

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION**Advisory Committee for Geosciences; Committee of Visitors: Notice of Meeting**

In accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92-463, as amended), the National Science Foundation announces the following meeting.

Name: Advisory Committee for Geosciences; Committee of Visitors (1755).
Date and Time: October 1 and 2, 1997 8:30 AM-5:00 PM each day.

Place: Room 730, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Blvd., Arlington, VA 22230.

Type of Meeting: Closed.

Contact Person: Dr. Donald Heinrichs, Head, Oceanographic Centers & Facilities Section, Division of Ocean Sciences; Room 725; 4201 Wilson Blvd., Arlington, VA 22230; telephone: (703) 306-1576.

Purpose of Meeting: To carry out a Committee of Visitors' (COV) review, including examination of decision on proposals, reviewer comments, and other privileged materials.

Agenda: Review activities of the Oceanographic Centers and Facilities Section.

Reason for Closing: The meeting is closed to the public because the Committee is reviewing proposal actions that will include privileged intellectual property and personal information that could harm individuals if disclosed. If discussions were open to the public, these matters that are exempted under 5 U.S.C. 552b(c), (4) and (6) of the Government in the Sunshine Act would be improperly disclosed.

Dated: September 11, 1997.

M. Rebecca Winkler,

Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 97-24605 Filed 9-16-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555-01-M

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION**Special Emphasis Panel in Mathematical Sciences; Notice of Meeting**

In accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92-463, as amended), the National Science Foundation announces the following meeting.

Name: Special Emphasis in Mathematical Sciences (1204).

Date and Time: September 24-25, 1997; 8:30 a.m. until 5:00 p.m.

Place: Room 310, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Blvd., Arlington, VA.

Type of Meeting: Closed.

Contact Person: Dr. Alvin I. Thaler, Program Director, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Blvd., Arlington, VA 22230. Telephone: (703) 306-1870.

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

Agenda: To review and evaluate proposals for the Group Infrastructure Grants Program 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 and financial data, such as salaries; and personal information concerning individuals associated with the proposals. These matters are exempt under 5 U.S.C. 552B(C) (4) and (6) of the Government in the Sunshine Act.

Reason for Late Notice: Difficulty in arranging an acceptable meeting date for the panelists.

Dated: September 11, 1997.

M. Rebecca Winkler,

Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 97-24602 Filed 9-16-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555-01-M

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION**Special Emphasis Panel in Networking and Communications Research and Infrastructure; 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 October 1 through 22, 1997, the Special Emphasis Panel in Networking & Communications Research & Infrastructure (1207) will be holding panel meetings to review and evaluate research proposals. The dates and types of proposals being reviewed are:

Dates of meetings	Types of proposal
10/1/97	K12.
10/6/97-	College.
10/7/97	
10/15/97-	High Performance.
10/16/97	
10/21/97-	High Performance.
10/22/97	

Times: 8:30 to 5:00 p.m. each day.

Place: National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Blvd., Arlington, VA.

Type of Meetings: Closed.

Contact Person: Douglas Gatchell, Program Director, Division of Networking & Communications Research & Infrastructure, Room 1175, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Blvd., Arlington, VA 22230, telephone (703) 306-1949.

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 connections to the Internet Program 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: September 11, 1997.

M. Rebecca Winkler,

Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 97-24604 Filed 9-16-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555-01-M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50-325 and 50-324]

Carolina Power & Light 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 amendments to Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-71 and DPR-62 issued to the Carolina Power & Light Company (the licensee) for operation of the Brunswick Steam Electric Plant, Units 1 and 2 (BSEP) located in Southport, North Carolina.

In an application dated August 6, 1997, as supplemented on August 26, 1997, the licensee proposed license amendments addressing an unreviewed safety question associated with handling of the spent fuel shipping cask at the BSEP. In a letter to the NRC dated November 16, 1982, the licensee characterized the cask lift rigging as having a redundant design. More recently, while responding to NRC questions related to NRC Bulletin 96-02, "Movement of Heavy Loads Over Spent Fuel," the licensee determined that site procedures allow lifting and loading of a IF-300 spent fuel shipping cask with only the primary yoke (a configuration that is not single-failure proof) during transfer from the tilting cradle to the secondary yoke. The cask is transported on a railway car in a horizontal position. After inspection and removal of any crash structure and tie-downs, the valve box covers are removed and the cask is raised to a vertical position using the primary yoke (which is non-redundant). The primary yoke is used to lift the cask from the tilting cradle and place it in the secondary yoke which is also on the railway car. Once the secondary yoke is engaged, the lifting device has redundant lifting capability. Similarly, after the cask is returned to the railway car, only the primary yoke is used in returning the cask from the vertical to

the horizontal position. The licensee concluded that the portion of the cask handling evolution where only the primary yoke is employed has not been reviewed by the NRC.

The licensee performed an analysis which considers the design, testing, and inspections of the primary yoke and concluded that there is high confidence that the primary yoke will not fail.

Before issuance of the proposed 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.

The Commission has made a proposed determination that the amendment request involves 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 amendments 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 license amendment does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated. Originally, a cask drop was not deemed a credible accident because the cask redundant lifting yoke is of redundant design and the crane on which it is used is single failure proof. Although a non-redundant lift is involved during transfer of the cask from the tilting cradle to the secondary yoke, analysis indicates that based on the design of the primary yoke, previous load tests, and a thorough inspection program, a drop of the spent fuel shipping cask is not credible. A non-redundant lift is assumed to have a slightly higher probability of failure than a redundant lift. However, the increased potential for a drop resulting from a non-redundant lift is not significant. Therefore, the proposed license amendment does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. The proposed license amendment will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated. CP&L has demonstrated that a cask drop accident is not credible using the existing procedures for spent fuel shipping cask handling at BSEP.

Therefore, the proposed license amendment will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

3. The proposed license amendment does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. Originally, a cask drop was not deemed a credible accident because the cask redundant lifting yoke is of redundant design and the crane on which it is used is single failure proof. Although a non-redundant lift is involved during transfer of the cask from the tilting cradle to the secondary yoke, a drop of the spent fuel shipping cask is not credible based on the design of the primary yoke, previous load tests, and a thorough inspection program. Since the cask drop remains a non-credible event, the proposed amendment does not result in a reduction of the margin of safety.

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 involves 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 amendments involve 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 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 October 17, 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 University of North Carolina at Wilmington, William Madison Randall Library, 601 S. College Road, Wilmington, North Carolina 28403-3297. 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: 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 General Counsel, Carolina Power & Light Company, P.O. Box 1551, Raleigh, North Carolina 27602, 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 amendments dated August 6, 1997, as supplemented on August 26, 1997, which is 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 University of North Carolina at Wilmington, William Madison Randall Library, 601 S. College Road, Wilmington, North Carolina 28403-3297.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 11th day of September 1997.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

David C. Trimble,

Project Manager, Project Directorate II-1, Division of Reactor Projects—I/II, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 97-24680 Filed 9-16-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. STN 50-456 AND STN 50-457]

Commonwealth Edison Company; Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendments to Facility Operating Licenses, Proposed no Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity for a Hearing

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of amendments to Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-72 and NPF-77 issued to the Commonwealth Edison Company (ComEd, the licensee) for operation of the Braidwood Station, Units 1 and 2, located in Will County, Illinois.

The proposed amendments would revise Technical Specifications (TS) Section 3.4.8, Figure 3.4-1 and Table 4.4-4 and also revise TS Bases Section 3/4.4.8. The revisions reduce the TS maximum allowable dose equivalent (DE) iodine-131 (I-131) concentration in the primary coolant from 0.35 to 0.10 microcuries per gram for the remainder of the present Braidwood, Unit 1, operating cycle (i.e., Cycle 7); this operating cycle is projected to end in September 1998.

Before issuance of the proposed 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.

The Commission has made a proposed determination that the amendments requested 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 amendments 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 change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

Generic Letter 95-05, "Voltage-Based Repair Criteria For Westinghouse Steam Generator Tubes Affected By Outside Diameter Stress Corrosion Cracking," allows lowering of the RCS [Reactor Coolant System] DE I-131 activity as a means for accepting higher projected