

least seven calendar days in advance of the first meeting. Such announcement shall state the times, dates, and place of the meetings, the testimony to be heard, whether any of the meetings, or any portion of a meeting, is to be closed, and if so, which ones, and the name and telephone number of the person to contact for further information."

All meetings of the CARP are open to the public, unless otherwise specified. To ensure that the public receives adequate notice of such meetings, the rule requires that the Office publish a schedule of the meetings at least seven days before the first meeting. See 59 FR 2550 (January 18, 1994). As set forth below, there are no further meetings for this proceeding scheduled at this time; thus, the seven-day advance publication requirement is unnecessary in this instance. Accordingly, this notice fulfills the requirements of § 251.11(b) for the proceeding to determine the distribution of the 1995–98 DART royalties in the Musical Works Funds.

On June 19, 2000, the parties to this proceeding met with the arbitrators for the purpose of setting a schedule and discussing the procedural aspects of this proceeding. The key procedural issue before the Panel at the outset of the proceeding was the consideration of the issue designated to the CARP of whether to suspend formal hearings and make the determination as to the distribution of the 1995–98 DART royalties in the Musical Works Funds on the written pleadings. See Order in Docket No. 99–3 CARP DD 95–98 (December 22, 1999). After hearing argument from all parties, the Panel announced its decision to waive the requirement of oral evidentiary hearings and to proceed upon the written record alone. The Panel stated in its Order that the following schedule would govern the remainder of the proceeding:

Deadline for submission of any revision desired at this time of a party's claim, pursuant to § 251.43(d): July 7, 2000.

Deadline for submission of any rebuttal case desired by a party: July 28, 2000.

Deadline for submission of findings of fact and conclusions of law and proposed orders, including specific calculations of royalty payments: August 18, 2000.

Deadline for submission of reply findings of fact and conclusions of law and proposed orders: August 28, 2000.

Order in Docket No. 99–3 CARP DD 95–98 (June 19, 2000).

At this time, the parties have not moved to close any portion of the proceeding to the public. Further refinements to the schedule will be

issued as orders to the parties participating in the proceeding. All changes will be noted in the docket file of the proceeding, as required by the Copyright Office regulations governing the administration of CARP proceedings. 37 CFR 251.11(c).

Dated: June 30, 2000.

**David O. Carson,**

*General Counsel.*

[FR Doc. 00–17108 Filed 7–5–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 1410–33–P

## NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

### Notice of Permits Issued Under the Antarctic Conservation Act of 1978

**AGENCY:** National Science Foundation.

**ACTION:** Notice of permits issued under the Antarctic Conservation of 1978, Public Law 95–541.

**SUMMARY:** The National Science Foundation (NSF) is required to publish notice of permits issued under the Antarctic Conservation Act of 1978. This is the required notice.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Nadene G. Kennedy, Permit Office, Office of Polar Programs, Rm. 755, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, VA 22230.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** On May 12, 2000, the National Science Foundation published a notice in the **Federal Register** of permit applications received. Permits were issued on June 28, 2000 to the following applicants: Norbert Wu, Permit No. 2001–008 Tom Yelvington, Permit No. 2001–010

**Nadene G. Kennedy,**

*Permit Officer.*

[FR Doc. 00–17061 Filed 7–5–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555–01–M

## NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

### Conservation Act of 1978; Notice of Permit Modification

**AGENCY:** National Science Foundation.

**SUMMARY:** The Foundation modified a permit to conduct activities regulated under the Antarctic Conservation Act of 1978 (Pub. L. 95–541; Code of Federal Regulations Title 45, Part 670).

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Nadene G. Kennedy, Permit Officer, Office of Polar Programs, Rm. 755, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, VA 22230.

### Description of Permit and Modification

1. On September 21, 1999, the National Science Foundation issued a

permit (ACA #2000–001) to Dr. Steven D. Emslie after posting a notice in the August 17, 1999 **Federal Register**. Public comments were not received. A request to modify the permit was posted in the **Federal Register** on April 11, 2000. No public comments were received. The modification, issued by the Foundation on May 16, 2000, allows for entry into additional Antarctic Specially Protected Areas for the purpose of conducting surveys and excavations by surveying ice-free areas to locate evidence of a past or modern breeding penguin colony. Access to the Antarctic Specially Protected Areas will be on an opportunity basis only depending upon vessel cruise tracks and schedules.

### Location

ASPA 104—Sabrina Island, Balleny Island  
ASPA 105—Beaufort Island  
ASPA 107—Dion Islands  
ASPA 108—Green Island, Berthelot Islands  
ASPA 112—Coppermine Peninsula, Robert Island  
ASPA 115—Lagotellerie Island, Marguerite Bay  
ASPA 116—New College Valley, Caughley Beach, Cape Bird  
ASPA 117—Avian Island, Northwest Marguerite Bay  
ASPA 126—Byers Peninsula, Livingston Island  
ASPA 133—Harmony Point, Nelson Island  
ASPA 134—Cierva Point, Danco Coast  
ASPA 149—Cape Shirreff, Livingston Island  
ASPA 150—Ardley Island, King George Island  
ASPA 154—Cape Evans, Ross Island

### Dates

January 1, 2000 to December 31, 2005.

**Nadene G. Kennedy,**

*Permit Officer.*

[FR Doc. 00–17062 Filed 7–5–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555–01–M

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50–336]

### Northeast Nuclear Energy Company, et al.; Millstone Nuclear Power Station Unit 2; Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an exemption from the requirements of Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Part 50 (10

CFR Part 50), Appendix R, Section III.J to Facility Operating License No. DPR-65, issued to the Northeast Nuclear Energy Company, et al., (NNECO or the licensee), for operation of the Millstone Nuclear Power Station, Unit 2, located in Waterford, Connecticut.

## Environmental Assessment

### Identification of the Proposed Action

The licensee has requested an exemption from the requirements of 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix R, Section III. J to the extent that it requires emergency lighting units with at least an 8-hour battery power supply to light all areas needed for operation of safe shutdown equipment and in access and egress routes thereto. The licensee based this exemption request primarily on the security lighting system currently installed at the plant for access and egress route emergency lighting to meet the underlying purpose of the rule. The underlying purpose of the rule is to ensure that lighting of sufficient duration and reliability is provided to allow operation of equipment required for post-fire, safe shutdown of the reactor.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application for an exemption dated February 14, 2000, as supplemented by letters dated April 5 and May 31, 2000.

### The Need for the Proposed Action

The proposed action is needed for the licensee to avoid the burden of full compliance with the regulations. Full compliance with the regulations would require battery powered lights to illuminate a large outdoor area for an 8-hour period. It is not considered practical to illuminate large outdoor areas with battery powered lighting for an 8-hour period. The licensee already has diesel-powered security lighting in the same area and portable lighting equipment is also available. As noted above, the underlying purpose of the rule can be met without the burden of installing additional lighting.

### Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The NRC has completed its evaluation of the proposed action. The underlying purpose of the rule the licensee is requesting to be exempted from is to ensure that the plant can be safely shut down in the event of a fire.

Based on the availability and reliability of the security lighting and the availability of portable lighting, there is reasonable assurance that the access and egress routes through the yard area that are relied on for safe

shutdown of the facility can be accessed in the event of a fire.

On the basis of its review, the staff concludes that the licensee will still have the capability to safely shut down the plant, in the event of a fire, after this exemption has been granted.

The proposed action will not significantly increase the probability or consequences of accidents, no changes are being made in the types of 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 non-radiological impacts, the proposed action does not involve any historic sites. It does not affect non-radiological plant effluents and has no other environmental impact. Therefore, there are no significant non-radiological 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 Final Environmental Statement for the Millstone Nuclear Power Station, Unit 2.

### Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on March 16, 2000, the staff consulted with the Connecticut State official, Michael Firsick of the Division of Radiation, Department of Environmental Protection, regarding the environmental impact of the proposed action. The State official had no comments.

### Finding of No Significant Impact

On the basis of the environmental assessment, the Commission concludes that the proposed action will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment. Accordingly, the Commission 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 letter dated February 14, 2000, as supplemented by letters dated April 5 and May 31, 2000, 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 Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS) Public Library component of the NRC Web site, <<http://www.nrc.gov>> (the Electronic Reading Room).

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 29th day of June, 2000.

For the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Jacob I. Zimmerman,**

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

[FR Doc. 00-17033 Filed 7-5-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50-327 and 50-328]

### Tennessee Valley Authority; Sequoyah Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2, Environment Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

#### Introduction

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is considering issuance of an amendment to Facility Operating Licenses Nos. DPR-77 and DPR-79, issued to the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA, the licensee) for operation of the Sequoyah Nuclear Plant (SQN) Units 1 and 2, respectively. The facility is located in Hamilton County, Tennessee.

#### Environmental Assessment

##### Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed action would revise License Condition 2.B.(5) in each of the licenses, which authorizes possession of byproduct and special nuclear materials (SNM). The License Condition states:

Pursuant to the Act and 10 CFR Parts 30, 40, and 70, to possess, but not separate, such byproduct and special nuclear materials as may be produced by the operation of the facility.

These proposed amendments change the words "as may be produced by the operation of the facility" to "as may be produced by the operation of the Sequoyah or Watts Bar Unit 1 Nuclear Plants." Upon NRC approval of the