WA99–16 (Mar. 12, 1999) (WA00–16)
WA99–17 (Mar. 12, 1999) (WA00–17)
WA99–18 (Mar. 12, 1999) (WA00–18)
WA99–19 (Mar. 12, 1999) (WA00–19)
WA99–20 (Mar. 12, 1999) (WA00–20)
WA99–21 (Mar. 12, 1999) (WA00–21)
WA99–22 (Mar. 12, 1999) (WA00–22)
WA99–23 (Mar. 12, 1999) (WA00–23)
WA99–24 (Mar. 12, 1999) (WA00–24)
WA99–25 (Mar. 12, 1999) (WA00–25)
WA99–26 (Mar. 12, 1999) (WA00–26)
WA99–27 (Mar. 12, 1999) (WA00–27)
Wyoming
WY99–01 (Mar. 12, 1999) (WY00–01)
WY99–02 (Mar. 12, 1999) (WY00–02)
WY99–03 (Mar. 12, 1999) (WY00–03)
WY99–04 (Mar. 12, 1999) (WY00–04)
WY99–05 (Mar. 12, 1999) (WY00–05)
WY99–06 (Mar. 12, 1999) (WY00–06)
WY99–07 (Mar. 12, 1999) (WY00–07)
WY99–08 (Mar. 12, 1999) (WY00–08)
WY99–09 (Mar. 12, 1999) (WY00–09)
WY99–10 (Mar. 12, 1999) (WY00–10)
WY99–11 (Mar. 12, 1999) (WY00–11)
WY99–12 (Mar. 12, 1999) (WY00–12)
WY99–13 (Mar. 12, 1999) (WY00–13)
WY99–14 (Mar. 12, 1999) (WY00–14)
WY99–15 (Mar. 12, 1999) (WY00–15)
WY99–16 (Mar. 12, 1999) (WY00–16)
WY99–17 (Mar. 12, 1999) (WY00–17)
WY99–18 (Mar. 12, 1999) (WY00–18)
WY99–19 (Mar. 12, 1999) (WY00–19)
WY99–20 (Mar. 12, 1999) (WY00–20)
WY99–21 (Mar. 12, 1999) (WY00–21)
WY99–22 (Mar. 12, 1999) (WY00–22)
WY99–23 (Mar. 12, 1999) (WY00–23)
WY99–24 (Mar. 12, 1999) (WY00–24)

Volume VII

Arizona
AZ99–01 (Mar. 12, 1999) (AZ00–01)
AZ99–02 (Mar. 12, 1999) (AZ00–02)
AZ99–03 (Mar. 12, 1999) (AZ00–03)
AZ99–04 (Mar. 12, 1999) (AZ00–04)
AZ99–05 (Mar. 12, 1999) (AZ00–05)
AZ99–06 (Mar. 12, 1999) (AZ00–06)
AZ99–07 (Mar. 12, 1999) (AZ00–07)
AZ99–08 (Mar. 12, 1999) (AZ00–08)
AZ99–09 (Mar. 12, 1999) (AZ00–09)
AZ99–10 (Mar. 12, 1999) (AZ00–10)
AZ99–11 (Mar. 12, 1999) (AZ00–11)
AZ99–12 (Mar. 12, 1999) (AZ00–12)
AZ99–13 (Mar. 12, 1999) (AZ00–13)
AZ99–14 (Mar. 12, 1999) (AZ00–14)
AZ99–15 (Mar. 12, 1999) (AZ00–15)
AZ99–16 (Mar. 12, 1999) (AZ00–16)
AZ99–17 (Mar. 12, 1999) (AZ00–17)
AZ99–18 (Mar. 12, 1999) (AZ00–18)
AZ99–19 (Mar. 12, 1999) (AZ00–19)
AZ99–20 (Mar. 12, 1999) (AZ00–20)
California
CA99–01 (Mar. 12, 1999) (CA00–01)
CA99–02 (Mar. 12, 1999) (CA00–02)
CA99–03 (Mar. 12, 1999) (CA00–03)
CA99–04 (Mar. 12, 1999) (CA00–04)
CA99–05 (Mar. 12, 1999) (CA00–05)
CA99–06 (Mar. 12, 1999) (CA00–06)
CA99–07 (Mar. 12, 1999) (CA00–07)
CA99–08 (Mar. 12, 1999) (CA00–08)
CA99–09 (Mar. 12, 1999) (CA00–09)
CA99–10 (Mar. 12, 1999) (CA00–10)
CA99–11 (Mar. 12, 1999) (CA00–11)
CA99–12 (Mar. 12, 1999) (CA00–12)
CA99–13 (Mar. 12, 1999) (CA00–13)
CA99–14 (Mar. 12, 1999) (CA00–14)
CA99–15 (Mar. 12, 1999) (CA00–15)
CA99–16 (Mar. 12, 1999) (CA00–16)
CA99–17 (Mar. 12, 1999) (CA00–17)
CA99–18 (Mar. 12, 1999) (CA00–18)
CA99–19 (Mar. 12, 1999) (CA00–19)
CA99–20 (Mar. 12, 1999) (CA00–20)
CA99–21 (Mar. 12, 1999) (CA00–21)
CA99–22 (Mar. 12, 1999) (CA00–22)
CA99–23 (Mar. 12, 1999) (CA00–23)
CA99–24 (Mar. 12, 1999) (CA00–24)
CA99–25 (Mar. 12, 1999) (CA00–25)
CA99–26 (Mar. 12, 1999) (CA00–26)
CA99–27 (Mar. 12, 1999) (CA00–27)
CA99–28 (Mar. 12, 1999) (CA00–28)
CA99–29 (Mar. 12, 1999) (CA00–29)
CA99–30 (Mar. 12, 1999) (CA00–30)
CA99–31 (Mar. 12, 1999) (CA00–31)
CA99–32 (Mar. 12, 1999) (CA00–32)
CA99–33 (Mar. 12, 1999) (CA00–33)
CA99–34 (Mar. 12, 1999) (CA00–34)
CA99–35 (Mar. 12, 1999) (CA00–35)
CA99–36 (Mar. 12, 1999) (CA00–36)
CA99–37 (Mar. 12, 1999) (CA00–37)
CA99–38 (Mar. 12, 1999) (CA00–38)
CA99–39 (Mar. 12, 1999) (CA00–39)
CA99–40 (Mar. 12, 1999) (CA00–40)
CA99–41 (Mar. 12, 1999) (CA00–41)
Hawaii
HI99–01 (Mar. 12, 1999) (HI00–01)
Nevada
NV99–01 (Mar. 12, 1999) (NV00–01)
NV99–02 (Mar. 12, 1999) (NV00–02)
NV99–03 (Mar. 12, 1999) (NV00–03)
NV99–04 (Mar. 12, 1999) (NV00–04)
NV99–05 (Mar. 12, 1999) (NV00–05)
NV99–06 (Mar. 12, 1999) (NV00–06)
NV99–07 (Mar. 12, 1999) (NV00–07)
NV99–08 (Mar. 12, 1999) (NV00–08)
NV99–09 (Mar. 12, 1999) (NV00–09)

General Wage Determination Publication

General Wage Determinations issued under the Davis-Bacon and related Acts, including those noted above, may be found in the Government Printing Office (GPO) document entitled ''General Wage Determinations Issued Under The Davis-Bacon and Related Acts.'' This publication is available at each of the 50 Regional Government Depository Libraries and many of the 1,400 Government Depository Libraries across the country.

The general wage determinations issued under the Davis-Bacon and related Acts are available electronically by subscription to the FedWorld Bulletin Board System of the National Technical Information Service (NTIS) of the U.S. Department of Commerce at 1–800–363–2068.

Hard-copy subscriptions may be purchased from: Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402; (202) 512–1800.

When ordering hard-copy subscription(s), be sure to specify the State(s) of interest, since subscriptions may be ordered for any or all of the seven separate volumes, arranged by State. Subscriptions include an annual edition (issued in January or February) which includes all current general wage determinations for the States covered by each volume. Throughout the remainder of the year, regular weekly updates are distributed to subscribers.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 1st day of February 2000.

Carl J. Poleskey,

Chief, Branch of Construction Wage Determinations.

[FR Doc. 00–2506 Filed 2–10–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–27–M

FEDERAL MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION

Sunshine Act Meeting

February 3, 2000.

TIME AND DATE: 10 a.m., Thursday, February 10, 2000.

PLACE: Room 6005, 6th Floor, 1730 K Street, NW., Washington, DC.

STATUS: Closed [Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. § 552b(c)(10)].

MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED: This Commission meeting is a continuation of the Commission meeting held in closed session on January 27, 2000, to discuss the following:

1. *Pero* v. *Cyprus Plateau Mining Corp.,* Docket No. WEST 97–154–D (Issues include whether substantial evidence supports the judge's finding that the operator did not discriminate against Pero in violation of section 105(c).).

CONTACT PERSON FOR MORE INFORMATION: Jean Ellen (202) 653–5629/(202) 708–9300 for TDD Relay/1–800–877–8339 for toll free.

Jean H. Ellen,

Chief Docket Clerk.

[FR Doc. 00–3365 Filed 2–9–00; 1:15 pm]

BILLING CODE 67635–01–M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Docket No. 50–289

Amergen Energy Company, LLC; Notice of Withdrawal of Application for Amendment to Facility Operating License

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has granted the request of AmerGen Energy Company, LLC, (the licensee) to withdraw the October 19, 1998, application, as supplemented by letters dated February 16, and September 2, 1999, filed by GPU Nuclear Inc., (the then-licensee) for proposed amendment

to Facility Operating License No. DPR–50 for the Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit No. 1, located in Dauphin County, Pa.

The proposed amendment requested approval of a revised reactor coolant maximum allowable dose equivalent iodine 131 specific activity level of 1.0 microcuries/gram.

The Commission had previously issued a Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment published in the **Federal Register** on November 18, 1998 (63 FR 64118). However, by letter dated December 29, 1999, the licensee withdrew the proposed change request.

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendment dated October 19, 1998, as supplemented February 16, and September 2, 1999, and the licensee's letter dated December 29, 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 accessible electronically through the ADAMS Public Electronic Reading Room link at the NRC Web site (http://www.nrc.gov).

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 7th day of February 2000.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Timothy G. Colburn,

Sr. Project Manager, Section 1, Project Directorate I, Division of Licensing Project Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 00–3190 Filed 2–10–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50–254 and 50–265]

Commonwealth Edison Company (Quad Cities Nuclear Power Station,Units 1 and 2);

Exemption

I.

The Commonwealth Edison Company (ComEd, the licensee) is the holder of Facility Operating Licenses Nos. DPR–29 and DPR–30 which authorize operation of the Quad Cities Nuclear Power Station, Units 1 and 2 (Quad Cities). The license provides, among other things, that the facility is subject to all rules, regulations, and orders of the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) now or hereafter in effect.

The facility consists of boiling water reactors (Units 1 and 2) located on the licensee's Quad Cities site in Rock Island County, Illinois. This exemption refers to both units.

II.

Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (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 CFRPart 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 the proposed amendments to the technical specification (TS) P–T limits, the licensee requested in its submittal of November 12, 1999, that the staff exempt Quad Cities 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 2, 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. 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. It should be noted that, although Code Case N–640 was incorporated into the ASME Code recently, an exemption is still needed because the proposed P–T limits (excluding Code Cases N–588 and N–640) are based on the 1989 edition of the ASME Code.

Code Case N–588

The licensee has proposed an exemption to allow the use of ASME Code Case N–588 in conjunction with ASME Section XI, 10 CFR 50.60(a) and 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix G, to determine the P–T limits.

The proposed amendments to revise the P–T limits for Quad Cities rely, in part, on the requested exemption. These proposed P–T limits have been developed using the postulation of a circumferentially-oriented reference flaw as the limiting flaw in a RPV circumferential weld in lieu of an axially-oriented flaw required by the 1989 Edition of ASME Section XI, Appendix G.

Postulating the Appendix G [axially-oriented flaw] reference flaw in a circumferential weld is physically unrealistic and overly conservative, because the length of the flaw is 1.5 times the vessel thickness, which is much longer than the width of the reactor vessel girth weld. Industry experience with the repair of weld indications found during preservice inspection, and data taken from destructive examination of actual vessel welds, confirms that any remaining flaws are small, laminar in nature, and do not transverse the weld bead orientation. Therefore, any potential defects introduced during the fabrication process, and not detected during subsequent nondestructive examinations, would only be expected to be oriented in the direction of weld fabrication. For circumferential welds this indicates a postulated defect with a circumferential orientation.

An analysis provided to the ASME Code's Working Group on Operating Plant Criteria (WGOPC) (in which Code Case N–588 was developed) indicated that if an axial flaw is postulated on a circumferential weld, then based on the stress magnification factors (M_m) given in the Code Case for the inside diameter circumferential (0.443) and axial (0.926) flaw orientations, it is equivalent to applying a safety factor of 4.18 on the pressure loading under normal operating conditions. Appendix G requires a safety factor of 2 on the contribution of the pressure load in the case of an axially-oriented flaw in an axial weld, shell plate, or forging. By postulating a circumferentially-oriented flaw on a circumferential weld and