

Units 1 and 2, currently held by Commonwealth Edison Company (ComEd), as the owner and licensed operator. On pages 53043, column 1; 53044, column 1; 53039, column 2; 53040, column 2; 53041, column 2; and 53042, column 1, the following sentence is corrected to read: "By September 20, 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."

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 8th day of September 2000.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Donna M. Skay,

Project Manager, Section 2, Project Directorate III, Division of Licensing Project Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 00-23609 Filed 9-13-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50-352, 50-353, 50-171, 50-277, 50-278, 50-272, 50-311]

Peco Energy Company, Limerick Generating Station, Units 1 and 2; Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station, Unit Nos. 1, 2, and 3; Salem Nuclear Generating Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2; Correction to Notice of Consideration of Approval of Application Regarding Proposed Corporate Restructuring and Opportunity for a Hearing

On August 31, 2000, the **Federal Register** published a notice of consideration of issuance of an order under 10 CFR 50.80 approving the indirect transfer of Facility Operating Licenses Nos. NPF-39 and NPF-85 for Limerick Generating Station, Units 1 and 2; DPR-12, DPR-44, and DPR-56 for Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station, Unit Nos. 1, 2, and 3; and DPR-70 and DPR-75 for Salem Nuclear Generating Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2. On pages 53046, column 1; 53045, column 1; and 53047, column 1, the following sentence is corrected to read: "By September 20, 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."

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 8th day of September 2000.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Donna M. Skay,

Project Manager, Section 2, Project Directorate III, Division of Licensing Project Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 00-23606 Filed 9-13-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-352]

PECO Energy Company (Limerick Generating Station, Unit 1); Exemption

I

The PECO Energy Company (PECO, the licensee) is the holder of Facility Operating License No. NPF-39 which authorizes operation of the Limerick Generating Station, Unit 1 (Limerick Unit 1). The license provides, among other things, that the facility is subject to all rules, regulations, and orders of the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC, the Commission) now or hereafter in effect.

The facility consists of a boiling water reactor located in Montgomery and Chester Counties in Pennsylvania.

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) for 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 P-T limits identified as "ASME Appendix G limits" in Table 1 require that the limits must be at least as conservative as the limits obtained by following the methods of analysis and the margins of safety of Appendix G of Section XI of the ASME Code.

To address provisions of a proposed license amendment to the technical specification P-T limits for the Limerick facility, the licensee requested in its submittal of May 15, 2000, as supplemented by May 19 and August 10, 2000, that the staff exempt Limerick Unit 1 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 2, 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. Code Case N-640 permits the use of an alternate reference fracture toughness (K_{Ic} fracture toughness curve instead of K_{Ia} fracture toughness curve) for reactor vessel materials in determining the P-T limits. Since the K_{Ic} fracture toughness curve shown in ASME Section XI, Appendix A, Figure A-2200-1 (the K_{Ic} fracture toughness curve, K_{Ic} curve) provides greater allowable fracture toughness than the corresponding K_{Ia} fracture toughness curve of ASME Section XI, Appendix G, Figure G-2210-1 (the K_{Ia} fracture toughness curve, K_{Ia} 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.

Code Case N-588

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

The proposed license amendment to revise the P-T limits for Limerick Unit 1 relies, 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 an RPV circumferential weld in lieu of an axially-oriented flaw required by the 1989 Edition of ASME 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 extend 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 confirm that any remaining flaws are small, laminar in nature, and do not transverse the weld bead orientation.