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 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 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 J. W. Durham, Sr., Esquire, Sr. V. P. and General Counsel, PECO Energy Company, 2301 Market Street, Philadelphia, PA 19101, 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 amendment dated February 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 3rd day of March 2000.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Bartholomew C. Buckley,

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

[FR Doc. 00–5747 Filed 3–8–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50–272 and 50–311]

Public Service Electric and Gas Company Salem Generating Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2; Notice of Consideration of Approval of Transfer of Facility Operating Licenses and Conforming Amendments, and Opportunity for a Hearing

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering the issuance of an order under 10 CFR 50.80 approving the transfer of Facility Operating Licenses DPR–70 for Salem Nuclear Generating Station, Unit No. 1, and DPR–75 for Salem Nuclear Generating Station, Unit No. 2, to the extent held by PECO Energy Corporation (PECO). PECO holds a 42.59-percent ownership interest in both Salem units, which are operated by Public Service Electric and Gas Company (PSE&G). The remaining interests in Salem, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, are owned by Delmarva Power & Light Company and Atlanta City Electric Company. The transfer would be to a new generating company, currently referred to as GENCO. GENCO will be a subsidiary of a new holding company, Exelon Corporation, which will be formed as a result of a merger of Unicom Corporation (the parent company of Commonwealth Edison Company) and PECO. The Commission is also considering amending the licenses for administrative purposes to reflect the proposed transfer.

According to the application for approval filed by PECO, GENCO would become the owner of PECO's ownership interests in each of the Salem units following approval of the proposed transfer of the licenses. After this transfer, PSE&G would continue to be exclusively responsible for the operation, maintenance, and eventual decommissioning of Salem Nuclear Generating Station. No physical changes to the facilities or operational changes are being proposed in the application. The proposed transfer does not involve any change with respect to the non-operating ownership interests held by Delmarva Power & Light and Atlantic City Electric Company, or the ownership interest of PSE&G.

The proposed amendments would replace references to PECO in the licenses with references to GENCO and make other changes for administrative purposes to reflect the proposed transfer.

Pursuant to 10 CFR 50,80, no license, or any right thereunder, shall be transferred, directly or indirectly, through transfer of control of the license, unless the Commission shall give its consent in writing. The Commission will approve an application for the transfer of a license if the Commission determines that the proposed transferee is qualified to hold the license, and that the transfer is otherwise consistent with the applicable provisions of law, regulations, and orders issued by the Commission pursuant thereto.

Before issuance of the proposed conforming 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.

As provided in 10 CFR 2.1315, unless otherwise determined by the Commission with regard to a specific application, the Commission has determined that any amendment to the license of a utilization facility which does not conform the license to reflect the transfer action involves no significant hazards consideration. No contrary determination has been made with respect to this specific license amendment application. In light of the generic determination reflected in 10 CFR 2.1315, no public comments with respect to significant hazards considerations are being solicited, notwithstanding the general comment procedures contained in 10 CFR 50.91.

The filing of requests for hearing and petitions for leave to intervene, and written comments with regard to the license transfer application, are discussed below.

By March 29, 2000, any person whose interest may be affected by the Commission's action on the application may request a hearing, and, if not the applicants, may petition for leave to intervene in a hearing proceeding on the Commission's action. Requests for a hearing and petitions for leave to intervene should be filed in accordance with the Commission's rulels of practice set forth in Subpart M, ''Public Notification, Availability of Documents and Records, Hearing Requests and

Procedures for Hearings on License Transfer Applications, ''of 10 CFR Part 2. In particular, such requests and petitions must comply with the requirements set forth in 10 CFR 2.1306, and should address the considerations contained in 10 CFR 2.1308(a). Untimely requests and petitions may be denied as provided in 10 CFR 2.1308(b), unless good cause for failure to file on time is established. In addition, an untimely request or petition should address the factors that the Commission will also consider, in reviewing untimely requests or petitions, set forth in 10 CFR 2.1308(b)(1)–(2).

Requests for a hearing and petitions for leave to intervene should be served upon: the counsel for PSE&G, Jeffrie J. Keenan, Esquire, Public Service Electric and Gas Company, Nuclear Business Unit—N21, P.O. Box 236, Hancocks Bridge, NJ 08038 (tel: 856–339–5429, fax: 856–339–1234, and e-mail: jeffrie.keenan@pseg.com); the counsel for PECO, William E. Baer, Jr., Esquire, Morgan, Lewis and Bockius LLP, 1800 M Street, NW., Washington, DC 20036–5869 (tel: 202–467–7454, e-mail: webaer@mlb.com); the General Counsel, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555 (e-mail address for filings regarding license transfer cases only: ogclt@nrc.gov); and the Secretary of the Commission, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001; Attention: Rulemakings and Adjudications Staff, in accordance with 10 CFR 2.1313.

The Commission will issue a notice or order granting or denying a hearing request or intervention petition, designating the issues for any hearing that will be held and designating the Presiding Officer. A notice granting a hearing will be publishing in the **Federal Register** and served on the parties to the hearing.

As an alternative to request for hearing and petitions to intervene, by April 10, 2000, persons may submit written comments regarding the license transfer application, as provided for in CFR 2.1305. The Commission will consider and, if appropriate, respond to these comments, but such comments will not otherwise constitute part of the decisional record. Comments should be submitted to the Secretary, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001, Attention: Rulemakings and Adjudications Staff, and shoudl cite the publication date and page number of this **Federal Register notice.**

For further details with respect to this action, see the application dated December 20, 1999, and supplement from ComEd dated January 14, 2000, 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 3rd day of March 2000.

For the nuclear Regulatory Commission.

William Gleaves,

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

[FR Doc. 00–5741 Filed 3–8–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Florida Power Corporation, et al.

[Docket No. 50–302]

Crystal River Unit 3; Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is considering issuance of an exemption from the requirements of 10 CFR 70.51(d) for Facility Operating License No. DPR–72 issued to Florida Power Corporation, et. al. (FPC or the licensee), for operation of Crystal River Unit 3, located in Citrus County, Florida.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed action

The proposed action would exempt the licensee from the requirement to perform a physical inventory of the fuel in the Crystal River Unit 3 spent fuel pool (SFP) every 12 months. Instead of this requirement, the licensee will perform a physical inventory of the fuel in the SFP within 90 days of removing missile shields covering the SFP, if a physical inventory had not been performed within the previous 12 months.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application for exemption dated July 14, 1999.

The Need for the Proposed Action

The underlying purpose of the annual physical inventory required by 10 CFR 70.51(d) is to verify that the material control and accounting procedures are sufficient to enable the licensee to account for the special nuclear material in the licensee's possession. When missile shields are in place on the SFP, movement of fuel in the SFP is not possible. Therefore, removing the missile shields for the sole purpose of conducting an annual inventory is an unnecessary burden on the licensee.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The NRC has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that it is administrative only and will have no environmental impact.

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 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 Commission 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 Crystal River Unit 3.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on February 15, 2000, the staff consulted with William Passetti, Chief, Department of Health, Bureau of Radiation Control, for the state of Florida, 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 NRC concludes that the proposed action will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment. Accordingly, the NRC has determined not to prepare an