4. *How often the collection is required:* On occasion.

5. *Who will be required or asked to report:* Holders of operating licenses for commercial nuclear power plants.

6. *An estimate of the number of responses:* 1130 annually.

7. *The estimated number of annual respondents:* 104.

8. *An estimate of the total number of hours needed annually to complete the requirement or request:* 56,500.

9. *An indication of whether Section 3507(d), Pub. L. 104–13 applies:* Not applicable.

10. *Abstract:* With NRC Forms 366, 366A, and 366B, the NRC collects reports of the types of reactor events and problems that are believed to be significant and useful to the NRC in its efforts to identify and resolve threats to public safety. They are designed to provide the information necessary for engineering studies of operational anomalies and trends and patters analysis of operational occurrences. The same information can be used for other analytic procedures that will aid in identifying accident precursors.

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–1 F23, 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 of this notice.

Comments and questions should be directed to the OMB reviewer listed below by June 4, 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 (3150–0104), 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 27th day of April 2001.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Beth St. Mary,

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

[FR Doc. 01–11110 Filed 5–2–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50–313]

Entergy Operations, Inc., Arkansas Nuclear One, Unit 1, Notice of Availability of the Final Supplement 3 to the Generic Environmental Impact Statement Regarding the License Renewal of Arkansas Nuclear One, Unit 1

Notice is hereby given that the U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has published a final plant-specific Supplement 3 to the Generic Environmental Impact Statement (GEIS), NUREG–1437, regarding the renewal of operating license DPR–51 for an additional 20 years of operation at Arkansas Nuclear One, Unit 1 (ANO–1). ANO–1 is located in Pope County, Arkansas. Possible alternatives to the proposed action (license renewal) include no action and reasonable alternative energy sources.

In Section 9.3 of the report, the staff concludes:

> The staff recommends that the Commission determine that the adverse environmental impacts of license renewal for ANO–1 are not so great that preserving the option of license renewal for energy planning decisionmakers would be unreasonable. This recommendation is based on (1) the analysis and findings in the Generic Environmental Impact Statement for License Renewal of Nuclear Power Plants, NUREG–1437; (2) the Entergy ER [Environmental Report]; (3) consultation with other Federal, State, and local agencies; (4) the staff's own independent review; and (5) the staff's consideration of public comments.

The final Supplement 3 to the GEIS is available electronically for public inspection in the NRC Public Document Room located at One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland, or from the Publicly Available Records (PARS) component of NRC's document system (ADAMS). ADAMS is accessible from the NRC Web site at *http://www.nrc.gov/NRC/ADAMS/index.html* (the Public Electronic Reading Room).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION, CONTACT: Mr. Thomas J. Kenyon, Generic Issues, Environmental, Financial, and Rulemaking Branch, Division of Regulatory Improvement Programs, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555. Mr. Kenyon may be contacted at (301) 415–1120 or by writing to: Thomas J. Kenyon, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, MS 0–11 F1, Washington, DC 20555.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 5th day of April, 2001.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

David B. Matthews,

Director, Division of Regulatory Improvement Programs, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 01–11109 Filed 5–2–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Meeting Concerning the Revision of the Oversight Program for Nuclear Fuel Cycle Facilities

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC).

ACTION: Notice of public meeting.

SUMMARY: NRC will hold a public meeting at the Information Age Park Resource Center at 2000 McCracken Boulevard, Paducah, Kentucky, to provide the local public, facility employees, citizens' groups, and local officials with information about, and an opportunity to provide views on, how the NRC plans to revise and improve its oversight program for nuclear fuel cycle facilities. The oversight program applies to commercial nuclear fuel cycle facilities regulated under 10 CFR parts 40, 70, and 76. The facilities currently include gaseous diffusion plants, highly enriched uranium fuel fabrication facilities (one of which is NFS), low-enriched uranium fuel fabrication facilities, and a uranium hexafluoride (UF_6) production facility. These facilities possess large quantities of materials that are potentially hazardous (*i.e.,* radioactive, toxic, and/or flammable) to the workers, public, and environment. Also, some of the facilities possess information and material important to national security. In this area, the NRC regulates both the Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant operated by the United States Enrichment Corporation, and the Honeywell Specialty Chemicals uranium conversion facility in Metropolis, Illinois.

The goal of this revision project is to have an oversight program that: (1) provides earlier and more objective indications of facility performance in the areas of safety and national security, (2) increases stakeholder confidence in the NRC, and (3) increases regulatory effectiveness, efficiency, and realism. To this end, the NRC is striving to make the oversight program more risk-informed and performance-based. The oversight revision project is described in SECY–99–188, ''Evaluation and Proposed Revision of the Nuclear Fuel Cycle Facility Oversight Program Nuclear Fuel

Cycle Facility Safety Inspection Program,'' and in SECY–00–0222, ''Status of Revision.'' SECY–99–188 and SECY–00–0222, as well as other background information, are available in the Public Document Room and on the NRC Web Page at *http://www.nrc.gov.*

Purpose of Meeting

To obtain stakeholder views for improving the NRC oversight program for ensuring fuel cycle licensees and certificate holders maintain protection of worker and public health and safety, protection of the environment, and safeguards for special nuclear material and classified matter in the interest of national security. The public meeting will focus on the revisions that are being made to the program, and on how interested parties can provide input to the change process.

DATE AND LOCATION: Members of the public, industry, and other stakeholders are invited to attend and participate in the meeting, which is scheduled for 7 to 8 p.m. on Wednesday, May 16, 2001. The meeting will be held in the Resource Center at the Paducah Information Age Park in Paducah, Kentucky.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Patrick Castleman, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, telephone (301) 415–8118, e-mail *pic@nrc.gov.*

Dated at Rockville, Maryland this 27th day of April 2001.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Patrick Castleman,

Project Manager, Inspection Section, Safety and Safeguards Support Branch, Division of Fuel Cycle Safety and Safeguards.

[FR Doc. 01–11111 Filed 5–2–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

NUREG–1742, ''Perspectives Gained From the Individual Plant Examination of External Events (IPEEE) Program''; Draft for Comment

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Notice of availability of the draft report for comment NUREG–1742, ''Perspectives Gained from the Individual Plant Examination of External Events (IPEEE) Program''.

SUMMARY: The Nuclear Regulatory Commission issued on June 28, 1991, Supplement 4 to Generic Letter 88–20, ''Individual Plant Examination of External Events (IPEEE) for Severe Accident Vulnerabilities, 10 CFR 50.54(f).'' Associated guidance for conduct of the IPEEEs was issued in June 1991 in NUREG–1407, ''Procedural and Submittal Guidance for the Individual Plant Examination of External Events (IPEEE) for Severe Accident Vulnerabilities.'' Specifically, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission requested that each licensee perform an IPEEE to identify and report to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission all plant-specific vulnerabilities to severe accidents caused by external events. This review was limited to plant behavior under full-power operating conditions. The external events to be considered included seismic events; internal fires; and high winds, floods, and other (HFO) external initiating events including transportation or nearby facility accidents and plant-unique hazards. All currently operating nuclear power plants in the United States have completed their assessments and submitted their analyses to the NRC.

Consistent with the intent of Generic Letter 88–20, the primary goal of the IPEEE program has been for each licensee to identify plant-specific vulnerabilities to severe accidents. More specifically, Supplement 4 to Generic Letter 88–20 identified the following four objectives for the IPEEE:

- To develop an appreciation of severe accident behavior,
- To understand the most likely severe accident sequences that could occur at the licensee's plant under full-power operating conditions,
- To gain a qualitative understanding of the overall likelihood of core damage and fission product releases, and
- To reduce, if necessary, the overall likelihood of core damage and radioactive material releases by modifying, where appropriate, hardware and procedures that would help prevent or mitigate severe accidents.

The primary objective of the NRC's technical review process was to ascertain the extent to which the licensee's IPEEE submittals have achieved the intent of Generic Letter 88–20, satisfied the four principle IPEEE objectives listed above, and followed the recommended guidance in NUREG–1407. The reviews focused on verifying that the critical elements of acceptable IPEEE analyses in the fire, seismic, and HFO areas were performed in accordance with the guidelines in NUREG–1407. Results of the reviews of each IPEEE are documented in plant-specific Staff Evaluation Reports and Technical Evaluation Reports which were transmitted to each licensee and made publically available. It should also be noted that the staff's reviews were not intended to validate or verify the licensees' IPEEEs analyses or results (i.e., an in-depth evaluation of the various inputs, assumptions, and calculations was not performed). Rather, methods, approaches, assumptions, and results were reviewed for reasonableness. If inconsistencies were encountered, they were reported in the plant-specific IPEEE Technical Evaluation Reports.

The draft report NUREG–1742, ''Perspectives Gained from the Individual Plant Examination of External Events (IPEEE) Program'' summarizes the findings from the review of the licensees' IPEEE submittals. The public is invited to provide feedback on this draft report.

As part of the IPEEE program, some generic issues were addressed by the licensees in their submittals. As noted in draft NUREG–1742, while this has resulted in resolution of most of the generic issues related to the IPEEE program, some aspects of some generic issues were not sufficiently discussed in all submittals to reach a resolution. Those remaining issues will be addressed separately from the IPEEE program.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This notice serves as a request for public comment on the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's draft report NUREG–1742, ''Perspectives Gained from the Individual Plant Examination of External Events (IPEEE) Program,'' that is dated April 2001 (web address: *http://www.nrc.gov/NRC/NUREGS/SR1742/V1/index.html*). Only written comments are requested. Feedback is especially requested on the following specific questions.

1. Does the information contained in NUREG–1742 represent a useful understanding of the potential vulnerabilities of nuclear power plants to external events? How will the information in this report be used by various stakeholders? What would make the information more useful?

2. Are there another comparisons of information from the IPEEE submittals that would yield useful insights? If so, what comparisons would be useful? Why?

3. Given the information from the IPEEE submittals on the risk from fire, seismic and other external events, is additional research needed to improve methods, reduce uncertainties, or resolve issues? If so, what research should be pursued and why? If not, why not?

4. Potential plant improvements, identified by licensees in their