is physically unrealistic and overly conservative, because the length of the flaw is 1.5 times the vessel wall, which is much longer than the width of the circumferential weld. Industry experience with the repair of weld indications found during preservice inspection, inservice nondestructive examinations, and data taken from destructive examination of actual vessel welds confirms that any remaining defects are small, laminar in nature, and do not cross transverse to the weld bead. Therefore, any postulated defects introduced during the fabrication process, and not detected during subsequent nondestructive examinations, would only be expected to be oriented in the direction of weld fabrication. ASME Code Case N–588 also provides appropriate procedures for determining the stress intensity factors for use in developing RPV P–T limits per ASME Code, Section XI, Appendix G, procedures. The procedures allowed by ASME Code Case N–588 are conservative and provide a margin of safety in the development of RPV P–T operating and pressure test limits that will prevent nonductile fracture of the vessel.

Code Case N–640, ''Alternative Reference Fracture Toughness for Development of P–T Limit Curves for ASME Section XI, Division 1,'' amends the provisions of ASME Section XI, Appendix G, by permitting the use of the $K_{Ic}$ equation as found in Appendix A in ASME Section XI, in lieu of the $K_{Ia}$ equation as found in Appendix G in ASME Section XI. Use of the $K_{Ic}$ equation in determining the lower bound fracture toughness in the development of the P–T operating limits curve is more technically correct than the use of the $K_{Ia}$ equation since the rate of loading during a heatup or cooldown is slow and is more representative of a static condition than a dynamic condition. Use of $K_{Ia}$ was justified by the initial conservatism of the $K_{Ia}$ equation since 1974 when the equation was codified. This initial conservatism was necessary due to the limited knowledge of RPV materials. Since 1974, additional knowledge has been gained about RPV materials, which demonstrates that the lower bound on fracture toughness provided by the $K_{Ia}$ equation is well beyond the margin of safety required to protect the public health and safety from potential RPV failure. The lower bound $K_{Ic}$ fracture toughness provides an adequate margin of safety to protect the public health and safety from potential RPV failure.

The staff has determined that, pursuant to 10 CFR 50.12(a)(2)(ii), the underlying purpose of the regulation to protect the integrity of the reactor coolant pressure boundary will continue to be served with the implementation of Code Cases N–588 and N–640.

*Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action*

The NRC has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that the exemption and implementation of the proposed alternatives as described above are consistent with the intent of the applicable regulations and would provide an acceptable margin of safety against brittle failure of the HCGS RPV. Therefore, the proposed action will not have a significant impact on the environment.

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 offsite, 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 environmental impacts, the proposed action does not involve any historic sites. It does not affect nonradiological plant effluents and has no other environmental impacts. Therefore, there are no significant nonradiological 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 HCGS.

*Agencies and Persons Consulted*

In accordance with its stated policy, on June 7, 2001, the staff consulted with the New Jersey State official, Mr. Dennis Zannoni, of the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection, 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 December 1, 2000, as supplemented by letters dated February 12, May 7, and May 14, 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 Agencywide Documents Access and Management Systems (ADAMS) Public Electronic Reading Room on the Internet at the NRC web site, *http://www.nrc.gov/NRC/ADAMS/index.html.* If you do not have access to ADAMS or if there are problems in accessing the documents located in ADAMS, contact the NRC Public Document Room (PDR) Reference staff at 1–800–397–4209, 301–415–4737 or by e-mail to *pdr@nrc.gov.*

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 19th day of June 2001.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Richard B. Ennis,**

*Project Manager, Section 2, Project Directorate I, Division of Licensing Project Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 01–15816 Filed 6–22–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

### Public Comment on Inspections, Tests, Analyses and Acceptance Criteria (ITAAC)

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff is seeking public comment on ITAAC that are required for issuance of combined licenses (COLs) for nuclear power facilities under Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations (10 CFR) Part 52, Subpart C. Subpart C of 10 CFR Part 52 sets forth a process for issuing combined licenses (COLs) for nuclear power facilities. A COL authorizes construction and conditional operation of a nuclear power facility. 10 CFR Section 52.79(c) requires that the COL application include ITAAC that are necessary and sufficient to demonstrate that the facility has been constructed and will operate in conformity with the

COL, the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, and the Commission's regulations. 10 CFR 52.103(g) requires that the Commission find that the acceptance criteria in the ITAAC have been met before a facility can be authorized to operate. The staff is seeking public comment on whether or not COL applications should contain ITAAC on operational programs such as security, training, and emergency planning (programmatic ITAAC).

In SECY–00–0092, ''Combined License Review Process'' dated April 20, 2000, the staff provided a basis for its stated position that ''programmatic'' ITAAC are necessary to meet the requirements of 10 CFR Part 52 and the Atomic Energy Act of 1954. In the staff requirements memorandum (SRM) on SECY–00–0092 dated September 6, 2000, the Commission provided guidance to the staff in this area and stated that ''in connection with the Part 52 rulemaking, the staff should specifically seek comment on and continue to work with stakeholders on the need for and scope of the ITAAC for programmatic areas.'' In accordance with the Commission direction, the NRC staff is seeking comments on the need for and scope of ITAAC for programmatic areas. Comments received will be evaluated by the staff.

In a letter dated May 14, 2001, to Chairman Meserve the Nuclear Energy Institute (NEI) provided its position that COL applications should not contain ITAAC on operational programs. NEI's letter contains a paper that summarizes its position. NEI requests an ''early resolution of this issue to allow licensees, the NRC, and other stakeholders to be clear on how key Part 52 requirements on the scope of COL ITAAC are to be met.''

The documents discussed above (i.e., SECY–00–0092, the SRM on SECY–00–0092, and the May 14, 2001, letter from NEI) are available in NRC's Public Document Room. 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. These documents are also accessible electronically from the ADAMS Public Library component on the NRC Web site, *http://www.nrc.gov* (the Electronic Reading Room). Questions and comments should be directed to Joseph M. Sebrosky, Mail Stop O–11 F1, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. 20555–001, *E-mail:jms3@nrc.gov* or by telephone at 301–415–1132. Comments should be submitted within 45 days of the publication of this notice.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland this 19th day of June 2001.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Richard J. Barrett,**

*Acting Director, Future Licensing Organization, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 01–15817 Filed 6–22–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

## OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

### Proposed Collection; Comment Request for Review of an Existing Information Collection: Court Orders Affecting Retirement Benefits

**AGENCY:** Office of Personnel Management.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (Public Law 104–13, May 22, 1995), this notice announces that the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) intends to submit to the Office of Management and Budget a request for review of an existing information collection. The regulations describe how former spouses give us written notice of a court order requiring us to pay benefits to the former spouse. Specific information is needed before OPM can make court-ordered benefit payments.

Approximately 19,000 former spouses apply for benefits based on court orders annually. We estimate it takes approximately 30 minutes to collect the information. The annual burden is 9,500 hours.

Comments are particularly invited on:

—Whether this collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of functions of OPM, and whether it will have practical utility;

—Whether our estimate of the public burden of this collection is accurate, and based on valid assumptions and methodology; and

—Ways in which we can minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, through use of the appropriate technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

For copies of this proposal, contact Mary Beth Smith-Toomey on (202) 606–8358, or E-mail to mbtoomey@opm.gov.

**DATES:** Comments on this proposal should be received within 60 calendar days from the date of this publication.

**ADDRESSES:** Send or deliver comments to—Ronald W. Melton, Chief, Operations Support Division, Retirement and Insurance Service, U.S. Office of Personnel Management, 1900 E Street, NW., Room 3349A, Washington, DC 20415–3450.

**FOR INFORMATION REGARDING ADMINISTRATIVE COORDINATION—CONTACT:** Donna G. Lease, Team Leader, Forms Analysis and Design, Budget and Administrative Services Division, (202) 606–0623.

U.S. Office of Personnel Management.

**Steven R. Cohen,**

*Acting Director.*

[FR Doc. 01–15828 Filed 6–22–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6325–50–P

## OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

### Proposed Collection; Comment Request for Review of a Revised Information Collection: Information and Instructions on Your Reconsideration Rights, RI 38–47

**AGENCY:** Office of Personnel Management.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (Public Law 104–13, May 22, 1995), this notice announces that the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) intends to submit to the Office of Management and Budget a request for review of a revised information collection. Information and Instructions on Your Reconsideration Rights, RI 38–47, outlines the procedures required to request reconsideration of an initial OPM decision about Civil Service or Federal Employees retirement, Retired Federal or Federal Employee Health Benefits requests to enroll or change enrollment, or Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance coverage. The form lists the procedures and time periods required for requesting reconsideration.

Comments are particularly invited on:

—Whether this collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of functions of OPM, and whether it will have practical utility;

—Whether our estimate of the public burden of this collection is accurate, and based on valid assumptions and methodology; and

—Ways in which we can minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, through the use of the appropriate technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology.