Information pertaining to the requirement to be submitted:

1. *Type of submission, new, revision, or extension:* Extension.

2. *The title of the information collection:* 10 CFR Part 60—''Disposal of High-Level Radioactive Wastes in Geologic Repositories.''

3. *The form number, if applicable:* N/A.

4. *How often the collection is required:* The information need only be submitted one time.

5. *Who is required or asked to report:* State or Indian Tribes, or their representatives, requesting consultation with the NRC staff regarding review of a potential high-level waste geologic repository site, or wishing to participate in a license application review for a potential geologic repository.

6. *An estimate of the number of responses:* Six.

7. *The number of annual respondents:* Two.

8. *The number of hours needed annually to complete the requirement or request:* An average of 40 hours per response for consultation requests, 80 hours per response for license application review participation proposals, and 1 hour per response for statements of representative authority. The total burden for all responses is estimated to be 242 hours.

9. *An indication of whether Section 3507(d), Pub. L. 104–13 applies:* Not applicable.

10. Abstract: Part 60 requires States and Indian Tribes to submit certain information to the NRC if they request consultation with the NRC staff concerning the review of a potential repository site, or wish to participate in a license application review for a potential repository. Representatives of States or Indian Tribes must submit a statement of their authority to act in such a representative capacity. The information submitted by the States and Indian Tribes is used by the Director of the Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards as a basis for decisions about the commitment of NRC staff resources to the consultation and participation efforts. On February 22, 1999, the Commission proposed to modify its generic criteria for disposal of spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive wastes in geologic repositories at 10 CFR part 60 to make clear that they will not apply, nor be the subject of litigation, in any NRC licensing proceeding for a repository at Yucca Mountain (64 FR 8639). Information collection requirements applicable to the licensing of a geologic repository at Yucca Mountain were proposed at that time, in 10 CFR part 63, and will be issued later this year.

A copy of the final supporting statement may be viewed free of charge at the NRC Public Document Room, 2120 L Street, NW (lower level), Washington, DC. OMB clearance requests are available at the NRC worldwide web site (http://www.nrc.gov/NRC/PUBLIC/OMB/index.html). The document will be available on the NRC home page site for 60 days after the signature date of this notice.

Comments and questions should be directed to the OMB reviewer by May 30, 2000: Erik Godwin, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs (3150–0143), NEOB–10202, Office of Management and Budget, Washington, DC 20503.

Comments can also be submitted by telephone at (202) 395–3087.

The NRC Clearance Officer is Brenda Jo. Shelton, 301–415–7233.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 21st day of April, 2000.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Brenda Jo. Shelton,

NRC Clearance Officer, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 00–10663 Filed 4–27–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50–282 and 50–306]

Northern States Power Company; Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendments to Facility Operating Licenses DPR–42 and DPR–60, Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity for a Hearing

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of amendments to Facility Operating Licenses DPR–42 and DPR–60 issued to Northern States Power Company (the licensee) for operation of the Prairie Island Nuclear Generating Plant, Units 1 and 2, located in Goodhue County, Minnesota.

The proposed amendments would relocate the shutdown margin requirements from the Technical Specifications to the Core Operating Limits Report (COLR).

Before issuance of the proposed license amendments, the Commission will have made findings required by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act) and the Commission's regulations.

The Commission has made a proposed determination that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration. Under the Commission's regulations in 10 CFR 50.92, this means that operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendments would not (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; or (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

1. The proposed amendment[s] will not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The proposed changes do not affect any systems that is a contributor to initiating events for previously evaluated design basis accidents. The proposed changes do not involve any system changes or modifications. No systems or equipment will be operated in a new manner as a result of the proposed changes. Therefore, the proposed changes do not involve a significant increase in the probability of an accident previously evaluated.

Relocation of the shutdown margin requirements to the COLR is an administrative change. The shutdown margin requirements being incorporated into the COLR will be developed using NRC approved methodology. That methodology will establish the minimum required shutdown margin for a dilution accident during Modes 3, 4, 5, and 6 and will ensure that a complete loss of shutdown margin will not occur for at least twenty-four minutes from initiation of the dilution as specified in the Prairie Island USAR [Updated Safety Analysis Report]. Therefore, the relocation of the shutdown margin requirements to the COLR will not result in any increase in the consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The proposed changes to Table TS.1–1 invoke an additional third criteria for shutdown margin during MODE 6. This proposed change involves an additional restriction designed to ensure that shutdown margin is maintained during MODE 6 operation, and as such will not result in any increase in the consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

Therefore, based on the conclusions of the above analysis, the proposed changes do not involve a significant increase in the probability of consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. The proposed amendment[s] will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously analyzed.

The proposed changes do not alter the design or function of any plant component and do not install any new or different equipment. The proposed changes do not alter the operation of any plant component in a manner which could lead to a new or

different kind of accident. Therefore, the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from those previously analyzed has not been created.

3. The proposed amendment[s] will not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety.

Relocation of the shutdown margin requirements to the COLR is an administrative change. The shutdown margin requirements being incorporated into the COLR will be developed using NRC approved methodology. That methodology will establish the minimum required shutdown margin for a dilution accident during Modes 3, 4, 5 and 6 will ensure that a complete loss of shutdown margin will not occur for at least twenty-four minutes from initiation of the dilution as specified in the Prairie Island USAR. Therefore, the relocation of the shutdown margin requirements to the COLR will not reduce the margin of safety because it has no effect on any safety analyses assumptions.

The proposed changes to Table TS.1–1 invoke an additional third criteria for shutdown margin during MODE 6. This proposed change involves an additional restriction designed to enhance plant safety by ensuring that shutdown margin is maintained during MODE 6 operation. The imposition of more restrictive requirements either has no effect on or increase the margin of plant safety. The change maintains requirements within the safety analyses and licensing basis. Therefore, the proposed changes to Table TS.1–1 do not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety.

Therefore, based on the conclusions of the above analysis, the proposed changes do not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

The Commission is seeking public comments on this proposed determination. Any comments received within 30 days after the date of publication of this notice will be considered in making any final determination.

Normally, the Commission will not issue the amendment until the expiration of the 30-day notice period. However, should circumstances change during the notice period such that failure to act in a timely way would result, for example, in derating or shutdown of the facility, the Commission may issue the license amendment before the expiration of the 30-day notice period, provided that its final determination is that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration. The final determination will consider all public and State comments received. Should the Commission take this action, it will publish in the **Federal Register** a notice of issuance and provide for opportunity for a hearing after issuance. The Commission expects that the need to take this action will occur very infrequently.

Written comments may be submitted by mail to the Chief, Rules and Directives Branch, Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001, and should cite the publication date and page number of this **Federal Register** notice. Written comments may also be delivered to Room 6D59, Two White Flint North, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland, from 7:30 a.m. to 4:15 p.m. Federal workdays. Copies of written comments received may be examined at the NRC Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC.

The filing of requests for hearing and petitions for leave to intervene is discussed below.

By May 30, 2000, the licensee may file a request for a hearing with respect to issuance of the amendment to the subject facility operating license and any person whose interest may be affected by this proceeding and who wishes to participate as a party in the proceeding must file a written request for a hearing and a petition for leave to intervene. Requests for a hearing and a petition for leave to intervene shall be filed in accordance with the Commission's ''Rules of Practice for Domestic Licensing Proceedings'' in 10 CFR part 2. Interested persons should consult a current copy of 10 CFR 2.714 which is available at the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, and accessible electronically through the ADAMS Public Electronic Reading Room link at the NRC Web site (http://www.nrc.gov). If a request for a hearing or petition for leave to intervene is filed by the above date, the Commission or an Atomic Safety and Licensing Board, designated by the Commission or by the Chairman of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, will rule on the request and/or petition; and the Secretary or the designated Atomic Safety and Licensing Board will issue a notice of hearing or an appropriate order.

As required by 10 CFR 2.714, a petition for leave to intervene shall set forth with particularity the interest of the petitioner in the proceeding, and how that interest may be affected by the results of the proceeding. The petition should specifically explain the reasons why intervention should be permitted with particular reference to the following factors: (1) The nature of the petitioner's right under the Act to be made party to the proceeding; (2) the nature and extent of the petitioner's property, financial, or other interest in the proceeding; and (3) the possible effect of any order which may be entered in the proceeding on the petitioner's interest. The petition should also identify the specific aspect(s) of the subject matter of the proceeding as to which petitioner wishes to intervene. Any person who has filed a petition for leave to intervene or who has been admitted as a party may amend the petition without requesting leave of the Board up to 15 days prior to the first prehearing conference scheduled in the proceeding, but such an amended petition must satisfy the specificity requirements described above.

Not later than 15 days prior to the first prehearing conference scheduled in the proceeding, a petitioner shall file a supplement to the petition to intervene which must include a list of the contentions which are sought to be litigated in the matter. Each contention must consist of a specific statement of the issue of law or fact to be raised or controverted. In addition, the petitioner shall provide a brief explanation of the bases of the contention and a concise statement of the alleged facts or expert opinion which support the contention and on which the petitioner intends to rely in proving the contention at the hearing. The petitioner must also provide references to those specific sources and documents of which the petitioner is aware and on which the petitioner intends to rely to establish those facts or expert opinion. Petitioner must provide sufficient information to show that a genuine dispute exists with the applicant on a material issue of law or fact. Contentions shall be limited to matters within the scope of the amendment under consideration. The contention must be one which, if proven, would entitle the petitioner to relief. A petitioner who fails to file such a supplement which satisfies these requirements with respect to at least one contention will not be permitted to participate as a party.

Those permitted to intervene become parties to the proceeding, subject to any limitations in the order granting leave to intervene, and have the opportunity to participate fully in the conduct of the hearing, including the opportunity to present evidence and cross-examine witnesses.

If a hearing is requested, the Commission will make a final determination on the issue of no

significant hazards consideration. The final determination will serve to decide when the hearing is held.

If the final determination is that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration, the Commission may issue the amendment and make it immediately effective, notwithstanding the request for a hearing. Any hearing held would take place after issuance of the amendment.

If the final determination is that the amendment request involves a significant hazards consideration, any hearing held would take place before the issuance of any amendment.

A request for a hearing or a petition for leave to intervene must be filed with the Secretary of the Commission, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001, Attention: Rulemakings and Adjudications Staff, or may be delivered to the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, by close of business on the above date. A copy of the petition should also be sent to the Office of the General Counsel, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001, and to Jay Silberg, Esq., Shaw, Pittman, Potts, and Trowbridge, 2300 N Street, NW, Washington, DC 20037, attorney for the licensee.

Nontimely filings of petitions for leave to intervene, amended petitions, supplemental petitions and/or requests for hearing will not be entertained absent a determination by the Commission, the presiding officer or the presiding Atomic Safety and Licensing Board that the petition and/or request should be granted based upon a balancing of the factors specified in 10 CFR 2.714(a)(1)(i)–(v) and 2.714(d).

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendment dated April 12, 1999, which is available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, and accessible electronically through the ADAMS Public Electronic Reading Room link at the NRC Web site (http://www.nrc.gov).

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 25th day of April 2000.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Tae Kim,

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

[FR Doc. 00–10665 Filed 4–27–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50–282 and 50–306]

Northern States Power Company; Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendments to Facility Operating Licenses DPR–42 AND DPR–60, Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity for a Hearing

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of amendments to Facility Operating Licenses DPR–42 and DPR–60 issued to Northern States Power Company (the licensee) for operation of the Prairie Island Nuclear Generating Plant (PINGP), Units 1 and 2, located in Goodhue County, Minnesota.

The proposed amendments would revise License Condition 2.C.4, ''Fire Protection,'' to correct cited references. More specifically, the amendments would remove the reference to NRC safety evaluations dated September 12, 1984, and June 25, 1985, from the current License Condition 2.C.4, and would also correct the date of a safety evaluation cited.

Before issuance of the proposed license amendments, the Commission will have made findings required by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act) and the Commission's regulations.

The Commission has made a proposed determination that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration. Under the Commission's regulations in 10 CFR 50.92, this means that operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendments would not (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; or (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

1. The proposed amendment[s] will not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of [any] accident previously evaluated.

The proposed changes are administrative in nature. The proposed changes clarify section 2.C.4 of the PINGP [Prairie Island Nuclear Generating Plant] Unit 1 and Unit 2 Operating Licenses as to which SER's [safety evaluation report's] approved the PINGP fire protection program. The proposed changes do not involve any change to the configuration or method of operation of any plant equipment that is used to mitigate the consequences of an accident, nor do they affect any assumptions or conditions in any of the accident analyses. Since the accident analyses remain bounding, their radiological consequences are not adversely affected.

Therefore, the proposed changes will not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. The proposed amendment[s] will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated?

The proposed changes are administrative in nature. The proposed changes clarify section 2.C.4 of the PINGP Unit 1 and Unit 2 Operating Licenses as to which SER's approved the PINGP fire protection program. The proposed changes do not involve any change to the configuration or method of operation of any plant equipment.

Therefore, the proposed changes will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident.

3. The proposed amendment[s] will not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety?

The proposed changes are administrative in nature. The proposed changes clarify section 2.C.4 of the PINGP Unit 1 and Unit 2 Operating Licenses as to which SER's approved the PINGP fire protection program.

Therefore, the proposed changes will not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

The Commission is seeking public comments on this proposed determination. Any comments received within 30 days after the date of publication of this notice will be considered in making any final determination.

Normally, the Commission will not issue the amendment until the expiration of the 30-day notice period. However, should circumstances change during the notice period such that failure to act in a timely way would result, for example, in derating or shutdown of the facility, the Commission may issue the license amendment before the expiration of the 30-day notice period, provided that its final determination is that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration. The final determination will consider all public and State comments received. Should the Commission take this action, it will publish in the **Federal Register** a notice of issuance and provide for opportunity for a hearing after issuance. The Commission expects that the need to