

55.59(a)(1), each licensed operator is required to successfully complete a requalification program developed by the licensee that has been approved by the Commission. This program is to be conducted for a continuous period not to exceed 24 months in duration and upon its conclusion must be promptly followed by a successive requalification program. In addition, pursuant to 10 CFR 55.59(a)(2), each licensed operator must pass a comprehensive requalification written examination and an annual operating test.

The Code of Federal Regulations at 10 CFR 55.11 states that "The Commission may, upon application by an interested person, or upon its own initiative, grant such exemptions from the requirements of the regulations in this part as it determines are authorized by law and will not endanger life or property and are otherwise in the public interest."

### 3.0 Discussion

By letter dated January 12, 2001, SCE&G requested a change to the cycle dates for the 2-year requalification training program required by 10 CFR 55.59. This request constitutes a request for exemption under 10 CFR 55.11 from the requirements of 10 CFR 55.59(a)(1) and (a)(2). The schedular exemption requested would extend the period for the current cycle of the V. C. Summer Nuclear Station requalification program from May 31, 2001, to August 31, 2001. The next requalification period would begin on September 1, 2001, and end on August 31, 2003, with subsequent requalification periods remaining on a September to August schedule. On October 13, 2000, during routine shutdown inspections, SCE&G discovered a leak in a weld in the reactor coolant system. Activities to determine the root cause and extent of this condition and to repair the leak extended through the end of February 2001, months beyond the original scheduled plant restart. To provide the necessary level of licensed operator support to ensure safety throughout the extended plant outage, SCE&G postponed the training and other requalification program activities originally planned during that time. 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 licensed operator requalification program, and the limited 3-month delay in completion of requalification for the current period will have a negligible effect on operator qualification.

### 4.0 Conclusion

Accordingly, the Commission has determined that pursuant to 10 CFR 55.11, granting an exemption to SCE&G from the requirements in 10 CFR 55.59(a)(1) and (a)(2) is authorized by law and will not endanger life or property and is otherwise in the public interest.

Therefore, the Commission hereby grants SCE&G an exemption from the schedular requirements of 10 CFR 55.59(a)(1) and (2) to allow the period for current cycle of the V. C. Summer Nuclear Station requalification program to be extended beyond 24 months but not exceeding 27 months, expiring on August 31, 2001. The successive 2-year requalification cycles will continue with September 1 as the start date and August 31 as the end date.

Pursuant to 10 CFR 51.32, the Commission has determined that the granting of this exemption will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment (66 FR 29187).

This exemption is effective upon issuance, and expires on August 31, 2001.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 29th day of May 2001.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Bruce A. Boger,**

*Director, Division of Inspection Program Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 01-13901 Filed 6-1-01; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7590-01-P**

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-247]

### License No. DPR-26; Consolidated Edison Company of New York, Inc.; Receipt of Petition for Director's Decision Under 10 CFR 2.206

Notice is hereby given that by Petition dated April 24, 2001, as supplemented by letter dated May 3, 2001, Mr. David A. Lochbaum, on behalf of Union of Concerned Scientists, requested that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) issue a Demand for Information (DFI) to licensees that use security personnel supplied by Wackenhut Corporation (Wackenhut), requiring them to provide a docketed response explaining how they comply with the requirement of Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations (10 CFR) section 26.10 that licensees "provide reasonable measures for the early detection of persons who are not fit to perform activities within the scope of this part" and the requirement of 10 CFR 26.20 that

"licensee policy should also address other factors that could affect fitness for duty such as mental stress, fatigue and illness."

The petitioner also requested that the DFI should require each licensee to generally describe its policy for the aforementioned factors and to explicitly describe its policy for these factors as applied to the security personnel supplied by Wackenhut.

As a basis for this request, the petitioner stated that:

"An individual employed by Wackenhut Corporation and assigned duties as a security officer at Indian Point 2 was fired on June 26, 2000 \* \* \*. The individual had worked five straight 12-hour shifts [(12 hours on shift followed by 12 hours off for 5 straight days)] and declined to report for a sixth straight 12-hour shift because he reported to his management—in writing—that it would be "physically and mentally exhausting." The individual reported to his management—in writing—that he was fully aware of his condition and "would not want to be negligent in performing [his] duties as a security officer."

The security officer had unescorted access to Indian Point 2 and thus was covered by 10 CFR part 26 as specified in Section 26.2 \* \* \*."

The petitioner also indicated that Wackenhut employees are required by terms of their employment application, Collective Bargaining Agreement, and the Security Officer's Handbook to report to work when required.

Thus, the petitioner contends that a worker employed by Wackenhut at an NRC-licensed facility reported to his management that he felt unfit for duty, declined to report for mandated overtime, and was terminated.

The petitioner also stated that "10 CFR 26.20 requires all licensees to have formal policy and written procedures for factors that could render plant workers unfit for duty. Fatigue is specifically mentioned in 10 CFR 26.20." The petitioner contends that the Wackenhut's contractual right conflicts with the Federal regulations in 10 CFR 26.10 (a) and (b) and that in the subject case, the individual essentially provided "reasonable measures for early detection" of a condition rendering him unfit to perform activities within the scope of part 26. The petitioner further stated that rather than respecting the individual's judgment or seeking another opinion by a Medical Review Officer or other health care professional, Wackenhut fired that individual.

This Petition has been accepted for review pursuant to 10 CFR 2.206 of the NRC's regulations, and has been referred to the Director of the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation for action. In accordance with Section 2.206,

appropriate action will be taken on this Petition. The Petition and the NRC's acknowledgment letter are available in ADAMS for inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room (PDR), located at One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland, and from the ADAMS Public Library component on the NRC's Web site, <http://www.nrc.gov> (the Public Electronic Reading Room) at Accession Nos. ML011150296 and ML011410223, respectively. 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 Reference staff at 1-800-397-4209, 301-415-4737 or by e-mail to [pdr@nrc.gov](mailto:pdr@nrc.gov).

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 29th day of May 2001.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Jon R. Johnson,**

*Deputy Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 01-13896 Filed 6-1-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

## NUCLEAR WASTE TECHNICAL REVIEW BOARD

### Joint Panel Meeting: June 20-21, 2001—Las Vegas, Nevada

Discussions of the Department of Energy's Supplemental Science and Performance Analyses (SSPA) report, which is expected to be released around the time of the meeting. Presentations on how the SSPA addresses four priority areas previously identified by the Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board as essential elements of any recommendation of the possible repository site at Yucca Mountain, Nevada.

Pursuant to its authority under section 5051 of Public Law 100-203, Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 1987, on Wednesday, June 20, and Thursday, June 21, 2001, members of the Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board's (Board) Panel on Performance Assessment and its Panel on the Repository will hold a joint meeting in Las Vegas, Nevada, to discuss the U.S. Department of Energy's (DOE) Supplemental Science and Performance Analyses (SSPA). The SSPA, which is expected to be released around the time of the meeting, will cover recent scientific and engineering studies and analyses not reported in previous DOE publications related to the possible repository site at Yucca Mountain, Nevada. The meeting will be open to the public, and opportunities for public

comment will be provided. The Board is charged by Congress with reviewing the technical and scientific validity of DOE activities related to civilian radioactive waste management.

The joint panel meeting will be held at the Crowne Plaza Hotel, 4255 South Paradise Road, Las Vegas, Nevada 89109. The telephone number is (702) 369-4400; the fax number is (702) 369-3770. Meeting times are 1:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. on Wednesday, June 20, and 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. on Thursday, June 21.

On June 20, the DOE will present the purpose, content, and overall results of the SSPA.

On June 21, the DOE will describe in detail how the SSPA addresses four priority areas identified by the Board at its January 2001 meeting in Amargosa Valley, Nevada, as essential elements of any potential site recommendation:

- Meaningful quantification of conservatism and uncertainties in the DOE's performance assessments
- Progress in understanding the underlying fundamental processes involved in predicting the rate of waste package corrosion
- An evaluation and a comparison of the base-case repository design with a low-temperature design
- Development of multiple lines of evidence to support the safety case of the proposed repository. The lines of evidence should be derived independently of performance assessment and thus not be subject to the limitations of performance assessment.

Time will be set aside at the end of each day for public comments. Those wanting to speak are encouraged to sign the "Public Comment Register" at the check-in table. A time limit may have to be set on individual remarks, but written comments of any length may be submitted for the record. Interested parties also will have the opportunity to submit questions in writing.

A detailed agenda will be available approximately one week before the meeting. Copies of the agenda can be requested by telephone or obtained from the Board's Web site at [www.nwtrb.gov](http://www.nwtrb.gov). Transcripts of the meeting will be available on the Board's Web site, via e-mail, on computer disk, and on a library-loan basis in paper format from Davonya Barnes of the Board staff, beginning on July 30, 2001.

A block of rooms has been reserved at the Crowne Plaza. Reservations must be made by May 25 to receive the meeting rate. When making a reservation, please state that you are attending the Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board meeting. For more information, contact the

NWTRB: Karyn Severson, External Affairs; 2300 Clarendon Boulevard, Suite 1300; Arlington, Virginia 22201-3367; (tel) 703-235-4473; (fax) 703-235-4495; (e-mail) [info@nwtrb.gov](mailto:info@nwtrb.gov).

The Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board was created by Congress in the Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 1987. The Board's purpose is to evaluate the technical and scientific validity of activities undertaken by the Secretary of Energy related to managing the disposal of the nation's spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste. In the same legislation, Congress directed the DOE to characterize a site at Yucca Mountain, Nevada, to determine its suitability as the location of a potential repository for the permanent disposal of spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste.

Dated: May 17, 2001.

**William D. Barnard,**

*Executive Director, Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board.*

[FR Doc. 01-13868 Filed 6-1-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6820-A-M

## OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

### Proposed Collection; Comment Request for Reclearance of Previously Approved Collections; SF 85, SF 85P, SF 85P-S, SF 86, SF 86A

**AGENCY:** U.S. Office of Personnel Management.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (Public Law 104-13, May 2, 1995) and 5 CFR 1320.5(a)(1)(iv), this notice announces that OPM intends to submit to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) a request for reclearance of five (5) information collections described below and solicits comments on them. Executive Order 12968 dated August 2, 1995, establishes a uniform Federal personnel security program. In addition, Executive Order 10450 requires an investigation appropriate to position sensitivity level.

The Standard Form 85, Questionnaire for Non-Sensitive Positions, is completed by appointees to non-sensitive duties with the Federal government. Information collected on this form is used by the Office of Personnel Management and by other Federal agencies to initiate the background investigations required to determine basic suitability for Federal employment in accordance with 5 U.S.C. 3301, 3302 and 3304 and E.O. 10577 (5 CFR Rule V) as amended by E.O. 12107.