provisions and requirements as are set forth in the licensee's 10 CFR 73.55 physical security plan, with additional conditions and exceptions.

Alternatively, an ISFSI can be constructed under a 10 CFR part 72-specific license, which requires a licensee to develop a detailed security plan in accordance with 10 CFR 73.51, ''Requirements for the physical protection of stored spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste.'' The design objective of 10 CFR 73.51 is to protect against a loss of control of the facility that could be sufficient to cause radiation exposure exceeding the dose as described in 10 CFR 72.106, ''Controlled area of an ISFSI or MRS [monitored retrievable storage].''

In an August 21, 2000, **Federal Register** notice (FRN) (65 FR 50606), the Commission clarified portions of 10 CFR Part 72, stating that the requirements of 10 CFR 72.106 apply to ISFSIs with either general or specific licenses. The offsite dose limits of 10 CFR 72.106 are defined such that any individual on or beyond the nearest boundary of the controlled area may not receive from any design basis accident the more limiting of a total effective dose equivalent of 0.05 Sv (5 rem) or the sum of the deep-dose equivalent and the committed dose equivalent to any individual organ or tissue of 0.5 Sv (50 rem).

2.0 Request

Pursuant to 10 CFR 72.212(b)(5), licensees who store their spent fuel under the provisions of 10 CFR part 72, Subpart K, ''General License for Storage of Spent Fuel at Power Reactor Sites,'' as MYAPC proposes to do, are required to ''Protect the spent fuel against the design basis threat of radiological sabotage in accordance with the same provisions and requirements as are set forth * * *'' in 10 CFR 73.55.

By letter dated January 4, 2001, as supplemented by letters dated March 12 and April 4, 2001, the licensee requested an exemption from the requirements of 10 CFR 72.212(b)(5) to ''Protect the spent fuel [in the MYAPS ISFSI currently under construction] against the design basis threat of radiological sabotage, in accordance with the same provisions and requirements as are set forth * * *'' in 10 CFR 73.55. MYAPC proposed alternative approaches to meet the provisions of portions of 10 CFR 73.55(b) through (h) related to the security organization, physical barriers, access requirements, detection aids, communications, and response requirements. By this same correspondence, the licensee also requested a license amendment that would revise its license to reference the revisions of the Physical Security Plan, Guard Training and Qualification Plan, and Safeguards Contingency Plan, provided in its supplemental letter dated March 12, 2001, and made available a copy of the MYAPC plans to assist the staff in its review of the exemption and amendment requests.

3.0 Discussion

Pursuant to 10 CFR 72.7, ''Specific exemptions,'' and 10 CFR 73.5, ''Specific exemptions,'' the Commission may, upon application by any interested person or upon its own initiative, grant exemptions from the requirements of the regulations that it determines are authorized by law and will not endanger life or property or the common defense and security and are otherwise in the public interest. Pursuant to 10 CFR 73.55(a), the Commission may authorize a licensee to provide measures for protection against radiological sabotage other than those specified in the regulations if the licensee demonstrates that the measures have the same high assurance objective as specified in 10 CFR 73.55(a) and that the overall level of system performance provides protection against radiological sabotage equivalent to that which could be provided by paragraphs (b) through (h) of 10 CFR 73.55.

In its submittal, MYAPC requested an exemption from the provisions of 10 CFR 72.212(b)(5) for protecting the spent fuel against the DBT of radiological sabotage. The staff concluded that MYAPC has not justified an exemption from the requirements of 10 CFR 72.212(b)(5), that licensees with general licenses protect the spent fuel against the DBT of radiological sabotage. The staff has reviewed the proposed MYAPC ISFSI and Fuel in Transit (FIT) Physical Protection Programs against the requirements of each section of 10 CFR 73.55 that 10 CFR 72.212(b)(5) references to determine whether the alternative measures that MYAPC proposed should be authorized pursuant to 10 CFR 73.55(a), or whether specific exemptions should be granted from the requirements of these regulations. As part of its review, the staff evaluated the offsite dose that would result from unimpeded access by the DBT of radiological sabotage without protracted loss of control of the facility. On the basis of MYAPC's plan in the ISFSI Physical Protection Program to maintain the boundary of its controlled area at a minimum of 300 meters from the dry cask storage installation and provisions in the ISFSI Physical Protection Program that provide the capability to summon off-site local law-enforcement agency response forces to preclude a protracted loss of control of the facility, the staff concluded that the DBT of radiological sabotage would result in an offsite dose well below the 10 CFR 72.106(b) limits. The staff therefore concluded that the alternative measures proposed by MYAPC are authorized pursuant to 10 CFR 73.55(a), with one exception. With regard to the requirements of 10 CFR 73.55(d)(5), the staff concluded that the measures proposed by MYAPC did not meet the criteria of 10 CFR 73.55(a) to be authorized as alternative measures. However, the staff concluded that pursuant to 10 CFR 72.7 and 10 CFR 73.5, the proposed alternatives to the requirements of 10 CFR 73.55(d)(5) that MYAPC requested could be granted as an exemption. A detailed discussion of the staff's evaluation is contained in the safety evaluation supporting these findings dated July 25, 2001.

4.0 Conclusion

Accordingly, the Commission has determined that, pursuant to 10 CFR 72.7 and 10 CFR 73.5, exemption from the requirements of 10 CFR 73.55(d)(5) related to access requirements is authorized by law, will not endanger life or property or the common defense and security, and are otherwise in the public interest.

Pursuant to 10 CFR 51.32, ''Finding of no significant impact,'' the Commission has previously determined that the granting of this exemption will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment (66 FR 31699, dated June 12, 2001).

This exemption is effective upon issuance.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 25th day of July 2001.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

John A. Zwolinski,

Director, Division of Licensing Project Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 01–19024 Filed 7–30–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request for Review of An Expiring Information Collection: Standard Form 2808

AGENCY: Office of Personnel Management.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104–13, May 22, 1995), this notice announces that the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) has submitted to the Office of Management and Budget a request for review of an expiring information collection. SF 2808, Designation of Beneficiary: Civil Service Retirement System (CSRS), is used by persons covered by CSRS to designate a beneficiary to receive the lump sum payment due from the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund in the event of their death.

Approximately 2,000 SF 2808 forms will be completed annually. We estimate it takes approximately 15 minutes to complete the form. The annual burden is estimated at 500 hours.

For copies of this proposal, contact Mary Beth Smith-Toomey on (202) 606–2150, FAX (202) 418–3251 or E-mail to mbtoomey@opm.gov. Please include a mailing address with your request.

DATES: Comments on this proposal should be received on or before August 30, 2001.

ADDRESSES: Send or deliver comments to—Ronald W. Melton, Chief, Operations Support Division, Retirement and Insurance Service, U.S. Office of Personnel Management, 1900 E Street, NW, Room 3349, Washington, DC 20415 and Joseph Lackey, OPM Desk Officer, Officer of Information & Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management & Budget, New Executive Office Building, NW, Room 10235, Washington, DC 20503.

FOR INFORMATION REGARDING ADMINISTRATIVE COORDINATION—CONTACT: Donna G. Lease, Team Leader, Forms Analysis and Design, Budget and Administrative Services Division, (202) 606–0623.

Office of Personnel Management.

Kay Coles James,

Director.

[FR Doc. 01–19009 Filed 7–30–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6325–50–P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34–44584; File No. SR–MSRB–2001–05]

Self-Regulatory Organizations; Notice of Filing and Immediate Effectiveness of Proposed Rule Change and Amendment Thereto by the Municipal Securities Rulemaking Board Relating to Municipal Fund Securities and Qualification of Municipal Securities Principals, Operative on August 6, 2001

July 23, 2001.

Pursuant to Section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (the ''Exchange Act'') and Rule 19b–4 thereunder,[1] notice is hereby given that on July 5, 2001, the Municipal Securities Rulemaking Board (the ''MSRB'') filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission (the ''Commission'') a proposed rule change (File No. SR–MSRB–2001–05) (the ''proposed rule change''). The MSRB subsequently filed an amendment to the proposed rule change with the Commission on July 11, 2001 (together with the proposed rule change, the ''Proposed Rule Change''). The Proposed Rule Change is described in Items I, II, and III below, which Items have been prepared by the MSRB. The Commission is publishing this notice to solicit comments on the Proposed Rule Change from interested persons.

I. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Terms of Substance of the Proposed Rule Change

The MSRB has filed with the Commission a Proposed Rule Change consisting of an amendment to rule G–3, on professional qualifications. The Proposed Rule Change will become operative on August 6, 2001. The text of the Proposed Rule Change is set forth below. Additions are italicized.

Rule G–3—Classification of Principals and Representatives; Numerical Requirements; Testing; Continuing Education Requirements

(a) No change.

(b) Municipal Securities Principal.

(i)–(iii) No change.

(iv) Temporary Provisions for Municipal Fund Securities Limited Principal. Until July 31, 2002, the following provisions shall apply to any broker, dealer or municipal securities dealer whose municipal securities activities are limited exclusively to municipal fund securities:

(A) notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (b)(ii), the broker, dealer or municipal securities dealer may designate any person who has taken and passed the General Securities Principal Qualification Examination or Investment Company and Annuity Principal Qualification Examination as a municipal fund securities limited principal.

(B) any municipal fund securities limited principal designated as provided in subparagraph (b)(iv)(A) may undertake all actions required or permitted under any Board rule to be taken by a municipal securities principal.

(C) the broker, dealer or municipal securities dealer may count one municipal fund securities limited principal toward the numerical requirement for municipal securities principal set forth in paragraph (b)(iii); provided that, if such broker, dealer or municipal securities dealer is only required to have one municipal securities principal, such broker, dealer, or municipal securities dealer may count one municipal fund securities limited principal toward the numerical requirement only if the broker, dealer or municipal securities dealer is described in subparagraph (b)(iii)(B).

(c)–(h) No change.

II. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Purpose of, and Statutory Basis for, the Proposed Rule Change

In its filing with the Commission, the MSRB included statements concerning the purpose of and basis for the Proposed Rule Change and discussed any comments it received on the Proposed Rule Change. The texts of these statements may be examined at the places specified in Item IV below. The MSRB has prepared summaries, set forth in Sections A, B, and C below, of the most significant aspects of such statements.

A. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Purpose of, and Statutory Basis for, the Proposed Rule Change

(a) Since 1998, the MSRB has been reviewing the application of its rules to transactions in municipal fund securities by brokers, dealers and municipal securities dealers (''dealers''). A municipal fund security is defined in rule D–12 as a municipal security issued by an issuer that, but for the application of Section 2(b) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (the ''Investment Company Act''), would constitute an investment company within the meaning of the Investment Company

[1] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1) and 17 CFR 240.19b–4 thereunder.