

Total Burden Cost (capital/startup): \$0.

Total Burden Cost (operating/maintaining): \$202.

Comments submitted in response to this notice will be summarized and/or included in the request for Office of Management and Budget approval of the information collection request; they will also become a matter of public record.

Dated: December 3, 1999.

George M. Fesak,

Director, Program Evaluation and Information Resources.

[FR Doc. 99-32056 Filed 12-9-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-43-M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-440]

FirstEnergy Nuclear Operating Company; Perry Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 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-58, issued to the FirstEnergy Nuclear Operating Company (the licensee), for operation of the Perry Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 1, located in Lake County, Ohio.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed action would eliminate the requirement in the Environmental Protection Plan to perform semi-annual (late spring and early fall) sampling of Lake Erie sediment in the Perry and Eastlake Plant area for Corbicula (i.e., Asiatic clams).

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application for amendment dated September 9, 1999.

The Need for the Proposed Action

The Perry Environmental Protection Plan was modified in 1988 to require semi-annual (late spring and early fall) sampling of areas at Perry and the licensee's Eastlake Plant to detect the presence of Corbicula. The purpose of the monitoring program is to provide for sufficient time to prepare for prevention and control programs, should Corbicula be detected at the Perry site. Corbicula, which have been detected in Lake Erie at the Eastlake Plant since June 1987, have not been detected at the Perry site. Zebra Mussels have been detected at the Perry site since 1987 and an effective control program has been implemented to suppress their growth and minimize the potential for system biofouling. The

licensee has concluded that the control program used for Zebra Mussels at the Perry site would be equally effective against Corbicula. Therefore, since adequate control programs have already been implemented at the Perry site, there would be no apparent benefit in requiring the licensee to perform semi-annual sampling for their detection. The proposed action is needed to eliminate the sampling program in the Environmental Protection Plan. The elimination of the sampling program will result in savings of about \$22,000 per year.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The NRC has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that it is acceptable because the control program currently implemented to monitor and mitigate potential biofouling by Zebra Mussels would be equally effective for Corbicula.

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 the Perry Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 1.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on October 27, 1999, the staff consulted with the Ohio State official, Carol O'Claire, of the Ohio Emergency Management Agency, 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 September 9, 1999, which is available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, The Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC. 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 7th day of December 1999.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Douglas V. Pickett,

Senior Project Manager, Section 2, Project Directorate III, Division of Licensing Project Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 99-32058 Filed 12-9-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Regulatory Guide; Issuance, Availability

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has issued a revision to a guide in its Regulatory Guide Series. This series has been developed to describe and make available to the public such information as methods acceptable to the NRC staff for implementing specific parts of the Commission's regulations, techniques used by the staff in evaluating specific problems or postulated accidents, and data needed by the staff in its review of applications for permits and licenses.

Revision 3 of Regulatory Guide 1.105, "Setpoints for Safety-Related Instrumentation," describes a method acceptable to the NRC staff for complying with the NRC's regulations for ensuring that setpoints for safety-related instrumentation are initially within and remain within the technical

specification limits. The guide is being revised to endorse Part 1 of an Instrument Society of America standard, ISA-S67-1994, "Setpoints for Nuclear Safety-Related Instrumentation." This standard provides a basis for establishing setpoints for nuclear instrumentation for safety systems.

Comments and suggestions in connection with items for inclusion in guides currently being developed or improvements in all published guides are encouraged at any time. Written comments may be submitted to the Rules and Directives Branch, Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555.

Regulatory guides are available for inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, 2120 L Street NW., Washington, DC. Recent regulatory guides, both draft and active, may be read or downloaded from the NRC website at <http://www.nrc.gov>. Single copies of regulatory guides may be obtained free of charge by writing the Reproduction and Distribution Services Section, OCIO, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, or by fax to (301) 415-2289. Issued guides may also be purchased from the National Technical Information Service on a standing order basis. Details on this service may be obtained by writing NTIS, 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, VA 22161. Regulatory guides are not copyrighted, and Commission approval is not required to reproduce them.

(5 U.S.C. 552(a))

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 29th day of November 1999.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Ashok C. Thadani,

Director, Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research.

[FR Doc. 99-32059 Filed 12-9-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

PENSION BENEFIT GUARANTY CORPORATION

Proposed Submission of Information Collection for OMB Review; Comment Request; Customer Satisfaction Surveys and Focus Groups

AGENCY: Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation.

ACTION: Notice of intention to request OMB approval.

SUMMARY: The Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation intends to request that the Office of Management and Budget extend and expand its approval of an

information collection under the Paperwork Reduction Act. The purpose of the information collection, which will be conducted through focus groups and surveys over a three-year period, is to help the PBGC assess the efficiency and effectiveness with which it serves its customers and to design actions to address identified problems. The PBGC invites public comment on this information collection.

DATES: Comments should be submitted by February 8, 2000.

ADDRESSES: All written comments should be addressed to: Office of the General Counsel, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, Suite 340, 1200 K St. NW., Washington, DC 20005-4026. The comments will be available for public inspection between 9:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. at the PBGC's Communications and Public Affairs Department, Suite 240, at the above address.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Thomas H. Gabriel, Attorney, Office of the General Counsel, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, 1200 K Street, NW., Washington, DC 20005-4026, (202) 326-4020, extension 3898. (For TTY and TDD users, call the Federal relay service toll-free at 1-800-877-8339 and ask to be connected to 202-326-4040.)

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number. The PBGC intends to request that the Office of Management and Budget extend its approval, for a three-year period, of a generic collection of information consisting of customer satisfaction focus groups and surveys (OMB control number 1212-0053; expires April 30, 1999). The PBGC also intends to request that the Office of Management and Budget expand its approval to encompass a broader range of surveys than those approved under 1212-0053, which provided for surveys only as an adjunct to focus groups. The expanded information collection will further the goals of Executive Order 12862, Setting Customer Service Standards, which states the Federal Government must seek to provide "the highest quality of service delivered to customers by private organizations providing a comparable or analogous service."

The PBGC uses customer satisfaction focus groups and surveys to find out about the needs and expectations of its customers and assess how well it is meeting those needs and expectations. By keeping these avenues of

communication open, the PBGC can continually improve service to its customers, including plan participants and beneficiaries, plan sponsors and their affiliates, plan administrators, pension practitioners, and others involved in the establishment, operation and termination of plans covered by the PBGC's insurance program. Because the areas of concern to the PBGC and its customers vary and may quickly change, it is important that the PBGC have the ability to evaluate customer concerns quickly by developing new vehicles for gathering information under this generic approval. The PBGC intends to include in this information collection two surveys already approved by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB Approval Nos. 1212-0056 and 1212-0058).

Participation in the focus groups and surveys will be voluntary. The PBGC will consult with the Office of Management and Budget regarding each specific information collection during the approval period.

The PBGC estimates that the annual burden for this collection of information will total 2,000 hours for 8,000 respondents.

The PBGC is specifically seeking public comments to:

(1) evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility;

(2) evaluate the accuracy of the estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;

(3) enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (4) minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology e.g., permitting electronic submission of responses.

Issued at Washington, DC, this 6th day of December, 1999.

Stuart A. Sirkin,

Director, Corporate Policy and Research Department, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation.

[FR Doc. 99-32096 Filed 12-9-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7708-01-P