was approved for use under NRC part 71 general license provisions. Hypothetical accident condition testing was not part of the requirements at the time this package was certified by the user. FEMA has acknowledged that the package would not survive hypothetical accident conditions that involved more than a 10 foot drop or a puncture of the package and that a radiological release could occur and has proposed compensatory safety measures that will provide an adequate level of safety consistent with the requirements of 10 CFR 71.8 by providing effective response to such a postulated accident. These compensatory measures include: (1) Pre and post-packing inspection for radiation hazard and proper packaging, (2) use of an exclusive use vehicle, (3) persons trained in radiation protection escorting the exclusive use vehicle, and (4) operational controls and procedures that would minimize accident risk and would ensure public safety in the event of a transportation accident. The NRC staff concluded by evaluation that the operations and administrative controls proposed by FEMA for the shipment provide reasonable assurance that any radiation exposure to the public or workers will not exceed regulatory limits in the event of an accident during shipment because of the quick response to such an event. Additionally, FEMA has selected transportation routes that will limit the road mileage traveled, further reducing the likelihood of an accident.

The staff concurs with FEMA's safety evaluation of the proposed exemption request and finds that FEMA's planned compensatory measures ensure that use of the package in accordance with the exemption requested does not pose a significant increased risk to public health and safety. Furthermore, the proposed action now under consideration would not change the potential environmental effects assessed in the 10 CFR part 71 rulemaking (40 FR 23768 (1977)).

Therefore, the staff has determined that there will be no significant environmental impacts as a result of approving the exemption for the one-time shipment of the specified calibrators.

Alternatives to the Proposed Action: The staff evaluated an alternative involving removal of the radioactive source at each site and found that this alternative produced a greater occupational exposure (200 mrem versus 20 mrem if shipped under the exemption), and an increased potential for radiation exposure to members of the public. Both of these results are not consistent with the NRC's as low as reasonably achievable (ALARA) concept, and this alternative would also result in increased handling and storage costs. Another alternative to the proposed action would be to require the state to continue to possess and store these calibrators until such time as FEMA can procure funding to design, test, and obtain NRC approval, and construct a transportation package that meets all 10 CFR part 71 requirements. This alternative would increase the likelihood of loss of control of material currently in the hands of state licensees which have lost Federal funding for their radiation protection programs. As such, both of the alternatives are less desirable than the proposed action.

Agencies and Persons Consulted: Officials from the DOT Office of Hazardous Materials Technology, and the Bureau of Radiological Health, Virginia Department of Health, were contacted about the EA for the proposed action and had no concerns.

Finding of No Significant Impact

The environmental impacts of the proposed action have been reviewed in accordance with the requirements set forth in 10 CFR part 51. Based upon the foregoing EA, the Commission finds that the proposed action of approving a package with an exemption from 10 CFR 71.73(c)(1) and (3) so that FEMA may transport ten calibrators containing cesium-137 will not significantly impact the quality of the human environment. Accordingly, the Commission has determined not to prepare an environmental impact statement for the proposed exemption.

For further details with respect to this exemption request, see the FEMA exemption request dated July 21, 1999, and FEMA's Safety Analysis and Environmental Report dated December 19, 2000, as supplemented February 13, and March 9, 2001, which are docketed under 10 CFR part 30, Docket No. 30–7130.

The exemption request is available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville, MD 20852, or from the publicly available records component of NRC's Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS). ADAMS is accessible from the NRC web site at *http://www.nrc.gov/NRC/ADAMS/index.html* (the Public Electronic Reading Room).

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 12th day of April 2001.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

E. William Brach,

Director, Spent Fuel Project Office, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.

[FR Doc. 01–9952 Filed 4–20–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50–412]

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

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is considering issuance of an exemption from certain requirements of its regulations for Facility Operating License No. NPF–73, issued to FirstEnergy Nuclear Operating Company, et al. (the licensee), for operation of Beaver Valley Power Station, Unit No. 2 (BVPS–2), located in Shippingport, Pennsylvania.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed action would exempt the licensee from the requirements of Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations (10 CFR) Section 50.71(e)(4) regarding submission of revisions to the Final Safety Analysis Report (FSAR) for BVPS–2. The proposed action would extend the regulatory requirement for submission of the next required update to the BVPS–2 FSAR from April 25, 2001, to August 23, 2001. The revision submitted would be required to reflect all changes made from the date the last revision was filed on April 30, 1999, to October 25, 2000 (6 months prior to the originally-required filing date of April 25, 2000).

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application for exemption dated March 13, 2001 (Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS) Accession No. ML010790328).

The Need for the Proposed Action

Section 50.71(e)(4) requires licensees to submit updates to their FSAR within 6 months after each refueling outage providing that the interval between successive updates does not exceed 24 months. BVPS–2's most recent refueling outage was completed on October 25, 2000, and the most recent revision to the BVPS–2 FSAR was filed on April 30, 1999. In order to comply with 10 CFR 50.71(e)(4), the licensee would need to

file its latest update to the BVPS–2 FSAR by April 25, 2001.

The need for the proposed action is based on taking advantage of the efficiencies of the NRC's recently commenced electronic information exchange (EIE) process which allows licensee's to voluntarily submit documents to the NRC over the internet or on a CD–ROM. The NRC issued Regulatory Issue Summary 2001–05, ''Guidance on Submitting Documents to the NRC by Electronic Information Exchange or on CD–ROM,'' on January 25, 2001 (ADAMS Accession No. ML003768343). The proposed action is requested due to the extensive nature of the planned FSAR revision (expected to exceed 1000 pages). Use of licensee and NRC resources to update the numerous hardcopies of the FSAR can be substantially reduced by providing an electronic version of the revised FSAR in its entirety. An additional 120 days from the currently required filing date reflects the licensee's estimated time required for production of an electronic version in lieu of the hardcopies.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The NRC has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that the proposed action is administrative in nature and is unrelated to plant operations.

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 BVPS–2, dated September 30, 1985 (Nuclear Documents System (NUDOCS) Accession No. 8509300559).

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on March 23, 2001, the NRC 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 March 13, 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 17th day of April 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. 01–9955 Filed 4–20–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET

Cumulative Report on Rescissions and Deferrals

April 1, 2001.

Section 1014(e) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (Public Law 93–344) requires a monthly report listing all budget authority for the current fiscal year for which, as of the first day of the month, a special message had been transmitted to Congress.

This report gives the status, as of April 1, 2001, of two deferrals contained in one special message for FY 2001. The message was transmitted to Congress on January 18, 2001.

Deferrals (Attachments A and B)

As of April 1, 2001, $1.6 billion in budget authority was being deferred from obligation. Attachment B shows the status of each deferral reported during FY 2001.

Information from Special Message

The special message containing information on the deferrals that are covered by this cumulative report is printed in the edition of the **Federal Register** cited below:

66 FR 8985, Monday, February 5, 2001

Mitchell E. Daniels, Jr.,

Director.

ATTACHMENT A—STATUS OF FY 2001 DEFERRALS

[In millions of dollars]

	Budgetary resources
Deferrals proposed by the President	1,946.7
Routine Executive releases through April 1, 2001	−343.6
Overturned by the Congress	.....
Currently before the Congress	1,603.1

BILLING CODE 3110–01–U