

Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 295, Arlington, Virginia 22230 or send email to tpierce@nsf.gov. Copies of the submission may be obtained by calling (703) 292-7555.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Teresa R. Pierce, Reports Clearance Officer at (703) 292-7555 or send email to tpierce@nsf.gov.

An agency may not conduct or sponsor a collection of information unless the collection of information displays a currently valid OMB control number and the agency informs potential persons who are to respond to the collection of information that such persons are not required to respond to the collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Title of Collection: National Science Foundation Information Technology Innovation Survey

OMB Control No.: 3145-NEW.

Abstract:

Proposed Project: The NSF plans to survey a nationally representative sample of about 3,750 U.S. businesses in selected manufacturing and service-sector industries. The survey is designed to collect information about the planning for and impact of technological innovation. Using Web and Computer-Assisted Telephone Interviewing technologies, firms will be asked about their strategic planning, use of technology, innovation activities based on information technology, factors influencing the decision to innovate, and the costs and expected benefits of information technology based innovation.

Use of the Information: The information will be used by NSF to: (1) Develop nationally representative profiles of corporate information technology innovators and users; (2) provide the means for comparative analyses among similar national studies; and (3) provide data for use by policy-makers to assist in understanding the development and use of information technology as they relate to formulating technology policy, regulatory reform, and other issues.

Estimate of Burden: Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 12 minutes per response.

Respondents: Business or other for-profit.

Estimated Number of Responses per Form: One.

Estimated Total Annual Burden or Respondents: 750 hours—3,750 respondents at 12 minutes per response.

Frequency of Responses: Once.

Dated: March 9, 2001.

Teresa R. Pierce,

Reports Clearance Officer.

[FR Doc. 01-6397 Filed 3-14-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555-01-M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50-334 and 50-412]

Pennsylvania Power Company, Ohio Edison Company, FirstEnergy Nuclear Operating Company, Beaver Valley Power Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2; Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is considering issuance of an amendment to Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-66 and NPF-73, issued to FirstEnergy Nuclear Operating Company, et al. (FENOC, the licensee), for operation of the Beaver Valley Power Station (BVPS), Unit Nos. 1 and 2, located in Shippingport, Pennsylvania.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed action would authorize revisions to the BVPS Updated Final Safety Analysis Reports (UFSARs) involving calculated doses and associated descriptions/information for selected Design Basis Accidents (DBAs). The following DBAs were revised as documented in the licensee's submittals for the BVPS, Unit 1 UFSAR (Exclusion Area Boundary (EAB) doses are calculated over the first 2 hours following the accident and all other doses are calculated over the duration of the accident).

Loss of Offsite AC Power

Changes include revisions to Table 14.1-3 to reflect corrected or conservative analysis input parameter values or input assumptions based on plant design and operation. The analysis methodology remained the same as had been previously reviewed and approved by the NRC for BVPS, Unit 1, and the revised analysis resulted in no increase in calculated doses.

Fuel-Handling Accident (FHA)

Changes include revisions to Section 14.2.1 and Tables 14.2-6 and 14.2-6a to reflect corrected or conservative analysis input parameter values or input assumptions based on plant design and operation. The analysis methodology remained the same as had been previously reviewed and approved by the NRC for BVPS, Unit 1. Because the

FHA dose analysis takes credit for removal of organic iodine by the supplemental leak collection and release system (SLCRS), the licensee added a safety factor of ≥ 2 in accordance with guidance given in Generic Letter (GL) 99-02, "Laboratory Testing of Nuclear-Grade Activated Charcoal." GL 99-02 guidance included testing nuclear-activated charcoal filters to a more stringent requirement (supported by the safety factor) than that assumed in the safety analysis to conservatively account for potential degradation to nuclear-grade charcoal filters over the surveillance interval. As a consequence of this safety factor, the calculated doses increased. The calculated thyroid dose at the EAB increased from 14.6 rem to 24.6 rem. The calculated control room operator thyroid dose increased from 3.2 rem to 6.26 rem. These doses are well within the applicable DBA dose guidelines set forth in Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations (10 CFR) Section 100.11 (EAB thyroid dose of 300 rem from iodine exposure) and 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix A, General Design Criterion (GDC) 19 (control room operator whole body dose of 5 rem or its equivalent to any organ).

Accidental Release of Waste Gas

Changes include revisions to Section 14.2.3 and Table 14.2-8 to reflect corrected or conservative analysis input parameter values or input assumptions based on plant design and operation. Some changes to the analysis methodology were made. As a result of the revisions to the analysis, the calculated control room whole body dose increased from less than .01 rem to .0295 rem.

Steam Generator Tube Rupture (SGTR)

Changes include revisions to Section 14.2.4 and Table 14.2-9 to reflect corrected or conservative analysis input parameter values or input assumptions based on plant design and operation. The methodology for the offsite dose analysis was changed to that of the current SGTR analysis of record for the control room operator dose. As a result, the calculated thyroid dose at the EAB for the coincident iodine spike increased from .9 rem to 1.37 rem.

Rod Cluster Control Assembly Ejection

Changes include revisions to Table 14.2.12 to reflect corrected or conservative analysis input parameter values or input assumptions based on plant design and operation. The analysis methodology remained the same as had been previously approved by the NRC for BVPS, Unit 1. The revised analysis

showed no increase in any calculated doses.

Single Reactor Coolant Pump Locked Rotor

Changes include revisions to Section 14.2.7 and Table 14.2-4b to reflect corrected or conservative analysis input parameter values or input assumptions based on plant design and operation. In addition, the coincident iodine spike, previously assumed to occur, is removed from the analysis, based on the assumption of 18-percent failed fuel. In its previous analysis of record, the licensee assumed both the coincident iodine spike and 18-percent failed fuel. SRP 15.3.3 guidance encourages the use of either of the assumptions but not both. The 18-percent failed fuel assumption is more conservative than the iodine spike occurrence assumption because the calculated dose consequences resulting from assuming 18-percent failed fuel are more severe than the calculated dose consequences resulting from the iodine spike occurrence. The revised analysis showed no increase in any calculated doses.

Loss of Reactor Coolant from Small Ruptured Pipes/Loss-of-Coolant Accidents (LOCA)

Changes include revisions to Section 14.3.5 and Tables 14.3-10, 14.3-13, and 14.3-14a to reflect corrected or conservative analysis input parameter values or input assumptions based on plant design and operation. In addition, some analysis methodology was revised. Shine from the area beneath the control room that is not within the control room ventilation envelope was added as an additional contributor to the control room dose. Also, because the LOCA dose analysis takes credit for removal of organic iodine by the SLCRS, the licensee added a safety factor of ≥ 2 in accordance with the guidance given in GL 99-02. As a result of the changes to the LOCA dose analysis, the calculated control room whole body dose increased from .17 rem to .71 rem.

The following DBAs were revised as documented in the licensee's submittals for the BVPS, Unit 2 UFSAR.

Steam System Piping Failures (Main Steam Line Break Accident)

Changes include revisions to Section 15.1.5 and Table 15.1-3 to reflect corrected or conservative analysis input parameter values or input assumptions based on plant design and operation. The analysis methodology remained the same as had been previously reviewed and approved by the NRC for BVPS,

Unit 2. The revised analysis showed no increase in any calculated doses.

Loss of AC Power

Changes include revisions to Section 15.2.6 and Table 15.2-2 to reflect corrected or conservative analysis input parameter values or input assumptions based on plant design and operation. The analysis methodology remained the same as had been previously reviewed and approved by the NRC for BVPS, Unit 2. The revised analysis showed no increase in any calculated doses.

Reactor Coolant Pump Shaft Seizure

Changes include revisions to Section 15.3.3 and Table 15.3-3 to reflect corrected or conservative analysis input parameter values or input assumptions based on plant design and operation. Unlike the previous analysis of record, isolation of the control room was not assumed to occur for the revised analysis. The control room isolation function remains operationally unchanged. It is conservatively not credited in the analysis. As a result, the calculated control room operator thyroid dose increased from 1.7 rem to 7.46 rem. This is well within the 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix A, GDC 19 DBA dose guidelines for control room operators.

Rod Cluster Control Assembly Ejection

Changes include revisions to Section 15.4.8 and Table 15.4-3 to reflect corrected or conservative analysis input parameter values or input assumptions based on plant design and operation. The analysis methodology remained the same as had been previously reviewed and approved by the NRC for BVPS, Unit 2. The revised analysis showed no increase in any calculated doses.

Failure of Small Lines Carrying Primary Coolant Outside Containment

Changes include revisions to Section 15.6.2 and Table 15.6-2 to reflect corrected or conservative analysis input parameter values or input assumptions based on plant design and operation. The analysis methodology remained the same as had been previously reviewed and approved by the NRC for BVPS, Unit 2. The revised analysis showed no increase in any calculated doses.

Steam Generator Tube Rupture

Changes include revisions to Section 15.6.3 and Table 15.6-5b to reflect corrected or conservative analysis input parameter values or input assumptions based on plant design and operation. The analysis methodology remained the same as had been previously reviewed and approved by the NRC for BVPS,

Unit 2. The revised analysis showed no increase in any calculated doses.

Loss-of-Coolant Accidents

Changes include revisions to Section 15.6.5 and Tables 15.6-11 and 15.6-12 to reflect corrected or conservative analysis input parameter values or input assumptions based on plant design and operation. The analysis methodology remained the same as had been previously reviewed and approved by the NRC for BVPS, Unit 2. As a result of the revisions, the calculated control room operator whole body dose increased from .32 rem to .33 rem and the calculated control room operator thyroid dose increased from 1.3 rem to 2 rem.

Waste Gas System Failures

Changes include revisions to Section 15.7.1 and Tables 15.7-1 and 15.7-2 to reflect corrected or conservative analysis input parameter values or input assumptions based on plant design and operation. The analysis methodology remained the same as had been previously reviewed and approved by the NRC for BVPS, Unit 2. The revised analysis showed no increase in any calculated doses.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application for amendment dated May 12, 2000, as supplemented on June 19, November 2, and December 1, 2000 and January 29, 2001.

The Need for the Proposed Action

The proposed revisions are a result of an extensive review by the licensee to assess the dose calculations' input parameter values, input assumptions, design basis consistency, calculation methodologies, and conservatism.

The change is not the result of hardware changes to the plant or a change in operating practices. The proposed changes reflect corrected or conservative analysis input parameters, assumptions, and new analysis methodologies. In addition, some changes were made in response to GL 99-02.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The NRC has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that the assumptions and methodologies used by the licensee in the analyses are acceptable and that there is reasonable assurance, in the event of a postulated DBA, that the calculated offsite doses would continue to be well within the 10 CFR part 100 guidelines, and the calculated control room operator doses would continue to be less than the 10

CFR part 50, Appendix A, GDC 19 guidelines.

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 Beaver Valley Power Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on February 1, 2000, the staff consulted with the Pennsylvania State official, Mr. L. Ryan, of the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection Bureau, Division of Nuclear Safety, 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 May 12, 2000, as supplemented on June 19, November 2, and December

1, 2000, and January 29, 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 9th day of March 2001.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Lawrence J. Burkhart,

Project Manager, Section 1, Project Directorate I, Division of Licensing Project Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 01–6405 Filed 3–14–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

PENSION BENEFIT GUARANTY CORPORATION

Interest Assumption for Determining Variable-Rate Premium; Interest Assumptions for Multiemployer Plan Valuations Following Mass Withdrawal

AGENCY: Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation.

ACTION: Notice of interest rates and assumptions.

SUMMARY: This notice informs the public of the interest rates and assumptions to be used under certain Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation regulations. These rates and assumptions are published elsewhere (or are derivable from rates published elsewhere), but are collected and published in this notice for the convenience of the public. Interest rates are also published on the PBGC’s web site (<http://www.pbgc.gov>).

DATES: The interest rate for determining the variable-rate premium under part 4006 applies to premium payment years beginning in March 2001. The interest assumptions for performing multiemployer plan valuations following mass withdrawal under part 4281 apply to valuation dates occurring in April 2001.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Harold J. Ashner, Assistant General Counsel, Office of the General Counsel, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, 1200 K Street, NW., Washington, DC 20005, 202–326–4024. (For TTY/TDD users, call the Federal relay service toll-free at 1–800–877–8339 and ask to be connected to 202–326–4024.)

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Variable-Rate Premiums

Section 4006(a)(3)(E)(iii)(II) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (ERISA) and § 4006.4(b)(1) of the PBGC’s regulation on Premium Rates (29 CFR part 4006) prescribe use of an assumed interest rate in determining a single-employer plan’s variable-rate premium. The rate is the “applicable percentage” (currently 85 percent) of the annual yield on 30-year Treasury securities for the month preceding the beginning of the plan year for which premiums are being paid (the “premium payment year”). The yield figure is reported in Federal Reserve Statistical Releases G.13 and H.15.

The assumed interest rate to be used in determining variable-rate premiums for premium payment years beginning in March 2001 is 4.63 percent (i.e., 85 percent of the 5.45 percent yield figure for February 2001).

The following table lists the assumed interest rates to be used in determining variable-rate premiums for premium payment years beginning between April 2000 and March 2001.

For premium payment years beginning in:	The assumed interest rate is:
April 2000	5.14
May 2000	4.97
June 2000	5.23
July 2000	5.04
August 2000	4.97
September 2000	4.86
October 2000	4.96
November 2000	4.93
December 2000	4.91
January 2001	4.67
February 2001	4.71
March 2001	4.63

Multiemployer Plan Valuations Following Mass Withdrawal

The PBGC’s regulation on Duties of Plan Sponsor Following Mass Withdrawal (29 CFR part 4281) prescribes the use of interest assumptions under the PBGC’s regulation on Allocation of Assets in Single-employer Plans (29 CFR part 4044). The interest assumptions applicable to valuation dates in April 2001 under part 4044 are contained in an amendment to part 4044 published elsewhere in today’s **Federal Register**. Tables showing the assumptions applicable to prior periods are codified in appendix B to 29 CFR part 4044.

Issued in Washington, DC, on this 12th day of March 2001.

John Seal,

Acting Executive Director, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation.

[FR Doc. 01–6487 Filed 3–14–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7708–01–P