III. Guidelines To Assess Consistency with Other Regulatory Principles.

A. A proposed change to a more performance-based approach is consistent and coherent with other overriding goals, principles and approaches involving the NRC's regulatory process.

a. The main sources of these principles are the Principles of Good Regulation, the Probabilistic Risk Assessment (PRA) Policy Statement, the Regulatory Guide 1.174, ''An Approach for Using PRA in Risk-Informed Decisions on Plant-Specific Changes to the Licensing Basis,'' and the NRC's Strategic Plan.

b. Consistent with the high-level at which the guidance described above has been articulated, specific factors which need to be addressed in each case (such as defense in depth and treatment of uncertainties) would depend on the particular regulatory issues involved.

Additional Information

The staff's proposed high-level guidelines reflect a measure of specificity designed to stimulate reactions, concerns, and views on the more detailed consideration or underpinnings of a set of high-level guidelines. In no way should this specificity be construed as an indication that the NRC has established any firm position regarding these guidelines. The NRC invites advice and recommendations from all interested persons on all aspects of its proposal. In addition, comments and supporting reasons are particularly requested in the following areas:

(1) Clarity and specificity of the guidelines;

a. Are the proposed guidelines appropriate and clear?

b. Are there additional guidelines that would improve clarity and specificity?

c. How does the ''high-level'' nature of the guidelines affect the clarity and specificity of the guidelines?

(2) Implementation of the guidelines;

a. What guidelines, if any, are mandatory for an activity to qualify as a performance-based initiative?

b. What is the best way to implement these guidelines?

c. How should the Backfit Rule apply to the implementation of performance-based approaches?

d. Should these guidelines be applied to all types of activity, e.g., should they be applied to petitions for rulemaking?

e. Should these guidelines only be applied to new regulatory initiatives?

f. Will these guidelines be effective in determining whether we can make a regulatory initiative more performance-based? The staff proposes that these guidelines be added to our Management Directives such that whenever the NRC is involved in a rulemaking, or changing a regulatory guide or branch technical position, etc., we will consider the option of making it more performance-based.

(3) Establishment of objective performance criteria;

a. In moving to performance-based requirements, should the current level of conservatism be maintained or should introduction of more realism be attempted?

b. What level of conservatism (safety margin) needs to be built into a performance criterion to avoid facing an immediate safety concern if the criterion is not met?

c. Recognizing that performance criteria can be set at different levels in a hierarchy (e.g., component, train, system, release, dose), on what basis is an appropriate level in the hierarchy selected for setting performance-based requirements, and what is the appropriate level of conservatism for each tier in the hierarchy?

d. Who would be responsible for proposing and justifying the acceptance limits and adequacy of objective criteria?

e. What are examples of performance-based objectives that are not amenable to risk analyses such as PRA or Integrated Safety Assessment?

f. In the context of risk-informed regulation, to what extent should performance criteria account for potential risk from beyond-design-basis accidents (i.e., severe accidents)?

(4) Identification and use of measurable (or calculable) parameters;

a. How and by whom are performance parameters to be determined?

b. How do you decide what a relevant performance parameter is?

c. How much uncertainty can be tolerated in the measurable or calculated parameters?

(5) Pilot projects;

a. Would undertaking pilot projects in the reactor, materials, and waste arenas provide beneficial experience before finalizing the guidelines?

b. What should be the relationship between any such pilot projects and those being implemented to risk-inform the regulations?

Agenda

9 A.M.—Welcome, ground rules, introductions, agenda overview—F.X. Cameron, Facilitator

9:15 A.M.—Overview of NRC performance-based regulatory initiative—P. Kadambi, Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research—Participant and audience questions

9:45 A.M.—Experience of other agencies with performance-based regulatory approaches—Participant and audience questions

10:15 A.M.—Break

10:30 A.M.—What is the nature of performance-based regulation? What are its objectives? What is the relationship between performance-based initiatives and risk-informed initiatives? Participant discussion

11:45 A.M.—Lunch

1 P.M.—Summary of morning discussion and introduction of new participants. What criteria should be used to select guidelines? Views on NRC's proposed guidelines (see subject FRN)—Participant discussion

2:30 P.M.—Implementation issues: What process should be used to implement the guidelines for performance-based regulatory approaches? What is the relationship between the guidelines and ongoing NRC performance-based regulatory approaches? What is the role of regulatory guidance, and inspection and enforcement in implementing performance-based regulatory initiatives? Should a pilot program be established before full scale application? Participant discussion

3:15 P.M.—Break

3:30 P.M.—Summary of day's discussion and review of specific NRC information needs. See FRN ''Additional Information.'' Discussion of future actions—Participant discussion

4 P.M.—Adjourn

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 11th day of February 2000.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Charles E. Rossi,

Director, Division of Systems Analysis and Regulatory Effectiveness, Office Of Nuclear Regulatory Research.

[FR Doc. 00–3803 Filed 2–16–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy

10 CFR Part 430

[Docket No. EE–RM/STD–98–440]

RIN: 1904–AA77

Energy Conservation Program for Consumer Products: Energy Conservation Standards for Central Air Conditioners and Central Air Conditioning Heat Pumps

AGENCY: Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Energy.

ACTION: Notice of Re-opening Public Comment Period.

SUMMARY: On November 24, 1999, the Department of Energy published a Supplemental Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (ANOPR) to consider amending the energy conservation standards for central air conditioners and central air conditioning heat pumps. The comment period ended on February 7, 2000. In response to requests from the Air Conditioning and Refrigeration Institute (ARI) and the California Energy Commission (CEC) to extend the comment period, the Department is re-opening the comment period until February 28, 2000.

DATES: The Department will accept written comments, data, and information regarding the ANOPR until Monday, February 28, 2000. The Department requests 10 copies of the written comments and a computer diskette (WordPerfect 8).

ADDRESSES: Written comments should be submitted to: U.S. Department of Energy, Attn: Brenda Edwards-Jones, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, ''Energy Efficiency Standards for Consumer Products, Central Air Conditioners and Central Air conditioning Heat Pumps'' (Docket No. EE–RM/STD–98–440), EE–41, Forrestal Building, 1000 Independence Avenue, SW, Room 1J–018, Washington, DC 20585, (202) 586–2945.

You can read copies of the transcript of the public workshop held on December 9, 1999, and public comments in the Freedom of Information Reading Room (Room No. 1E–190) at the U.S. Department of Energy, Forrestal Building, 1000 Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, DC, between the hours of 9:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

The latest information regarding central air conditioner and heat pump rulemaking is available on the Building Research and Standards web site at the following address: http://www.eren.doe.gov/buildings/codes standards/applbrf/central air conditioner.html

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dr. Michael E. McCabe, U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Forrestal Building, Mail Station EE–41, 1000 Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, D.C. 20585–0121, (202) 586–0854, E-mail: Michael.E.McCabe@ee.doe.gov.

Edward Levy, Esq., U.S. Department of Energy, Office of General Counsel, Forrestal Building, Mail Station GC–72, 1000 Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, D.C. 20585, (202) 586–9507, E-mail: Edward.Levy@hq.doe.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Department published a Supplemental Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking on November 24, 1999, entitled ''Energy Conservation Program for Consumer Products: Energy Conservation Standards for Central Air Conditioners and Heat Pumps.'' The notice announced a 75-day comment period, ending on February 7, 2000. At the December public workshop on the ANOPR, it was recommended the Department conduct additional analysis to examine the sensitivity of the Life Cycle Cost (LCC) results to a number of the underlying assumptions. DOE performed some of the requested sensitivity analyses and, on January 14, 2000, e-mailed the results to all workshop attendees who had provided an e-mail address. On January 20, 2000, the Department posted the results of the supplemental LCC sensitivity analysis to the DOE web site identified above under **ADDRESSES**.

In a letter dated January 28, 2000, ARI requested an extension of the comment period in order to allow members to evaluate the supplemental information and to respond to the Department's request for comments. In addition, the CEC also requested an extension of the comment period.

Because interested parties need adequate time to review the recently released LCC sensitivity analyses, we are re-opening the comment period until Monday, February 28, 2000. For those parties that plan to submit comments during this period, we ask that they make known to us the extent and nature of their comments they intend to submit, by either phone or E-mail to the address above, as soon as possible. This will enable us to plan for any additional data collection or analyses which may be necessary to resolve the comments. We hope that this re-opening will permit a more comprehensive review and commentary preparation for the supplemental LCC sensitivity results.

Issued in Washington, DC, on February 11, 2000.

David J. Leiter,

Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy.

[FR Doc. 00–3839 Filed 2–16–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 2000–NM–06–AD]

RIN 2120–AA64

Airworthiness Directives; Fokker Model F27 Mark 050, 100, 200, 300, 400, 500, 600, and 700 Series Airplanes; and Model F28 Mark 0070, 0100, 1000, 2000, 3000, and 4000 Series Airplanes

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM).

SUMMARY: This document proposes the adoption of a new airworthiness directive (AD) that is applicable to certain Fokker Model F27 Mark 050, 100, 200, 300, 400, 500, 600, and 700 series airplanes, and Model F28 Mark 0070, 0100, 1000, 2000, 3000, and 4000 series airplanes. This proposal would require a one-time functional test to verify correct installation of the shoulder harnesses of the pilot's and co-pilot's seats and, if necessary, replacement of the shoulder harness assembly with a new or serviceable shoulder harness assembly. This proposal is prompted by issuance of mandatory continuing airworthiness information by a foreign civil airworthiness authority. The actions specified by the proposed AD are intended to prevent failure of the shoulder harness, which could result in injury to the flight crew during turbulent flight conditions or during emergency landing conditions.

DATES: Comments must be received by March 20, 2000.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments in triplicate to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Transport Airplane Directorate, ANM–114, Attention: Rules Docket No. 2000–NM–06–AD, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055–4056. Comments may be inspected at this location between 9:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

The service information referenced in the proposed rule may be obtained from Fokker Services B.V., P.O. Box 231, 2150 AE Nieuw-Vennep, the Netherlands. This information may be examined at the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Norman B. Martenson, Manager, International Branch, ANM–116,