

Basic class	Proposed year 2001 quotas
Trimeperidine	2
Schedule II:	
1-Phenylcyclohexylamine ..	12
1- Piperidinocyclohexanecarbonitrile (PCC)	10
Alfentanil	3,000
Alphaprodine	2
Amobarbital	12
Amphetamine	10,958,000
Cocaine	251,000
Codeine (for sale)	43,248,000
Codeine (for conversion) ..	59,051,000
Dextropropoxyphene	134,401,000
Dihydrocodeine	272,000
Diphenoxylate	401,000
Ecgonine	51,000
Ethylmorphine	12
Fentanyl	440,000
Glutethimide	2
Hydrocodone (for sale)	21,417,000
Hydrocodone (for conversion)	26,540,000
Hydromorphone	1,409,000
Isomethadone	12
Levo-alphaacetylmethadol (LAAM)	41,000
Levomethorphan	2
Levorphanol	15,000
Meperidine	10,168,000
Methadone (for sale)	8,347,000
Methadone (for conversion)	60,000
Methadone Intermediate ...	9,503,000
Methamphetamine	2,226,000
850,000 grams of levo-desoxyephedrine for use in a non-controlled, non-prescription product;	
1,325,000 grams for methamphetamine for conversion to a Schedule III product; and 51,000 grams for methamphetamine (for sale).	
Methylphenidate	14,957,000
Morphine (for sale)	14,706,000
Morphine (for conversion) ..	117,675,000
Nabilone	2
Noroxymorphone (for sale) ..	25,000
Noroxymorphone (for conversion)	3,180,000
Opium	570,000
Oxycodone (for sale)	46,680,000
Oxycodone (for conversion)	449,000
Oxymorphone	264,000
Pentobarbital	22,037,000
Phencyclidine	40
Phenmetrazine	2
Phenylacetone	10
Secobarbital	12
Sufentanil	1,000
Thebaine	65,596,000

The Deputy Administrator further proposes that aggregate production quotas for all other Schedules I and II controlled substances included in Sections 1308.11 and 1308.12 of Title 21

of the Code of Federal Regulations be established at zero.

All interested persons are invited to submit their comments and objections in writing regarding this proposal. A person may object to or comment on the proposal relating to any of the above-mentioned substances without filing comments or objections regarding the others. If a person believes that one or more of these issues warrant a hearing, the individual should so state and summarize the reasons for this belief.

In the event that comments or objections to this proposal raise one or more issues which the Deputy Administrator finds warrant a hearing, the Deputy Administrator shall order a public hearing by notice in the **Federal Register**, summarizing the issues to be heard and setting the time for the hearing.

The Office of Management and Budget has determined that notices of aggregate production quotas are not subject to centralized review under Executive Order 12866. This action has been analyzed in accordance with the principles and criteria contained in Executive Order 13132, and it has been determined that this matter does not have sufficient federalism implications to warrant the preparation of a Federalism Assessment.

The Deputy Administrator hereby certifies that this action will have no significant impact upon small entities whose interests must be considered under the Regulatory Flexibility Act, 5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.* The establishment of aggregate production quotas for Schedules I and II controlled substances is mandated by law and by international treaty obligations. The quotas are necessary to provide for the estimated medical, scientific, research and industrial needs of the United States, for export requirements and the establishment and maintenance of reserve stocks. While aggregate production quotas are of primary importance to large manufacturers, their impact upon small entities is neither negative nor beneficial. Accordingly, the Deputy Administrator has determined that this action does not require a regulatory flexibility analysis.

Dated: September 27, 2000.

Julio F. Mercado,

Deputy Administrator.

[FR Doc. 00-25421 Filed 10-3-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-09-M

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Committee Management; Renewal

The NSF management official having responsibility for the U.S. National Assessment Synthesis Team (#5219) has determined that renewing through October 31, 2000, is necessary and in the public interest in connection with the performance of duties imposed upon the Director, National Science Foundation (NSF), by 42 USC 1861 *et seq.* This determination follows consultation with the Committee Management Secretariat, General Services Administration.

Authority for this Committee will expire on October 31, 2000. For more information, please contact Karen York, NSF, at (703) 292-4387.

Dated: September 28, 2000.

Karen J. York,

Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 00-25400 Filed 10-3-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555-01-M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-213]

Connecticut Yankee Atomic Power Company, et al., Haddam Neck Plant; Notice of Public Meeting To Discuss the Haddam Neck License Termination Plan

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is in receipt of and has made available for public inspection and comment the License Termination Plan (LTP) for the Haddam Neck Plant (HNP) located in Haddam, Connecticut. NRC's receipt of the HNP LTP and the LTP's availability for comment was noticed in the **Federal Register** on August 23, 2000 (65 FR 51345). The subject of this notice is to announce that NRC staff will conduct a public meeting to discuss the HNP LTP on Tuesday, October 17, 2000, at 7:00 p.m. at Haddam—Killingworth High School, Higganum, Connecticut.

Connecticut Yankee Atomic Power Company (CYAPC, or the licensee) announced permanent cessation of power operations of HNP on December 5, 1996. In accordance with NRC regulations, CYAPC submitted a Post-Shutdown Decommissioning Activities Report (PSDAR) for HNP to the NRC on August 22, 1997. The facility is undergoing active decontamination and dismantlement.

In accordance with 10 CFR 50.82(a)(9), all power reactor licensees must submit an application for termination of their license. The application for termination of license

must be accompanied or preceded by an LTP to be submitted for NRC approval. If found acceptable by the NRC staff, the LTP is approved by license amendment, subject to such conditions and limitations as the NRC staff deems appropriate and necessary. CYAPC submitted the proposed LTP for HNP by application dated July 7, 2000. In accordance with 10 CFR 20.1405 and 10 CFR 50.82(a)(9)(iii), the NRC provided notice to individuals in the vicinity of the site that the NRC was in receipt of the HNP LTP and would accept comments from affected parties (65 FR 51345). In accordance with 10 CFR 50.82(a)(9)(iii), the NRC is hereby providing notice that NRC staff will conduct a meeting to discuss the HNP LTP.

The HNP LTP (ADAMS Accession Number ML003735143) may be examined, and/or copied for a fee, at the NRC's Public Document Room, located at One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland, and is accessible electronically from the ADAMS Public Library component on the NRC Web site, <http://www.nrc.gov> (the Public Electronic Reading Room). The LTP may also be viewed at the CYAPC Web site at www.connyankee.com.

For further information, contact: Mr. Louis L. Wheeler by mail, Mail Stop O-7-C2, Project Directorate IV & Decommissioning, Division of Licensing Project Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. 20555-0001; telephone 301-415-1444; or e-mail dxw@nrc.gov.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 28th day of September 2000.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Michael T. Masnik,

Chief, Decommissioning Section, Project Directorate IV and Decommissioning, Division of Licensing Project Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 00-25462 Filed 10-3-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-368]

Entergy Operations, Inc.; Arkansas Nuclear One, Unit 2 Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is considering issuance of an exemption from 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J, for Facility Operating License No. NPF-6, issued to

Entergy Operations, Inc. (the licensee), for operation of Arkansas Nuclear One, Unit 2 (ANO-2), located in Pope County, Arkansas.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed action would provide a one-time exemption to Entergy Operations, Inc. from the requirements of Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations (10 CFR) Part 50, Appendix J, "Primary Reactor Containment Leakage Testing For Water-Cooled Power Reactors," which requires that licensees of all power reactors conduct integrated leakage rate tests (ILRT) under conditions representing design basis loss-of-coolant accident containment peak pressure. The licensee requires an exemption in order to conduct the ILRT at the same pressure that is used for the structural integrity test (SIT).

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application for exemption dated June 29, 2000.

The Need for the Proposed Action

The ANO-2 steam generators (SGs) are scheduled for replacement during the fall of 2000. The replacement SGs (RSGs) will require that an access opening be cut in the containment building structure. Upon closure of the structure, an ILRT will be required to test for primary containment leakage integrity.

The ANO-2 containment building was originally designed and tested for an internal pressure of 54 psig. The ANO-2 containment building has recently been reevaluated, to address the containment post-accident response resulting from the RSGs, for an increase in accident pressure to 58 psig with a design pressure of 59 psig, and shown to be acceptable as discussed in a letter to the NRC dated November 3, 1999, as revised by a letter dated June 29, 2000. As a result of this increase, an SIT will be performed to evaluate the ANO-2 containment building for the change in containment design pressure. The purpose of the SIT is to verify that the containment building structure can safely carry design loads and that the structural behavior is similar to that predicted by analysis. The post-RSG SIT will be performed at 68 psig (1.15 times the revised design pressure). The licensee would like to also perform the ILRT concurrently with the post-RSG SIT, at the SIT pressure of 68 psig, in order to recover approximately 30 hours of projected plant outage time. However, Appendix J requires that the ILRT be conducted at a pressure representing the

design basis loss-of-coolant accident containment peak pressure, which is 58 psig. Hence, the need for the proposed exemption.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The NRC has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that 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 nonradiological impacts, the proposed action does not involve any historic sites. It does not affect nonradiological plant effluents and has no other environmental impact. Therefore, there are no significant nonradiological 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 Related to the Operation of Arkansas Nuclear One, Unit 2," dated June 1977.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on September 7, 2000, the staff consulted with the Arkansas State official, Bernie Beville of the Arkansas Department of Health, 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