from among labor organizations, business and industry, educational institutions, and the general public.

DATES: The Committee will meet on January 28, 1999 from 9:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.

ADDRESSES: U.S. Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Avenue NW, Room N–5437–A, Washington, D.C. 20210. The meeting is open to the public on a first-come, first served basis.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Irasema Garza, designated Federal Officer, U.S. NAO, U.S. Bureau of International Labor Affairs, U.S. Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Avenue, NW, Room C–4327, Washington, D.C. 20210. Telephone 202–501–6653 (this is not a toll free number).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Please refer to the notice published in the **Federal Register** on December 15, 1994 (59 FR 64713) for supplementary information.

Signed at Washington, DC, on December 23, 1998.

Irasema T. Garza,

Secretary, U.S. National Administrative Office.

[FR Doc. 98–34433 Filed 12–28–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–28–M

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Occupational Safety and Health Administration

Maritime Advisory Committee for Occupational Safety and Health; Change of Date and Location of Committee Meeting

AGENCY: Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), Labor.

ACTION: Maritime Advisory Committee for Occupational Safety and Health (MACOSH); Change of Date and Location of Committee Meeting.

SUMMARY: This notice is to advise the public that the date and address of the previously announced MACOSH meeting has been changed. The location of this meeting, which was announced in the **Federal Register** of December 1, 1998 (63 FR 66202) has had to be changed due to the unavailability of the previously announced facility where the meeting was to take place. The meeting will now be held at the Hotel S. Marie, 827 Toulouse Street, New Orleans, Louisiana 70112; Telephone (504) 561–8951. The meeting dates have also been changed (from the originally scheduled January 13 and 14) to January 12 and 13, 1999 due to facility availability. On January 12, the meeting will begin at 9:00 a.m.; on January 13, the meeting will begin at 8:30 a.m. The meeting will adjourn at approximately 5:00 P.M. on both days. The new address for the meeting is a few blocks from the original location.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Larry Liberatore, Maritime Facilitator, Office of Maritime Standards; telephone (202) 693–2042.

Signed at Washington, D.C. this 22nd day of December, 1998.

Charles N. Jeffress,

Assistant Secretary of Labor.

[FR Doc. 98–34432 Filed 12–28–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–26–M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50–254 and 50–265]

Commonwealth Edison Company and Midamerican Energy Company (Quad Cities Nuclear Power Station, Units 1 and 2); Order Approving Application Regarding Proposed Merger of Midamerican Energy Holdings Company With Calenergy Company

I

MidAmerican Energy Company (MEC) owns a 25-percent interest in Quad Cities Nuclear Power Station, Units 1 and 2. Commonwealth Edison Company (ComEd) owns the remaining 75-percent share of the facilities. MEC and ComEd hold Facility Operating Licenses Nos. DPR–29 and DPR–30 issued by the U. S. Atomic Energy Commission pursuant to Part 50 of Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR Part 50) on December 14, 1972. Under these licenses, only ComEd, acting for itself and as agent and representative of MEC has the authority to operate the Quad Cities Nuclear Power Station, Units 1 and 2. Quad Cities is located in Rock Island County, Illinois.

II

By application accompanied by cover letters dated September 10, 1998, from CalEnergy Company, Inc. (CalEnergy) and MEC, through counsel Roy P. Lessy, Jr., and from ComEd, MEC and CalEnergy informed the Commission of a proposed merger of CalEnergy with MidAmerican Energy Holdings Company (MEHC), the parent of MEC, which would effectively result in CalEnergy becoming the parent corporation and sole owner of MEHC. MEHC would continue to be the parent of MEC. MEC would continue to remain a 25-percent minority owner and possession-only licensee of the Quad Cities Nuclear Power Station, Units 1 and 2, and would remain an ''electric utility'' as defined in 10 CFR 50.2, engaged in the generation, transmission, and distribution of electric energy for wholesale and retail, according to the application. The application was supplemented by letters dated September 16 and November 20, 1998, and attachments thereto, from counsel for the applicants. MEC and CalEnergy requested the Commission's approval of the indirect license transfers to CalEnergy to the extent effected by the proposed corporate merger, pursuant to 10 CFR 50.80. Notice of this request for approval was published in the **Federal Register** on October 27, 1998 (63 FR 57324).

Upon review of the information submitted in the application, including the supplemental information provided by the applicants, and other information before the Commission, the NRC staff has determined that the proposed merger will not affect the qualifications of MEC as a holder of the license, and that the transfer of control of the licenses, to the extent effected by the proposed merger is otherwise consistent with applicable provisions of law, regulations, and orders issued by the Commission subject to the conditions set forth herein. These findings are supported by a Safety Evaluation dated December 22, 1998.

III

Accordingly, pursuant to Sections 161b, 161i, 161o, and 184 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, 42 U.S.C. §§ 2201(b), 2201(i), 2201(o), and 2234; and 10 CFR 50.80, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Commission approves the application regarding the proposed merger of MEHC with CalEnergy, subject to the following: (1) MEC shall provide the Director of the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation a copy of any application, at the time it is filed, to transfer (excluding grants of security interests or liens) from MEC to its parent or to any other affiliated company, facilities for the production, transmission, or distribution of electric energy having a depreciated book value exceeding ten percent (10%) of MEC's consolidated net utility plant, as recorded on MEC's books of account, and (2) should the merger of CalEnergy and MEHC not be completed by December 31, 1999, this Order shall become null and void, provided, however, on application and for good cause shown, such date may be extended.

This Order is effective upon issuance.

IV

By January 19, 1999, any person whose interest may be affected by this Order may file in accordance with the Commission's rules of practice set forth in subpart M of 10 CFR Part 2, a request for a hearing and petition for leave to intervene with respect to issuance of the Order. Such requests and petitions must comply with the requirements set forth in 10 CFR 2.1306, and should address the considerations contained in 10 CFR 2.1308(a). Untimely requests and petitions may be denied, as provided in 10 CFR 2.1308(b), unless good cause for failure to file on time is established. In addition, an untimely request or petition should address the factors that the Commission will also consider, in reviewing untimely requests or petitions, set forth in 10 CFR 2.1308(b)(1)–(2).

Requests for a hearing and petitions for leave to intervene should be served upon Michael I. Miller, Esquire, Sidley and Austin, One First National Plaza, Chicago, Illinois 60603, attorney for ComEd; Roy P. Lessy, Jr., Akin, Gump, Straus, Hauer, & Feld, L.L.P., 1333 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W., Suite 400, Washington, DC 20036, attorney for CalEnergy and MEC; the General Counsel, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. 20555; and the Secretary of the Commission, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. 20555-001, Attention: Rulemakings and Adjudications Staff, in accordance with 10 CFR 2.1313.

The Commission will issue a notice or order granting or denying a hearing request or intervention petition, designating the issues for any hearing that will be held and designating the Presiding Officer. A notice granting a hearing will be published in the **Federal Register** and served on the parties to the hearing.

For further details with respect to this Order, see the application for consent concerning the proposed corporate merger of CalEnergy and MEHC submitted under cover letters dated September 10, 1998, and supplemental information submitted under cover letters dated September 16 and November 20, 1998, and the safety evaluation dated December 22, 1998, which are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, The Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, and at the local public document room located at the Dixon Public Library, 221 Hennipen Avenue, Dixon, Illinois.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland this 22nd day of December 1998.

Samuel J. Collins,

Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 98–34438 Filed 12–28–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50–245]

Northeast Nuclear Energy Company; Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating License, Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity for a Hearing

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an amendment to Facility Operating License No. DPR–21 issued to Northeast Nuclear Energy Company (the licensee) for operation of the Millstone Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1, located in Waterford, Connecticut.

The proposed amendment would change the technical specifications for staffing and training requirements to allow the use of Certified Fuel Handlers to meet plant staffing requirements.

Before issuance of the proposed license amendment, the Commission will have made findings required by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act) and the Commission's regulations.

The Commission has made a proposed determination that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration. Under the Commission's regulations in 10 CFR 50.92, this means that operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; or (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

A review of the proposed changes has determined that there is no Unreviewed Safety Question. The proposed change to the Technical Specifications has been evaluated against the standards of 10 CFR 50.92 and has been determined to not involve a significant hazards consideration. The proposed change does not:

1. Involve a significant increase in the probability or consequence of an accident previously evaluated.

The purpose of this proposed change is to eliminate the requirements for licensed operators and a licensed operator training program and to replace those with certified fuel handlers and a certified fuel handler training and retraining program. The plant has permanently ceased operation and will be maintained in a defueled condition. The range of accidents for which an operator needs to be trained has significantly diminished. The only credible design basis accident is a Fuel Handling Accident. As such, a training program of the depth and breadth of that required by 10 CFR Part 55 is no longer needed. In lieu of a 10 CFR Part 55 licensed operator training program, an NRC approved certified fuel handler training and retraining program will be implemented. This training program will adequately equip appropriate operations personnel for fuel handling operations, including responses to abnormal events/accidents. In addition, the requirements are being changed to ensure that an individual qualified in radiation protection procedures is onsite during fuel handling operations. Therefore, there will be no increase in the probability of occurrence or in the consequences of events associated with fuel handling activities. The proposed changes do not affect plant equipment or procedures for equipment operation or response to abnormal events/accidents in the defueled condition.

2. Create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

The purpose of this proposed change is to eliminate the requirements for licensed operators and a licensed operator training program and to replace those with certified fuel handlers and a certified fuel handler training and retraining program. The changes ensure that the qualifications of operations personnel are commensurate with the tasks to be performed for normal and/or abnormal conditions that could occur in the defueled condition. In addition, the requirements are being changed to ensure that an individual qualified in radiation protection procedures is onsite during fuel handling operations. These changes do not affect plant equipment or the procedures for operating plant equipment, and therefore, do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

3. Involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The purpose of this proposed change is to eliminate the requirements for licensed operators and a licensed operator training program and to replace those with certified fuel handlers and a certified fuel handler training and retraining program. The changes ensure that the qualifications of operations personnel are commensurate with the tasks to be performed for normal and/or abnormal conditions that could occur in the defueled condition. In addition, the requirements are being changed to ensure that an individual qualified in radiation protection procedures is onsite during fuel handling operations. The assumptions for a fuel handling accident in the Reactor Building are not affected by the proposed changes. Therefore, the proposed changes do not involve a reduction in a margin of safety.