

One of the approaches we are considering would be to focus on encouraging industry to lead partnerships of key stakeholders to identify and set voluntary skill standards for cross industry clusters. These clusters could cut across multiple industries and could be defined by the work people do. Skill standards would be defined by the way work is done in an organization striving for high performance from its employees. Within each cluster, the skill standard would reflect multiple levels of performance, each higher level representing a progression in responsibility from the one preceding it. For each cluster, there may be multiple industry standards, each of these industry standards incorporating the cluster standard on which it is based. This process would be dynamic, needing constant reexamination of the clusters and the industry standards derived from them, so that the skill standards would reflect the continually changing demands of the economy. Only if the voluntary standards have value for the employer and the worker, will they be used.

Voluntary Partnerships

The Board itself will not develop skill standards. Instead, the legislation calls for the NSSB to encourage the formation of industry-led voluntary partnerships to develop the skill standards, and to endorse skill standards produced by voluntary partnerships. The NSSB must decide on the criteria, their definition, and how a partnership will demonstrate it meets these endorsement criteria. The NSSB welcomes the input of the public on these topics to inform our decisions.

The legislation requires that the voluntary partnerships have the following composition:

- Representatives of large and small businesses who have expertise in the area of workforce skill requirements and who are recommended by national business organizations or trade associations in the occupation or industry for which a standard is being developed;
- Representatives of trade associations that have received grants from the Department of Labor or the Department of Education to establish skill standards prior to enactment of the National Skill Standards Act;
- Employees who have expertise in the area of workforce skill development and who shall be:

—Individuals recommended by organized labor organizations representing employees in the occupation or industry for which a standard is being developed; and

—Such other individuals who are non-managerial employees with significant experience and tenure in such occupation or industries as are appropriate given the nature and structure of employment in the occupation or industry;

- Representatives of educational institutions; community-based organizations; and state and local agencies involved in education, vocational-technical education, or employment and training;
- Representatives of other policy development organizations with expertise in the area of workforce skill requirements;
- Representatives of non-governmental organizations with a demonstrated history of successfully protecting the rights of racial, ethnic, or religious minorities, women, individuals with disabilities, or older persons; and
- Individuals with expertise in measurement and assessment, including relevant experience in designing unbiased assessments and performance-based assessments.

The foregoing information on the NSSB's mission, and its views on the purpose and characteristics of skill standards, occupational clusters, the focus of the Board's work, and the composition of the voluntary partnerships are intended to serve as background and a context for public response to the questions below. The Board strongly encourages your comments; they will help shape and inform its decision making process.

Questions for Public Comment

1. What constructive advice can you offer the board as it works towards its mission?
2. Are the characteristics of skill standards as described in the section "Skill Standards' Purposes and Characteristics" important? Would you add or delete characteristics?
3. How do you see your efforts benefiting from a voluntary skill standards framework?
4. What models might we learn from and what guidance can you provide on the process NSSB uses for building a framework of voluntary skill standards?
5. What guidance would you give the board as it develops criteria for endorsing voluntary partnerships?
6. What skill sets are most necessary to assure the success of your group or enterprise and the employability of workers, now and long term?
7. Do you agree that the focus of NSSB's work should be on setting skill standards for broad clusters of jobs or occupations that could cut across

multiple industries? If not, what do you think our focus should be and why?

8. Does the emphasis on encouraging the development of skill standards for highly skilled jobs needed in the modern economy make sense?

9. Does it make sense for the board to encourage the growth of organizations who wish to become high performance?

10. What principles should guide the identification of occupational clusters?

A copy of the authorizing legislation will be available at the hearing. Interested parties may call (202)-254-8628 to request a copy.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 18th day of March, 1996.

Judy Gray,

Executive Director, National Skill Standards Board.

[FR Doc. 96-6988 Filed 3-22-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-23-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

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

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC).

ACTION: Notice of 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:* Revision.
2. *The title of the information collection:* 48 CFR 20, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Acquisition Regulation.
3. *The form number if applicable:* Not applicable.
4. *How often the collection is required:* On occasion; one time.
5. *Who is required or asked to report:* Offerors responding to NRC solicitations and contractors receiving contract awards from NRC.
6. *An estimate of the number of responses:* 11,311.
7. *The estimated number of annual respondents:* 750.
8. *An estimate of the total number of hours needed annually to complete the*

requirement or request: 120,449 hours (10.6 hours per response).

9. *An indication of whether Section 3507(d), Public Law 104-13 applies:* Not applicable.

10. *Abstract:* The mandatory requirements of the NRCAR implement and supplement the governmentwide Federal Acquisition Regulation, and ensure that the regulations governing the procurement of goods and services within the NRC satisfy the needs of the agency.

A copy of the submittal may be viewed free of charge at the NRC Public Document Room, 2120 L Street, NW., (lower level), Washington, DC. Members of the public who are in the Washington, DC, area can access the submittal via modem on the Public Document Room Bulletin Board (NRC's Advanced Copy Document Library), NRC subsystem at FedWorld at 703-321-3339. Members of the public who are located outside the Washington, DC, area can dial FedWorld, 1-800-303-9672, or use the FedWorld Internet address: fedworld.gov (Telnet). The document will be available on the bulletin board for 30 days after the signature date of this notice. If assistance is needed in accessing the document, please contact the FedWorld help desk at 703-487-4608. Additional assistance in locating the document is available from the NRC Public Document Room, nationally at 1-800-397-4209, or within the Washington, DC, area at 202-634-3273.

Comment and questions should be directed to the OMB reviewer by April 24, 1996. Peter Francis, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs (3150-0169), NEOB-10202, Office of Management and Budget, Washington, DC 20503.

Comments can also be submitted by telephone at (202) 395-3084.

The NRC Clearance Officer is Brenda Jo Shelton, (301) 415-7233.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 19th day of March, 1996.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.
Gerald F. Cranford,
Designated Senior Official for Information Resource Management.

[FR Doc. 96-7145 Filed 3-22-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

[Docket No. 50-483]

Union Electric Company Callaway Plant, Unit 1; Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is

considering issuance of an amendment to Facility Operating License No. NPF-30 to Union Electric Company (the licensee) for the Callaway Plant, Unit 1 located in Callaway County, Missouri.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

By letter dated September 6, 1995, (ULNRC-03264) the licensee proposed to change the Technical Specifications (TSs) to allow an increase in fuel enrichment (Uranium 235) from 4.45 to 5.0 weight percent for fuel with integral fuel burnable absorbers (IFBAs) and from 3.85 to 4.10 weight percent for fuel without IFBAs. In addition, the licensee proposed to change the maximum reference K_∞ from 1.455 to 1.480 for storage of fuel in Region 1 of the spent fuel pool and to change the maximum initial enrichment for fuel storage in Region 2 of the spent fuel pool to 5.0 weight percent.

Need for Proposed Action

The licensee intends to load fuel into the core during Refuel 8 and subsequent refueling outages which does not currently meet the TSs. By increasing the fuel enrichment, the licensee will implement the fuel strategies developed for the Callaway Plant.

Environmental Impact of the Proposed Action

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed revision to the TSs and concludes that storage and use of Vantage 5 fuel enriched with U-235 up to 4.10 weight percent for fuel without IFBAs and up to 5.0 weight for fuel with IFBAs at the Callaway Plant, Unit 1 is acceptable. The safety considerations associated with higher enrichments have been evaluated by the NRC staff and the staff has concluded that such changes would not adversely affect plant safety. The proposed changes have no adverse effect on the probability of any accident. As a result, there is no increase in individual or cumulative radiation exposure.

The environmental impacts of transportation resulting from the use of higher enrichment and extended irradiation are discussed in the staff assessment entitled "NRC Assessment of the Environmental Effects of Transportation Resulting from Extended Fuel Enrichment and Irradiation." This assessment was published in the Federal Register on August 11, 1988 (53 FR 30355) as corrected on August 24, 1988 (53 FR 32322) in connection with the Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant, Unit I: Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact. As

indicated therein, the environmental cost contribution of an increase in fuel enrichment of up to 5 weight percent U-235 and irradiation limits of up to 60 Gigawatt Days per Metric Ton (GWD/MT) are either unchanged, or may in fact be reduced from those summarized in Table S-4 as set forth in 10 CFR 51.52(c). These findings are applicable to the proposed amendment for the Callaway Plant, Unit 1. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that this proposed action would result in no significant radiological environmental impact.

With regard to potential nonradiological impacts, the proposed changes involve systems located within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20. It does not affect nonradiological plant effluents and has no other environmental impact. Therefore, the Commission concludes that there are no significant nonradiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed amendment.

The Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating License, Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity for a Hearing in connection with this action was published in the Federal Register on November 8, 1995 (60 FR 56372).

Alternative to the Proposed Action

Since the Commission concluded that there are no significant environmental effects that would result from the proposed action, any alternative with equal or greater environmental impacts need not be evaluated.

The principal alternative would be to deny the requested amendment. This would not reduce environmental impacts of plant operation and would result in reduced operational flexibility.

Alternative Use of Resources

This action does not involve the use of any resources not previously considered in the Final Environmental Statement for Callaway Plant, Unit 1, dated January 1982 (NUREG-0813).

Agencies and Persons Contacted

In accordance with its stated policy, on March 18, 1996, the staff consulted with the Missouri State official, Mr. David A. Shorr, Director, Department of Natural Resources, regarding the environmental impact of the proposed action. The State official had no comments.

Finding of No Significant Impact

Based upon the environmental assessment, the Commission concludes