

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.
Leonard N. Olshan,
*Project Manager, Section 1, Project
Directorate II, Division of Licensing Project
Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor
Regulation.*
[FR Doc. 01-26945 Filed 10-25-01; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Final Decision Related to the U.S. Department of Energy's General Guidelines for the Recommendation of Sites for Nuclear Waste Repositories and its Yucca Mountain Site Suitability Guidelines

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory
Commission.

ACTION: Concurrence on the U.S.
Department of Energy's revision of its
general guidelines for the
recommendation of sites for nuclear
waste repositories, and on its guidelines
for determining the suitability of the site
at Yucca Mountain, Nevada.

SUMMARY: This final decision sets forth
the reasons of the U.S. Nuclear
Regulatory Commission ("NRC" or the
"Commission") for concurring on the
revised "General Guidelines for the
Recommendation of Sites for Nuclear
Waste Repositories" and on the "Yucca
Mountain Site Suitability Guidelines,"
designated 10 CFR part 963, proposed
by the U.S. Department of Energy
("DOE" or the "Department"). These
draft final guidelines were submitted by
DOE to the Commission for review and
concurrence on May 4, 2000.

EFFECTIVE DATE: October 26, 2001.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION, CONTACT:
Michael P. Lee, Division of Waste
Management, Environmental and
Performance Assessment Branch,
telephone 301/415-6677, e-mail:
mpl@NRC.gov; or C. William Reamer,
Division of Waste Management, High-
Level Waste Branch, telephone 301/
415-6537, e-mail: cbr@NRC.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Introduction

Section 112(a) of the Nuclear Waste
Policy Act of 1982 (NWPA) directed
DOE to develop general siting
guidelines for the recommendation of
sites for characterization as potential
repositories for the disposal of spent
nuclear fuel and other high-level
radioactive wastes (HLW). Section
112(a) also called for NRC to concur on
those guidelines. DOE issued its final
guidelines, in the form of 10 CFR part
960, on December 6, 1984 (49 FR

47715). The DOE guidelines defined the
technical requirements that candidate
sites must meet, and specified how DOE
would implement its HLW repository
site-selection process. The guidelines
also recognized NRC jurisdiction for the
resolution of differences between the
guidelines and NRC's regulations
governing the disposal of HLW in
geologic repositories at 10 CFR part 60
and provided that DOE would obtain
NRC concurrence on future revisions to
the siting guidelines. NRC concurred on
DOE's general siting guidelines in July
1984 (49 FR 28130).

In 1987, Congress amended the
NWPA and directed DOE to characterize
only the Yucca Mountain site, in Nye
County, Nevada. In 1992, in the Energy
Policy Act (EnPA—Public Law 102-
486), Congress directed the National
Academy of Sciences (NAS) to conduct
a study to provide findings and
recommendations on reasonable
standards for protection of the public
health and safety, from releases of
radioactive materials stored or disposed
of in a repository at the Yucca Mountain
site. The EnPA also required the U.S.
Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)
to issue public health and safety
standards consistent with the findings
and recommendations of the NAS, and
the NRC to modify its technical
requirements and criteria to be
consistent with EPA's standards. The
NAS published its recommendations in
August 1995.

On December 16, 1996, DOE
published proposed modifications to its
original 1984 guidelines (61 FR 66158).
DOE's proposed amendments would
have created a new subpart to part 960,
addressing only the Yucca Mountain
site, and were designed to concentrate
the regulatory review on the analyses of
overall repository performance. EPA
published its final site-specific radiation
standards for Yucca Mountain (40 CFR
part 197) on June 13, 2001 (66 FR
32073). After publication of proposed
site-specific disposal regulations for
public comment on February 22, 1999
(64 FR 8640), NRC considered and
affirmed NRC's final regulations on
September 7, 2001.

II. DOE's Revised Siting Guidelines

In 1999, DOE decided to issue a
revised proposal amending its general
guidelines, in lieu of finalizing the 1996
proposed revised guidelines. Its revised
proposal limited the general guidelines
to the preliminary screening of potential
sites for a nuclear waste repository, and
added a new part 963 for determining
the suitability of the Yucca Mountain
site for a potential geologic repository
(64 FR 67054).

DOE gave three principal reasons for
its new proposal: (a) The need to
provide more specificity for the criteria
and methodology to be used in
evaluating the suitability of the Yucca
Mountain site and to better explain the
legal bases for the proposal; (b) DOE's
issuance, in December 1998, of the
report entitled, "Viability Assessment of
a Repository at Yucca Mountain,"
which sets forth the bases for the site
suitability criteria DOE is proposing to
use and the methodology for applying
the criteria to a design for a proposed
repository at the Yucca Mountain site;
and (c) the need for better alignment
with EPA's and NRC's site-specific
regulations, under development at the
time. See 64 FR 67054, 67055. The
public comment period for the proposed
rule ended on February 14, 2000. In
addition, DOE conducted two public
hearings in Nevada as part of the public
comment process. Overall, DOE
received about 125 comments,
questions, and concerns on its proposal
from 45 entities and members of the
public, including comments from the
NRC staff, dated March 3, 2000.

In the new part 963, DOE proposes
two separate determinations for
evaluating the suitability of the Yucca
Mountain site. Using information and
data developed through its site
characterization programs to date, DOE
would conduct both a preclosure and a
postclosure safety evaluation. The two
separate, risk-based assessments are
consistent with NRC's final site-specific
regulation for the proposed Yucca
Mountain site, 10 CFR part 63, which
calls for an Preclosure Safety
Assessment and Total System
Performance Assessment for the two
respective phases of repository
activities. DOE would compare the
results from each of the two analyses
with the applicable EPA standards and
the NRC regulations. 10 CFR part 963
also specifies the evaluation methods
and criteria to be used, as well as the
specific determinations to be reached by
DOE. Although the revised draft final
siting guidelines at part 963 are closely
linked to certain licensing criteria and
requirements in NRC's part 63
regulation, DOE has noted that meeting
part 963 would not be the equivalent of
a determination that the candidate site
and the proposed design will meet all
the NRC licensing requirements
necessary to receive authorization to
construct the proposed repository at
Yucca Mountain.

In a letter dated May 4, 2000, DOE
sent to the Commission, for its review
and concurrence, the revised draft final
siting guidelines, in the form of a
proposed **Federal Register** notice

amending part 960 and containing the new part 963. Also included as part of the proposed **Federal Register** notice were a DOE analysis and response to the comments.

III. Concurrence Criteria

The Commission considered what criteria were appropriate for its concurrence in its 1984 decision-making on DOE's siting guidelines and believes that these criteria should continue to be used, to the extent that they are still appropriate. The 1984 concurrence criteria were:

1. The siting guidelines must not be in conflict with NRC's geologic disposal regulations.
2. The siting guidelines must not contain provisions that might lead DOE to select sites that would not be reasonable alternatives for an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).
3. The siting guidelines should not contain provisions that are in conflict with NRC responsibilities embodied in NWPA, as amended.

The Commission finds that the first and the third criteria remain relevant. The second criterion is no longer relevant because the 1987 amendments to the NWPA eliminated the need for consideration of alternative repository sites in an EIS. Moreover, in providing its 1984 concurrence, DOE agreed to meet seven conditions, of which the principal two¹ were:

1. DOE was to amend its siting guidelines to recognize NRC jurisdiction over resolution of differences between the Department's siting guidelines and NRC's geologic disposal regulations.
2. DOE was to commit to obtain NRC concurrence on future siting guideline revisions.

These two conditions remain valid for the present concurrence decision.

IV. Commission Decision

The NRC staff raised three issues in its March 3, 2000, comments on DOE's 1999 proposed revised guidelines. First, the staff pointed out that there appeared to be no discussion addressing the potential matter of a conflict between the proposed revisions and the applicable NRC regulations and recommended that this issue be addressed in the statement of considerations (SOC) for the guidelines. Second, the staff noted that the SOC inappropriately included a reference to NRC's quality assurance (QA) criteria of Appendix B in 10 CFR part 50 as "considerations" rather than as "pass/fail

standards" in DOE's discussion of how it has defined "criteria." Staff underscored that NRC's QA criteria are factors that must be present if DOE's QA program is to be judged adequate and that any implication that NRC's QA criteria are not required should be avoided, lest confusion result as to their standing as regulatory requirements. Third, the staff noted that DOE's proposed definition of "cladding" conveyed the inaccurate notion that all cladding is corrosion-resistant, whereas, in reality, some spent nuclear fuels are clad in aluminum, which is not generally considered corrosion-resistant.

DOE has addressed these comments in its draft final revisions to its guidelines. With respect to the first comment, DOE has added material in its SOC explaining that the necessary consistency between the DOE and NRC regulations is obtained through the careful crafting of its regulation to conform to pertinent parts of NRC's part 63, and that any conflicts between the two are resolved through the concurrence process. With respect to the second comment, DOE's SOC now acknowledges that NRC's QA criteria are factors that must be present for anyone's QA program to be judged adequate, and that NRC's QA criteria are mandatory despite their lack of quantitative, pass-fail references. Finally, DOE has revised its definition of "cladding" to indicate that it is generally made of corrosion-resistant zirconium alloy or stainless steel, thereby eliminating the implication that it is always made of such material. The Commission finds that DOE acceptably addressed the NRC staff's comments.

Further, the Commission has not identified anything in DOE's revised siting guidelines that conflicts with NRC's 10 CFR part 63 regulation, as modified to be consistent with the final EPA standard for Yucca Mountain, nor has the Commission identified anything in DOE's revised siting guidelines that would conflict with NRC's responsibilities under the NWPA, as amended. With respect to the two conditions, DOE has responded acceptably, as described above, to the concerns that NRC jurisdiction be recognized for the resolution of any potential conflicts between DOE and NRC regulations. Regarding the second condition, DOE continues to commit [see 10 CFR 963.10(b)] to seek NRC concurrence on future revisions, if any, to its siting guidelines.

In summary, the Commission has determined that DOE has acceptably addressed the issues raised by the NRC staff in its March 3, 2000, letter. Further, the Commission finds: (a) that the siting

guidelines are not in conflict with NRC's geologic disposal regulations at 10 CFR part 63; and (b) the siting guidelines do not contain provisions that are in conflict with NRC responsibilities embodied in the NWPA, as amended. Therefore, the Commission concurs on DOE's revised general guidelines for the recommendation of sites for nuclear waste repositories (part 960) and on its guidelines for determining the suitability of the Yucca Mountain site (part 963).

The Commission recognizes that DOE could make further changes to its revised draft final siting guidelines submitted to the Commission, for concurrence, prior to the publication of the guidelines. Consequently, the Commission's concurrence is conditional on DOE's agreement to notify NRC of any changes to the draft final guidelines (including changes to the Supplemental Information) and its agreement to retransmit the revised rulemaking package to the Commission, if any substantive changes are made, for a determination as to whether re-concurrence is needed.²

V. Commission Concurrence Process

Neither the NWPA nor its amendments specify any particular procedure for NRC concurrence on DOE's siting guidelines. In an earlier ruling on a petition by the Yakima Indian Nation, the Commission found that NRC's concurrence responsibility is not a rulemaking and does not require notice and opportunity for public comment (48 FR 39536). The State of Nevada and Nye County (Nevada), in May 2000, requested that the Commission provide the opportunity for public comment by interested stakeholders.

DOE's siting guidelines at part 963 are similar to, and consistent with, NRC's site-specific disposal regulations for Yucca Mountain at Part 63. Extensive public comment was obtained, on the proposed part 63,³ through a **Federal Register** notice and the conduct of five public meetings in Nevada. Moreover, the Commission has reviewed the record of public comments on the proposed part 963 as well. Consequently, the Commission has determined that sufficient information is available in the record regarding

² We also note that DOE needs to modify the reference to "the quality assurance (QA) criteria of Appendix B in 10 CFR part 50 * * * "in the Supplemental Information of its May 4, 2000, proposed **Federal Register** notice. This reference is no longer warranted in light of the incorporation of applicable part 50 QA criteria in the final part 63 rule.

³ On September 7, 2001, the Commission approved the final rule at part 63.

¹ The remaining conditions pertained to specific language in the siting criteria, themselves, as well as clarifications and additional specificity regarding their application.

stakeholder concerns such that further stakeholder involvement before the Commission's concurrence on part 963 is not necessary.

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

For the Commission.

Annette Vietti-Cook,

Secretary of the Commission.

[FR Doc. 01-26946 Filed 10-25-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE BOARD OF GOVERNORS

Sunshine Act Meeting

Board Votes To Close October 22, 2001, Meeting

By telephone vote on October 22, 2001, the Board of Governors of the United States Postal Service voted unanimously to close to public observation its meeting held in Washington, DC, via teleconference. The Board determined that prior public notice was not possible.

ITEM CONSIDERED: 1. Emergency Capital Funding—Hazardous Materials.

GENERAL COUNSEL CERTIFICATION: The General Counsel of the United States Postal Service has certified that the meeting was properly closed under the Government in the Sunshine Act.

CONTACT PERSON FOR MORE INFORMATION: Requests for information about the meeting should be addressed to the Secretary of the Board, David G. Hunter, at (202) 268-4800.

David G. Hunter,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 01-27175 Filed 10-24-01; 2:28 am]

BILLING CODE 7710-12-M

UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE BOARD OF GOVERNORS

Sunshine Act Meeting

TIMES AND DATES: 10:30 a.m., Monday, November 5, 2001; 3:30 p.m., Monday, November 5, 2001.

PLACE: Washington, DC, at U.S. Postal Service Headquarters, 475 L'Enfant Plaza, SW., in the Benjamin Franklin Room.

STATUS: November 5—10:30 a.m. (Closed); November 5—3:30 p.m. (Open).

MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED:

Monday, November 5—10:30 a.m. (Closed).

1. Financial Performance.
2. Strategic Planning.

3. Personnel Matters and Compensation Issues.

Monday, November 5—3:30 p.m. (Open)

1. Minutes of the Previous Meeting, October 1-2, 2001.
2. Remarks of the Postmaster General and CEO.
3. Tentative Agenda for the December 3-4, 2001, meeting in Washington, DC.

CONTACT PERSON FOR MORE INFORMATION:

David G. Hunter, Secretary of the Board, U.S. Postal Service, 475 L'Enfant Plaza, SW., Washington, DC 20260-1000. Telephone (202) 268-4800.

David G. Hunter,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 01-27176 Filed 10-24-01; 2:28 pm]

BILLING CODE 7710-12-M

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Investment Company Act Release No. 25217; 812-11592]

Evergreen Select Fixed Income Trust, *et al.*; Notice of Application

October 22, 2001.

AGENCY: Securities and Exchange Commission ("Commission").

ACTION: Notice of application for an order under the Investment Company Act of 1940 (the "Act") under (i) section 6(c) of the Act granting an exemption from sections 18(f) and 21(b) of the Act; (ii) section 12(d)(1)(f) of the Act granting an exemption from section 12(d)(1) of the Act; (iii) sections 6(c) and 17(b) of the Act granting an exemption from sections 17(a)(1) and 17(a)(3) of the Act; and (iv) section 17(d) of the Act and rule 17d-1 under the Act to permit certain joint transactions.

SUMMARY OF APPLICATION: Applicants request an order that would permit certain registered open-end management investment companies to participate in a joint lending and borrowing facility.

Applicants: Evergreen Selected Fixed Income Trust; Evergreen Select Equity Trust; Evergreen Select Money Market Trust; Evergreen Municipal Trust; Evergreen Equity Trust; Evergreen Fixed Income Trust; Evergreen International Trust; Evergreen Money Market Trust; Evergreen Variable Annuity Trust (collectively, the "Evergreen Trusts"); Evergreen Investment Management Company, LLC ("Evergreen"); any person controlling, controlled by or under common control with Evergreen (together with Evergreen, an "Evergreen Adviser"); any other open-end management investment company and

its series registered under the Act for which an Evergreen Adviser serves as investment adviser ("Future Trusts" and together with the Evergreen Trusts, the "Trusts").¹

FILING DATES: The application was filed on April 22, 1999, and amended on August 1, 2001. Applicants have agreed to file another amendment during the notice period, the substance of which is reflected in this notice.

Notice or Notification Hearing: An order granting the application will be issued unless the Commission orders a hearing. Interested persons may request a hearing by writing to the Commission's Secretary and serving applicants with a copy of the request, personally or by mail. Hearing requests should be received by the Commission by 5:30 p.m. on November 16, 2001 and should be accompanied by proof of service on the applicants, in the form of an affidavit or, for lawyers, a certificate of service. Hearing requests should state the nature of the writer's interest, the reason for the request, and the issues contested. Persons who wish to be notified of a hearing may request notification by writing to the Commission's Secretary.

ADDRESSES: Secretary, Commission, 450 Fifth Street, NW., Washington, DC 20549-0609; Applicants: Catherine Foley, Esq., Wachovia Corporation, c/o Evergreen Funds, 200 Berkeley Street, Boston, MA 02116.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Karen L. Goldstein, Senior Counsel, at (202) 942-0646, or Nadya B. Roytblat, Assistant Director, at (202) 945-0564 (Division of Investment Management, Office of Investment Company Regulation).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The following is a summary of the application. The complete application may be obtained for a fee at the Commission's Public Reference Branch, 450 Fifth Street, NW., Washington, DC 20549-0102 (tel. (202) 942-8090).

Applicant's Representations

1. Each Evergreen Trust is registered under the Act as an open-end management investment company and is organized as a Delaware business trust. Currently, there are nine Evergreen Trusts comprised of one hundred and five series (together with the series of the Future Trusts, the "Funds"). Evergreen, a subsidiary of Wachovia Corporation ("Wachovia"),

¹ All Trusts that currently intend to rely on the order are named as applicants, and any other Trust that subsequently relies on the order will comply with the terms and conditions of the application.