

NRTL meets certain criteria. In this sense, they are special conditions that the Agency places on an NRTL's recognition. OSHA does not consider these programs in determining whether an NRTL meets the requirements for recognition, or for an expansion or renewal of recognition, under 29 CFR 1910.7.

#### **Preliminary Finding on the Application**

UL has submitted an acceptable request for expansion of its recognition as an NRTL. In connection with these requests, OSHA carried out on-site reviews of the three sites covered by the expansion request during the period of September 14–29, 1998. Discrepancies noted by the review team during the on-site reviews were responded to following their completion and are included as an integral part of the on-site review report (see Exhibits 20). With the preparation of the final review report, the NRTL Program staff is satisfied that UL has addressed concerns arising from the review. In the report, the staff recommended that OSHA expand the recognition of UL to include the three (3) additional sites listed above. The staff also recommended that these sites be permitted to use all the supplemental programs.

Following a review of the application file and the on-site review report, the NRTL Program staff concluded that UL appeared to have met the requirements for the expansion of recognition to include the three (3) additional sites listed above. The staff therefore recommended to the Assistant Secretary that the application be preliminarily approved. This recognition will be limited to UL utilizing the additional sites for performing product testing and certifications only to the test standards for which the site has the proper capability and programs, and for which OSHA has recognized UL.

Based upon a review of the complete application, and the recommendations of the staff, the Assistant Secretary has made a preliminary finding that Underwriters Laboratory Inc., can meet the requirements as prescribed by 29 CFR 1910.7 for the expansion of its recognition to include the three additional sites listed above, subject to the above limitation. This preliminary finding does not constitute an interim or temporary approval of the application.

OSHA welcomes public comments, in sufficient detail, as to whether UL has met the requirements of 29 CFR 1910.7 for expansion of its recognition as a Nationally Recognized Testing Laboratory. Your comment should consist of pertinent written documents and exhibits. To consider it, OSHA must

receive the comment at the address provided above (see **ADDRESS**), no later than the last date for comments (see **DATES** above). You may obtain or review copies of UL's requests, the supporting information, the on-site review report, and all submitted comments, as received, by contacting the Docket Office, Room N2625, Occupational Safety and Health Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, at the above address. You should refer to Docket No. NRTL-4-93, the permanent records of public information on UL's recognition.

The NRTL Program staff will review all timely comments and, after resolution of issues raised by these comments, will recommend whether to grant UL's expansion request. The Assistant Secretary will make the final decision on granting the expansion and, in making this decision, may undertake other proceedings prescribed in Appendix A to 29 CFR Section 1910.7. OSHA will publish a public notice of this final decision in the **Federal Register**.

Signed at Washington, D.C. this 3rd day of August, 1999.

**Charles N. Jeffress,**  
Assistant Secretary.

[FR Doc. 99-20998 Filed 8-12-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-26-P

---

#### **NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION**

##### **Committee Management; Notice of Establishment**

The Director of the National Science Foundation has determined that the establishment of the Public Affairs Advisory Group is necessary and in the public interest in connection with the performance of duties imposed upon the National Science Foundation (NSF), by 42 U.S.C. 1861 *et seq.* This determination follows consultation with the Committee Management Secretariat, General Services Administration.

*Name of Committee:* Public Affairs Advisory Group (PAAG).

*Purpose:* The Group's objective is twofold. First, the Group will assess NSF's current public affairs programs, strategies and goals aimed at improving public understanding and appreciation of science and engineering research and education. Second, the Group will advise NSF on strategies and mechanisms for strengthening NSF's public affairs programs in the future. This includes help in building strategic partnerships between NSF and the private sector that will amplify the agency's public affairs programs.

*Balanced Membership Plans.* Members are broadly representative of

communications and public affairs professions—public relations, print and broadcast journalism, science and technology publishing, science policy analysis, science and technology education and outreach, and entertainment—and engineering and science professionals successful in making science and technology accessible to large publics. Stature and familiarity with NSF and its programs are considered in selecting committee members. Every effort is made to achieve a balanced membership with representation including women, minority members, disabled persons as well as different geographic regions in the U.S. About 20 individuals will serve on this committee.

*Responsible NSF Official:* Susan Chase, Acting Section Head, Special Projects, Office of Legislative and Public Affairs, Room 1245, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, VA 22230, telephone, (703) 306-1070.

Dated: August 10, 1999.

**Karen J. York,**

Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 99-21065 Filed 8-12-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555-01-M

---

#### **NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

[Docket No. 50-397]

##### **Energy Northwest, Notice of Withdrawal of Application for Amendment to Facility Operating License**

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has granted the request of Energy Northwest (the licensee), formerly known as the Washington Public Power Supply System, to withdraw its October 15, 1996, application for proposed amendment to Facility Operating License No. NPF-21 for WNP-2, located in Benton County, Washington.

The proposed amendment would have revised the facility technical specifications pertaining to secondary containment drawdown time and secondary containment bypass leakage.

The Commission had previously issued a Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment published in the **Federal Register** on September 23, 1998 (63 FR 50942). However, by letter dated July 16, 1999, the licensee withdrew the proposed change and stated that they planned to revise and resubmit the amendment request by November 12, 1999.

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendment dated October 15, 1999, as supplemented by letters dated December 4, 1997, April 12, 1999, and June 10, 1999, and the licensee's letter dated July 16, 1999, which withdrew the application for license amendment. The above documents are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, and at the local public document room located at the Richland Public Library, 955 Northgate Street, Richland, Washington 99352.

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

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.  
**Jack Cushing,**

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

[FR Doc. 99-21055 Filed 8-12-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-298]

### Nebraska Public Power District; Notice of Withdrawal of Application for Amendment to Facility Operating License

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has granted the request of Nebraska Public Power District to withdraw its August 6, 1998, application for proposed amendment to Facility Operating License No. DPR-46 for the Cooper Nuclear Station, located in Nemaha County, Nebraska.

The proposed amendment would have revised the Updated Safety Analysis Report to reflect the as-built configuration of the reactor building isolation dampers.

The Commission had previously issued a Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment published in the **Federal Register** on August 26, 1998 (63 FR 45526). However, by letter dated August 2, 1999, the licensee withdrew the proposed change.

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendment dated August 6, 1998, and the licensee's letter dated August 2, 1999, which withdrew the application for license amendment. The above documents are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC,

and at the local public document room located at the Auburn Memorial Library, 1810 Courthouse Avenue, Auburn, NE 68305.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 6th day of August 1999.

For The Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
**S. Patrick Sekerak,**  
*Project Manager, Section 1, Project Directorate IV & Decommissioning, Division of Licensing Project Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 99-21056 Filed 8-12-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50-277 and 50-278]

### PECO Energy Co., Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendments to Facility Operating Licenses, 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 Nos. DPR-44 and DPR-56, issued to PECO Energy Company (the licensee), for operation of the Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station (PBAPS) Units 2 and 3, located in York County, Pennsylvania.

The proposed amendments would revise the Technical Specifications (TSs) contained in Appendix A to the Operating Licenses to incorporate a note into the TSs which will permit a one-time exemption, until September 30, 1999, from the 90 °F limit stated in Surveillance Requirement (SR) 3.7.2.2. This SR currently requires that the average water temperature of the normal heat sink be less than or equal to 90 °F as demonstrated on a 24-hour frequency. As stated in the proposed TS note, during the time period between approval and September 30, 1999, the average water temperature of the normal heat sink will be limited to less than or equal to 92 °F.

The licensee requested that these proposed amendments be processed as an exigent request pursuant to 10 CFR 50.91(a)(6) to permit implementation during this summer. The licensee's basis for the exigent request is as follows: "On August 1, 1999 at approximately 1500 hours, the normal heat sink temperature for the intake of Units 2 and 3 reached 89 °F. Based on the current and projected low rainfall conditions, above normal atmospheric temperatures, and below normal precipitation, the Conowingo Pond (Normal Heat Sink)

temperature is expected to approach and/or exceed 90 °F on a periodic basis resulting in the failure to meet Technical Specification SR 3.7.2.2. This would require PBAPS, Units 2 and 3 to enter into Mode 3 [hot shutdown] operation within 12 hours and Mode 4 [cold shutdown] operation within 36 hours.

On July 18, 1999, the normal heat sink temperature reached 86 °F, which is four (4) degrees below the TS limit of 90 °F. At that time, PBAPS Engineering began to identify the design basis impacts of the increased cooling water temperatures, analyze the environmental conditions that impact the normal heat sink temperature, and develop the analysis which would support continued safe plant operation at elevated cooling water temperatures. Throughout this period, up to the submittal of this exigent license change, significant resources have been committed to performing engineering analysis and preparing related documents, reviews of the analysis by on-site and off-site review groups, and preparation of the license amendment package itself.

Shutdown of the plants would cause undue stress on the regional electrical grid which could potentially destabilize power flow to all customers and to the PBAPS offsite sources. During two periods in the month of July (July 6 and 19, 1999), energy demands resulted in voltage reduction situations. Loss of the PBAPS, Units 2 and 3, capacity during a period in which energy is needed most, could result in a load shedding situation. Additionally, the unforeseen weather conditions resulting in the recent abnormally high normal heat sink temperature did not permit the submittal of this change under the normal license amendment process." 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.

Pursuant to 10 CFR 50.91(a)(6) for amendments to be granted under exigent circumstances, the NRC staff must determine that the amendment requests involve 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