*Agenda:* To review and evaluate formal proposals submitted to the ROLE Program as a part of the selection process for awards.

*Reason for Closing:* The proposals being reviewed include information of a propriety 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. 522b(c), (4) and (6) of the Government in the Sunshine Act.

Dated: October 10, 2000.

**Karen J. York,**

*Committee Management Officer.*

[FR Doc. 00–26319 Filed 10–12–00; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7555–01–M**

## NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

### Advisory Committee for Small Business Industrial Innovation; 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 Small Business Industrial Innovation (61).

*Date/Time:* November 2, 3, 14, 15, and 16, 2000, 8:30 a.m.–5 p.m.

*Place:* National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Blvd., Room 130, Arlington, VA.

*Type of Meeting:* Closed.

*Contact Person:* Joseph Hennessey, Acting Director, Small Business Innovation Research and Small Business Technology Transfer Programs, Room 590, Division of Design, Manufacturing, and Industrial Innovation, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, VA 22230. Telephone (703) 292–7069.

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

*Agenda:* To review and evaluate proposals submitted to the Small Business Innovation Research (SBIR) and Small Business Technology Transfer (STTR) Programs as part of the selection process for awards.

*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. 522b(c), (4) and (6) of the Government in the Sunshine Act.

Dated: October 10, 2000.

**Karen J. York,**

*Committee Management Officer.*

[FR Doc. 00–26324 Filed 10–12–00; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7555–01–M**

## NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

### Advisory Panel for Social and Political Sciences; Notice of Meetings

In accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92–463, and amended), the National Science Foundation announces the following meetings of the Advisory Panel for Social and Political Sciences (1761).

*Date and Time:* November 15–16; 9 am to 5 pm.

*Place:* National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Room 920, Arlington, VA.

*Contact Person:* Dr. Frank Scioli and Dr. Marianne Stewart, Program Directors for Political Science, National Science Foundation. Telephone: (703) 292–8762.

*Agenda:* To review and evaluate the political science proposals as a part of the selection process for awards.

*Date and Time:* November 5–6; 9 am to 5 pm.

*Place:* National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Room 970, Arlington, VA.

*Contact Person:* Dr. Marie Provine, Program Director, Law and Social Science, National Science Foundation. Telephone: (703) 292–8762.

*Agenda:* To review and evaluate the Law and Science Proposals as a part of the selection process for awards.

*Date and Time:* December 11–12; 9 am to 5 pm.

*Place:* National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Room 970, Arlington, VA.

*Contact Person:* Dr. Patricia White and Dr. Fred Pampel, Department of Sociology, National Science Foundation. Telephone: (703) 292–8762.

*Agenda:* To review and evaluate the Sociology proposals as a part of the selection process for awards.

*Type of Meetings:* Closed.

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

*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: October 10, 2000.

**Karen J. York,**

*Committee Management Officer.*

[FR Doc. 00–26326 Filed 10–12–00; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7555–01–M**

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

**[Docket Nos. 50–361 and 50–362]**

### Southern California Edison Company; San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station, Units 2 and 3; Facility Operating License, Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity for a Hearing

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of amendments to Facility Operating License No. NPF–10 and Facility Operating License No. NPF–15 for San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station (SONGS), Units 2 and 3, respectively.

The proposed amendments would revise the SONGS Units 2 and 3 technical specifications (TSs) applicable in shutdown MODES relating to positive reactivity additions. For a summary of specific proposed TS changes, see Tables 1 and 2 of the licensee's application dated September 22, 2000 (PCN–520). The licensee's proposal generally conforms to industry Technical Specification Task Force (TSTF), TSTF–286, Revision 2.

Before issuance of the proposed license amendments, the Commission will have made findings required by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act) and the Commission's regulations.

The Commission has made a proposed determination that the amendments request involves no significant hazards consideration. Under the Commission's regulations in 10 CFR 50.92, this means that operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendments would not (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated, or (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated, or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

1. Will operation of the facility in accordance with this proposed change involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of any accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

The proposed change would revise 14 specific Limiting Conditions For Operation (LCOs) of the Technical Specifications (TS) for San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station Units 2 and 3 (SONGS 2 & 3) as itemized in Table 1 [See application dated September 22,

2000]. The intent is to clarify those specifications involving positive reactivity additions to the shutdown reactor so that small, controlled, safe insertions of positive reactivity will be allowed where they are now categorically prohibited, posing operational difficulties. This amendment application conforms to TSTF–286 Revision 2 of the industry Technical Specification Task Force, with the exception of the plant-specific differences identified in Table 2. The proposed change does not permit the shutdown margin required by the TS to be reduced. While the proposed change will permit reductions in the discretionary shutdown margin above the TS requirements, this excess margin is not credited in the safety analyses. Therefore, the probability or consequences of any accident previously evaluated will not be significantly increased by the proposed change.

2. Will operation of the facility in accordance with this proposed change create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

This amendment request allows for minor plant operational perturbations without adversely impacting the safety analysis required shutdown margin. It does not involve any change to plant equipment or the shutdown margin requirements in the TS. Therefore, it will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated.

3. Will operation of the facility in accordance with this proposed change involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety?

Response: No.

This amendment request does not change the manner in which safety limits or limiting safety settings are determined.

The proposed change will permit reductions in discretionary shutdown margin, above the TS requirements, that are now prohibited. However, the reductions are not deemed significant because the shutdown margin required by the TS will be preserved.

Therefore, the proposed change will not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendments request involves no significant hazards consideration.

The Commission is seeking public comments on this proposed determination. Any comments received within 30 days after the date of publication of this notice will be considered in making any final determination.

Normally, the Commission will not issue the amendments until the expiration of the 30-day notice period. However, should circumstances change during the notice period such that failure to act in a timely way would result, for example, in derating or shutdown of the facility, the Commission may issue the license amendments before the expiration of the 30-day notice period, provided that its final determination is that the amendments involve no significant hazards consideration. The final determination will consider all public and State comments received. Should the Commission take this action, it will publish in the **Federal Register** a notice of issuance and provide for opportunity for a hearing after issuance. The Commission expects that the need to take this action will occur very infrequently.

Written comments may be submitted by mail to the Chief, Rules and Directives Branch, Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001, and should cite the publication date and page number of this **Federal Register** notice. Written comments may also be delivered to Room 6D59, Two White Flint North, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland, from 7:30 a.m. to 4:15 p.m. Federal workdays. Documents may be examined, and/or copied for a fee, at the NRC's Public Document Room, located at One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland.

The filing of requests for hearing and petitions for leave to intervene is discussed below. By November 13, 2000, the licensee may file a request for a hearing with respect to issuance of the amendments to the subject facility operating licenses and any person whose interest may be affected by this proceeding and who wishes to participate as a party in the proceeding must file a written request for a hearing and a petition for leave to intervene. Requests for a hearing and a petition for leave to intervene shall be filed in accordance with the Commission's ''Rules of Practice for Domestic Licensing Proceedings,'' in 10 CFR Part 2. Interested persons should consult a current copy of 10 CFR 2.714 which is available at the Commission's Public Document Room, located at One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland, and accessible electronically through the ADAMS Public Electronic Reading Room link at the NRC Web site (http://www.nrc.gov). If a request for a hearing or petition for leave to intervene is filed by the above date, the Commission or an Atomic Safety and Licensing Board, designated by the Commission or by the Chairman of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, will rule on the request and/or petition; and the Secretary or the designated Atomic Safety and Licensing Board will issue a notice of hearing or an appropriate order.

As required by 10 CFR 2.714, a petition for leave to intervene shall set forth with particularity the interest of the petitioner in the proceeding, and how that interest may be affected by the results of the proceeding. The petition should specifically explain the reasons why intervention should be permitted with particular reference to the following factors: (1) The nature of the petitioner's right under the Act to be made party to the proceeding, (2) the nature and extent of the petitioner's property, financial, or other interest in the proceeding, and (3) the possible effect of any order which may be entered in the proceeding on the petitioner's interest. The petition should also identify the specific aspect(s) of the subject matter of the proceeding as to which petitioner wishes to intervene. Any person who has filed a petition for leave to intervene or who has been admitted as a party may amend the petition without requesting leave of the Board up to 15 days prior to the first prehearing conference scheduled in the proceeding, but such an amended petition must satisfy the specificity requirements described above.

Not later than 15 days prior to the first prehearing conference scheduled in the proceeding, a petitioner shall file a supplement to the petition to intervene which must include a list of the contentions which are sought to be litigated in the matter. Each contention must consist of a specific statement of the issue of law or fact to be raised or controverted. In addition, the petitioner shall provide a brief explanation of the bases of the contention and a concise statement of the alleged facts or expert opinion which support the contention and on which the petitioner intends to rely in proving the contention at the hearing. The petitioner must also provide references to those specific sources and documents of which the petitioner is aware and on which the petitioner intends to rely to establish those facts or expert opinion. Petitioner must provide sufficient information to show that a genuine dispute exists with the applicant on a material issue of law or fact. Contentions shall be limited to matters within the scope of the amendments under consideration. The contention must be one which, if proven, would entitle the petitioner to relief. A petitioner who fails to file such a supplement which satisfies these requirements with respect to at least one contention will not be permitted to participate as a party.

Those permitted to intervene become parties to the proceeding, subject to any limitations in the order granting leave to intervene, and have the opportunity to participate fully in the conduct of the hearing, including the opportunity to present evidence and cross-examine witnesses.

If a hearing is requested, the Commission will make a final determination on the issue of no significant hazards consideration. The final determination will serve to decide when the hearing is held.

If the final determination is that the amendments request involves no significant hazards consideration, the Commission may issue the amendments and make them immediately effective, notwithstanding the request for a hearing. Any hearing held would take place after issuance of the amendments.

If the final determination is that the amendments request involves a significant hazards consideration, any hearing held would take place before the issuance of any amendments.

A request for a hearing or a petition for leave to intervene must be filed with the Secretary of the Commission, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001, Attention: Rulemakings and Adjudications Staff, or may be delivered to the Commission's Public Document Room, located at One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland, by the above date. A copy of the petition should also be sent to the Office of the General Counsel, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001, and to Douglas K. Porter, Esquire, Southern California Edison Company, 2244 Walnut Grove Avenue, Rosemead, California 91770, attorney for the licensee.

Nontimely filings of petitions for leave to intervene, amended petitions, supplemental petitions and/or requests for hearing will not be entertained absent a determination by the Commission, the presiding officer or the presiding Atomic Safety and Licensing Board that the petition and/or request should be granted based upon a balancing of the factors specified in 10 CFR 2.714(a)(1)(i)–(v) and 2.714(d).

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendments dated September 22, 2000 (ADAMS Accession No. ML003753695), which is available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, located at One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland, and accessible electronically through the ADAMS Public Electronic Reading Room link at the NRC Web site (http://www.nrc.gov).

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 6th day of October 2000.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**L. Raghavan,**

*Senior Project Manager, Section 2, Project Directorate IV and Decommissioning, Division of Licensing Project Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 00–26340 Filed 10–12–00; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7590–01–P**

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

**[Docket Nos. 50–373 and 50–374]**

## Commonwealth Edison Company; LaSalle County Station, Units 1 and 2; Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is considering issuance of an exemption from certain requirements of 10 CFR 50.60(a) for Facility Operating Licenses Nos. NPF–11 and NPF–18, issued to Commonwealth Edison Company (ComEd, or the licensee) for operation of LaSalle County Station, Units 1 and 2, located in LaSalle County, Illinois.

### Environmental Assessment

*Identification of the Proposed Action*

10 CFR Part 50, Appendix G, requires that pressure-temperature (P–T) limits be established for reactor pressure vessels (RPVs) during 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 requirements for these limits are the American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME) Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code (Code), Section XI, Appendix G Limits.

To address provisions of amendments to the technical specifications (TS) P–T limits, the licensee requested in its submittal dated February 29, 2000, that the staff exempt ComEd 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. 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 pressure stresses on a circumferentially-oriented flaw are lower than the pressure stresses on an axially-oriented flaw by a factor of two, 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(b). Likewise, since the $K_{IC}$ fracture toughness curve shown in ASME Section XI, Appendix A, Figure A–2200–1 (the $K_{IC}$ fracture toughness 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), 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(b).

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application for exemption dated February 29, 2000.

*The Need for the Proposed Action*

The proposed exemption is needed to allow the licensee to implement ASME Code Case N–588 and Code Case N–640 in order to revise the method used to determine the reactor coolant system (RCS) P–T limits, because continued use of the present curves unnecessarily restricts the P–T operating window. Since the RCS P–T operating window is defined by the P–T operating and test limit curves developed in accordance with the ASME Section XI, Appendix G procedure, continued operation of LaSalle with these P–T curves without the relief provided by ASME Code Case N–640 would unnecessarily require the RPV to maintain a temperature exceeding 212 degrees Fahrenheit in a limited operating window during the pressure test. Consequently, steam vapor hazards would continue to be one of the safety concerns for personnel conducting inspections in primary containment. Implementation of the proposed P–T curves, as allowed by ASME Code Cases N–588 and N–640, does not significantly reduce the margin of safety and would eliminate steam vapor hazards by allowing inspections in primary containment to be conducted at a lower coolant temperature.

In the associated exemption, the staff has determined that, pursuant to 10 CFR 50.12(a)(2)(ii), the underlying purpose of the regulation will continue to be