

*Agenda:* To review and evaluate CISE Information Technology Workforce proposals submitted in response to the program announcement (NSF 00-77).

*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: July 24, 2000.

**Karen J. York,**

*Committee Management Officer.*

[FR Doc. 00-19030 Filed 7-26-00; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7555-01-M**

## NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

### U.S. National Assessment Synthesis Team; Notice of Meeting

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

*Name:* U.S. National Assessment Synthesis Team (#5219).

*Date/Time:* August 24, 2000; 8 a.m.-5:30 p.m. (**Note:** signups for making public comments will begin at 7:45 a.m.)

*Place:* Historic Inns of Annapolis, Governor Calvert Conference Center, 58 State Circle, Annapolis, MD, 21401.

*Type of Meeting:* Open.

*Contact Person:* Dr. Thomas Spence, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Blvd., Suite 705, Arlington, VA 22230. Tel 703-306-1502 (703-292-5078 as of July 31); Fax: 703-306-0372 (703-292-9042 as of July 31); Email: tspence@nsf.gov. Interested persons should contact Ms. Susan Hensen at the above number as soon as possible to ensure space provisions are made for all participants and observers.

*Meeting Minutes:* May be obtained from the contact person listed above.

*Purpose of Meeting:* To review public comments on the draft report of the National Assessment Synthesis Team on the potential consequences of climate variability and climate change for the United States and to consider changes to the draft report in preparation for final review by the National Science and Technology Council.

*Agenda:* Members will review comments received during the public comment period and discuss and decide upon revisions to the draft report; parts of meeting may be subdivided into three concurrent subpanels, each of which will be open to the public. Beginning at approximately 8:30 AM, up to one hour will be provided for oral presentations by members of the public. Signups for making public comments will begin at 7:45 am.

Dated: July 24, 2000.

**Karen J. York,**

*Committee Management Officer.*

[FR Doc. 00-19032 Filed 7-26-00; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7555-01-M**

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-219]

### AmerGen Energy Company, LLC; Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station; Notice of Consideration of Approval of Transfer of Facility Operating License and Opportunity for a Hearing

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering the issuance of an order under 10 CFR 50.80 approving the transfer of Facility Operating License No. DPR-16 for the Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station, currently held by GPU Nuclear, Inc. and Jersey Central Power & Light Company, as the owner and licensed operator.

A direct transfer of this license from GPU Nuclear, Inc. and Jersey Central Power & Light Company to AmerGen Energy Company, LLC (AmerGen) was approved by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission by an order dated June 6, 2000. The conforming amendment to the license to reflect this transfer will be issued upon completion of the purchase of the facility by AmerGen. Upon completion of this transfer, AmerGen will hold the license as the owner and licensed operator of Oyster Creek.

AmerGen submitted an application to the Commission dated February 28, 2000, which was supplemented by submittals dated May 12, June 1, and June 28, 2000, for a subsequent transfer of the license following the acquisition of Oyster Creek by AmerGen. The subsequent transfer proposed in the application dated February 28, 2000, as supplemented would result from the acquisition of PECO Energy Company's (PECO's) existing interest in AmerGen by a new generation company, Exelon Generation Company, LLC (EGC). EGC is to be a subsidiary of Exelon Ventures Company, which will be a wholly owned subsidiary of a new holding company, Exelon Corporation. Exelon Corporation will be formed from a planned merger between PECO and Unicom Corporation (Unicom). The facility is located in Lacey Township, Ocean County, New Jersey.

According to the application filed for approval by AmerGen, AmerGen is a limited liability company formed to acquire and operate nuclear power

plants in the United States. British Energy, Inc., and PECO each own 50 percent of AmerGen. Following completion of the merger between Unicom and PECO, EGC will acquire PECO's existing 50-percent ownership interest in AmerGen. AmerGen, as owned by EGC and British Energy, Inc., will continue to be responsible, assuming the completion of the transfer of Oyster Creek to AmerGen, for the operation, maintenance, and eventual decommissioning of Oyster Creek. No physical changes to the facility or operational changes are being proposed in the application.

Pursuant to 10 CFR 50.80, no license, or any right thereunder, shall be transferred, directly or indirectly, through transfer of control of the license, unless the Commission shall give its consent in writing. The Commission will approve an application for the transfer of a license if the Commission determines that the proposed transferee is qualified to hold the license, and that the transfer is otherwise consistent with applicable provisions of law, regulations, and orders issued by the Commission pursuant thereto.

The filing of requests for hearing and petitions for leave to intervene, and written comments with regard to the license transfer application, are discussed below.

By August 16, 2000, any person whose interest may be affected by the Commission's action on the application may request a hearing and, if not the applicant, may petition for leave to intervene in a hearing proceeding on the Commission's action. Requests for a hearing and petitions for leave to intervene should be filed in accordance with the Commission's rules of practice set forth in Subpart M, "Public Notification, Availability of Documents and Records, Hearing Requests and Procedures for Hearings on License Transfer Applications," of 10 CFR Part 2.

In particular, 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: Kevin P. Gallen, Esq., Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP, 1800 M Street, NW., Washington, DC 20036-5869; the General Counsel, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555 (e-mail address for filings regarding license transfer cases only: OGCLT@NRC.gov); and the Secretary of the Commission, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, 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.

As an alternative to requests for hearing and petitions to intervene, by August 28, 2000, persons may submit written comments regarding the license transfer application, as provided for in 10 CFR 2.1305. The Commission will consider and, if appropriate, respond to these comments, but such comments will not otherwise constitute part of the decisional record. Comments should be submitted to the Secretary, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, Attention: Rulemakings and Adjudications Staff, and should cite the publication date and page number of this **Federal Register** notice.

For further details with respect to this action, see the application dated February 28, 2000, and the supplements dated May 12, June 1, and June 28, 2000, available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, and accessible electronically through the ADAMS Public Electronic Reading Room link at the NRC Web site (<http://www.nrc.gov>).

Dated at Rockville, Maryland this 21st day of July 2000.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Helen N. Pastis,**

Senior Project Manager, Section 1, Project Directorate I, Division of Licensing Project Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 00-19008 Filed 7-26-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-410]

### Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation; 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. NPF-69 issued to Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation (the licensee) for operation of the Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station, Unit No. 2 (NMP2) located in Scriba, Oswego County, New York.

The proposed amendment would allow a delay in implementation of the Improved Technical Specifications (ITS) from the current August 31, 2000, to December 31, 2000. The current implementation date was imposed by Amendment No. 91, dated February 15, 2000. Specifically, License Condition 2.C.(10), "Additional Condition 1," of the operating license would be revised to show the new date of December 31, 2000.

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:

*The operation of Nine Mile Point Unit 2, in accordance with the proposed amendment, will not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.*

The proposed amendment delays implementation of the Improved Technical Specifications (ITS) from August 31, 2000 to December 31, 2000. The proposed deferral of the ITS implementation date is necessary in order to allow Operations shift crews a transition period of operating the plant using

the CTS [current TS, referring to the pre-Amendment-No. 91 TS] and ITS in parallel to familiarize themselves with the differences. This transition period is considered essential to proper ITS implementation.

The proposed change is administrative in nature in that it simply defers implementation of the ITS for four months. Until the ITS are implemented, the CTS will remain in effect and the unit will continue to be operated in accordance with the NRC approved CTS requirements. Since the change is administrative, previously evaluated accident precursors or initiators are not affected and, as a result, the probability of accident initiation will remain as previously evaluated. Furthermore, the change will not affect the design, function, or operation of any structures, systems, or components, nor will it affect any maintenance, modification, or testing activities. Thus, there will be no impact on the capability of any structures, systems, or components to perform their credited safety functions to prevent an accident or mitigate the consequences of an accident previously evaluated. It is, therefore, concluded that operation in accordance with the proposed change will not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

*The operation of Nine Mile Point Unit 2, in accordance with the proposed amendment, will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.*

Deferral of the ITS implementation date is an administrative change. As such, the proposed change will not affect the design, function, or operation of any plant structures, systems, or components, nor will it affect any maintenance, modification, or testing activities. Since the change is administrative, there will be no impact on the process variables, characteristics, or functional performance of any structures, systems, or components in a manner that could create a new failure mode. Furthermore, the change will not introduce any new modes of plant operation or eliminate any actions required to prevent or mitigate accidents. It is, therefore, concluded that operation in accordance with the proposed change will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

*The operation of Nine Mile Point Unit 2, in accordance with the proposed amendment, will not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.*

Deferral of the ITS implementation date is an administrative change. As such, the proposed change does not involve any hardware changes or physical alteration of the plant and the change will have no impact on the design or function of any structures, systems, or components. Furthermore, the change will not eliminate any requirements, impose any new requirements, or alter any physical parameters which could reduce the margin to an acceptance limit. It is, therefore, concluded that operation in accordance with the proposed change will not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.