whether the information will have practical utility;

(2) Evaluate the accuracy of the agency's 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.

#### **Overview of This Information**

(1) Type of Information Collection: Extension of a currently approved collection.

(2) Title of the Form/Collection: COPS School-Based Partnership Implementation Report.

(3) Agency form number, if any, and the applicable component of the Department of Justice sponsoring the collection: Form: COPS PPSE/04. Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, U.S. Department of Justice.

(4) Affected public who will be asked or required to respond, as well as a brief abstract: Approximately 500 grant project coordinators, school administrators, and school resource officers, who have participated in the implementation of a COPS School-Based Partnership '98 grant project, will be asked to respond. The COPS School-Based Partnership Report will allow the COPS office to collect information from COPS School-Based Partnership '98 grantees on the implementation of collaborative problem-solving techniques used to address crime and disorder in and around schools. The COPS office will use the information collected to examine the processes undertaken by SBP grantees in implementing collaborative problemsolving techniques. A report of these findings will identify lessons learned and will provide recommendations to policing agencies and schools seeking to implement similar problem-solving partnerships.

(5) An estimate of the total number of respondents and the amount of time estimated for an average respondent to respond: Surveys will be administered by mail to approximately 500 project coordinators, school administrators, and school resource officers, who have participated in the implementation of a COPS School-Based Partnership '98 grant project. Survey completion will

take approximately 0.25 hours per respondent (there is no recordkeeping burden for this collection).

(6) An estimate of the public burden (in hours) associated with the collection: The estimated burden hours are 125.

If additional information is required contact: Mrs. Brenda E. Dyer, Deputy Clearance Officer, United States Department of Justice, Information Management and Security Staff, Justice Management Division, Suite 1220, National Place, 1331 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20530.

Dated: February 28, 2001.

#### Brenda E. Dyer,

Department Deputy Clearance Officer, United States Department of Justice.

[FR Doc. 01–5278 Filed 3–2–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-AT-M

## NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

[Notice 01-032]

### NASA Advisory Council, Aero-Space Technology Advisory Committee, Aviation Operations Systems Subcommittee; Meeting

**AGENCY:** National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

**ACTION:** Notice of meeting cancellation.

Federal Register Citation of Previous Announcement: 66FR29, Notice Number 01–022, February 12, 2001.

Previously Announced Dates of Meeting: Wednesday, March 28, 2001, 1 p.m. to 5 p.m. and Thursday, March 29, 2001, 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. The meeting will be rescheduled.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mr. Robert A. Jacobsen, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Ames Research Center, Moffett Field, CA 94035, 650/604–3743.

Dated:February 27, 2001.

### Beth M. McCormick,

Advisory Committee Management Officer, National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

[FR Doc. 01–5213 Filed 3–2–01; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 7510–01–P

# NORTHEAST DAIRY COMPACT COMMISSION

#### **Notice of Meeting**

**AGENCY:** Northeast Dairy Compact Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice of meeting.

**SUMMARY:** The Compact Commission will hold its regular monthly meeting to

consider matters relating to administration and enforcement of the price regulation, including the reports and recommendations of the Commission's standing Committees.

**DATES:** The meeting will begin at 10 a.m. on Wednesday, March 14, 2001.

**ADDRESSES:** The meeting will be held at the Holiday Inn, 700 Elm Street, Manchester, NH.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Daniel Smith, Executive Director, Northeast Dairy Compact Commission, 64 Main Street, Room 21, Montpelier, VT 05602. Telephone (802) 229–1941.

Authority: 7 U.S.C. 7256 Dated: February 27, 2001.

#### Daniel Smith,

Executive Director.

[FR Doc. 01–5272 Filed 3–2–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 1650-01-P

# NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50-317 and 50-318]

Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant, Inc; Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant, Unit Nos. 1 and 2; Exemption

#### 1.0 Backround

Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant, Inc. (CCNPPI, the licensee) is the holder of Renewed Facility Operating License Nos. DPR–53 and DPR–69 which authorize operation of the Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant, Unit Nos. 1 and 2 (CCNPP). The licenses provide, among other things, that the facility is subject to all rules, regulations, and orders of the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC, the Commission) now or hereafter in effect.

The facility consists of two pressurized-water reactors located in Calvert County, Maryland.

### 2.0 Purpose

Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations (10 CFR) Part 50, Appendix G, requires that pressure-temperature (P-T) limits be established for reactor pressure vessels (RPVs) for normal operating and hydrostatic or leak rate testing conditions. Specifically, 10 CFR part 50, Appendix G states, "The appropriate requirements on both the pressure-temperature limits and the minimum permissible temperature must be met for all conditions." Appendix G of 10 CFR Part 50 also states that the "P-T limits identified as "ASME [American Society of Mechanical Engineers] Appendix G limits" in Table 1 require that the limits must be at least as conservative as limits obtained by

following the methods of analysis and the margins of safety of Appendix G of Section XI of the ASME Code." Section XI of the ASME Code, Appendix G, Figure G–2210–1 specifies a  $K_{\rm la}$  fracture toughness curve for reactor vessel materials in determining P–T limits.

To address provisions of a proposed license amendment to the Technical Specification P–T limits for CCNPP, the licensee requested, in its submittal of September 14, 2000, that the NRC staff exempt CCNPP from application of specific requirements of 10 CFR Part 50, Section 50.60(a) and Appendix G, and substitute use of ASME Code Case N-640. Code Case N-640 permits the use of an alternate reference fracture toughness (K<sub>lc</sub> fracture toughness curve instead of K<sub>la</sub> fracture toughness curve) for reactor vessel materials in determining the P–T limits. Since the K<sub>lc</sub> fracture toughness curve shown in ASME Section XI, Appendix A, Figure A-2200-1 (the  $K_{lc}$  fracture toughness curve, K<sub>Ic</sub> curve) provides greater allowable fracture toughness than the corresponding K<sub>la</sub> fracture toughness curve of ASME Section XI, Appendix G, Figure G-2210-1 (the K<sub>la</sub> fracture toughness curve, K<sub>la</sub> curve), using Code Case N-640 for establishing the P-T limits would be less conservative than the methodology currently endorsed by 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix G, and, therefore, an exemption to apply the Code Case would also be required by 10 CFR 50.60.

## Code Case N–640 (Formerly Code Case N–626)

The licensee has proposed an exemption to allow use of ASME Code Case N–640 in conjunction with ASME Section XI, 10 CFR 50.60(a) and 10 CFR part 50, Appendix G, to determine P–T limits. These revised P–T limits have been developed using the  $K_{\rm lc}$  fracture toughness curve, in lieu of the  $K_{\rm la}$  fracture toughness curve, as the lower bound for fracture toughness.

Use of the K<sub>lc</sub> curve in determining the lower bound fracture toughness in the development of P-T operating limits curve is more technically correct than use of the  $K_{la}$  curve since the rate of loading during a heatup or cooldown is slow and is more representative of a static condition than a dynamic condition. The  $K_{lc}$  curve appropriately implements the use of static initiation fracture toughness behavior to evaluate the controlled heatup and cooldown process of a reactor vessel. The NRC staff has required use of the initial conservatism of the K<sub>la</sub> curve since 1974 when the curve was codified. This initial conservatism was necessary due to the limited knowledge of RPV

materials. Since 1974, additional knowledge has been gained about RPV materials which demonstrates that the lower bound on fracture toughness provided by the  $K_{la}$  curve is well beyond the margin of safety required to protect the public health and safety from potential RPV failure. In addition, P–T curves based on the  $K_{lc}$  curve will enhance overall plant safety by opening the P–T operating window with the greatest safety benefit in the region of low temperature operations.

#### 3.0 Discussion

Pursuant to 10 CFR 50.12, the Commission may, upon application by any interested person or upon its own initiative, grant exemptions from the requirements of 10 CFR part 50, when (1) the exemptions are authorized by law, will not present an undue risk to public health or safety, and are consistent with the common defense and security; and (2) when special circumstances are present. These circumstances include the special circumstances that "Application of the regulation in the particular circumstances would not serve the underlying purpose of the rule or is not necessary to achieve the underlying purpose of the rule; \* \*

The underlying purpose of 10 CFR part 50, Appendix G is to provide an adequate margin of safety against brittle failure of the RPV. Use of a P-T limit that is at least as conservative as the limits obtained by following the methods of analysis and margin of safety of the ASME Code, Section XI, Appendix G is not necessary, in this case, to achieve the underlying purpose of the rule. Specifically, substitution of the K<sub>Ic</sub> fracture toughness curve for the K<sub>la</sub> fracture toughness curve for establishing the P-T limits provides a more technically correct outcome in that it accounts for the rate of loading during heatup or cooldown and is more representative of a static condition. In addition, the staff has determined that improved knowledge regarding the RPV materials justifies elimination of unnecessary conservatisms, such as that brought about by the use of the K<sub>la</sub> curve. Use of the less conservative  $K_{lc}$ curve would provide an adequate margin of safety against brittle failure of the RPV in this case, due in part to the remaining conservatisms incorporated into the methodologies of 10 CFR part 50, Appendix G and Regulatory Guide 1.99 which would still be applicable. Therefore, use of a P-T limit that is at least as conservative as the limits obtained by following the methods and margins of safety of the ASME Code, Section XI, Appendix G, is not

necessary in this case to achieve the underlying purpose of the rule, i.e., to provide sufficient margin of RPV fracture toughness to ensure structural integrity of the RPV.

Therefore, the staff concludes that granting an exemption under the special circumstances of 10 CFR 50.12(a)(2)(ii) is appropriate and that the methodology of Code Case N-640 may be used to revise the P-T limits for CCNPP.

#### 4.0 Conclusion

In summary, the ASME Section XI, Appendix G, procedure was conservatively developed based on the level of knowledge existing in 1974 concerning RPV materials and the estimated effects of operation. Since 1974, the level of knowledge about these topics has been greatly expanded. The NRC staff concurs that this increased knowledge permits relaxation of the ASME Section XI, Appendix G, requirements by application of ASME Code Case N-640. Implementation of the proposed P-T limits, as allowed by ASME Code Case N-640, are sufficient to ensure the structural integrity of RPVs during plant operations. Thus, pursuant to 10 CFR 50.12(a)(2)(ii), the underlying purpose of the regulation will continue to be served.

Accordingly, the Commission has determined that, pursuant to 10 CFR 50.12(a), the exemption is authorized by law, will not endanger life or property or common defense and security, and is, otherwise, in the public interest. Also, special circumstances are present in that application of the regulation is not necessary to achieve the underlying purpose of the rule. Therefore, the Commission hereby grants CCNPPI an exemption from the requirements of 10 CFR Part 50, Section 50.60(a) and 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix G, for CCNPP.

Pursuant to 10 CFR 51.32, the Commission has determined that the granting of this exemption will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment (66 FR 9729).

This exemption is effective upon issuance.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 26th day of February 2001.

#### John A. Zwolinski,

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

[FR Doc. 01–5217 Filed 3–2–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P