The survey will be mailed primarily to the administrators at the Institutional Research Offices. To minimize burden, institutions are provided with (in addition to paper copy) file specifications needed to upload data from the web data collection system (http://www.qrc.com/exp).

*Description of Respondents:* Not-for-profit institutions.

*Number of Respondents:* 698 (average).

*Frequency of Responses:* Reporting annually.

*Total Burden Hours:* 9,014.

Approximately 65% responded electronically using the previous Automatic Survey Questionnaire on diskette to this voluntary survey in FY 1997 and a total response rate of 98.0% was obtained. Burden estimates are as follows:

| | Total number of institutions | Burden Hours | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Doctorate-granting | Masters-granting | Bachelors or below |
| FY 1997 | 692 | 19.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 |
| FY 1996 | 692 | 21.5 | 7.1 | 6.2 |

Dated: February 26, 1999.

**Suzanne H. Plimpton,**

*Reports Clearance Officer.*

[FR Doc. 99–5231 Filed 3–2–99; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7555–01–M**

## NATIONAL WOMEN'S BUSINESS COUNCIL

### Sunshine Act Meeting

**AGENCY:** National Women's Business Council.

**ACTION:** Notice of Meeting.

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with the Women's Business Ownership Act, Public law 105–135 as amended, the National Women's Business Council (NWBC) announces a forthcoming Council meeting and joint meeting of the NWBC and Interagency Committee on Women's Business Enterprise. The meetings will cover action items worked on by the National Women's Business Council and the Interagency Committee on Women's Business Enterprise included by not limited to procurement, access to capital and training.

**DATES:** March 19, 1999.

**ADDRESSES:** *Council Meeting & Joint Meeting,* The White House/Old Executive Office Building, Indian Treaty Room, Washington, DC 20502.

10:00 am–11:00 am/Council Meeting
11:00 am–12:00 pm/Joint Meeting.

**STATUS:** Open to the public—limited space available.

**CONTACT:** National Women's Business Council, 409 Third Street, S.W., 5th Floor, Washington, DC 20024, (202) 205–3850.

**NOTE:** Please call by March 10, 1999. Attendance/Clearance by RSVP only.

**Gilda Presley,**

*Administrative Officer, National Women's Business Council.*

[FR Doc. 99–5400 Filed 3–1–99; 3:02 pm]

**BILLING CODE 6820–AB–M**

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

**[Docket 72–9]**

### Department of Energy Issuance of Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact Regarding the Proposed Exemption From Requirements of 10 CFR Part 20

By letter dated December 10, 1997, as supplemented by letter dated December 9, 1998, the Department of Energy (DOE or applicant) requested an exemption from the requirements of 10 CFR 20.1501(c) related to DOE's proposed operation of the Fort St. Vrain (FSV) Independent Spent Fuel Storage Installation (ISFSI). The facility is located in Weld County, Colorado.

**Environmental Assessment (EA)**

*Identification of Proposed Action*

The applicant is seeking Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC or Commission) approval to take possession of NRC Materials License SNM–2504 to operate the FSV ISFSI. The FSV ISFSI is an existing facility constructed and licensed to store spent nuclear fuel from the formerly licensed Fort St. Vrain High Temperature Gas Reactor. By letter dated December 17, 1996, DOE submitted an application to transfer SNM–2504 from Public Service Company of Colorado (the current license holder) to DOE. The NRC staff is currently performing a review of that application. In a December 10, 1997, supplement to the application, DOE requested an exemption from the requirements of 10 CFR 20.1501(c). Section 20.1501(c) states, in part, that ''All personnel dosimeters * * * that require processing * * * must be processed and evaluated by a dosimetry processor * * * (1) Holding current personnel dosimetry accreditation from the National Voluntary Laboratory Accreditation Program (NVLAP) of the National Institute of Standards and Technology. * * *'' Specifically, the applicant has requested authorization to use the Department of Energy Laboratory Accreditation Program (DOELAP) as an alternative dosimetry processing accreditation standard.

*Need for the Proposed Action*

The applicant is preparing to operate the FSV ISFSI as described in its application and accompanying safety analysis report (SAR), subject to transference of the existing NRC License SNM–2504 to DOE. The applicant is implementing programs and procedures necessary to operate the ISFSI and seeks to have those programs make efficient use of resources. One of the programs developed by DOE is the capability to monitor personnel occupational radioactive dose for routine and non-routine activities at the FSV ISFSI. Personnel dosimetry requires processing by a qualified processing facility. DOE prefers to use a processing organization that currently processes dosimetry for its Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory (INEEL). That processor is accredited under the DOE Laboratory Accreditation Program, rather than under the NVLAP program. To support the efficient use of resources, DOE has requested to use a DOELAP accreditation process for processing personnel dosimetry associated with FSV.

*Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action*

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission staff has examined both the NVLAP and DOELAP accreditation processes and standards. Both the NVLAP and DOELAP programs have similar requirements in that they incorporate similar test categories (type of radiation and energy levels), tolerance levels, bias, and performance criteria. The staff concluded that the DOELAP process is

at least as stringent as the NVLAP process and further concludes that, for the FSV ISFSI, the DOELAP process is an acceptable alternative to the NVLAP process required by 10 CFR 20.1501(c).

The Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed transfer of SNM–2504 (62 FR 15737, April 2, 1997) considered the potential environmental impacts of transfer of the FSV ISFSI license from the existing licensee, Public Service Company of Colorado, to DOE. The proposed actions now under consideration would not change the potential environmental effects assessed in the April 2, 1997, EA. Specifically, there are no environmental impacts associated with the accreditation program for personnel dosimetry processing, which is purely an administrative function.

*Alternatives to the Proposed Action*

Since there are no significant environmental impacts associated with the proposed action, any alternatives with equal or greater environmental impact are not evaluated. The alternative to the proposed action would be to deny approval of the exemption and, therefore, not allow use of the DOELAP accreditation program by DOE. These alternatives would have no significant environmental impacts as well.

*Agencies and Persons Consulted*

Officials from the State of Colorado 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 granting an exemption from 10 CFR 20.1501(c) so that DOE may use a DOELAP accreditation program, rather than an NVLAP program as required by existing regulations, 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.

This application was docketed under 10 CFR Part 72, Docket 72–9. For further details with respect to this action, see the application for an ISFSI license dated December 17, 1996, the request for exemption dated December 10, 1997, and supplement dated December 9, 1998, which are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, 2120 L Street, NW, Washington, DC 20555.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 19th day of February, 1999.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**E. William Brach,**

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

[FR Doc. 99–5200 Filed 3–2–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

**[Docket Number 40–8904]**

## Sohio Western Mining Company's L-Bar Site

**AGENCY:** U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**ACTION:** Final finding of no significant impact.

**SUMMARY:** Notice is hereby given that the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) proposes to amend Sohio Western Mining Company's (Sohio's) Source Material License SUA–1472, to allow alternate concentration limits (ACLs) for ground water hazardous constituents at the L-Bar uranium mill site in Cibola County, New Mexico. An Environmental Assessment (EA) was performed by the NRC staff in accordance with the requirements of 10 CFR Part 51. The conclusion of the EA was a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) for this licensing action.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Kenneth R. Hooks, Uranium Recovery Branch, Division of Waste Management, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555. Telephone (301) 415–7777.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**Background**

By letter of September 24, 1998, Sohio requested that Source Material License SUA–1472 be amended to allow ACLs for ground water constituents selenium and uranium at the L-Bar site. On October 26 and November 25, 1998, Sohio provided additional information that was requested by NRC staff. Based on its evaluations of the information provided, NRC staff has concluded that the ACLs proposed by Sohio are acceptable. In order to terminate the existing ground water corrective action program (CAP), the licensee must meet 10 CFR Part 40, Appendix A, Criterion 5B(5), which requires that, at the point of compliance (POC), the concentration of a hazardous constituent must not exceed the established background concentration of that constituent, the maximum concentration limits (MCLs) given in Table 5C of Appendix A, or an alternate concentration limit established by NRC.

**Summary of the Environmental Assessment**

**Identification of the Proposed Action**

The proposed action is an amendment to SUA–1472 to allow the application of ACLs for ground water hazardous constituents selenium and uranium, at the Sohio Western Mining Company's L-Bar uranium mill tailings site, as provided in 10 CFR Part 40, Appendix A, Criterion 5B(5). NRC staff's review was conducted in accordance with the ''Staff Technical Position, Alternate Concentration Limits for Title II Uranium Mills,'' dated January 1996.

Based on its evaluation of Sohio's amendment request, NRC staff has concluded that granting Sohio the request for ACLs will not result in significant impacts. The staff decision was based on information provided by Sohio, demonstrating that its proposed ACLs would not pose a substantial present or potential future hazard to human health and the environment, and are as low as reasonably achievable (ALARA). A review of alternatives to the requested action indicates that implementation of alternate methods would result in little net reduction of ground water constituent concentrations.

**Conclusion**

NRC staff concludes that approval of Sohio's amendment request to allow ACLs for ground water hazardous constituents will not cause significant health or environmental impacts. The following statements summarize the conclusions resulting from the EA:

1. Currently, all concentrations with the exception of uranium and selenium in a few POC wells will meet the established ground-water background values for the site at the POC wells.

2. Due to the attenuation capability of the formations through which the acidic ground-water plume will move, the residual amounts of uranium and selenium will be reduced to background levels that will not pose any greater health risk than that assigned to the maximum concentration limits for ground-water protection.

3. The POCs are located along the site boundary of the restricted area that will be maintained by the long-term care custodian (most likely the U.S. Department of Energy) following termination of Sohio's license for the L-Bar site.

4. Ground water use from the First Tres Hermanos Sandstone and Mancos