with an entity that is a State or Federal government agency or whose operations are regulated by a State or Federal agency. The amendment would also require a licensee to notify the NRC in writing when it proposes to materially amend its agreement and when a licensee intends to make a disbursement or payment (other than payment of ordinary administrative expenses). As an accompaniment to this rulemaking, the NRC intends to update Regulatory Guide 1.159, ''Assuring the Availability of Funds for Decommissioning Nuclear Reactors,'' to include sample trust fund language, terms, and conditions.

Submit, by June 29, 2001, comments that address the following questions:

1. Is the proposed collection of information necessary for the NRC to properly perform its functions? Does the information have practical utility?

2. Is the burden estimate accurate?

3. Is there a way to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected?

4. How can the burden of information be minimized, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology?

A copy of the submittal may be viewed free of charge at the NRC Public Document Room, One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Room O–1 F23, Rockville, MD 20852. The proposed rule indicated in ''The title of the information collection'' is or has been published in the **Federal Register** within several days of the publication date of this **Federal Register** Notice. Instructions for accessing the electronic OMB clearance package for the rulemaking have been appended to the electronic rulemaking. Members of the public may access the electronic OMB clearance package by following the directions for electronic access provided in the preamble to the titled rulemaking.

Comments and questions should be directed to the OMB reviewer by June 29, 2001; Amy Farrell, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs (3150–0011), 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 23rd day of May, 2001.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Brenda Jo. Shelton,

NRC Clearance Officer, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 01–13491 Filed 5–29–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50–269, 50–270, 50–287]

Duke Energy Corporation; Oconee Nuclear Station, Units 1, 2, and 3; Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is considering issuance of an exemption from 10 CFR 55.59 for Facility Operating License Nos. DPR–38, DPR–47, and DPR–55, issued to the Duke Energy Corporation (DEC, the licensee), for operation of the Oconee Nuclear Station, Units 1, 2, and 3, located in Seneca, South Carolina.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed action would allow the licensed operator requalification examinations for the Oconee Nuclear Station, Units 1, 2, and 3 to be rescheduled. The requested exemption would extend the completion date for

the examinations from June 4, 2001, to July 13, 2001. The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application for exemption dated March 6, 2001.

The Need for the Proposed Action

The proposed action would extend the current Oconee Nuclear Station, Units 1, 2, and 3 requalification program from June 4, 2001, to July 13, 2001. To require the licensee's operators and staff to support the comprehensive examination and operating tests scheduled during the 24-month requalification cycle could have a detrimental effect on the public interest because it would remove qualified operators from refueling operations and place them into the training program, which could interfere with the current Oconee Unit 2 refueling outage schedule. Further, this one-time exemption will provide additional operator support during plant shutdown conditions, which would provide a safety enhancement during plant shutdown operations and post-maintenance testing. The affected licensed operators will continue to demonstrate and possess the required levels of knowledge, skills, and abilities needed to safely operate the plant throughout the transitional period via continuation of the current satisfactory licensed operator requalification program. Upon completion of the examinations on July 13, 2001, the follow-on cycle will end on March 8, 2003. Future annual requalification cycles will run from March to March.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The NRC has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes, as set forth below, that there are no environmental impacts associated with the extension of the operator requalification examinations from June 4, 2001, to July 13, 2001. The proposed action will not significantly increase the probability or consequences of accidents, no changes are being made in the types or amounts 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 the Oconee Nuclear Station, Units 1, 2, and 3.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on May 18, 2001, the staff consulted with the South Carolina State official, Mr. Henry Porter of the Division of Waste Management, 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 letter dated March 6, 2001. Documents may be examined, and/or copied for a fee, at the NRC's Public Document Room, located at One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland. Publicly available records will be accessible electronically from the ADAMS Public Library component on the NRC Web site, *http://* www.nrc.gov≤ (the Public Electronic Reading Room).

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 24th day of May 2001.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

David E. LaBarge,

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

[FR Doc. 01–13606 Filed 5–29–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards, Subcommittee Meeting on Thermal-Hydraulic Phenomena; Notice of Meeting

The ACRS Subcommittee on Thermal-Hydraulic Phenomena will hold a meeting on June 12, 2001, Room T–2B3, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland.

Portions of the meeting will be closed to public attendance to discuss proprietary information per 5 U.S.C. 552b(c)(4) pertinent to General Electric Nuclear Energy.

The agenda for the subject meeting shall be as follows:

Tuesday, June 12, 2001–8:30 a.m. Until the Conclusion of Business

The Subcommittee will discuss potential issues for consideration by the NRC staff pertaining to its review of applications for core power uprates. The purpose of this meeting is to gather information, analyze relevant issues and facts, and to formulate proposed positions and actions, as appropriate, for deliberation by the full Committee.

Oral statements may be presented by members of the public with the concurrence of the Subcommittee Chairman. Written statements will be accepted and made available to the Committee. Electronic recordings will be permitted only during those portions of the meeting that are open to the public, and questions may be asked only by members of the Subcommittee, its consultants, and staff. Persons desiring to make oral statements should notify the cognizant ACRS staff engineer named below five days prior to the meeting, if possible, so that appropriate arrangements can be made.

During the initial portion of the meeting, the Subcommittee, along with any of its consultants who may be present, may exchange preliminary views regarding matters to be considered during the balance of the meeting.

The Subcommittee will then hear presentations by and hold discussions with representatives of the NRC staff, General Electric Nuclear Energy, the ACRS staff, and other interested persons regarding this review.

Further information regarding topics to be discussed, whether the meeting has been canceled or rescheduled, and the Chairman's ruling on requests for the opportunity to present oral statements and the time allotted therefor, can be obtained by contacting the cognizant ACRS staff engineer, Mr. Paul A. Boehnert (telephone 301–415–