

proprietary or confidential nature, including technical information; financial data, such as salaries; and personal information concerning individuals associated with the proposals. These matters are exempt under 5 U.S.C. 552b. (c) (4) and (6) of the Government in the Sunshine Act.

Dated: November 22, 1999.

Karen J. York,

Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 99-30756 Filed 11-24-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555-01-M

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Special Emphasis Panel in Biological Sciences; 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 and Committee Code: Special Emphasis Panel in Biological Sciences (#1754).

Date and Time: Thursday, January 20, 2000, 8:30 a.m.-5:00 p.m.; Friday, January 21, 2000, 8:30 a.m.-Adjourn.

Place: Room 390, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, Virginia 22230.

Type of Meeting: Closed.

Contact Person: Carter Kimsey, Program Coordinator, Postdoctoral Research Fellowships in Biological Informatics, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, Virginia 22230. Telephone: (703) 306-1469.

Purpose of Meeting: To provide advice and recommendations concerning proposals submitted to the National Science Foundation for financial support.

Agenda: To review and evaluate Postdoctoral Research Fellowships in Biological Informatics proposals submitted in response to the program announcement (NSF) 98-162.

Reason for Closing: The proposals being reviewed include information of a proprietary or confidential nature, including technical information; financial data, such as salaries; and personal information concerning individuals associated with the proposals. These matters are exempt under 5 U.S.C. 552b(c), (4) and (6) of the Government in the Sunshine Act.

Dated: November 22, 1999.

Karen J. York,

Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 99-30753 Filed 11-24-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555-01-M

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

U.S. National Assessment Synthesis Team; 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: U.S. National Assessment Synthesis Team (#5219).

Date: December 15-16, 1999, 8:30 a.m.-5:00 p.m. each day.

Place: The Westin St. Francis Hotel, 355 Powell Street, San Francisco, California.

Type of Meeting: Open.

Contact Person: Melissa J. Taylor, Office of the U.S. Global Change Research Program (USGCRP), 400 Virginia Avenue, SW, Suite 750, Washington, DC 20024. Tel: 202 314 2230; Fax: 202 488 8681; Email: mtaylor@usgcrp.gov. Interested persons should contact Ms. Taylor as soon as possible to assure space provisions are made for all participants and observers.

Minutes: May be obtained from the contact person listed above.

Purpose of Meeting: To provide advice and recommendations to the interagency Subcommittee on Global Change Research on the design and conduct of the national effort to assess the consequences of climate variability and climate change for the United States.

Agenda:

Day 1 (December 15) Members will review technical comments received and will discuss revisions to report.

Day 2 (December 16) Discussion of technical comments and revisions will continue.

Dated: November 22, 1999.

Karen J. York,

Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 99-30754 Filed 11-24-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555-01-M

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Special Emphasis Panel in Research, Evaluation and Communication; Notice of Meeting

In accordance with Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92-463, as amended), the National Science Foundation announces the following meeting:

Name: Special Emphasis Panel in Research, Evaluation and Communication (1210)

Date/Time: December 7-8, 1999, 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

Place: National Science Foundation, Room 855, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, VA 22230.

Type of Meeting: Closed.

Contact Person: Dr. Bernice Anderson, Program Director, Research, Evaluation and Communication (REC), National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Room 855, Arlington, VA 22230. (703) 306-1650.

Purpose of Meeting: To provide advice and recommendations concerning proposals submitted to NSF for financial support.

Agenda: To review and evaluate formal proposals submitted to advance the field in appropriate use and analysis of student achievement data in systemic reform program accountability.

Reason For Closing: the proposals being reviewed include information of a proprietary or confidential nature, including technical information; financial data, such as salaries; and personal information concerning individuals associated with the proposals. These matters are exempt under 5 U.S.C. 552b(c)(4), and (6) of the Government in the Sunshine Act.

Dated: November 22, 1999.

Karen J. York,

Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 99-30755 Filed 11-24-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555-01-M

NEIGHBORHOOD REINVESTMENT CORPORATION

Sunshine Act Meeting

Regular Meeting of the Board of Directors

TIME & DATE: 2:00 P.M., Monday, December 6, 1999.

PLACE: Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation, 1325 G Street, NW, Suite 800, Board Room, Washington, DC 20005.

STATUS: Open/Closed.

CONTACT PERSON FOR MORE INFORMATION: Jeffrey T. Bryson, General Counsel/Secretary, (202) 220-2372.

AGENDA:

- I. Call to Order
- II. Treasurer's Report
- III. Budget Committee Report: November 12, 1999 Meeting
- IV. Executive Director's quarterly Management Report
- V. Personnel Committee Report: November 3, 1999, Closed Meeting
- VI. Adjourn.

Jeffrey T. Bryson,

General Counsel/Secretary.

[FR Doc. 99-30950 Filed 11-23-99; 3:34 pm]

BILLING CODE 7570-01-M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-333]

Power Authority of the State of New York; James A FitzPatrick Nuclear Power Plant; Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an amendment to 10 CFR part 50 for Facility Operating License No. NPF-59, issued to the Power Authority of the State of New York (PASNY or the licensee), for operation of the James A. FitzPatrick

Nuclear Power Plant (FitzPatrick), located in Oswego County, New York.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed action will revise the existing, or current, Technical Specifications (CTS) for FitzPatrick in their entirety based on the guidance provided in NUREG-1433, "Standard Technical Specifications for General Electric Plants, BWR/4," Revision I, dated April 1995, and in the Commission's "Final Policy Statement on Technical Specifications Improvements for Nuclear Power Reactors," published on July 22, 1993 (58 FR 39132). The proposed amendment is in accordance with the licensee's amendment request dated March 31, 1999, as supplemented by letters dated May 20, June 1, July 14, and October 14, 1999.

The Need for the Proposed Action

It has been recognized that nuclear safety in all nuclear power plants would benefit from an improvement and standardization of plant Technical Specifications (TS). The "NRC Interim Policy Statement on Technical Specification Improvements for Nuclear Power Plants," (52 FR 3788) contained proposed criteria for defining the scope of TS. Later, the Commission's "Final Policy Statement on Technical Specifications Improvements for Nuclear Power Reactors," published on July 22, 1993 (58 FR 39132), incorporated lessons learned since publication of the interim policy statement and formed the basis for revisions to 10 CFR 50.36, "Technical Specifications." The "Final Rule" (60 FR 36953) codified criteria for determining the content of TS. To facilitate the development of standard TS for nuclear power reactors, each power reactor vendor owners' group (OG) and the NRC staff developed standard TS. For FitzPatrick, the Improved Standard Technical Specifications (ISTS) are in NUREG-1433, Revision 1. These documents formed part of the basis for the FitzPatrick Improved Technical Specifications (ITS) conversion. The NRC Committee to Review Generic Requirements (CRGR) reviewed the ISTS, made note of its safety merits, and indicated its support of the conversion by operating plants to the ISTS.

Description of the Proposed Change

The proposed changes to the CTS are based on NUREG-1433, Revision 1, and on guidance provided by the Commission in its Final Policy

Statement. The objective of the changes is to completely rewrite, reformat, and streamline the CTS (*i.e.*, to convert the CTS to the ITS). Emphasis is placed on human factors principles to improve clarity and understanding of the TS. The Bases section of the ITS has been significantly expanded to clarify and better explain the purpose and foundation of each specification. In addition to NUREG-1433, Revision 1, portions of the CTS were also used as the basis for the development of the FitzPatrick ITS. Plant-specific issues (*e.g.*, unique design features, requirements, and operating practices) were discussed with the licensee, and generic matters were discussed with General Electric and other OGs.

The proposed changes from the CTS can be grouped into the following four categories: relocated requirements, administrative changes, less restrictive changes involving deletion of requirements, and more restrictive changes. These categories are as follows:

1. Relocated requirements (*i.e.*, the licensee's R or LA_n changes) are items which are in the CTS but do not meet the criteria set forth in the Final Policy Statement. The Final Policy Statement establishes a specific set of objective criteria for determining which regulatory requirements and operating restrictions should be included in the TS. Relocation of requirements to documents with an established control program, controlled by the regulations or the TS, allows the TS to be reserved only for those conditions or limitations upon reactor operation which are necessary to obviate the possibility of an abnormal situation or event giving rise to an immediate threat to the public health and safety, thereby focusing the scope of the TS. In general, the proposed relocation of items from the CTS to the Updated Safety Analysis Report (USAR), appropriate plant-specific programs, plant procedures, or ITS Bases follows the guidance of NUREG-1433 and NUREG-1434, Revision 1. Once these items have been relocated to other licensee-controlled documents, the licensee may revise them under the provisions of 10 CFR 50.59 or other NRC-approved control mechanisms, which provide appropriate procedural means to control changes by the licensee.

2. Administrative changes (*i.e.*, the licensee's A_n changes) involve the reformatting and rewording of requirements, consistent with the style of the ISTS in NUREG-1433, Revision I, to make the TS more readily understandable to plant operators and other users. These changes are purely editorial in nature, or involve the

movement or reformatting of requirements without affecting the technical content. Application of a standardized format and style will also help ensure consistency is achieved among specifications in the TS. During this reformatting and rewording process, no technical changes (either actual or interpretational) to the TS will be made unless they are identified and justified.

3. Less restrictive changes and the deletion of requirements involves portions of the CTS (*i.e.*, the licensee's L_n) which (1) provide information that is descriptive in nature regarding the equipment, systems, actions, or surveillances, (2) provide little or no safety benefit, and (3) place an unnecessary burden on the licensee. This information is proposed to be deleted from the CTS and, in some instances, moved to the proposed Bases, USAR, or procedures. The removal of descriptive information to the Bases of the TS, USAR, or procedures is permissible because these documents will be controlled through a process that utilizes 10 CFR 50.59 and other NRC-approved control mechanisms. The relaxations of requirements were the result of generic NRC actions or other analyses. They will be justified on a case-by-case basis for FitzPatrick and described in the safety evaluation to be issued with the license amendment.

4. More restrictive requirements (*i.e.*, the licensee's M_n changes) are proposed to be implemented in some areas to impose more stringent requirements than are in the CTS. In some cases, these more restrictive requirements are being imposed to be consistent with the ISTS. Such changes have been made after ensuring the previously evaluated safety analysis for FitzPatrick was not affected. Also, other more restrictive technical changes have been made to achieve consistency, correct discrepancies, and remove ambiguities from the TS. Examples of more restrictive requirements include: placing a Limiting Condition for Operation (LCO) on plant equipment which is not required by the CTS to be operable; more restrictive requirements to restore inoperable equipment; and more restrictive surveillance requirements.

There are other proposed changes to the CTS that may be included in the proposed amendment to convert the CTS to the ITS. These are beyond-scope changes in that they are changes to both the CTS and the ISTS. For the FitzPatrick, these are the following:

1. ITS 3.0.3, Limiting Condition for Operation (LCO) to be in MODE 2 was changed to allow a 9-hour completion time.

2. ITS 3.3.1.1, Reactor Protection System (RPS) Instrumentation Function 5, reactor scram on main steam isolation valve (MSIV) closure. The trip setting valve was changed from less than or equal to 10 percent (in the CTS) to less than or equal to 14 percent in the ITS.

3. ITS 3.3.1.1, Extending Required Action F.1 Completion Time from 6 hours to 8 hours for consistency with Current Licensing Basis (CLB) and changing 3.0.3 which allows 8 hours to be in MODE 2 after initiation of Action.

4. ITS 3.3.5.1, Automatic Depressurization System (ADS) initiation timer and the Containment Spray (CS) and Low-Pressure Coolant Injection (LPCI) pump start timer values were changed from the CTS and the STS and tolerances relaxed to allow the extension of CALIBRATION Frequency to 24 months in the ITS.

5. ITS 3.3.5.1, CS, LPCI and ADS Logic System Functional Test (LSFT) Frequency was extended from 18 months (in the CTS) to 24 months in the ITS.

6. ITS 3.4.9, Reactor Coolant System (RCS) Pressure/Temperature (P/T) Limits in CTS were changed to add a new alternate criteria in ITS to allow idle recirculating pump (loop) start if the operating loop is greater than 40 percent flow or if the idle loop is less than 40% flow for less than or equal to 30 minutes.

7. ITS 3.5.1, ECCS—Operating, High-Pressure Coolant Injection (HPCI) and LPCI pump flow rates in CTS were reduced to SAFER/GESTR-Loss-of-Coolant Accident (LOCA) flow rates in the ITS.

8. ITS 3.5.2, ECCS—Shutdown, reduced Residual Heat Removal (RHR) LPCI pump flow rates in CTS to SAFER/GESTR-LOCA flow rates as in ITS 3.5.1 for RHR LPCI pumps.

9. ITS 3.8.1, AC Sources—Operating, Condition D for two reserve circuits inoperable in CTS was changed to add new interim power reduction to less than or equal to 45 percent with a 36-hour Completion Time in the ITS.

10. ITS 3.8.4, DC Sources—“Operating (in CTS) was changed to allow 8 hours to restore one inoperable source in the ITS.

11. ITS 5.5, changed Standby Gas Treatment (SGT) and Control Room Emergency Ventilation Air Supply (CREVAS) system filter testing (in the CTS) from 6 months (or 12 months) to 24 months in the ITS for consistency with Regulatory Guide 1.52, Revision 2 or the fuel cycle length.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The NRC has completed its evaluation of the proposed conversion of the CTS to the ITS for FitzPatrick, including the beyond-scope issues discussed above. Changes which are administrative in nature have been found to have no effect on the technical content of the TS. The increased clarity and understanding these changes bring to the TS are expected to improve the operators control of FitzPatrick in normal and accident conditions.

Relocation of requirements from the CTS to other licensee-controlled documents does not change the requirements themselves. Future changes to these requirements may then be made by the licensee under 10 CFR 50.59 and other NRC-approved control mechanisms which will ensure continued maintenance of adequate requirements. All such relocations have been found consistent with the guidelines of NUREG-1431 and the Commission's Final Policy Statement.

Changes involving more restrictive requirements have been found to enhance plant safety.

Changes involving less restrictive requirements have been reviewed individually. When requirements have been shown to provide little or no safety benefit, or to place an unnecessary burden on the licensee, their removal from the TS was justified. In most cases, relaxations previously granted to individual plants on a plant-specific basis were the result of a generic action, or of agreements reached during discussions with the owners groups, and found to be acceptable for the plant. Generic relaxations contained in NUREG-1433, Revision 1, have been reviewed by the NRC staff and found to be acceptable.

In summary, the proposed revisions to the TS were found to provide control of plant operations such that reasonable assurance will be provided that the health and safety of the public will be adequately protected.

The proposed action will not significantly increase the probability or consequences of accidents, no changes are being made in the types of any effluents that may be released off site, and there is no significant increase in occupational or public radiation exposure. Therefore, there are no significant radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

With regard to potential nonradiological impacts, the proposed action involves features located entirely within the restricted area for the plant

defined in 10 CFR Part 20 and does not involve any historic sites. It does not affect nonradiological plant effluents and have no other environmental impact. They do not increase any discharge limit for the plant. Therefore, there are no significant nonradiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

Accordingly, the NRC concludes that there are no significant environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

Alternatives to the Proposed Action

As an alternative to the proposed action, the staff considered denial of the proposed action (*i.e.*, the “no-action” alternative). Denial of the application would result in no change in current environmental impacts. The environmental impacts of the proposed action and the alternative action are similar.

Alternative Use of Resources

This action does not involve the use of any resources not previously considered in the FES for FitzPatrick.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on November 4, 1999, the staff consulted with the New York State official, Jack Spath, of the New York Energy and Research Authority, regarding the environmental impact of the proposed amendment. The State official had no comments.

Finding of No Significant Impact

On the basis of the environmental assessment, the NRC concludes that the proposed amendment will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment. Accordingly, the NRC has determined not to prepare an environmental impact statement for the proposed action.

For further details with respect to the proposed action, see the licensee's application dated March 31, 1999, as supplemented by letters dated May 20, June 1, July 14, and October 14, 1999, which are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, The Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC. Publicly available records will be accessible electronically from the ADAMS Public Library component on the NRC Web site, <http://www.nrc.gov> (the Electronic Reading Room).

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 19th day of November 1999.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.
Sheri R. Peterson,
Chief, Section 1, Project Directorate I, Division of Licensing Project Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.
[FR Doc. 99-30735 Filed 11-24-99; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 40-648]

UMETCO Minerals Corp.; Final Finding of No Significant Impact; Notice of Opportunity for Hearing

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Final Finding of No Significant Impact; Notice of Opportunity for Hearing.

SUMMARY: The Umetco Minerals Corporation (Umetco) requested that the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) amend its NRC Source Material License SUA-648 to authorize reclamation of the A-9 Repository (disposal cell), located in Natrona County, Wyoming, according to the 1998 Enhanced Reclamation Plan, as amended. The Umetco East Gas Hills site is located approximately 50 miles (80 kilometers) southeast of the town of Riverton, Wyoming. The A-9 cell is a former surface uranium mine that was lined with clay and used for mill tailings disposal. Cover construction was begun under a previously approved reclamation design and several changes have been proposed in the enhanced plan. An Environmental Assessment (EA) was performed by the NRC staff in support of its review of Umetco's license amendment request, in accordance with the requirements of 10 CFR part 51. The conclusion of the EA is a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) for the proposed licensing action.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Elaine Brummett, Uranium Recovery and Low-Level Waste Branch, Division of Waste Management, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Mail Stop T7-J9, Washington, DC 20555. Telephone 301/415-6606.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The Umetco Mineral Corporation (Umetco) site is licensed by the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) under Materials License SUA-648 to possess byproduct material in the form of uranium waste tailings as well as other radioactive wastes generated by

past milling operations. The mill has been dismantled and current site activities include completion of reclamation of three disposal areas and continuation of the ground-water corrective action program.

The total volume of waste in the A-9 cell is approximately 3.5 million cubic yards (cyd) and up to 0.5 million cyd may be placed during final site decommissioning activities. An interim cover from 1 to 5 feet (30.5 to 152 cm) thick was placed over the entire A-9 area in 1988 and 1989. The final cover has not been constructed as additional waste and fill will be placed in the cell. Umetco submitted the enhanced reclamation plan by letter dated October 27, 1998. Additional information and revised pages to the plan were submitted December 10, 1998, and March 29, 1999. The plan provides designs to:

1. Reduce the planned frost protection soil layer to 4.5 feet (1.37 m) and increase the clay radon barrier to 1.5 feet (45 cm) for a total soil cover thickness of 7 feet (1.8 m) (previously 10 feet (3 m)) for the A-9 cell;
2. Change the vegetative cover to 6 to 12 inches (15 to 30 cm) of riprap (rock);
3. Grade the site for appropriate drainage, including east and west diversion ditches;
4. Reclaim the north and south evaporation ponds; and
5. Reclaim the C-18 pit.

The 35-acre A-9 disposal cell will need up to 23 feet (7 m) of fill in some areas to bring the surface to the proposed grade. The enhanced design increases the cell capacity and its footprint by approximately 16 acres. The change to a rock cover was proposed to improve the long-term erosion protection for the cover.

The site grading plan uses contours approved with the reclamation plans for the heap leach and above-grade impoundments, diverts an existing drainage channel to minimize potential erosion of the above-grade impoundment cover, raises the final elevation of the A-9 cell by approximately 10 feet (3 m) to accommodate additional material, grades the east side of the A-9 cell to a 3:1 or less slope, provides diversion ditches on the east and west side of the A-9 cell to direct runoff away from the cover, grades the area of the north and south evaporation ponds to 5:1 or less slope, and provides positive drainage for other areas on the site.

The north and south ponds (22 acres) were constructed in 1979 over mine overburden. In 1993, the ponds were dry and the upper portion of the clay liner was excavated and placed in the

A-9 cell. The enhanced plan indicates that the remaining clay liner also will be excavated and placed in the A-9 cell. Umetco provided data indicating that residual byproduct material was not detectable in the rocky material under the pond liners (Design Report Part 1, Section 6) so a cover for this area is not required.

The C-18 former uranium surface mining pit is about 80 feet (24.4 m) deep and 500 feet (152.4 m) wide at the surface (covers 5.3 acres). The pit may have some byproduct material at the bottom from site drainage, therefore, Umetco has proposed to treat this pit as a repository with the required engineered cover.

The cover design of the A-9 cell and the other aspects of the enhanced design have been evaluated by the NRC staff. This technical review will be documented as part of the agency licensing action.

Summary of the Environmental Assessment

The NRC staff performed an appraisal of the environmental impacts associated with the enhanced reclamation plan for the Impoundment, in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act, 10 CFR part 51, and Licensing and Regulatory Policy Procedures for Environmental Protection. The license amendment would authorize Umetco to complete reclamation as proposed. In conducting its appraisal, the NRC staff considered the following information: (1) Umetco's 1998 license amendment request and proposed design, as amended; (2) previous environmental evaluations of the facility; (3) data contained in required semiannual environmental monitoring reports; (4) existing license conditions; (5) results of NRC staff site visits and inspections of the Umetco facility; and (6) consultations with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the U.S. Bureau of Land Management, the Wyoming Department of Environmental Quality, and the Wyoming State Historic Preservation Officer.

The results of the staff's appraisal are documented in an EA placed in the docket file. Based on its review, the NRC staff has concluded that there are no significant environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

Conclusions

The NRC staff has examined actual and potential impacts associated with the enhanced reclamation plan, and has determined that the requested amendment of Source Material License SUA-648, authorizing implementation of the reclamation plan, will: (1) be