

Dated: May 10, 2001.

**Kathryn M. Turman,**

*Director, Office for Victims of Crime.*

[FR Doc. 01-12256 Filed 5-15-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-18-P

## NATIONAL FOUNDATION FOR THE ARTS AND HUMANITIES

### Institute of Museum and Library Services, Office of Research and Technology

#### Submission for OMB Review, Comment Request; Museum School Partnership Research

**AGENCY:** Institute of Museum and Library Services, NFAH.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The Institute of Museum Services has submitted the following public information request to the Office of Management and Budget for review and approval in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104-13, 44 U.S.C. Chapter 35). Currently, the Institute of Museum and Library Services is soliciting comments concerning a new collection entitled, Museum School Partnership Research. A copy of the proposed instrument, with applicable supporting documentation, may be obtained by calling the Institute of Museum and Library Services, Director, Office of Research and Technology, Rebecca Danvers (202) 606-2478. Individuals who use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TTY/TDD) may call (202) 606-8636.

Comments should be sent to Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Attn.: OMB Desk Officer for Education, Office of Management and Budget, Room 10235, Washington, DC 20503 (202) 395-7316, by June 15, 2001.

The OMB is particularly interested in comments which:

- Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility;
- Evaluate the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;
- Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and
- Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated,

electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, e.g., permitting electronic submission of responses.

#### BACKGROUND:

*Type of Review:* New.

*Agency:* Institute of Museum and Library Services.

*Title:* Museum School Partnership Research.

*OMB Number:* N/A.

*Affected Public:* Museums.

*Total Respondents:* 1,500.

*Frequency:* Once.

*Total Responses:* 1,500.

*Average Time per Response:* 90 minutes.

*Estimated Total Burden Hours:* 2,250 hours.

*Total Burden Cost (capital/startup):* \$0.

*Total Burden Cost (operating/maintenance):* \$0.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Mamie Bittner, Director, Public and Legislative Affairs, Institute of Museum and Library Services, 1100 Pennsylvania Ave., NW., Washington, DC 20506.

Dated: May 10, 2001.

**Mamie Bittner,**

*Director, Public and Legislative Affairs.*

[FR Doc. 01-12262 Filed 5-15-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7036-01-M

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50-390, 50-327, 50-328, 50-269, 50-260, 50-296; License Nos. NPF-90, DPR-77, DPR-79, DPR-33, DPR-52, DPR-68 EA 99-234]

### Tennessee Valley Authority, Watts Bar Nuclear Plant, Unit 1, Sequoyah Nuclear Plant, Units 1 & 2, Browns Ferry Nuclear Plant, Units 1, 2 & 3; Order Imposing Civil Monetary Penalty

#### I

Tennessee Valley Authority (Licensee) is the holder of Operating License Nos. NPF-90, DPR-77, DPR-79, DPR-33, DPR-52, DPR-68, issued by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC or Commission) on February 7, 1996, September 17, 1980, September 15, 1981, December 20, 1973, August 2, 1974, and July 2, 1976. The licenses authorize the Licensee to operate Watts Bar Nuclear Plant, Unit 1, Sequoyah Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2, and Browns Ferry Nuclear Plant, Units 1, 2, and 3, in accordance with the conditions specified therein.

#### II

An investigation of the Licensee's activities was completed on August 4,

1999. The results of this investigation indicated that the Licensee had not conducted its activities in full compliance with NRC requirements. A written Notice of Violation and Proposed Imposition of Civil Penalty (Notice) was served upon the Licensee by letter dated February 7, 2000. The Notice states the nature of the violation, the provision of the NRC's requirements that the Licensee had violated, and the amount of the civil penalty proposed for the violation.

The Licensee responded to the Notice in letters dated January 22, 2001, and March 9, 2001. In its response, the Licensee denied the violation and protested the proposed imposition of a civil penalty.

#### III

After consideration of the Licensee's response and the statements of fact, explanation, and argument for mitigation contained therein, the NRC staff has determined that the violation occurred as stated and that the penalty proposed for the violation designated in the Notice should be imposed.

#### IV

In view of the foregoing and pursuant to Section 234 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (Act), 42 U.S.C. 2282, and 10 CFR 2.205, it is hereby ordered that:

The Licensee pay a civil penalty in the amount of \$110,000 within 30 days of the date of this Order, in accordance with NUREG/BR-0254. In addition, at the time of making the payment, the Licensee shall submit a statement indicating when and by what method payment was made, to the Director, Office of Enforcement, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, MD 20852-2738.

#### V

The Licensee may request a hearing within 30 days of the date of this Order. Where good cause is shown, consideration will be given to extending the time to request a hearing. A request for extension of time must be made in writing to the Director, Office of Enforcement, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, and include a statement of good cause for the extension. A request for a hearing should be clearly marked as a "Request for an Enforcement Hearing" and shall be submitted to the Secretary, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, ATTN: Rulemakings and Adjudications Staff, Washington, DC 20555. Copies also shall be sent to the Director, Office of Enforcement, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory

Commission, Washington, DC 20555, to the Assistant General Counsel for Materials Litigation and Enforcement at the same address, and to the Regional Administrator, NRC Region II, 61 Forsyth Street, SW., Suite 23T85, Atlanta, Georgia 30303-8931.

If a hearing is requested, the Commission will issue an Order designating the time and place of the hearing. If the Licensee fails to request a hearing within 30 days of the date of this Order (or if written approval of an extension of time in which to request a hearing has not been granted), the provisions of this Order shall be effective without further proceedings. If payment has not been made by that time, the matter may be referred to the Attorney General for collection.

In the event the Licensee requests a hearing as provided above, the issues to be considered at such hearing shall be:

(a) Whether the Licensee was in violation of the Commission's requirements as set forth in the Notice referenced in Section II above, and

(b) Whether, on the basis of such violation, this Order should be sustained.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 4th day of May 2001.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**William F. Kane,**

*Deputy Executive Director for Regulatory Programs.*

[FR Doc. 01-12340 Filed 5-15-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Louisiana License Nos. LA-0577-L01; LA-7112-L01; LA-10207-L01]

### Request for Exemption From 10 CFR 34.20, Performance Requirements for Industrial Radiography Equipment; Environmental Assessment, Finding of No Significant Impact, and Notice of Opportunity for a Hearing

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission is considering authorizing Global X-ray & Testing Corporation, Bayou Testing Services Inc, Accurate NDE & Inspection L.L.C., and others an exemption to use pipeliner style radiography devices on lay barges in the Gulf of Mexico.

#### Environmental Assessment

##### Identification of the Proposed Action

Global X-ray & Testing Corporation, Morgan City, Louisiana; Bayou Testing Services, Inc, Amelia, Louisiana; Accurate NDE & Inspection L.L.C., Opelousas, Louisiana, (the applicants)

are licensed by the State of Louisiana to conduct industrial radiography operations. They have requested, in letters dated July 11, 2000, August 28, 2000, and September 18, 2000, respectively, that the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) grant them reciprocity, and an exemption from 10 CFR 34.20(a)(1), to use their pipeliner type radiography cameras (pipeliners) for pipeline radiography, on lay barges, in areas under exclusive Federal jurisdiction, within the Gulf of Mexico. Pipeliners are older model radiography cameras that do not meet the requirements of 10 CFR 34.20(a)(1). These regulations require equipment, used in industrial radiographic operations, to meet the requirements in ANSI N432-1980<sup>1</sup>. Each of the applicants are allowed to conduct similar operations in the State of Louisiana under an exemption granted in their state licenses, and they are requesting NRC exemptions under 10 CFR 150.20 "Recognition of Agreement States Licenses" (Reciprocity).

##### Need for the Proposed Action

The exemption is needed so that the applicants can conduct pipeline radiography on lay barges. The applicants contend that due to the design of the lay barges, and the limited space available, the pipeliner is the only device of its kind that will keep up with production rate on a lay barge, while at the same time provide a safe working environment for their radiographers and barge personnel.

##### Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

There will be no significant environmental impact from the proposed action due to the fact that no radioactive material is being released into the environment, and all of the radioactive material is wholly contained within the radiography camera, which is only used in an enclosed radiography stall on a lay barge.

During normal operation the external radiation dose levels will not be significantly greater than an approved radiography camera's normal operating external radiation dose levels. Compensatory safety measures will be in place at all times during the operation of the pipeliner device.

##### Alternatives to the Proposed Action

As required by section 102(2)(E) of NEPA (42 U.S.C. 4322(2)(E)), possible

<sup>1</sup>"Radiological Safety for the Design and Construction of Apparatus for Gamma Radiography (ANSI N432-1980)," (published as NBS Handbook 136, issued January 1981).

alternatives to the final action have been considered. The only alternative is to deny the exemption. This option was not considered practical, and there would be no gain in protecting the human environment. Denying the exemption request would force the applicants to revert to radiography cameras that are designed to meet ANSI N432-1980, but, according to the applicants, these cameras would not be easily adaptable to lay barge operations. The newer cameras would be similar to the pipeliners in that their radioactive material is housed as a sealed source and there would be no release of material to the environment. However, the newer cameras have associated equipment, such as a drive cable and guide tube, that would require additional space to perform radiography on pipelines. According to the applicant, this equipment becomes cumbersome and may get in the way as the pipe is moved through the lay barge. In the newer devices, the sealed source would have to be cranked out of the shielded position in the camera housing through a guide tube to the exposure head location where the radiograph takes place. Because this "crank out" action causes the source to be unshielded while the source is cranked out to the exposure head, the "restricted area" boundary must be increased and could cause a greater potential exposure to non-radiography personnel on the lay barge.

##### Alternative Use of Resources

No alternative use of resources was considered due to the reasons stated above.

##### Agencies and Persons Consulted

The State of Louisiana was contacted by telephone on 04/18/01 regarding this proposed action. The State of Louisiana did not object to the proposed action and had no additional comments.

##### Identification of Sources Used

Letters from the applicants to U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Region IV, Re: Global X-ray & Testing Corporation, Louisiana License No. LA-0577-L01, July 11, 2000; Bayou Testing Services Inc., Louisiana License No. LA-7112-L01, August 28, 2000; Accurate NDE & Inspection L.L.C., Louisiana License No. LA-10207-L01, September 18, 2000.

##### Finding of No Significant Impact

Based on the above environmental assessment, the Commission has concluded that environmental impacts that would be created by the proposed action would not have a significant