same as that covered by the Peoria Regional Office.

The newly created Subregion will be designated as Subregion 33.

The last list of Regional and Subregional Offices was published at 53 FR 10305–10308, March 30, 1988.

Accordingly, the NLRB revises its Statement of Organization and Functions to reflect the addition of Subregion 33, Peoria, Illinois, and the elimination of Region 33.

Dated: Washington, DC, August 29, 2000.

By direction of the Board. National Labor Relations Board.

Lester A. Heltzer,

Acting Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc. 00–22554 Filed 8–31–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7545–01–M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50–400–LA; ASLBP No. 99–762–02–LA]

Carolina Power & Light Company; Notice of Reconstitution

Pursuant to the authority contained in 10 CFR 2.721, the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board in the Carolina Power & Light Company proceeding, with the above-identified Docket Number, is hereby reconstituted by appointing Administrative Judge Thomas D. Murphy in place of Administrative Judge Frederick J. Shon. This Licensing Board reconstitution is a result of Judge Shon's retirement.

As reconstituted, the Board is comprised of the following Administrative Judges: G. Paul Bollwerk, III, Chairman, Dr. Peter S. Lam, Thomas D. Murphy.

All correspondence, documents, and other material shall be filed with the Licensing Board in accordance with 10 CFR 2.712. The address of the new member is: Administrative Judge Thomas D. Murphy, Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001.

Issued at Rockville, Maryland, this 28th day of August 2000.

G. Paul Bollwerk III,

Chief Administrative Judge, Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel.

[FR Doc. 00–22493 Filed 8–31–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50–237 and 50–249]

Commonwealth Edison Company (Dresden Nuclear Power Station, Units 2 and 3); Exemption

I

The Commonwealth Edison Company (ComEd, the licensee) is the holder of Facility Operating Licenses Nos. DPR–19 and DPR–25 which authorize operation of the Dresden Nuclear Power Station, Units 2 and 3 (Dresden). The licenses provide, among other things, that the facility is subject to all rules, regulations, and orders of the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) now or hereafter in effect.

The facility consists of boiling water reactors (Units 2 and 3) located on the licensee's Dresden site in Grundy County, Illinois. This exemption refers to both units.

II

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) during 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 specifies that the PT limits must meet the safety margin requirements specified in the American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME) Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code (Code) Section XI, Appendix G.

To address provisions of the proposed amendments to the technical specification (TS) P–T limits, in its submittal of February 23, 2000, the licensee requested that the staff exempt Dresden from application of specific requirements of 10 CFR Part 50, Section 50.60(a) and Appendix G, and substitute use of ASME Code Cases N–588 and N–640. Code Case N–588 permits the postulation of a circumferentially-oriented flaw (in lieu of an axially-oriented flaw) for the evaluation of the circumferential welds in RPV P–T limit curves. Since the pressure stresses on a circumferentially-oriented flaw are lower than the pressure stresses on an axially-oriented flaw by a factor of two, using Code Case N–588 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 be required by 10 CFR 50.60(a). Code Case N–640 permits the use of an alternate reference fracture toughness (K_{1c} fracture toughness curve instead of K_{1a} fracture toughness curve) for reactor vessel materials in determining the P–T limits. Since the K_{1c} fracture toughness curve shown in ASME Code, Section XI, Appendix A, Figure A–2200–1 provides greater allowable fracture toughness than the corresponding K_{1a} fracture toughness curve of ASME Code, Section XI, Appendix G, Figure G–2210–1 (the K_{1a} fracture toughness 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(a).

Code Case N–588

The licensee has proposed an exemption to allow the use of ASME Code Case N–588 in conjunction with ASME Code, Section XI, 10 CFR 50.60(a) and 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix G, to determine the P–T limits.

The proposed amendments to revise the P–T limits for Dresden rely, in part, on the requested exemption. These proposed P–T limits have been developed using the postulation of a circumferentially-oriented reference flaw as the limiting flaw in a RPV circumferential weld in lieu of an axially-oriented flaw required by the 1989 Edition of ASME Code, Section XI, Appendix G.

Postulating the Appendix G (axially-oriented flaw) reference flaw in a circumferential weld is physically unrealistic and overly conservative because the length of the flaw would extent well beyond the girth of the circumferential weld and into the adjoining base metal material. Industry experience with the repair of weld indications found during preservice inspection, and data taken from destructive examination of actual vessel welds, confirms that any remaining flaws are small, laminar in nature, and do not transverse the weld bead orientation. Therefore, any potential defects introduced during the fabrication process, and not detected during subsequent nondestructive examinations, would only be expected to be oriented in the direction of weld fabrication. A defect with a circumferential orientation is, therefore, postulated for circumferential welds.

An analysis provided to the ASME Code's Working Group on Operating Plant Criteria (WGOPC) (in which Code Case N–588 was developed) indicated