renewed. For more information, please contact Rebecca Winker, NSF, at (702) 306–1185.

Dated: June 29, 1998.

**M. Rebecca Winkler,**

*Committee Management Officer.*

[FR Doc. 98–17612 Filed 7–1–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555–01–M

## NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

### Committee of Visitors Meeting for the Physiology & Ethology Cluster; 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 Biological Sciences, Committee of Visitors for the Physiology & Ethology Cluster (1110).

*Date & Time:* July 13–15, 1998—8:30 am–5:00 pm each day.

*Place:* Room 360, NSF, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, VA.

*Type of Meeting:* Part-Open—(see agenda below).

*Contract Person:* Dr. John Fray, Deputy Division Director, Division of Integrative Biology & Neuroscience, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, VA 22230, 703 306–1420.

*Purpose of Meeting:* To carry out Committee of Visitors (COV) review, including program evaluation, GPRA assessments, and access to privileged materials.

*Open:* July 13 from 8:30 am–10:30 am & July 15 from 10:30 am–12 noon—To provide background information on the role of COVs and GPRA at NSF. To summarize findings regarding the quality of program management, including merit review; and discussion and review of grantee outputs and outcomes during the past three years.

*Closed:* July 13 from 10:30 am–5:00 pm; July 14 from 8:30 am–5:00 pm; July 15 from 8:30 am–10:30 am and from 1:00 pm–5:00 pm—To review the merit review processes covering funding decisions made during the past three fiscal years of the Physiology & Ethology Cluster.

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

*Reason for Late Notice:* Difficulty in arranging schedules of COV members.

Dated: June 29, 1998.

**M. Rebecca Winkler,**

*Committee Management Officer.*

[FR Doc. 98–17613 Filed 7–1–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555–01–M

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

**[Docket No. 52–002]**

### Notice of Issuance of Final Design Approval Pursuant to 10 CFR Part 52, Appendix O System 80+ Standard Design ABB-Combustion Engineering, Inc.

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) has issued a revised final design approval (FDA) to ABB-Combustion Engineering, Inc. (ABB–CE) pursuant to 10 CFR part 52, Appendix O. This FDA allows the System 80+ standard design to be referenced in an application for a construction permit or operating license pursuant to 10 CFR Part 50, or in an application for a combined license pursuant to 10 CFR part 52. The FDA is being revised to make it coterminous with the design certification rule that was issued on May 21, 1997. This FDA supersedes the FDAs dated July 26 and November 23, 1994.

A copy of the revised FDA has been placed in the NRC's Public Docket Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20037, for review by interested persons.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 24th day of June 1998.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Theodore R. Quay,**

*Director, Standardization Project Directorate, Division of Reactor Program Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 98–17606 Filed 7–1–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

**[Docket No. 50–255]**

### Consumers Energy Company; Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating License No. DPR–20 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–20 issued to Consumers Energy Company (the licensee) for operation of the Palisades Nuclear Plant, located in Van Buren County, Michigan.

The proposed amendment would revise Section 3.1.1c of the Technical Specifications (TS), Appendix A of the Operating License for the Palisades Nuclear Plant, to change the minimum required primary coolant system flow. The currently specified value is $140.7 \times 10^6$ lb/hr [pounds per hour] or greater, when corrected to 532 °F. The licensee proposed to revise the TS to specify a value of greater than or equal to 352,000 gpm [gallons per minute], which is equivalent to approximately $135 \times 10^6$ lb/hr, when corrected to 532 °F.

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 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 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:

a. Involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The proposed change to the minimum reactor vessel flow does not alter the assumed initiators to any analyzed event. Rather, specification of a minimum reactor vessel flow provides assurance that sufficient cooling will take place during normal and accident operating conditions of the reactor. Therefore the probability of an accident previously evaluated has not been increased by this proposed change.

Each of the applicable Palisades FSAR [Final Safety Analysis Report] Chapter 14 accident analyses have been evaluated with respect to the proposed reduction in minimum reactor vessel flow rate. The results of these analyses, which have been incorporated into the Palisades Cycle 14 Disposition and Analysis of Standard Review Plan (SRP) Events, demonstrate that the acceptance criteria for each of the events continues to be met.

Therefore, operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed change to TS section 3.1.1c would not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

b. Create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated.

The proposed changes provide a reduced requirement for PCS [primary coolant system] flow through the reactor vessel than currently exists in the TS. The change does not, however, involve any alteration in the plant configuration (no new or different type

of equipment will be installed) or make changes in the methods governing normal plant operation. However, these changes are consistent with the assumptions in the safety analyses and licensing basis. Therefore, the changes do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

Therefore, operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed change to TS section 3.1.1c would not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated.

c. Involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The proposed change to the minimum reactor vessel flow has been evaluated against each of the applicable Palisades FSAR Chapter 14 accident analyses. Reducing the assumed minimum reactor vessel flow did not result in a significant change (per 10 CFR 50.46) in the results of the Loss Of Coolant Accident (LOCA) Emergency Core Cooling System (ECCS) analyses. Reducing the assumed minimum reactor vessel flow did not result in penetration of TS DNB [departure from nucleate boiling] limits or additional fuel failures for non-LOCA events. Reducing the assumed minimum reactor vessel flow did not result in a change in the results of the LOCA or Main Steam Line Break containment response analyses. Reducing the assumed minimum reactor vessel flow did not result in a change to the radiological consequences of the SRP events with respect to 10 CFR 100 offsite dose or SRP 6.4 control room habitability requirements. Therefore, operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed change to TS 3.1.1c does not involve a significant reduction in 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 by close of business 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 and Directives Branch, Division of Administrative 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 6D59, 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 August 3, 1998, 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 Van Wylen Library, Hope College, Holland, Michigan 49423–3698. 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 close of business on 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 Judd L. Bacon, Esquire, Consumers Energy Company, 212 West Michigan Avenue, Jackson, Michigan 49201, 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 June 17, 1998, and supplement dated June 23, 1998, 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 Van Wylen Library, Hope College, Holland, Michigan 49423–3698.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 26th day of June 1998.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Robert G. Schaaf,**

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

[FR Doc. 98–17609 Filed 7–1–98; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7590–01–P**

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

**[Docket No. 50–341]**

## Detroit Edison 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. NPF–43 issued to the Detroit Edison Company (the licensee) for operation of the Fermi 2 plant located in Monroe County, Michigan.

The proposed amendment would provide a one-time extension of the interval for a number of technical specification (TS) surveillance requirements that will be performed in the sixth refueling outage. TS 4.0.2 and Index page xxii would be revised and TS tables 4.0.2–1 and 4.0.2–2 would be replaced to reflect the extensions.

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 June 26, 1998, 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 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 TS changes do not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The proposed TS changes involve a one-time only change in the surveillance testing intervals to facilitate a one-time only change in the Fermi 2 operating cycle. The proposed TS changes do not physically impact the plant nor do they impact any design or functional requirements of the associated systems. That is, the proposed TS changes do not significantly degrade the performance or increase the challenges of any safety systems assumed to function in the accident analysis. The proposed TS changes affect only the frequency of the surveillance requirements and do not impact the TS surveillance requirements themselves. In addition, the proposed TS changes do not introduce any new accident initiators since no accidents previously evaluated have as their initiators anything related to the change in the frequency of surveillance testing. Also, the proposed TS changes do not significantly affect the availability of equipment or systems required to mitigate the consequences of an accident because of other, more frequent testing or the availability of redundant systems or equipment. Furthermore, a historical review of surveillance test results supports the above conclusions. Therefore, the proposed TS changes do not significantly increase the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. The proposed TS changes do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

The proposed TS changes involve a one-time only change in the surveillance testing intervals to facilitate a one-time only change in the Fermi 2 operating cycle. The proposed TS changes do not introduce any failure mechanisms of a different type than those previously evaluated since there are no physical changes being made to the facility. In addition, the surveillance test requirements themselves will remain unchanged. Therefore, the proposed TS changes do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated.

3. The proposed TS changes do not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

Although the proposed TS changes will result in an increase in the interval between some surveillance tests, the impact, if any, on system availability is small based on other, more frequent testing or redundant systems or equipment, and there is no evidence of any time dependent failures that would impact the availability of the systems. Therefore, the assumptions in the licensing basis are not impacted, and the proposed TS changes do not significantly reduce a 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 by the close of business 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