

*Contact Person:* Drs. Lee L. Zia and C. Dianne Martin, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, VA 22230. Telephone: (703) 306-1667/9.

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

*Agenda:* To review and evaluate NSDL proposals 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 individual 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: April 3, 2000.

**Karen J. York,**

*Committee Management Officer.*

[FR Doc. 00-8498 Filed 4-5-00; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7555-01-M**

## **NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

[Docket No. 72-9]

### **Notice of Issuance of Amendment to Materials License SNM-2504 Department of Energy; Fort St. Vrain Independent Spent Fuel Storage Installation**

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC or the Commission) has issued Amendment 8 to Materials License No. SNM-2504 held by the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) for the receipt, possession, storage, and transfer of spent fuel at the Fort St. Vrain (FSV) independent spent fuel storage installation (ISFSI), located in Weld County, Colorado. The amendment is effective as of the date of issuance.

By application dated January 18, 2000, DOE requested an amendment to its ISFSI license to revise its radiological environmental monitoring program and to revise Technical Specification 5.5.2, "Essential Program Control Program."

This amendment complies with the standards and requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), and the Commission's rules and regulations. The Commission has made appropriate findings as required by the Act and the Commission's rules and regulations in 10 CFR Chapter I, which are set forth in the license amendment.

In accordance with 10 CFR 72.46(b)(2), a determination has been made that the amendment does not present a genuine issue as to whether public health and safety will be significantly affected. Therefore, the publication of a notice of proposed

action and an opportunity for hearing or a notice of hearing is not warranted. Notice is hereby given of the right of interested persons to request a hearing on whether the action should be rescinded or modified.

The Commission has determined that, pursuant to 10 CFR 51.22(c)(11), an environmental assessment need not be prepared in connection with issuance of the amendment.

Documents related to this action are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room located at the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW, Washington, DC 20555, 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 24th day of March 2000.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission

**M. Wayne Hodges,**

*Acting Director, Spent Fuel Project Office,  
Office of Nuclear Material Safety and  
Safeguards.*

[FR Doc. 00-8433 Filed 3-5-00; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7590-01-P**

## **NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

[Docket Nos. 50-259, 50-260 and 50-296]

### **Tennessee Valley Authority; Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment to 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 an amendment to Facility Operating Licenses Nos. DPR-33, DPR-52 and DPR-68, issued to the Tennessee Valley Authority (the licensee), for operation of the Browns Ferry Nuclear Plant Units 1, 2, and 3 located in Limestone County, Alabama.

The proposed amendment would revise the Appendix A Technical Specifications to provide for maintenance on a secondary containment access door, when the other door in the flow path is closed, when one or more units are operating.

Exigent circumstances exist due to the need to repair an air leak on a pneumatic door seal on the inner main equipment access air lock. The licensee is concerned that the air leak could worsen if not repaired soon, potentially rendering the inner equipment access door inoperable. In this case, equipment transfer into and out of the secondary containment via the main equipment

lock would be prohibited thereby hindering outage activities.

Before issuance of the proposed license amendment, 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 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 amendment 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:

TVA has concluded that operation of Browns Ferry Nuclear Plant (BFN) Units 1, 2, and 3 in accordance with the proposed change to the technical specifications does not involve a significant hazards consideration. TVA's conclusion is based on its evaluation, in accordance with 10 CFR 50.91(a)(1), of the three standards set forth in 10 CFR 50.92(c).

A. The proposed amendment does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The proposed change is an administrative clarification of the existing requirements. Verifying that one door in each access opening is closed ensures the infiltration of outside air of such a magnitude as to prevent the maintaining of the desired post-accident negative pressure does not occur.

Therefore the proposed amendment does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

B. The proposed amendment does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

The proposed amendment does not add any new equipment or require any existing equipment to be operated in a manner different from the present design. The proposed change is consistent with the SAR [Safety Analysis Report] analysis for design basis accidents. No operation outside of the existing design basis is introduced by the proposed amendment.

Therefore, the proposed amendment does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

The proposed amendment does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The proposed change is consistent with the BFN PSAR [Final Safety Analysis Report] accident analysis. The change does not physically modify any equipment, setpoints, or equipment initiation sequences.

For these reasons, the proposed amendment does not involve a significant reduction in the 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 amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

The Commission is seeking public comments on this proposed determination. Any comments received within 14 days after the date of publication of this notice will be considered in making any final determination.

Normally, the Commission will not issue the amendment until the expiration of the 14-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 amendment before the expiration of the 14-day notice period, provided that its final determination is that the amendment involves 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. 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. Copies of written comments received may be examined at the NRC Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC.

The filing of requests for hearing and petitions for leave to intervene is discussed below.

By April 20, 2000, the licensee may file a request for a hearing with respect to issuance of the amendment to the subject facility operating license 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, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, 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 a 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 amendment 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 the amendment is issued before the expiration of the 30-day hearing period, the Commission will make a final determination on the issue of no significant hazards consideration. If a hearing is requested, the final determination will serve to decide when the hearing is held.

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

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

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, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, 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 General Counsel, Tennessee Valley

Authority, 400 West Summit Hill Drive, ET 10H, Knoxville, Tennessee 3790.

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 amendment dated March 29, 2000, which is available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, 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 31st day of March 2000.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**William O. Long,**

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

[FR Doc. 00–8434 Filed 4–5–00; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7590–01–P**

## OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

### Proposed Collection; Comment Request for Review of a New Information Collection; OPM Form 1644

**AGENCY:** Office of Personnel Management.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (Public Law 104–13, May 22, 1995), this notice announces that the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) intends to submit to the Office of Management and Budget a request for review of a new information collection. OPM Form 1644, Child Care Provider Information: Care Tuition Assistance Program for Federal Employees, is used to verify that child care providers are licensed and/or regulated by local and/or State authorities. Agencies need to know that child care providers to whom they make disbursements in the form of tuition assistance subsidies, are licensed and/or regulated by local and/or State authorities.

Pub. L. 106–58, passed by Congress on September 29, 1999, permits Federal

agencies to use appropriated funds to help their lower income employees with their costs for child care. It is up to the agencies to decide on whether to implement this law. This is a new law and the extent to which it will be implemented, including the number of providers that will be involved, cannot be easily predicted. The form will take approximately 10 minutes to complete by each provider. The annual estimated burden is 83.5 hours.

Comments are particularly invited on:

- Whether the form adequately captures the information needed to verify child care provider State and/or local licensure and regulation.
- Whether our estimate of the public burden of this collection is accurate, and based on valid assumptions and methodology; and
- Ways in which we can minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, through use of the appropriate technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

For copies of this proposal, contact Mary Beth Smith-Toomey on 202–606–8358, or e-mail to [mbtoomey@opm.gov](mailto:mbtoomey@opm.gov).

**DATES:** Comments on this proposal should be received on or before April 16, 2000.

**ADDRESSES:** Send or deliver comments to:

Anice V. Nelson, Director, Family-Friendly Workplace Advocacy Office, U.S. Office of Personnel Management, 1900 E St. NW, Washington, DC 20415.

And

Joseph Lackey, Agency Desk Officer, Office of Management and Budget, 725 17th St. NW Room 10235, Washington, DC 20503.

#### FOR INFORMATION REGARDING

**ADMINISTRATION COORDINATION CONTACT:**  
**PAT KINNEY, WORK/LIFE TEAM LEADER,**  
**FAMILY-FRIENDLY WORKPLACE ADVOCACY**  
**OFFICE, (202) 606–1313.**

U.S. Office of Personnel Management.

**Janice R. Lachance,**  
*Director.*

[FR Doc. 00–8399 Filed 4–5–00; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6325–01–P**

## SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

### Rescission of Social Security Acquiescence Ruling 88–1(11)

**AGENCY:** Social Security Administration.

**ACTION:** Notice of rescission of Social Security Acquiescence Ruling 88–

1(11)—*Patterson v. Bowen*, 799 F.2d 1455 (11th Cir. 1986), reh'g denied, (February 12, 1987).

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with 20 CFR 402.35(b)(2), 404.985(e) and 416.1485(e) the Commissioner of Social Security gives notice of the rescission of Social Security Acquiescence Ruling 88–1(11).

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** The rescission of the Acquiescence Ruling will be effective May 8, 2000.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Gary Sargent, Litigation Staff, Social Security Administration, 6401 Security Boulevard, Baltimore, MD 21235, (410) 965–1695.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** A Social Security Acquiescence Ruling explains how we will apply a holding in a decision of a United States Court of Appeals that we determine conflicts with our interpretation of a provision of the Social Security Act or regulations when the Government has decided not to seek further review of the case or is unsuccessful on further review.

As provided by 20 CFR 404.985(e)(4) and 416.1485(e)(4), a Social Security Acquiescence Ruling may be rescinded as obsolete if we subsequently clarify, modify or revoke the regulation or ruling that was the subject of the circuit court holding for which the Acquiescence Ruling was issued.

On January 29, 1988, we issued Acquiescence Ruling 88–1(11) to reflect the holding in *Patterson v. Bowen*, 799 F.2d 1455 (11th Cir. 1986), reh'g denied, (February 12, 1987), regarding the consideration of a claimant's age as a vocational factor at the last step of the sequential evaluation process for determining disability. Acquiescence Ruling 88–1(11), Social Security Rulings (Cumulative Edition 1988, p. 123). The Eleventh Circuit interpreted 20 CFR 404.1563 and 416.963 to permit a claimant to offer evidence of his or her physical or mental impairments as proof that his or her ability to adapt to other work in terms of age alone is less than the level established under the medical-vocational guidelines for claimants of that age. The court held that such evidence, which the Social Security Administration (SSA) <sup>1</sup> already considers in assessing a claimant's residual functional capacity, is relevant

<sup>1</sup> Under the Social Security Independence and Program Improvements Act of 1994, Pub. L. No. 103–296, effective March 31, 1995, SSA became an independent Agency in the Executive Branch of the United States Government and was provided ultimate responsibility for administering the Social Security and Supplemental Security Income programs under titles II and XVI of the Act. Prior to March 31, 1995, the Secretary of Health and Human Services had such responsibility.