

up to 45 days (which can be renewed) for situations involving weapons or drugs; and (c) asking a hearing officer to order a student be placed in an interim alternative educational setting for up to 45 days (which can be renewed) if it is demonstrated that the student is substantially likely to injure himself or others in his current placement. School officials may also seek a Honig injunction as discussed previously if they are unable to reach agreement with a student's parents and they feel that the new statutory provisions are not sufficient.

On January 25, 2001 the General Accounting Office (GAO) submitted a report entitled *Student Discipline: Individuals with Disabilities Education Act to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations*. Following the 1997 Amendments to the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), there was a perception of a double standard for student discipline for students with disabilities. As a result, Congress directed the GAO to conduct a study to determine how the IDEA Amendments of 1997 affect the ability of schools to maintain a safe environment conducive to learning. Some of the results of the GAO study, which primarily involved a survey of principals of 272 middle and high schools from around the country, indicate, for example, that (a) students with disabilities are receiving the same punishments as their general education peers for violent acts they commit in school, contrary to what some lawmakers stated in legislation last year; (b) the same proportion of each group of students who commit violence, about one in six, is expelled from school or placed in an alternative educational setting as a consequence of their actions; (c) 74 percent of responding principals generally regarded their overall special education discipline policy, which is essentially a combination of IDEA and local policies, as having a positive or neutral effect on their schools' levels of safety and orderliness; and (d) the remaining 26 percent of responding principals rated the policies as having a negative effect.

During the 2001 calendar year, two "discipline" amendments relating to children with disabilities were offered and accepted during Congressional debates on H.R.1 (107th Congress), the No Child Left Behind Act. Both amendments would have altered the scope of protection and procedural safeguards for certain IDEA eligible students. These two amendments did not survive the joint House-Senate Conference on H.R.1 but are sure to

make their way into IDEA Reauthorization debates.

NCD needs to hear from the community:

1. Are the discipline procedures under IDEA clear and understandable?
2. To what extent is the current IDEA discipline policy properly implemented?
3. What are challenges and obstacles to implementing the IDEA discipline policy?
4. To what extent are resources available to school districts, educational personnel, and parents to ensure implementation of the IDEA discipline policy?
5. Should changes be considered to the current IDEA discipline policy?
6. To what extent are state and local school districts not complying with the current IDEA discipline policy? How can this policy be enforced?

#### Conclusions

One of the nation's best tools in promoting education equity and excellence is a public education system that is focused directly on accountability, achievement, and enforcement. To deal with the existing realities when it comes to Federal education policymaking, during IDEA reauthorization, NCD will use a variety of forums and mechanisms to solicit stakeholders' input to advise the Administration and Congress regarding a range of critical policy issues. These policy issues and suggested policy options for reauthorization go to the heart of education reform for over 6 million students with disabilities and involve: (a) Accountability in Federal education spending, (b) achievement and progress in the K-12 arena, and (c) fidelity of implementation in all aspects of the IDEA entitlement program.

Signed in Washington, DC, on March 28, 2002.

**Ethel D. Briggs,**

*Executive Director.*

[FR Doc. 02-8005 Filed 4-2-02; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6820-MA-P**

#### NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

##### Advisory Committee for Cyberinfrastructure; Notice of Meeting

In accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92-463, as amended), the National Science Foundation announces the following meeting:

*Name:* Advisory Committee for Cyberinfrastructure (#10719).

*Date/Time:* Friday, April 19, 2002, 1:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. EST.

*Place:* Room 555 Stafford II, National Science Foundation, 4121 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, VA.

*Type of Meeting:* Open Meeting.

Persons wishing to attend the meeting at NSF should contact Richard Hilderbrandt to arrange for a visitor's pass.

*Contact Persons:* Dr. Richard Hilderbrandt, Program Director, Division of Advanced Computational Infrastructure and Research, Suite 1122, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, VA 22230, Tel: (703) 292-7093, e-mail: [rhilder@nsf.gov](mailto:rhilder@nsf.gov).

*Purpose of Meeting:* To present a first draft of the committee report.

#### Agenda

(Meeting will begin promptly at 1:00 PM EST)

1. Review of status of the panel's activities and goals for this meeting.
2. Reports from the authoring subcommittees.
3. Review and discussion of the working draft of the report.
4. Discussion of primary recommendations.
5. Stewardship and additional use of the material gathered by the Panel.
6. Summary of additional activities to create final version of report.
7. Matters arising.

Dated: March 28, 2002.

**Karen J. York,**

*Committee Management Officer.*

[FR Doc. 02-8006 Filed 4-2-02; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7555-01-M**

#### NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

##### Agency Information Collection Activities: Proposed Collection; Comment Request

**AGENCY:** Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC).

**ACTION:** Notice of pending NRC action to submit an information request to OMB and solicitation of public comment.

**SUMMARY:** The NRC is preparing a submittal to OMB for review of continued approval of information collections under the provisions of Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35).

Information pertaining to the requirement to be submitted:

1. *The title of the information collection:* 10 CFR part 33—Specific Domestic Licenses of Broad Scope for Byproduct Material.

2. *Current OMB approval number:* 3150-0015.

**3. How often the collection is required:** There is a one-time submittal of information to receive a license. Once a specific license has been issued, there is a 10-year resubmittal of the information for renewal of the license.

**4. Who is required or asked to report:** All applicants requesting a license of broad scope for byproduct material and all current licensees requesting renewal of a broad scope license.

**5. The number of annual respondents:** 1.

**6. The number of hours needed annually to complete the requirement or request:** 1.

**7. Abstract:** 10 CFR part 33 contains mandatory requirements for the issuance of a broad scope license authorizing the use of byproduct material. The subparts cover specific requirements for obtaining a license of broad scope. These requirements include equipment, facilities, personnel, and procedures adequate to protect health and minimize danger to life or property.

Submit, by June 3, 2002, comments that address the following questions:

1. Is the proposed collection of information necessary for the NRC to properly perform its functions? Does the information have practical utility?

2. Is the burden estimate accurate?

3. Is there a way to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected?

4. How can the burden of the information collection be minimized, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology?

A copy of the draft supporting statement may be viewed free of charge at the NRC Public Document Room located at One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, MD. OMB clearance requests are available at the NRC World Wide Web site (<http://www.nrc.gov/public-involve/doc-comment/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 about the information collection requirements may be directed to the NRC Clearance Officer, Brenda Jo. Shelton, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, T-6 E 6, Washington, DC 20555-0001, by telephone at (301) 415-7233, or by Internet electronic mail at [INFOCOLLECTS@NRC.GOV](mailto:INFOCOLLECTS@NRC.GOV).

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 28th day of March 2002.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.  
**Brenda Jo. Shelton,**  
*NRC Clearance Officer, Office of the Chief Information Officer.*  
[FR Doc. 02-8040 Filed 4-2-02; 8:45 am]  
**BILLING CODE 7590-01-P**

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

### Agency Information Collection Activities: Submission for the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Review; Comment Request

**AGENCY:** Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC).

**ACTION:** Notice of the OMB review of information collection and solicitation of public comment.

**SUMMARY:** The NRC has recently submitted to OMB for review the following proposal for the collection of information under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35). The NRC hereby informs potential respondents that an agency may not conduct or sponsor, and that a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number.

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

**2. The title of the information collection:** 10 CFR part 54, "Requirements for Renewal of Operating Licenses for Nuclear Power Plants".

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

**4. How often the collection is required:** One-time submission with application for renewal of an operating license for a nuclear power plant and occasional collections for holders of renewed licenses.

**5. Who will be required or asked to report:** Commercial nuclear power plant licensees who wish to renew their operating licenses.

**6. An estimate of the number of responses:** 20 (an average of 6 responses annually + 14 recordkeepers).

**7. The estimated number of annual respondents:** 14 (6 respondents annually based on an estimate of the receipt of 19 new renewal applications over three years + 8 current recordkeepers).

**8. An estimate of the total number of hours needed annually to complete the requirement or request:** Approximately 432,333 hours (405,333 hours one-time reporting burden and 27,000 hours recordkeeping burden).

**9. An indication of whether Section 3507(d), Pub. L. 104-13 applies:** N/A.

**10. Abstract:** 10 CFR part 54 of the NRC regulations, "Requirements for

Renewal of Operating Licenses for Nuclear Power Plants," specifies the procedures, criteria, and standards governing nuclear power plant license renewal, including information submittal and recordkeeping requirements, so that the NRC may make determinations that the operation of civilian nuclear power reactors during the extended term of the license will adequately protect the health and safety of the public and the environment.

A copy of the final supporting statement may be viewed free of charge at the NRC Public Document Room, One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Room O-1 F23, Rockville, MD 20852. OMB clearance requests are available at the NRC World Wide Web site: <http://www.nrc.gov/public-involve/doc-comment/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 listed below by May 3, 2002. Comments received after this date will be considered if it is practical to do so, but assurance of consideration cannot be given to comments received after this date. Bryon Allen, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs (3150-0155), 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 28th day of March 2002.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Brenda Jo. Shelton,**  
*NRC Clearance Officer, Office of the Chief Information Officer.*

[FR Doc. 02-8037 Filed 4-2-02; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7590-01-P**

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

**[Docket No. 50-443]**

### North Atlantic Energy Service Corporation, Seabrook Station, Unit No. 1; 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 No. NPF-86, issued to North Atlantic Energy Service Corporation (the licensee), for operation of the Seabrook Station, Unit No. 1, located in Rockingham County, New Hampshire. Therefore, as required by 10