

Purpose of Meeting: To provide advice and recommendations concerning proposals submitted to NSF for financial support.

Agenda: To review and evaluate proposals and provide advice and recommendations as part of the selection process for proposals submitted to the Research on Education, Policy, and Practice (REPP) Program.

Reason for Closing: Because the proposals reviewed include information of a proprietary or confidential nature, including technical information; financial data, such as salaries; and personal information concerning individuals associated with proposals, the meetings are closed to the public. These matters are within exemptions (4) and (6) of 5 U.S.C. 552b(c), Government in the Sunshine Act.

Dated: June 19, 1997.

M. Rebecca Winkler,

Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 97-16548 Filed 6-23-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555-01-M

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Special Emphasis Panel in Undergraduate Education; Notice of Meetings

This notice is being published in accord with the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92-463, as amended). During the period July through December, 1997, the Special Emphasis Panel will be holding panel meetings to review and evaluate research proposals. The dates, contact person, and types of proposals are as follows:

Special Emphasis Panel in Undergraduate Education (1214)

1. **Date:** July 21-24, 1997.

Contact: Herbert Richtol, Program Director, Course and Curriculum Development Program, & Susan Hixson, Program Director, Undergraduate Faculty Enhancement Program, Room 835, 703-306-1666.

Times: 7:30 p.m. to 9:30 p.m. (July 21); 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. (July 22 & July 23); 8:30 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. (July 24).

Place: Doubletree Hotel, 300 Army Navy Drive, Arlington, VA 22202.

Type of Proposal: Course and Curriculum Development.

2. **Date:** December 8-9, 1997.

Contact: Herbert Levitan, Section Head, Institution-Wide Reform of Undergraduate Education, Room 835, 703-306-1666.

Times: 8:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. each day.

Place: The Latham Hotel, 3000 M Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20007.

Type of Proposal: Institution-Wide Reform of Undergraduate Education.

Type of Meetings: Closed.

Purpose of Meetings: To provide advice and recommendations concerning proposals submitted to NSF for financial support.

Agenda: To review and evaluate proposals submitted to the Directorate as part of the selection process for awards.

Reason for Closing: The proposals being reviewed include information of a

proprietary or confidential nature, including technical information; financial data, such as salaries, and personal information concerning individuals associated with the proposals. These matters are exempt under 5 USC 552b(c) (4) and (6) of the Government in the Sunshine Act.

Dated: June 19, 1997.

M. Rebecca Winkler,

Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 97-16551 Filed 6-23-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555-01-M

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

Sunshine Act Meeting

TIME: 9:30 a.m., Tuesday, July 1, 1997.

PLACE: The Board Room, 5th Floor, 490 L'Enfant Plaza, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20594.

STATUS: Open.

MATTERS TO BE DISCUSSED: 6793C Aviation Accident Report: Runway Collision, United Express Flight 5925, and Beechcraft King Air A90, Quincy Municipal Airport, Quincy, Illinois, November 19, 1996.

NEWS MEDIA CONTACT: Telephone: (202) 314-6100.

FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT: Bea Hardesty, (202) 314-6065.

Dated: June 20, 1997.

Bea Hardesty,

Federal Register Liaison Officer.

[FR Doc. 97-16626 Filed 6-20-97; 11:15 am]

BILLING CODE 7533-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Docket No. 50-263

Northern States Power Company; Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating License, Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity for a Hearing

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an amendment to Facility Operating License No. DPR-22 issued to Northern States Power Company (the licensee) for operation of the Monticello Nuclear Generating Plant, located in Wright County, Minnesota.

The proposed amendment would evaluate the unreviewed safety questions associated with the increase in calculated peak suppression pool temperature and the reliance on containment pressure to compensate for the deficiency in net positive suction head for the emergency core cooling

system pumps following a design basis accident.

Before issuance of the proposed license amendment, the Commission will have made findings required by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act) and the Commission's regulations.

The Commission has made a proposed determination that the amendment requests involve no significant hazards consideration. Under the Commission's regulations in 10 CFR 50.92, this means that operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; or (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

(1) *The proposed amendment will not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated:*

These changes do not affect the physical configuration of the plant or how it is operated. These changes:

(1) Document the acceptability of the limiting mode of long-term post-LOCA [loss of coolant accident] containment heat removal that has been analyzed and found to be acceptable.

(2) Document the acceptability of the use of a limited amount of post-LOCA containment overpressure to assure adequate NPSH [net positive suction head] for ECCS [emergency core cooling system] pump operation.

The changes clarify the Technical Specification Bases to correctly describe the design and licensing basis for containment spray/cooling equipment and ECCS pump NPSH following a loss of coolant accident.

The original Monticello FSAR [final safety analysis report] identified the most degraded condition for containment spray/cooling equipment availability. This condition could occur following a postulated loss of offsite power and loss of one diesel generator. One RHR [residual heat removal] pump and one RHRSW [residual heat removal service water] pump would be available under these conditions. An update of the containment pressure and temperature analysis following completion of the Mark I Containment Long-term Program in the early 1980's

inadvertently assumed the availability of two RHR pumps and two RHRSW pumps. The Bases of the Monticello Technical Specifications also appears to have been written based on the availability of two RHR pumps and two RHRSW pumps for containment spray/cooling. This error in the containment pressure and temperature analysis was identified during the Monticello design basis reconstitution program and was corrected by a revised analysis.

This analysis has been revised to meet NRC Staff requirements and is being submitted for review and approval in conjunction with the Technical Specification changes proposed in this License Amendment Request. The proposed changes will correct the Bases of the Monticello Technical Specifications to clearly describe the design basis of the plant for the post-LOCA containment spray/cooling function. One RHR pump and one RHRSW pump are fully adequate for this function.

The use of containment pressure to provide a portion of the NPSH required by ECCS pumps following a loss of coolant accident was not adequately documented in the original design and licensing basis for the Monticello plant. Detailed ECCS pump NPSH analyses have been completed and submitted for NRC Staff review and approval. It is proposed that the Bases of the Technical Specifications also be corrected to document the acceptability of taking credit for a limited amount of containment overpressure for ECCS pump NPSH.

The proposed changes do not introduce new accident scenarios. These changes have no impact on the protection of the health and safety of the public. There is a small reduction in margin, as discussed in (3) below, resulting from new analyses of loss of coolant accident containment temperature and pressure response and ECCS pump NPSH requirements.

(2) *The proposed amendment will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously analyzed.*

These changes are administrative in nature and do not affect the physical configuration of the plant or how it is operated.

The changes will revise the Technical Specification Bases to correctly describe the design basis of the Monticello plant for performing the post-LOCA containment spray/cooling function and for satisfying ECCS pump NPSH requirements. They are based on new analyses submitted to the NRC Staff for their review and approval.

(3) *The proposed amendment will not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety.*

The minimum number of RHR and RHRSW pumps assumed to be operable for long-term containment heat removal analysis has been reduced from the number assumed to be operable in earlier licensing documentation provided to the NRC for review.

In addition, analyses of ECCS pump NPSH requirements take credit for containment pressure under some conditions. The original Monticello licensing basis documentation reviewed by the NRC Staff did not clearly state that containment pressure was necessary to assure adequate ECCS pump NPSH.

The reduction in the number of RHR and RHRSW pump used for containment cooling results in an increase in suppression pool temperature. This temperature increase, and the limited dependence on containment pressure to ensure adequate ECCS pump NPSH, are considered to be reductions in margin.

The new containment long-term heat removal and ECCS pump NPSH analyses provided with this License Amendment Request use input assumptions which conservatively model the phenomena involved. An updated computer code and decay heat model are used in a conservative manner at an assumed power level of 112.5% (1880 Mwt [megawatts thermal]) of license reactor power in the new analyses. Appropriate baseline and benchmark analyses have been performed. An increase in long-term peak suppression pool temperature from 182 °F to 194.2 °F is predicted for the limiting configuration of one RHR and one RHRSW pump. A reanalysis of torus attached piping, RHR room temperature, and environment qualification considerations for operation with the higher suppression pool temperature was completed with satisfactory results. It is concluded that one RHR pump and one RHRSW pump provide adequate margins for long-term containment cooling.

Analyses were performed to evaluate the NPSH adequacy for Monticello ECCS pumps for a broad range of pump combinations and failure modes. The minimum containment pressure available and the containment pressure required to satisfy NPSH requirements was calculated for each limiting combination of pumps. It was concluded that proper operation of the ECCS pumps is assured under all conditions following a loss of coolant accident.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involve no significant hazards consideration.

The Commission is seeking public comments on this proposed determination. Any comments received within 30 days after the date of publication of this notice will be considered in making any final determination.

Normally, the Commission will not issue the amendment until the expiration of the 30-day notice period. However, should circumstances change during the notice period such that failure to act in a timely way would result, for example, in derating or shutdown of the facility, the Commission may issue the license amendment before the expiration of the 30-day notice period, provided that its final determination is that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration. The final determination will consider all public and State comments received. Should the Commission take this action, it will publish in the **Federal Register** a notice of issuance and provide for opportunity for a hearing after issuance. The Commission expects that the need to take this action will occur very infrequently.

Written comments may be submitted by mail to the Chief, Rules Review and Directives Branch, Division of Freedom of Information and Publications Services, Office of Administration, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, and should cite the publication date and page number of this **Federal Register** notice. Written comments may also be delivered to Room 6D22, Two White Flint North, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland, from 7:30 a.m. to 4:15 p.m. Federal workdays. Copies of written comments received may be examined at the NRC Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC.

The filing of requests for hearing and petitions for leave to intervene is discussed below.

By July 24, 1997, the licensee may file a request for a hearing with respect to issuance of the amendment to the subject facility operating license and any person whose interest may be affected by this proceeding and who wishes to participate as a party in the proceeding must file a written request for a hearing and a petition for leave to intervene. Requests for a hearing and a

petition for leave to intervene shall be filed in accordance with the Commission's "Rules of Practice for Domestic Licensing Proceedings" in 10 CFR Part 2. Interested persons should consult a current copy of 10 CFR 2.714 which is available at the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, and at the local public document room located at the Minneapolis Public Library, Technology and Science Department, 300 Nicollet Mall, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55401. If a request for a hearing or petition for leave to intervene is filed by the above date, the Commission or an Atomic Safety and Licensing Board, designated by the Commission or by the Chairman of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, will rule on the request and/or petition; and the Secretary or the designated Atomic Safety and Licensing Board will issue a notice of hearing or an appropriate order.

As required by 10 CFR 2.714, a petition for leave to intervene shall set forth with particularity the interest of the petitioner in the proceeding, and how that interest may be affected by the results of the proceeding. The petition should specifically explain the reasons why intervention should be permitted with particular reference to the following factors: (1) the nature of the petitioner's right under the Act to be made party to the proceeding; (2) the nature and extent of the petitioner's property, financial, or other interest in the proceeding; and (3) the possible effect of any order which may be entered in the proceeding on the petitioner's interest. The petition should also identify the specific aspect(s) of the subject matter of the proceeding as to which petitioner wishes to intervene. Any person who has filed a petition for leave to intervene or who has been admitted as a party may amend the petition without requesting leave of the Board up to 15 days prior to the first prehearing conference scheduled in the proceeding, but such an amended petition must satisfy the specificity requirements described above.

Not later than 15 days prior to the first prehearing conference scheduled in the proceeding, a petitioner shall file a supplement to the petition to intervene which must include a list of the contentions which are sought to be litigated in the matter. Each contention must consist of a specific statement of the issue of law or fact to be raised or controverted. In addition, the petitioner shall provide a brief explanation of the bases of the contention and a concise statement of the alleged facts or expert opinion which support the contention

and on which the petitioner intends to rely in 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: Docketing and Services Branch, 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 Jay Silberg, Esq., Shaw, Pittman, Potts, and Trowbridge, 2300 N Street, NW, Washington, DC 20037, 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 January 23, 1997, as supplemented January 28, March 4, and June 19, 1997, which are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, and at the local public document room located at the Minneapolis Public Library, Technology and Science Department, 300 Nicollet Mall, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55401.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 20th day of June 1997.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Tae Kim,

Senior Project Manager, Project Directorate III-1, Division of Reactor Projects—III/IV, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 97-16648 Filed 6-20-97; 12:00 pm]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50-259, 50-260, and 50-296]

Tennessee Valley Authority; Notice of Withdrawal of Application for Amendment to Facility Operating License

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has granted the request of the Tennessee Valley Authority (the licensee) to withdraw its October 7, 1994 application for proposed amendment to Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-33, DPR-52, and DPR-68 for the Browns Ferry Nuclear Plant, Unit Nos. 1, 2, and 3, located in Limestone County, Alabama.

The proposed amendment would have revised surveillance requirements associated with emergency diesel generators.

The Commission had previously issued a Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment published in the **Federal Register** on November 23, 1994 (59 FR 60387). However, by letter dated June 4, 1997, the licensee withdrew the proposed change.

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendment dated October 7, 1994, and the licensee's letter dated June 4, 1997, which withdrew the application for license amendment. The above