Amendment Nos.: 223 and 204.
Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-70 and DPR-75. The amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register**: March 10, 1999 (64 FR 11965).

The April 26, 1999, letter provided clarifying information that did not change the initial proposed no significant hazards consideration determination.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated July 21, 1999.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Salem Free Public Library, 112 West Broadway, Salem, NJ 08079.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 4th day of August 1999.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

#### Suzanne C. Black,

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

[FR Doc. 99–20545 Filed 8–10–99; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

# NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

#### Seabrook Nuclear Power Station; Issuance of Director's Decision Under 10 CFR 2.206

Notice is hereby given that the Director, Office of Enforcement, has issued a Director's Decision concerning a petition dated March 31, 1999, filed by Mr. David A. Lochbaum against unspecified individuals working at the Seabrook Nuclear Power Station (Seabrook Station) pursuant to Section 2.206 of Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations (10 CFR 2.206). The petition requests that the individuals responsible for discrimination against a contract electrician at the Seabrook Nuclear Generating Station as identified in NRC Office of Investigations (OI) Report No. 1-98-005 be banned by the NRC from participation in licensed activities at and for any nuclear power plant for a period of at least five (5) years; that the individuals responsible for creating a false record to cover up the concern raised by the contract electrician as identified in the cited OI report also be banned by the NRC from participation in licensed activities at and for any nuclear power plant for a period of a least five (5) years; and that the Petitioner be permitted to attend the upcoming pre-decisional enforcement conference on this matter.

The Director, Office of Enforcement, has determined that the petition should

be denied for the reasons stated in the "Director's Decision Under 10 CFR 2.206" (i.e., DD-99-10). While the NRC staff concluded that the foreman had engaged in wrongdoing, the Director, Office of Enforcement denied Mr. Lochbaum's request to ban the foreman from participating in licensed activities for a period of at least five years because the requested enforcement action is not appropriate based on the circumstances of the case. The Director's Decision and the Notices of Violation issued to the foreman, Williams Power Corporation, and NAESCO for the foreman's wrongdoing are available for public inspection and copying in the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street NW, Washington, DC, and on the NRC's web page at http://www.nrc.gov/NRC/ PUBLIC/2206/index.html and http:// www.nrc.gov/OE/rpr/oehome4.htm respectively.

A copy of the Director's Decision has been filed with the Secretary of the Commission for the Commission's review in accordance with 10 CFR 2.206(c). As provided therein, the Director's Decision will become the final action of the Commission twenty-five days after issuance unless the Commission, on its own motion, institutes a review of the Decision within that time.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland this 3rd day of August 1999.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. **R. W. Borchardt.** 

Director, Office of Enforcement.
[FR Doc. 99–20686 Filed 8–10–99; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

# NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

### Standard Review Plan: Licensee Requests To Delay initiation of Decommissioning Activities

NRC's "Timeliness in Decommissioning of Materials Facility" rule (hereafter the Timeliness Rule), became effective on August 15, 1994. The Timeliness Rule established the criteria necessary to avoid future problems resulting from delayed decommissioning of contaminated inactive facilities, separate buildings, and outdoor areas.

In May 1996, the Nuclear Energy Institute (NEI) filed a petition for rulemaking to amend the Timeliness Rule to allow licensees to delay decommissioning and operate in a "standby" mode. NRC denied NEI's petition for rulemaking because the Timeliness Rule contains provisions which allow licensees to request delays or postponement of decommissioning, provided they can demonstrate that the delay is not detrimental to the public health and safety and is otherwise in the public interest. However, along with denying the petition, the Commission requested that NRC prepare guidance to identify the acceptance criteria necessary to demonstrate that postponement of decommissioning activities will not be detrimental to the public interest.

In response to the Commission request, NRC has developed the draft Standard Review Plan (SRP) titled, "Licensee Requests to Delay Initiation of Decommissioning Activities." NRC has posted the draft SRP on the internet (www.nrc.gov/NMSS/DWM/DECOM/ decomm.htm) to provide interested parties an opportunity to review and comment on NRC's acceptance criteria necessary to demonstrate that postponement of decommissioning activities will not be detrimental to the public health and safety and is otherwise in the public interest. NRC will consider all comments received in finalizing the SRP for implementation.

The draft SRP is available for inspection at the NRC's Public Document Room, 2120 L Street NW, Washington, DC 20555.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 2nd day of August 1999.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

### Larry W. Camper,

Chief, Decommissioning Branch, Division of Waste Management, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards. [FR Doc. 99–20684 Filed 8–10–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

## OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET

### **Budget Rescissions and Deferrals**

TO THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES:

In accordance with the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, I herewith report one revised deferral of budget authority, now totaling \$173 million.

The deferral affects programs of the Department of State.

William J. Clinton THE WHITE HOUSE, August 2, 1999.

#### **Supplemental Report**

### Report Pursuant to Section 1013 of P.L. 93-

This report updates Deferral No. 99–1A, which was transmitted to Congress on February 1, 1999.

This revision increases by \$72,276,278 the previous deferral of \$100,581,381 in the United States Emergency Refugee and Migration Assistance Fund, Department of State, resulting in a total deferral of \$172,857,659. This increase results from the deferral of new budget authority provided for FY 1999 in the FY 1999 Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act (P.L. 106–31)

#### **DEFERRAL OF BUDGET AUTHORITY**

# Report Pursuant to Section 1013 of P.L. 93-344

Agency: DEPARTMENT OF STATE
Bureau: Other.
Account: United States emergency refugee
and migration assistance fund 1
(11X0400)

New budget authority: \*\$195,000,000 Other budgetary resources: \*75,412,337 Total budgetary resources: \*270,412,337 Amount deferred for entire year: \*172,857,659

Justification: This deferral withholds funds available for emergency refugee and migration assistance for which no determination has been made by the President to provide assistance as required by Executive Order No. 11922. Funds will be released as the President determines assistance to be furnished and designates refugees to be assisted by the Fund. This deferral action is taken under the provisions of the Antideficiency Act (31 U.S.C. 1512).

Section 501(a) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act of 1976 (Public Law 94–141) and section 414(b)(1) of the Refugee Act of 1980 (Public Law 96–212) amended section 2(c) of the Migration and Refugee Assistance Act of 1962 (22 U.S.C. 2601) by authorizing a fund to enable the President to provide emergency assistance for unexpected urgent refugee and migration needs.

Executive Order No. 11922 of June 16, 1976, allocated all funds appropriated to the President for emergency refugee and migration assistance to the Secretary of State, but reserved for the President the determination of assistance to be furnished and the designation of refugees to be assisted by the Fund.

Estimated programmatic effect: None.

[FR Doc. 99–20700 Filed 8–10–99; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 3110–01–P

## OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET

OMB Circular A-110, "Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants and Agreements With Institutions of Higher Education, Hospitals, and Other Non-Profit Organizations"

**AGENCY:** Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President.

**ACTION:** Request for Comments on Clarifying Changes to Proposed Revision on Public Access to Research Data.

**SUMMARY:** This notice offers interested parties an opportunity to comment on clarifying changes to a proposed revision to OMB Circular A-110, "Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants and Agreements with Institutions of Higher Education, Hospitals, and Other Non-Profit Organizations." Public Law 105-277 directs OMB to amend Section .36 of the Circular "to require Federal awarding agencies to ensure that all data produced under an award will be made available to the public through the procedures established under the Freedom of Information Act" (FOIA). Pursuant to the direction of Public Law 105-277, OMB published a Notice of Proposed Revision on February 4, 1999.

OMB received over 9,000 comments on the proposed revision. Many of these comments raised serious concerns about the impact Public Law 105-277 and the proposed revision would have on the conduct of scientific research. In part, these concerns arose from questions as to how expansively or narrowly the proposed revision would be interpreted and applied. In raising these questions, commenters on both sides of the debate sought clarification of four concepts found in the proposed revision: "data," 'published," "used by the Federal Government in developing policy or rules," and cost reimbursement.

In response to these comments, and in order to advance implementation of the requirements of Public Law 105-277, OMB has developed proposed clarifying definitions for the first three of these concepts and is providing additional background discussion regarding the fourth. In framing these definitions, OMB has used its discretion to balance the need for public access to research data with protections of the research process. Specifically, OMB seeks to further the interest of the public in obtaining the information needed to validate Federally-funded research findings, ensure that research can continue to be conducted in accordance with the traditional scientific process, and implement a public-access process that will be workable in practice. OMB will consider all comments received in response to this notice, and the comments received in response to the prior notice, in its development of the final revision to the Circular. OMB intends to publish the final revision on or before September 30, 1999. It is not necessary to re-submit comments already provided to OMB.

**DATES:** Comments must be received by September 10, 1999.

**ADDRESSES:** Comments on this proposed revision should be addressed to: F. James Charney, Policy Analyst, Office of Management and Budget, Room 6025, New Executive Office Building, Washington, DC 20503. Comments may be submitted via E-mail (grants@omb.eop.gov), but must be made in the text of the message and not as an attachment. Since OMB will consider all comments that it receives, it is not necessary to send multiple copies of a comment letter to different officials in the Executive Branch. The full text of Circular A-110, the text of this notice, and the text of the February 4, 1999, Notice of Proposed Revision, may be obtained by accessing OMB's home page (http:// www.whitehouse.gov/OMB), under the heading "Grants Management." Copies of Public Law 105-277 can be obtained by accessing the Library of Congress's home page (http://thomas.loc.gov). FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: F. James Charney, Policy Analyst, Office of Management and Budget, at (202) 395-3993. Press inquiries must be directed to OMB's Communications Office, at (202) 395 - 7254.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

#### I. Approach to Implementation

Congress included a two-sentence provision in Public Law 105–277 that directs OMB to amend Circular A-110 "to require Federal awarding agencies to ensure that all data produced under an award will be made available to the public through the procedures established under the Freedom of Information Act." The provision also provides for a reasonable fee to cover the costs incurred in responding to the request. The Circular applies to grants and other financial assistance provided to institutions of higher education, hospitals, and non-profit institutions, from all Federal agencies. Therefore, the proposed revision will affect the full range of research activities funded by the Federal Government.

In response to the provision contained in Public Law 105–277, OMB published a Notice of Proposed Revision to the Circular on February 4, 1999 (64 FR 5684). OMB received over 9,000 comments on the proposed revision. Many of these comments (including many of those from the scientific community) raised serious concerns about the effect the provision contained in Public Law 105–277 and the proposed revision would have on scientific research. They sought protection for the privacy of research

 $<sup>^{\</sup>scriptscriptstyle 1}$  This account was the subject of a similar deferral in FY 1998 (D98–7).

<sup>\*</sup> Revised from previous report.