

integrity, development and enhancement of NSF's business operations.

#### Agenda

October 22, 2002

AM: Introductions and Updates—Office of Budget, Finance, and Award Management and Office of Information and Resource Management activities.

Presentation and Discussion—NSF Business Analysis; NSF Academy.

PM: Presentation and Discussion—Meet with NSF Deputy Director; Office of Management Discussion—Performance Assessment; Integrating Budget, Cost, and Performance; NIH Presentation on Compliance.

PM: Discussion—Planning for next meeting; feedback; other business.

*Reason for Late Notice:* This notice is late because there were last minute revisions to the agenda.

Dated: October 9, 2002.

**Susanne Bolton,**

*Committee Management Officer.*

[FR Doc. 02–26133 Filed 10–11–02; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7555–01–M**

## NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

### Advisory Committee for Education and Human Resources

#### 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:* Advisory Committee for Education and Human Resources (ACEHR) (#1119).

*Date and Time:* November 6, 8:30 a.m.–6 p.m., November 7, 8:30 a.m.–3 p.m.

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

*Type of Meeting:* Open.

*Contact Person:* Jane T. Stutsman, Deputy Assistant Director Directorate for Education and Human Resources, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Room 805, Arlington, VA 22230, 703–292–8601.

*Purpose of Meeting:* To provide advice and recommendations concerning NSF support for Education and Human Resources.

*Agenda:* Discussion of FY 2002 programs of the Directorate for Education and Human Resources and planning for future activities.

Dated: October 8, 2002.

**Susanne Bolton,**

*Committee Management Officer.*

[FR Doc. 02–26134 Filed 10–11–02; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7555–01–M**

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50–410]

### Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station, LLC; Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station, Unit No. 2; Exemption

#### 1.0 Background

Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station, LLC (NMPNS, or the licensee) is the holder of Facility Operating License Nos. DPR–63 and NPF–69, which authorize operation of Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2 (NMP1 and NMP2), respectively. The licenses provide, among other things, that the licensee 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 two boiling-water reactors (BWRs) located in Oswego County in New York; this exemption addresses only NMP2.

#### 2.0 Request/Action

Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR), part 54, Section 54.17(c) (10 CFR 54.17(c)) stipulates that an application for a renewed license may not be submitted to the Commission earlier than 20 years before the expiration of the operating license currently in effect.

NMPNS, however, requested a schedular exemption from the 20-year restriction specified in 10 CFR 54.17(c) to allow it to submit a renewal application for NMP2 earlier than 20 years before expiration of its operating license. Such an exemption would allow NMPNS to submit one application for renewal of the operating licenses of both NMP1 and NMP2, with the goal of attaining efficiencies for preparation and review of the application. The current operating license for NMP1 (DPR–63) expires on August 22, 2009, and for NMP2 (NPF–69) on October 31, 2026. By the end of 2003, NMP1 will have more than 34 years of operating experience and NMP2 will have more than 17 years of experience.

By application dated January 4, 2002, as supplemented by letter dated June 27, 2002, NMPNS proposed a schedular exemption from the 20-year restriction in 10 CFR 54.17(c) to allow it to submit a renewal application for NMP2 earlier than 20 years before expiration of its operating license.

#### 3.0 Discussion

Pursuant to 10 CFR 54.15, the Commission may, upon application by any interested person or upon its own

initiative, grant exemptions from the requirements of 10 CFR part 54, in accordance with the provisions of 10 CFR 50.12, when (1) the exemptions are authorized by law, will not present an undue risk to public health or safety, and are consistent with the common defense and security; and (2) when special circumstances are present.

The current operating licenses for NMP1 and NMP2 were issued in accordance with the Atomic Energy Act (AEA), as amended, and 10 CFR 50.51, which limit the duration of an operating license to a maximum of 40 years. In accordance with 10 CFR 54.31, the renewed license will be of the same class as the operating license currently in effect and cannot exceed a term of 40 years. Therefore, the term of the renewed licenses for NMP1 and NMP2, are limited both by Federal statute and the Commission's regulations to 40 years. Additionally, Section 54.31(b) of 10 CFR states that:

A renewed license will be issued for a fixed period of time, which is the sum of the additional amount of time beyond the expiration of the operating license (not to exceed 20 years) that is requested in a renewal application plus the remaining number of years on the operating license currently in effect. The term of any renewed license may not exceed 40 years.

The potential exists, due to NMPNS's decision to apply early for license renewal for NMP2, that the renewed NMP2 license may not have the maximum 20-year period of extended operation permitted by 10 CFR 54.31(b). Any actual reduction from the maximum of 20 years will depend on the date the renewed NMP2 license is issued.

The Commission's basis for establishing the 20-year limit contained in 10 CFR 54.17(c) is discussed in the 1991 Statement of Consideration for 10 CFR part 54 (56 FR 64963). The limit was established to ensure that substantial operating experience was accumulated by a licensee before a renewal application is submitted, such that any plant-specific concerns regarding aging would be disclosed. While amending the rule in 1995, the Commission sought public comment on whether the 20-year limit should be reduced. The Commission determined that sufficient basis did not exist to generically reduce the 20-year limit. However, the Commission indicated in the Statement of Consideration for the amended rule (60 FR 22488), that it was willing to consider plant-specific exemption requests by applicants who believe that sufficient information is available to justify applying for license renewal prior to 20 years from