

463, as amended), the National Science Foundation announces the following meeting.

*Name:* Special Emphasis Panel in Advanced Networking Infrastructure Research (#1207).

*Date & Time:* October 19 and 20, 1998; 8:30 a.m.–5:00 p.m.

*Place:* Room 1280, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Blvd., Arlington, VA 22230.

*Type of Meeting:* Closed.

*Contact Person:* Anne C. Richeson, Division of Advanced Networking Infrastructure Research, Room 1175, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Blvd., Arlington, VA 22230. Telephone: (703) 306-1950.

*Purpose of Meeting:* 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 U.S.C. 552b(c), (4) and (6) of the Government in the Sunshine Act.

Dated: September 28, 1998.

**M. Rebecca Winkler,**

*Committee Management Officer.*

[FR Doc. 98-26271 Filed 9-30-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555-01-M

## NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

### Special Emphasis Panel in Engineering Education and Centers; Notice of Meeting

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

*Name:* Special Emphasis Panel Engineering Education and Centers (173).

*Date and Time:* October 19–20, 1998, 7:30 a.m.–5:30 p.m.

*Place:* National Science Foundation, Room 310, 4201 Wilson Blvd., Arlington, VA 22230.

*Type of Meeting:* Closed.

*Contact Person:* Dr. Win Aung, Senior Staff Associate, Engineering Education and Centers, Division, National Science Foundation, Room 585, 4201 Wilson Blvd., Arlington, VA 22230.

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

*Agenda:* To review and evaluate proposals submitted under the Funding for Research Centers—Small Firms Collaborative R&D.

*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 U.S.C. 552b(c) (4) and (6) of the Government in the Sunshine Act.

Dated: September 28, 1998.

**M. Rebecca Winkler,**

*Committee Management Officer.*

[FR Doc. 98-26270 Filed 9-30-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555-01-M

## NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

### Special Emphasis Panel in Experimental and Integrative Activities; 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 Panel in Experimental and Integrative Activities (1193).

*Date and Time:* October 27, 1998; 8:30 a.m.–5:00 p.m.

*Place:* National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Rooms 1120 and 1150, Arlington, VA 22230.

*Type of Meeting:* Closed.

*Contact Person(s):* Harry G. Hedges, Program Director CISE/EIA, Room 1160, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, VA 22230. Telephone: (703) 306-1980.

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

*Agenda:* To review and evaluate CISE Research Experiences for Undergraduates proposals 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 U.S.C. 552b(c), (4) and (6) of the Government in the Sunshine Act.

Dated: September 28, 1998.

**M. Rebecca Winkler,**

*Committee Management Officer.*

[FR Doc. 98-26269 Filed 9-30-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555-01-M

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50-282 and 50-306]

### Northern States Power 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 Licenses DPR-42 and DPR-60 issued to Northern States Power Company (NSP or the licensee) for operation of the Prairie Island Nuclear Generating Plant, Units 1 and 2, located in Goodhue County, Minnesota.

The proposed amendments would change the design basis of the cooling water system emergency intake line flow capacity. The licensee determined through testing that the emergency intake line flow capacity was less than the design value stated in the Updated Safety Analysis Report. The proposed changes reflect the use of operator actions to control cooling water system flow following a seismic event. The proposed changes also reclassify the intake canal for use during a seismic event, which would be an additional source of cooling water during a seismic event. This notice incorporates additional information contained in supplemental submittals.

The licensee submitted its request for amendments in a letter dated January 29, 1997, as supplemented February 11, 12, March 7, 10, 11, 19, 20, April 29, June 30, and July 10, 1997, June 20, June 22, July 24 and September 15, 1998. The licensee's original application was noticed in the **Federal Register** on February 7, 1997 (62 FR 5857). A public announcement was published in local newspapers (St. Paul Pioneer Press on March 15, 1997, Minneapolis Star Tribune on March 16, 1997, and Red Wing Republican Eagle on March 17, 1997) to reflect additional supplements and give public notice of an interim amendment.

The interim amendments were issued on March 25, 1997 (Unit 1—Amendment 128, Unit 2—Amendment 120) and authorized NSP to continue operation of Prairie Island Units 1 and 2 on an interim basis, through the incorporation of three license conditions into the licenses, until a seismically qualified emergency cooling water source was demonstrated. The licensee has completed an analysis which demonstrates that the intake canal is a seismically qualified emergency cooling water source. The

proposed amendments would incorporate the licensee's seismic analysis of the intake canal into the licensing basis.

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. The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis against the standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c). The NRC staff's review is presented below.

1. The proposed amendments will not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The accident of concern for this issue is a seismic event. None of the proposed changes can have any effect on the probability of a seismic event.

Operator action is required to assure continued operation of the cooling water system following a design-basis earthquake. Evaluations have shown that sufficient time is available for the operator actions to be completed. Procedures are in place to direct the operator actions and operators have been trained on the use of the procedures. Thus, use of operator actions within the time frame available does not involve a significant increase in the consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

Failure of the intake canal slopes could result in soil being deposited into the canal. However, analyses show that if portions of the intake canal slopes fail and fall into the canal, it will not be a large volume of soil that gets displaced. The amount of potential soil to be displaced will not interfere with the function of the cooling water system. Thus, the cooling water system will continue to perform its safety function following a design-basis earthquake and will not result in a significant increase in the consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

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

The cooling water system is provided in the plant to mitigate accidents and it is not a design-basis accident initiator; thus, the proposed reliance on operator action in the available time and consideration of bank failure effects do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident.

3. The proposed amendments will not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety.

Plant margin of safety may be reduced by the reduced flow capacity of the emergency intake line. However, plant margin is restored by implementing operator actions to reduce cooling water loads and by taking credit for cooling water in the intake canal during a seismic event. The procedure for reducing cooling water demand has been demonstrated on the plant simulator and operators have been trained. Analyses have demonstrated that a sufficient amount of water will remain in the intake canal for the cooling water system to continue to perform its safety function following a design-basis earthquake. Thus, the changes proposed in this license amendment request do not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety.

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 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 November 2, 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 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: 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 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 amendments dated January 29, 1997, as supplemented February 11, 12, March 7, 10, 11, 19, 20, April 29, June 30, and July 10, 1997, June 20, June 22, July 24, and September 15, 1998, 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 Minneapolis Public Library, Technology and Science Department, 300 Nicollet Mall, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55401.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 25th day of September 1998.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Beth A. Wetzel,**

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

[FR Doc. 98-26280 Filed 9-30-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-271]

### Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corporation; 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-28 issued to Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corporation (the licensee) for operation of the Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station located in Vernon, Vermont.

The proposed amendment would increase the spent fuel storage capacity of the Vermont Yankee spent fuel pool from 2,870 to 3,355 fuel assemblies.

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:

1. The operation of Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station in accordance with the proposed amendment, will not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

Vermont Yankee has determined that the proposed change to increase the spent fuel pool capacity does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated. The installation of new storage racks of similar design to the existing racks does not increase the probability or consequences of a fuel handling accident. Fuel handling equipment is not affected by the proposed amendment and the top of the new racks will be at the same elevation as the existing racks to prevent operator difficulties during fuel handling.