

specific requests, non-specific hierarchical requests, report generation and customized production of machine-readable products.

6. Provides guidance and direction in developing copy statements, subschema definitions, and reports describing the characteristics of the software and data that support SSA's mission.

7. Directs the establishment of automated documentation products and analytical products to support software engineering and data base integration.

8. Provides support and direction for the automated interface between the DRMS and other system management systems such as EDPOCS, VALUE, ASM-2, etc.

9. Provides direction in identifying techniques and tools that support data resource management as well as evaluating new data resource technology to the SSA environment.

10. Responsible for devising, promoting, ensuring and enforcing appropriate security measures for the facility, operational activity, or both, for the defined areas of management and/or supervisory responsibility.

G. The Electronic Processing Staff (S4NE).

1. Serves as the agency focal point for technologies related to document imaging, electronic document management and electronic workflow processes.

2. Directs the definition of data and image management to facilitate workflow processing and re-engineering of processes to support data management based upon performance characteristics and capabilities required in the SSA environment.

3. Directs the development and evaluation of implementation alternatives for each data base, data image and workflow process and its integration with other projects.

4. Provides guidance and direction in the selection of the appropriate commercial software packages and developmental software to satisfy data base, data image and workflow requirements.

5. Directs the design, development, acquisition, validation, and implementation of data image and workflow management systems and data support software.

6. Directs the design and development of new or modified software for document imaging and workflow processing and directs the selection and implementation of commercial packages for this purpose.

7. Directs the establishment of systems and procedures for protecting and monitoring data integrity including the establishment of data backup and

recovery methods, data access controls and audit trails.

8. Provides direction in the design, development and implementation of applications support software to facilitate interaction between document imaging and workflow processing and applications software.

9. Directs the establishment and maintenance of support software providing document imaging and workflow processing so that the evolution to new architectures is not disruptive to SSA's applications software.

10. Directs the design and development of software and/or identifies commercial software that handles computer output to laser disc (COLD) applications.

11. Devises, promotes, ensures and enforces appropriate security measures for the facility, operational activity, or both, for the defined areas of management and/or supervisory responsibility.

Dated: March 30, 2001.

**Larry G. Massanari,**

*Acting Commissioner of Social Security.*

[FR Doc. 01-8838 Filed 4-10-01; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4191-02-U**

## DEPARTMENT OF STATE

### [Public Notice 3638]

#### **Culturally Significant Objects Imported for Exhibition Determinations: "Empire of the Sultans: Ottoman Art from the Khalili Collection"**

**DEPARTMENT:** Department of State.

**ACTION:** Notice; change.

**SUMMARY:** On December 6, 1999, Notice was published on page 68190 of the **Federal Register** (Volume 64, Number 233) by the Department of State pursuant to Pub. L. 89-259 relating to the exhibit "Empire of the Sultans: Ottoman Art from the Khalili Collection." The referenced Notice is changed as follows. After "July 20, 2003," insert the following additional venues: "and at the North Carolina Museum of Art, Raleigh, North Carolina from on or about May 18, 2002, to on or about July 28, 2002; the Museum of Art, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah from on or about August 17, 2002, to on or about January 26, 2003; the Oklahoma City Art Museum, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma from on or about February 15, 2003 to on or about April 27, 2003; the Museum of Arts and Sciences, Macon, Georgia from on or about August 30, 2003 to on or about November 9, 2003; the Frick Art and

Historical Center, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania from on or about November 29, 2003 to on or about February 8, 2004 is in the national interest."

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** For further information, including a list of exhibit objects, contact Carol Epstein, Attorney-Adviser, Office of the Legal Adviser, U.S. Department of State (telephone: 202/619-6981. The address is U.S. Department of State, SA-44; 301 4th Street, SW., Room 700, Washington, DC 20547-0001.

Dated: April 4, 2001.

**Helena Kane Finn,**

*Acting Assistant Secretary for Educational and Cultural Affairs, United States Department of State.*

[FR Doc. 01-8938 Filed 4-10-01; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4710-08-P**

## TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

### **Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement: Bellefonte Conversion Project**

**AGENCY:** Tennessee Valley Authority.

**ACTION:** Notice of intent.

**SUMMARY:** The Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) will prepare a supplemental environmental impact statement (SEIS) for the construction and operation of an integrated gasification combined cycle (IGCC) power plant by partially converting the Bellefonte Nuclear Plant (BLN) site in Jackson County, Alabama. The primary fuels for the proposed IGCC plant would be coal and petroleum coke. The plant would supply baseload capacity to the TVA electrical generation system to meet growing power demands. The SEIS will supplement the final environmental impact statement (FEIS) that TVA completed in 1997 on options for converting the Bellefonte facility to a fossil-fueled power plant. One of the options considered in the 1997 FEIS was an IGCC plant. The current proposed action differs from the 1997 proposed action in the extent to which the unfinished BLN would be converted to a fossil-based facility. The 1997 proposed action was for the full conversion of BLN, while the current proposed action would result in the partial conversion of BLN. Public comment is invited concerning both the scope of the SEIS and environmental issues that should be addressed in the SEIS.

**DATES:** Comments on the scope of the SEIS must be postmarked or e-mailed no

later than May 7, 2001, to ensure consideration.

**ADDRESSES:** Written comments or e-mails on the scope of issues to be addressed in the SEIS should be sent to Charles P. Nicholson, Senior Specialist, National Environmental Policy Act, Environmental Policy and Planning, Tennessee Valley Authority, 400 West Summit Hill Drive WT 8C, Knoxville, Tennessee 37902-1499 (e-mail: cpnicholson@tva.gov).

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Charles P. Nicholson, Tennessee Valley Authority, 400 West Summit Hill Drive WT 8C, Knoxville, Tennessee 37902-1499 (email: cpnicholson@tva.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**Background**

In 1988, TVA halted and deferred completion of BLN because TVA power system requirements grew more slowly than projected. In December 1994, the TVA Board announced that Bellefonte would not be completed as a nuclear plant without a partner to share investment and operating risk, and put further construction activities on hold until a comprehensive review of TVA's power needs was completed. This comprehensive review, known as Energy Vision 2020—Integrated Resource Plan and Environmental Impact Statement, was completed in December 1995. One of the recommendations in Energy Vision 2020 was a reiteration of the decision to not complete Bellefonte as a nuclear plant without a partner.

The short-term action plan in Energy Vision 2020 included the recommendation to convert the unfinished BLN to a fossil-fueled power plant. The analysis of this conversion is contained in TVA's 1997 Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Bellefonte Conversion Project. The conversion options analyzed were a pulverized coal plant, a natural gas combined cycle plant, an IGCC plant, an IGCC plant with chemical coproduction, and a combination natural gas/IGCC plant with chemical coproduction. TVA's preferred conversion option was a natural gas combined cycle plant producing about 2,400 megawatts of electricity. TVA has not yet made a decision on the Bellefonte conversion project.

The completion of Bellefonte Units 1 and 2 in partnership with the Department of Energy (DOE) was subsequently considered in DOE's 1999 Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Production of Tritium in a Commercial Light Water Reactor. TVA formally adopted DOE's EIS in

accordance with Council of Environmental Quality and TVA National Environmental Policy Act procedures. DOE subsequently chose to use TVA's completed light water reactors for tritium production and not partner with TVA to complete BLN.

Under the medium electrical load growth forecast in Energy Vision 2020, TVA expected that an additional 6,250 megawatts of energy resources would be needed by 2005. TVA has completed several projects to meet this demand and has others underway. The proposed IGCC plant would further help TVA meet this demand.

**Proposed Action**

TVA proposes to enter into agreements under which an IGCC plant would be built and operated at TVA's BLN site. The plant would generate about 1500 megawatts of baseload electricity and begin commercial operation in four to six years. The plant would utilize portions of the existing raw water intake, plant cooling facilities, and electrical switchyard on the Bellefonte site.

The primary fuel would be Illinois Basin coal delivered by barge. The use of petroleum coke as a fuel will also be considered. TVA would construct and operate a barge unloading facility on the adjacent Tennessee River. Two options for the startup fuel will be considered, natural gas and fuel oil. Fuel oil would be delivered to the site by barge and stored in an onsite facility. Natural gas service to the site does not presently exist, and its selection as the backup fuel would require the construction of a pipeline to connect the site with a gas supply.

**Proposed Issues To Be Addressed**

The environmental and socioeconomic resources at and in the vicinity of the Bellefonte site were described in the 1997 FEIS. The description of these resources was updated in DOE's 1999 FEIS for tritium production that TVA subsequently adopted. These descriptions will be further updated in the SEIS. The SEIS will evaluate the potential impacts of constructing and operating the proposed IGCC plant on air quality, water quality, aquatic and terrestrial ecology, endangered and threatened species, wetlands, aesthetics and visual resources, noise, land use, historic and archaeological resources, and socioeconomic resources. Other issues raised during scoping will also be considered.

**Alternatives**

The 1997 FEIS evaluated two alternatives. The no action alternative was the continued deferral of BLN for its potential completion with a partner. The action alternative was the conversion of Bellefonte to one of the five types of fossil-fueled plants listed above. The current IGCC proposal will be presented as an action alternative, and the SEIS will compare its potential impacts with those of the alternatives evaluated in the 1997 FEIS.

**Scoping Process**

Scoping, which is integral to the NEPA process, is a procedure that solicits public input to the EIS process to ensure that: (1) Issues are identified early and properly studied; (2) issues of little significance do not consume substantial time and effort; (3) the draft EIS is thorough and balanced; and (4) delays caused by an inadequate EIS are avoided. TVA's NEPA procedures require that the scoping process commence soon after a decision has been reached to prepare an EIS in order to provide an early and open process for determining the scope and for identifying the significant issues related to a proposed action. The scope of alternatives and issues to be addressed in the draft SEIS will be determined from written comments received from the public by mail or e-mail, internal agency scoping, and comments received from other agencies.

Agencies expected to participate in the discussions on the SEIS include the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, various state of Alabama agencies including the Department of Environmental Management, and other federal, state, and local agencies as appropriate. The identification in this notice of reasonable alternatives and environmental issues is not meant to be exhaustive or final.

The public is invited to submit written comments or e-mail comments on the scope of this SEIS no later than the date given under the **DATES** section of this notice.

Upon consideration of the scoping comments, TVA will develop alternatives and identify important environmental issues to be addressed in the SEIS. Following analysis of the environmental consequences of the alternatives, TVA will prepare a draft SEIS for public review and comment. Notice of availability of the draft SEIS will be published in the **Federal Register**. The notice will solicit written comments on the draft SEIS, and information about a public meeting to

comment on the draft SEIS will be announced by TVA. TVA expects to release a final SEIS by December 2001.

Dated: April 3, 2001.

**Kathryn J. Jackson,**

*Executive Vice President, River System Operations & Environment.*

[FR Doc. 01-8851 Filed 4-10-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8120-08-U

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Federal Aviation Administration

[Docket No. FAA-2001-9119]

#### Notice of Public Meeting

**AGENCY:** Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

**ACTION:** Notice of public meeting.

**SUMMARY:** The FAA plans to convene a public meeting to solicit public views and information regarding liability and risk-sharing for commercial space launch and reentry activities. In addition to the public meeting, the FAA announces an on-line public forum on the Internet to solicit comments and information from the public. Public views obtained at the meeting and from the on-line forum will be included in a report to Congress on the appropriateness and effectiveness of current risk-sharing arrangements under law, and the need to continue or modify laws governing liability risk-sharing for commercial launches and reentries beyond December 31, 2004.

**DATES:** The public meeting will begin on April 25, 2001, at 9 a.m. and conclude for the day at 4:30 p.m. If necessary, the meeting will resume on April 26, 2001, at 9 a.m. and may continue through 4:30 p.m. A two-week on-line public forum will begin on April 27, 2001, at 9 a.m. EST and end on May 11, 2001, at 4:30 p.m. EST. Written comments may also be submitted to the docket through May 11, 2001. Comments submitted to the docket after May 11 will be considered and included in the report to the extent practicable; however, the FAA encourages timely submission of comments to facilitate preparation of the report.

**ADDRESSES:** The meeting will take place in the FAA Auditorium, located at 800 Independence Avenue, SW., 3rd floor, Washington, DC 20591. The on-line public forum can be reached by clicking the "On-Line Public Forum" hyperlink on the Associate Administrator for Commercial Space Transportation's (AST) Internet home page, <http://ast.faa.gov>. Persons unable to participate in either the public meeting

or the on-line public forum may mail or deliver views to the U.S. Department of Transportation Dockets, Docket No. FAA-2001-9119, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC, 20590. The FAA requests two copies of any written comments. Comments may also be submitted to the docket electronically by sending them to the Documents Management Systems (DMS) at the following Internet address: <http://dms.dot.gov/>. Proprietary data should be marked as such and should not be submitted electronically. Comments to the docket should be submitted by May 11, 2001. Written views, as well as a transcript of the public meeting, may be examined in Room PL 401 at the U.S. Department of Transportation, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC, 20590, between 10 a.m. and 5 p.m. weekdays except Federal holidays.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Ms Esta M. Rosenberg, Senior Attorney-Advisory, Regulations Division, Office of the Chief Counsel, Federal Aviation Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation (202) 366-9320, or Mr. Ronald K. Gress, Manager, Licensing and Safety Division, Associate Administrator for Commercial Space Transportation, Federal Aviation Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation (202) 267-7985.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Background

Congress has directed the Secretary of Transportation to study the liability risk-sharing regime currently applicable to U.S. commercial space transportation and recommend any appropriate modifications as part of a comprehensive report. The study mandated by the Commercial Space Transportation Competitiveness Act of 2000 (referred to in this Notice as the Space Competitiveness Act), Public Law 106-405, covers a variety of issues associated with liability risk-sharing for commercial space transportation. Government agency and public views will be presented as part of the final report to Congress.

A Notice issued in the **Federal Register** on March 19, 2001, provides background information concerning the liability risk-sharing regime applicable to commercial space transportation under current law. 66 FR 15521-15523, March 19, 2001. The Notice outlines report requirements and the specific areas of study and analysis identified in the Space Competitiveness Act. It can be viewed at the AST Internet home page, <http://ast.faa.gov>.

The on-line public forum will allow electronic discussion of the issues

identified for analysis by the Space Competitiveness Act. Through the Internet, a large cross-section of the interested public will be able to share views and information with each other and the FAA, and assist the FAA in compiling the range of perspectives concerning an appropriate risk-sharing regime for commercial space transportation. According to an AST report issued February 2001, "The Economic Impact of Commercial Space Transportation on the U.S. Economy," U.S. economic activity in 1999 linked to the commercial space industry totaled over \$61.3 billion. Industries enabled by commercial space transportation are not limited to launch vehicle and satellite manufacturing. They include associated consumer services such services as telecommunications, mobile data, direct-to-home television, remote sensing and related processing, as well as distribution industries. Accordingly, the interested public is not limited to launch services providers and their immediate customers but may include all persons who utilize satellite services, directly and indirectly. Through the on-line public forum, the FAA invites participation of all sectors of the interested public, including consumers.

At the public meeting and in the on-line public forum, the FAA will solicit public comments and on-line discussion on the following issues, and welcomes other related ideas and information from the public. When responding to questions posed and providing views and information, please provide specific and detailed responses along with supporting rationale (quantitative and qualitative) for your answers.

1. Could the U.S. commercial space transportation industry compete effectively against non-U.S. launch providers without the existing liability risk-sharing regime?

2. Are the liability risk-sharing regimes of other space-faring countries relevant to the competitiveness of the U.S. space transportation industry? Are there specific elements of particular foreign regimes that you believe provide advantages or benefits to entities that fall under those regimes?

3. Does holding a launch operator strictly liable for the damage or injury that results from its launch hinder the commercialization of space launch capability?

4. By treaty, the U.S. Government accepts absolute liability for damage on the ground or to aircraft in flight outside of the United States when a launch takes place from U.S. territory or facilities. Given the Government's obligations in this regard, does the existing liability risk-sharing regime