

the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated October 6, 2000.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

*Union Electric Company, Docket No. 50-483, Callaway Plant, Unit 1, Callaway County, Missouri*

*Date of application for amendment:* May 25, 2000 (ULNRC-04258).

*Brief description of amendment:* The amendment expands (1) The range of acceptable lift settings for the pressurizer safety valves (PSVs), and (2) the tolerance (from  $\pm 1\%$  to  $\pm 2\%$ ) of the as-found, measured lift settings of tested PSVs, to be operable. Following testing, however, the lift settings of the PSVs would remain nor more than the current  $\pm 1\%$ . The amendment revises Technical Specifications (TS) 3.3.2, "Engineered Safety Features Actuation System (ESFAS) Instrumentation," 3.4.10, "Pressurizer Safety Valves," and 3.4.11, "Pressurizer Power Operated Relief Valves (PORVs)," of the Callaway TS. For TS 3.3.2, a new Action H for one or more trains inoperable is added, the note for surveillance requirement (SR) 3.3.2.14 is revised to identify another slave relay that the SR would be applicable to, and the automatic PORV actuation is added to Table 3.3.2-1, "Engineered Safety Features Actuation System Instrumentation." For TS 3.4.10, the range of allowable PSV lift settings in the limiting condition for operation (LCO) is expanded from  $\geq 2460$  and  $\leq 2510$  to  $\geq 2411$  and  $\leq 2509$ , and SR 3.4.10.1 is revised to state that, following testing, the lift settings shall be "within 1% of 2460 psig" instead of simply "within 1%." The nominal PSV lift setting would be changed from 2485 psig to 2460 psig. For TS 3.4.11, Actions A and B is revised to be actions for inoperable PORVs either solely due to excessive PORV seat leakage (Action A) or for reasons other than excessive seat leakage (Action B), and Action E would remain an action for two inoperable PORVs, but would be only for reasons other than excessive seat leakage.

*Date of issuance:* September 25, 2000.

*Effective date:* September 25, 2000, to be implemented (including issuing the revised EOP E-O and training all the control room operator crews on the revised procedure) before the restart from refueling outage 11, the next refueling outage for Callaway Plant, Unit 1, scheduled to begin in Spring 2001.

*Amendment No.:* 137.

*Facility Operating License No. NPF-30:* The amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* June 28, 2000 (65 FR 29964).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated September 25, 2000.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

*Union Electric Company, Docket No. 50-483, Callaway Plant, Unit 1, Callaway County, Missouri*

*Date of application for amendment:* July 21, 2000 (ULNRC-04285), as supplemented August 16, 2000.

*Brief description of amendment:* The amendment revises Limiting Condition for Operation (LCO) 3.9.4, "Containment Penetrations," of the Callaway Technical Specifications (TS) to allow containment penetrations with direct access to the outside atmosphere to be open under administrative controls during refueling operations, by adding a note to the LCO that states "containment penetration flow path(s) providing direct access from the containment atmosphere to the outside atmosphere may be unisolated under administrative controls." In addition, there is a format and editorial correction to TS 3.8.3, "Diesel Fuel Oil, Lube Oil, and Start Air," to correct an error in the conversion to the improved TS issued May 28, 1999, in Amendment No. 133.

*Date of issuance:* September 26, 2000.

*Effective date:* September 26, 2000, to be implemented (including the completion of the administrative procedures that ensure that open containment penetrations, with direct access to the outside atmosphere during refueling operations with core alterations and irradiated fuel movement inside containment, will be promptly closed in the event of a fuel handling accident inside containment) before refueling operations during refueling outage 11.

*Amendment No.:* 138.

*Facility Operating License No. NPF-30:* The amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* August 23, 2000 (65 FR 51364). The August 16, 2000, supplement provided additional clarifying information, did not expand the scope of the application as originally noticed, and did not change the staff's original proposed no significant hazards consideration determination.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated September 26, 2000.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

*Union Electric Company, Docket No. 50-483, Callaway Plant, Unit 1, Callaway County, Missouri*

*Date of application for amendment:* September 8, 1999.

*Brief description of amendment:* The amendment authorizes revisions to the descriptions of the steam generator tube rupture and main steam line break accidents in the Callaway Plant, Unit 1 Final Safety Analysis Report (FSAR) to reflect increases in the radiological dose consequences calculated by the licensee for these accidents.

*Date of issuance:* September 27, 2000.

*Effective date:* September 27, 2000, to be implemented in the next periodic update to the FSAR in accordance with 10 CFR 50.71(e). Implementation of the amendment is the incorporation into the FSAR the changes to the description of the facility as described in the licensee's application dated September 8, 1999, and evaluated in the staff's Safety Evaluation attached to the amendment.

*Amendment No.:* 139.

*Facility Operating License No. NPF-30:* The amendment revised the Final Safety Analysis Report.

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* October 6, 1999 (64 FR 54383).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated September 27, 2000.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 11th day of October 2000.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**John A. Zwolinski,**

*Director, Division of Licensing Project Management. Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 00-26645 Filed 10-17-00; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7590-01-P**

## PRESIDIO TRUST

**Presidio Theatre (Building 99), The Presidio of San Francisco, California, Notice of Termination of Environmental Impact Statement Process**

**AGENCY:** The Presidio Trust.

**ACTION:** Notice of termination of Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process for the rehabilitation and expansion of the Presidio Theatre (Building 99) within The Presidio of San Francisco, San Francisco, California (Presidio).

**RATIONALE:** The Presidio Trust (Trust) is terminating the EIS process for the Presidio Theatre in order to complete an update of the 1994 General Management

Plan Amendment (GMPA) for Area B of the Presidio and associated EIS as noticed on June 30, 2000 (65 FR 40707–40708) and amended on October 11, 2000 (65 FR 60477–60478). It is expected that this plan update, known as the Presidio Trust Implementation Plan (PTIP) will provide a comprehensive planning framework within which future projects for the Presidio would proceed. Following the completion and adoption of the PTIP and associated EIS and if appropriate within the adopted comprehensive planning framework, the Trust expects to re-propose and reinitiate a project related to the Presidio Theatre, and will inform the public of its intent at that later date. As a result of this notice of termination, the Presidio Theatre project is no longer being treated as an assumption common to all alternatives (*i.e.*, as a “given”) in the PTIP NEPA process.

## Background

On April 14, 2000, the Trust announced in the **Federal Register** (65 FR 20218) its intention to prepare an Environmental Assessment (EA) for rehabilitating the existing 15,140-square-foot Presidio Theatre and adding up to 45,000 square feet of new construction for theater uses, a restaurant, retail museum and library store (project). On May 10, 2000, the Trust held a public scoping workshop to solicit public comment regarding the range of alternatives and the specific impacts to be evaluated in the EA. Following the workshop, the Trust determined based upon public comment that an EIS rather than an EA, as previously noticed, would better serve the agency’s compliance with the NEPA’s requirements. Therefore, on June 9, 2000, pursuant to 40 CFR 1508.22, the Trust published a notice of intent to prepare an EIS (65 FR 36746) and to extend the public scoping period to provide additional time for the public to make views known on the project. In response to public input at the May 10, 2000 scoping workshop, the Trust held a second public scoping workshop on June 19, 2000, at which time the public was able to tour Building 99 and neighboring Building 100 and to comment on revised project alternatives. Shortly after the end of the public comment period on July 24, 2000, the Trust had received 11 comment letters on NEPA issues and concerns regarding the project from seven agencies, two commenting organizations (one organization submitted two letters), and one individual. An additional 15 organizations and individuals also

submitted letters expressing either their support or opposition to the project.

Termination of the Presidio Theatre project EIS at this time is with the mutual agreement of both the Trust and San Francisco Film Centre (project proponent). Independent of the Presidio Theatre EIS process, the Trust initiated the review and update of the GMPA. The PTIP and associated EIS will provide a comprehensive planning framework for Area B of the Presidio. Therefore, the Trust and the Presidio Theatre project proponent have determined to terminate the Presidio Theatre EIS process until completion of the PTIP and PTIP EIS process. A complete administrative record, including all public and agency comments received and all work completed or underway on the Presidio Theatre project, will be maintained by the Trust pending reinitiation, if appropriate, of a Presidio Theatre project following adoption of a governing comprehensive plan for Area B of the Presidio.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** John Pelka, NEPA Compliance Coordinator, The Presidio Trust, 34 Graham Street, P.O. Box 29052, San Francisco, CA 94129–0052. Telephone: 415–561–5300.

Dated: October 12, 2000.

**Karen A. Cook,**  
*General Counsel.*

[FR Doc. 00–26706 Filed 10–17–00; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4310–4R–P**

---

## SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

**Issuer Delisting; Notice of Application To Withdraw From Listing and Registration; (DuraSwitch Industries, Inc., Common Stock, \$.001 Par Value) File No. 1–15069**

October 12, 2000.

DuraSwitch Industries, Inc., a Nevada corporation (“Company”), has filed an application with the Securities and Exchange Commission (“Commission”), pursuant to Section 12(d) of the Securities and Exchange Act of 1934 (“Act”)<sup>1</sup> and Rule 12d2–2(d) thereunder,<sup>2</sup> to withdraw its Common Stock, \$.001 par value (“Security”), from listing and registration on the American Stock Exchange LLC (“Amex”).

The Company has effected a new listing for its Security on the National Market of the Nasdaq Stock Market, Inc. (“Nasdaq”). Trading in the Security on

the Nasdaq commenced, and was concurrently suspended on the Amex, at the opening of business on October 11, 2000. The Company hopes to realize a broader institutional and retail investor base by transferring trading in its Security to the Nasdaq.

The Company has stated in its application that it has complied with the rules of the Amex governing the withdrawal of its Security and that its application relates solely to the withdrawal of the Security from listing and registration on the Amex and shall have no effect upon the Security’s continued designation for quotation on the Nasdaq and registration under Section 12(g) of the Act.<sup>3</sup>

Any interested person may, on or before November 2, 2000, submit by letter to the Secretary of the Securities and Exchange Commission, 450 Fifth Street, NW., Washington, DC 20549–0609, facts bearing upon whether the application has been made in accordance with the rules of the Amex and what terms, if any, should be imposed by the Commission for the protection of investors. The Commission, based on the information submitted to it, will issue an order granting the application after the date mentioned above, unless the Commission determines to order a hearing on the matter.

For the Commission, by the Division of Market Regulation, pursuant to delegated authority.<sup>4</sup>

**Jonathan G. Katz,**  
*Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 00–26743 Filed 10–17–00; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 8010–01–M**

---

## SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. IC–24685; File No. 812–12138]

**The Penn Mutual Life Insurance Company, et al., Notice of Application**

October 11, 2000.

**AGENCY:** Securities and Exchange Commission (“SEC” or “Commission”).

**ACTION:** Notice of application for an order under section 6(c) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (the “1940 Act” or “Act”) granting exemptions from the provisions of sections 2(a)(32), 22(c), and 27(i)(2)(A) of the Act, and rule 22c–1 thereunder.

**SUMMARY OF APPLICATION:** Applicants seek an order to permit the recapture of certain credit enhancements (i) made by

<sup>1</sup> 15 U.S.C. 78j(d).

<sup>2</sup> 17 CFR 240.12d2–2(d).

<sup>3</sup> 15 U.S.C. 78l(g).

<sup>4</sup> 17 CFR 200.30–3(a)(1).