issuance of an exemption from certain requirements of appendix G to part 50 of Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations (10 CFR part 50) for Facility Operating License No. DPR–35, issued to Entergy Nuclear Generation Company, (the licensee), for operation of the Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station (Pilgrim), located in Plymouth, Massachusetts.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed action would exempt the licensee from certain requirements of Appendix G to 10 CFR Part 50 to allow the application of the methodology approved for determining the pressure-temperature (P–T) limit curves in the American Society of Mechanical Engineers Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code (ASME Code), Section XI, Code Case N–640 entitled, "Alternate Reference Fracture Toughness for Development of P–T Curves for ASME Section XI, Division I."

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application for an exemption dated January 19, 2001, as supplemented by letter dated February 8, 2001.

The Need for the Proposed Action

The licensee would like to revise the currently approved methodology for P-T limit calculations to incorporate the methodology approved for use in Code Case N-640. Code Case N-640 allows the use of K_{IC} fracture toughness curve instead of K_{la} fracture toughness curve, as required by Appendix G to Section XI, for determining P-T limits for reactor pressure vessel (RPV) materials. The exemption is needed because the methodology in Code Case N-640 is less conservative in determining P-T limits than the approved methodology in Appendix G of Section XI. The proposed action also supports the licensee's application for a license amendment, dated November 22, 2000, as supplemented on January 30 and February 2, 2001, to revise the Technical Specifications (TSs) P-T limits for the remainder of operating cycles 13 and 14.

In the associated exemption, the staff has determined that, pursuant to 10 CFR 50.12(a)(2)(ii), the underlying purpose of the regulation will continue to be served by the implementation of the code case.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The NRC has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes

that the exemption described above would provide an adequate margin of safety against brittle failure of the RPV at Pilgrim.

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 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 Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station dated May 1972.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on March 14, 2001, the staff consulted with the Massachusetts State official, James Muckerheide of the Massachusetts Emergency Management Agency, 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 January 19, 2001, as

supplemented by letter dated February 8, 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 Electronic Reading Room).

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 6th day of April 2001.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. Alan B. Wang,

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

[FR Doc. 01–9050 Filed 4–11–01; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

Proposed Collection; Comment Request for Extension of a Currently Approved Information Collection: Standard Form 2808

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 extension of a currently approved information collection. SF 2808, Designation of Beneficiary: Civil Service Retirement System (CSRS), is used by persons covered by CSRS to designate a beneficiary to receive the lump sum payment due from the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund in the event of their death.

Comments are particularly invited on: whether this 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 of information 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 appropriate technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

Approximately 2,000 SF 2808 forms will be completed annually. We estimate it takes approximately 15 minutes to complete the form. The

annual burden is estimated at 500 hours.

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 on or before June 11,

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 3349, Washington, DC 20415.

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. 01–8997 Filed 4–11–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6325-50-P

OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request for Review of a Revised Information Collection: Instructions and Model CFC Application

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 intends to submit to the Office of Management and Budget a request for clearance of a revised information collection. The model Combined Federal Campaign application and instructions are used to collect information from charitable organizations applying for eligibility.

We estimate 1,400 applications are completed annually. Each form takes approximately 3 hours to complete. The annual estimated burden is 4200 hours.

Comments are particularly invited on: whether this collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of functions of the Office of Personnel Management, 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 on or before June 11, 2001.

ADDRESSES: Send or deliver comments to: Mara T. Patermaster, Office of Extragovernmental Affairs, CFC Operations, U.S. Office of Personnel Management, 1900 E Street, NW, Room 5450, Washington, DC 20415.

U.S. Office of Personnel Management.

Steven R. Cohen,

Acting Director.

[FR Doc. 01–8998 Filed 4–11–01; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 6325–46–P

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

Proposed Collection; Comment Request

SUMMARY: In accordance with the requirement of section 3506(c)(2)(A) of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 which provides opportunity for public comment on new or revised data collections, the Railroad Retirement Board (RRB) will publish periodic summaries of proposed data collections.

Comments are invited on: (a) Whether the proposed information collection is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information has practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the RRB's estimate of the burden of the collection of the information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden related to the collection of information on respondents, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

Title and purpose of information collection: Employer Service and Compensation Reports; OMB 3220–0070.

Section 2(c) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act (RUIA) specifies the maximum normal unemployment and sickness benefits that may be paid in a benefit year. Section 2(c) further provides for extended benefits for certain employees and for beginning a benefit year early for other employees. The conditions for these actions are prescribed in 20 CFR 302.

All information about creditable railroad service and compensation

needed by the RRB to administer section 2(c) is not always available from annual reports filed by railroad employers with the RRB (OMB 3220–0008). When this occurs, the RRB must obtain supplemental information about service and compensation.

The RRB utilizes Form UI–41, Supplemental Report of Service and Compensation, and Form UI–41a, Supplemental Report of Compensation, to obtain the additional information about service and compensation from railroad employers. Completion of the forms is mandatory. One response is required of each respondent.

The RRB proposes minor editorial changes to Form UI–41 and UI–41a. The completion time for Form UI–41 and UI–41a is estimated at 8 minutes per response.

Additional Information or Comments: To request more information or to obtain a copy of the information collection justification, forms, and/or supporting material, please call the RRB Clearance Officer at (312) 751–3363. Comments regarding the information collection should be addressed to Ronald J. Hodapp. Railroad Retirement Board, 844 N. Rush Street, Chicago, Illinois 60611–2092. Written comments should be received within 60 days of this notice.

Chuck Mierzwa,

Clearance Officer.

[FR Doc. 01–9092 Filed 4–11–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7905-01-M

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

Proposed Collection; Comment Request

SUMMARY: In accordance with the requirement of section 3506 (c)(2)(A) of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 which provides opportunity for public comment on new or revised data collections, the Railroad Retirement Board (RRB) will publish periodic summaries of proposed data collections.

Comments are invited on: (a) Whether the proposed information collection is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information has practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the RRB's estimate of the burden of the collection of the information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden related to the collection of information on respondents, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.