

By the National Credit Union Administration Board on August 26, 1999.
Hattie M. Ulan,
Acting Secretary of the Board.
 [FR Doc. 99-22707 Filed 8-31-99; 8:45 am]
 BILLING CODE 7535-01-P

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Committee Management; Renewal

The NSF management official having responsibility for the NSB Public Service Award Committee (#5195) has determined that renewing this charter for another two years is necessary and in the public interest in connection with the performance of duties imposed upon the Director, National Science Foundation (NSF), by 42 USC 1861 *et seq.* This determination follows consultation with the Committee Management Secretariat, General Services Administration.

Authority for this Committee will expire on September 4, 2001, unless it is renewed. For more information, please contact Karen York, NSF, at (703) 306-1182.

Dated: August 26, 1999.

Karen J. York,
Committee Management Officer.
 [FR Doc. 99-22712 Filed 8-31-99; 8:45 am]
 BILLING CODE 7555-01-M

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Special Emphasis Panel in Advanced Computational Infrastructure and Research; Notice of Meeting

In accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92-463, as amended), the National Science Foundation announces the following meeting:

Name: Special Emphasis Panel in Advanced Computational Infrastructure and Research (#1185).

Date and Time: September 9-10, 1999 8:30 a.m. to 5 p.m.

Place: National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 320, Arlington, VA 22230.

Type of Meeting: Closed.

Contact Person: Dr. Charles H. Koelbel, Program Director, Advanced Computational Research Program, Suite 1122, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, VA 22230, (703) 306-1962.

Purpose of Meeting: provide recommendations and advice concerning Software proposals submitted to NSF for financial support.

Agenda: To review and evaluate Proposals in the Advanced Computational Research Program as part of the selection process for awards.

Reason for Closing: The proposals being reviewed include information of a proprietary or confidential nature, including technical information; financial data, such as salaries; and personal information concerning individuals associated with the proposals. These matters are exempt under 5 U.S.C. 552b(c), (4) and (6) of the Government in the Sunshine Act.

Dated: August 26, 1999.

Karen J. York,
Committee Management Officer.
 [FR Doc. 99-22711 Filed 8-31-99; 8:45 am]
 BILLING CODE 7555-01-M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50-348 and 50-364]

Southern Nuclear Operating Company, Inc.; 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 Nos. NPF-2 and NPF-8 issued to Southern Nuclear Operating Company, Inc. (SNC, or the licensee) for operation of the Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2, located in Houston County, Alabama.

The proposed amendments, requested by SNC in letters dated February 22, 1999, supplemented by letters dated March 19 and June 30, 1999, would revise the technical specifications (TS) to clarify surveillance requirements for the control room emergency filtration system, penetration room filtration system, storage pool ventilation, and radiation monitoring instrumentation. SNC also proposes to delete the containment purge exhaust filter.

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:

1. The proposed changes do not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The proposed changes to convert from ANSI N510-1980 to ASME N510-1989 for specific [Farley Nuclear Plant] FNP filtration surveillance testing requirements and related changes do not affect the probability of any accident occurring. The consequences of any accident will not be affected since the proposed changes will continue to ensure that appropriate and required surveillance testing for FNP filtration systems will be performed consistent with the revised accident analyses. The results of the fuel handling accident remain well within the guidelines of 10 CFR Part 100 and the doses due to a [loss-of-coolant-accident] LOCA, including [emergency core cooling system] ECCS recirculation loop leakage, remain within the guidelines of 10 CFR Part 100 and General Design Criterion [GDC] 19 of Appendix A to 10 CFR Part 50. Relocating specific testing requirements to the FNP [Final safety Analysis Report] FSAR has no effect on the probability or consequences of any accident previously evaluated since required testing will continue to be performed.

Therefore, the proposed TS changes do not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. The proposed changes do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

Testing differences between ANSI N510-1980 and ASME N510-1989 have been evaluated by SNC and none of the proposed changes have the potential to create an accident at FNP. ASME N510-1989 is referenced by the NRC in NUREG 1431. Testing the additional channels of radiation monitoring and verification of penetration room boundary integrity do not require the affected systems to be placed in configurations different from design. Thus, no new system design or testing configuration is required for the changes being proposed that could create the possibility of any new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated. Relocating specific testing requirements to the FSAR has no effect on the possibility of creating a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated since it is an administrative change in nature.

Therefore, the proposed changes do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

3. The proposed changes do not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

Conversion from the testing requirements of ANSI N510-1980 sections 10, 12, and 13 to ASME N510-1989 sections 10, 11, and 15

has been previously approved by the NRC at other nuclear facilities. ASME N510-1989 has been approved and endorsed by the NRC in NUREG 1431. The safety factor associated with the conservative charcoal adsorber laboratory test methods and dose calculations ensures that doses will continue to meet the guidelines of 10 CFR Part 100 and GDC 19 of Appendix A to 10 CFR Part 50. The enhanced testing of radiation monitoring instrumentation and the penetration room boundary integrity provide additional assurance that the acceptance criteria of the safety analyses and the resultant margins of safety are not reduced. Relocating specific testing requirements to the FSAR has no effect on the margin of plant safety since required testing will continue to be performed. Clarifying the 10[-]hour run with heaters on is consistent with the Improved TS language and accomplishes the purpose for the surveillance. Changing the heater capacity and flow rates has been factored into the dose calculations and are within the design capacities of the systems involved.

Therefore, SNC concludes based on the above, that the proposed changes do not result in a significant reduction of margin with respect to plant safety as defined in the Final Safety Analysis Report or the bases of the FNP technical specifications.

Therefore, the proposed changes do not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis, and based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

The Commission is seeking public comments on this proposed determination. Any comments received within 30 days after the date of publication of this notice will be considered in making any final determination.

Normally, the Commission will not issue the amendment until the expiration of the 30-day notice period. However, should circumstances change during the notice period such that failure to act in a timely way would result, for example, in derating or shutdown of the facility, the Commission may issue the license amendment before the expiration of the 30-day notice period, provided that its final determination is that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration. The final determination will consider all public and State comments received. Should the Commission take this action, it will publish in the **Federal Register** notice of issuance and provide for opportunity for a hearing after issuance. The Commission expects that the need to take this action will occur very infrequently.

Written comments may be submitted by mail to the Chief, Rules and Directives Branch, Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, and should cite the publication date and page number of this **Federal Register** notice. Written comments may also be delivered to Room 6D59, Two White Flint North, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland, from 7:30 a.m. to 4:15 p.m. Federal workdays. Copies of written comments received may be examined at the NRC Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC.

The filing of requests for hearing and petitions for leave to intervene is discussed below.

By October 1, 1999, the licensee may file a request for a hearing with respect to issuance of the amendment to the subject facility operating license and any person whose interest may be affected by this proceeding and who wishes to participate as a party in the proceeding must file a written request for a hearing and a petition for leave to intervene. Requests for a hearing and a petition for leave to intervene shall be filed in accordance with the Commission's "Rules of Practice for Domestic Licensing Proceedings" in 10 CFR Part 2. Interested persons should consult a current copy of 10 CFR 2.714 which is available 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 Houston-Love Memorial Library, 212 W. Burdeshaw Street, Post Office Box 1369, Dothan, Alabama. If a request for a hearing or petition for leave to intervene is filed by the above date, the Commission or an Atomic Safety and Licensing Board, designated by the Commission or by the Chairman of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, will rule on the request and/or petition; and the Secretary or the designated Atomic Safety and Licensing Board will issue a notice of hearing or an appropriate order.

As required by 10 CFR 2.714, a petition for leave to intervene shall set forth with particularity the interest of the petitioner in the proceeding, and how that interest may be affected by the results of the proceeding. The petition should specifically explain the reasons why intervention should be permitted with particular reference to the following factors: (1) The nature of the petitioner's right under the Act to be made party to the proceeding; (2) the nature and extent of the petitioner's property, financial, or other interest in

the proceeding; and (3) the possible effect of any order which may be entered in the proceeding on the petitioner's interest. The petition should also identify the specific aspect(s) of the subject matter of the proceeding as to which petitioner wishes to intervene. Any person who has filed a petition for leave to intervene or who has been admitted as a party may amend the petition without requesting leave of the Board up to 15 days prior to the first prehearing conference scheduled in the proceeding, but such an amended petition must satisfy the specificity requirements described above.

Not later than 15 days prior to the first prehearing conference scheduled in the proceeding, a petitioner shall file a supplement to the petition to intervene which must include a list of the contentions which are sought to be litigated in the matter. Each contention must consist of a specific statement of the issue of law or fact to be raised or controverted. In addition, the petitioner shall provide a brief explanation of the bases of the contention and a concise statement of the alleged facts or expert opinion which support the contention and on which the petitioner intends to rely in proving the contention at the hearing. The petitioner must also provide references to those specific sources and documents of which the petitioner is aware and on which the petitioner intends to rely to establish those facts or expert opinion. Petitioner must provide sufficient information to show that a genuine dispute exists with the applicant on a material issue of law or fact. Contentions shall be limited to matters within the scope of the amendment under consideration. The contention must be one which, if proven, would entitle the petitioner to relief. A petitioner who fails to file such a supplement which satisfies these requirements with respect to at least one contention will not be permitted to participate as a party.

Those permitted to intervene become parties to the proceeding, subject to any limitations in the order granting leave to intervene, and have the opportunity to participate fully in the conduct of the hearing, including the opportunity to present evidence and cross-examine witnesses.

If a hearing is requested, the Commission will make a final determination on the issue of no significant hazards consideration. The final determination will serve to decide when the hearing is held.

If the final determination is that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration, the Commission may issue the amendment

and make it immediately effective, notwithstanding the request for a hearing. Any hearing held would take place after issuance of the amendment.

If the final determination is that the amendment request involves a significant hazards consideration, any hearing held would take place before the issuance of any amendment.

A request for a hearing or a petition for leave to intervene must be filed with the Secretary of the Commission, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, Attention: Rulemakings and Adjudications Staff, or may be delivered to the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, by the above date. A copy of the petition should also be sent to the Office of the General Counsel, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, and to M. Stanford Blanton, Esq., Balch and Bingham, Post Office Box 306, 1710 Sixth Avenue North, Birmingham, Alabama, attorney for the licensee.

Nontimely filings of petitions for leave to intervene, amended petitions, supplemental petitions and/or requests for hearing will not be entertained absent a determination by the Commission, the presiding officer or the presiding Atomic Safety and Licensing Board that the petition and/or request should be granted based upon a balancing of the factors specified in 10 CFR 2.714(a)(1)(i)-(v) and 2.714(d).

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendment dated February 22, 1999, supplemented by letters dated March 19 and June 30, 1999, 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 Houston-Love Memorial Library, 212 W. Burdeshaw Street, Post Office Box 1369, Dothan, Alabama.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 26th day of August 1999.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

L. Mark Padovan,

*Project Manager, Project Directorate II,
Division of Licensing Project Management,
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*
[FR Doc. 99-22766 Filed 8-31-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

**NUCLEAR REGULATORY
COMMISSION**

[Docket No. 40-08980]

**Environmental Assessment, Finding of
No Significant Impact, and Notice of
Opportunity for a Hearing for
Remediation of the Lakehurst, NJ Site**

Summary and Conclusions

The environmental assessment (EA) reviews the environmental impacts of the decommissioning actions proposed by Heritage Minerals, Incorporated (HMI) of their Lakehurst, New Jersey facility. Based upon the NRC staff evaluation of the HMI Final Status Survey Plan (FSSP), dated November 3, 1997, it was determined that the proposed decommissioning can be accomplished in compliance with the NRC public and occupational dose limits, effluent release limits, and residual radioactive material limits. In addition, the approval of the proposed action, i.e., decommissioning of HMI's Lakehurst, New Jersey facility in accordance with the commitments in NRC license SMB-1541 and the FSSP (decommissioning plan), will not result in significant adverse impact on the environment.

1.0 Introduction

1.1 Background

Heritage Minerals, Inc. is the current holder of NRC radioactive source materials license SMB-1541 (NRC Docket 40-08980) for the possession of radioactive material resulting from operations at their facility located in Lakehurst, New Jersey. The license authorizes HMI to possess at any one time a maximum of 300 kg of uranium in the form of natural uranium as monazite and 15,000 kg of thorium in the form of natural thorium as monazite. Processing of licensed material is not authorized except incident to facility decommissioning activities and packaging materials for shipment.

In December 1996, HMI informed the NRC staff that it intended to decommission the Lakehurst, New Jersey facility. The licensee submitted the Final Status Survey Plan (FSSP or decommissioning plan) to the NRC for review on November 3, 1997. The license was renewed on May 26, 1998 to authorize possession, packaging, storage, and decommissioning in accordance with the FSSP and transfer of products and waste to authorized recipients. Prior to the renewal, a safety evaluation report (SER), which evaluated conformance of the proposed action with NRC regulations and regulatory guidance was prepared and

the opportunity for a hearing was publicly noticed in the March 12, 1998, **Federal Register** Notice (63 Federal Register 12114). In response to NRC requests, in 1998-99, HMI provided additional information to clarify certain planned remediation activities. The NRC is considering a license amendment which include additional HMI commitments during facility decommissioning.

1.2 Purpose and Need for Proposed Action

NRC is considering approval of the FSSP to allow Heritage Minerals, Inc. to remove radioactive material attributable to licensed operations at the site, to levels that permit release of the property for unrestricted use and termination of radioactive source materials license SMB-1541.

1.3 Description of Proposed Action

The objective of HMI is to decontaminate and decommission the Lakehurst, NJ facility to permit release for unrestricted use and termination of NRC license SMB-1541. Decommissioning will involve remediation of buildings and other above-grade structures, decontamination of process equipment and sumps, excavation of soil containing monazite sands, and restoration of excavated areas. Soil and other radioactively contaminated materials will be transported to either a licensed disposal facility or recipient authorized to receive such material.

NRC staff reviewed the information provided by HMI in the FSSP describing the proposed decommissioning actions and, by letter dated March 16, 1999, requested additional information regarding specific areas that needed clarification. NRC staff concluded that the decommissioning plan (FSSP) and supplemental information (letters dated November 30, 1998, June 24, 1999, July 13, 1999 and August 17, 1999) from A.J. Thompson, Attorney for HMI, Inc., responding to NRC comments provided an adequate information base for assessing potential environmental impacts from the proposed action.

2.0 Facility Description/Operating History

2.1 Site Locale and Physical

Description The Heritage Minerals, Inc. site is located on Route 70 in Lakehurst, Manchester Township (Ocean County), New Jersey, in the Atlantic Coastal Plain. It encompasses an area of approximately 7000 acres, of which 1000-1200 acres were used for mining operations involving monazite.