

and (6) of section 552b of Title 5, United States Code.

1. *Date:* February 27–28, 1995.

Time: 9 a.m. to 5:30 p.m.

Room: 430

Program: This meeting will review applications for Special Projects for the Special Competition deadline, submitted to the Division of Public Programs, for projects beginning after July 1, 1995.

2. *Date:* March 1, 1995.

Time: 9 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

Room: 415

Program: This meeting will review applications for Elementary and Secondary Education in the Humanities, submitted to the Division of Education Programs, for projects beginning after July 1, 1994.

3. *Date:* March 2–3, 1995.

Time: 9 a.m. to 5:30 p.m.

Room: 430

Program: This meeting will review applications submitted to Special Projects for the Special Competition deadline of January 27, 1995, submitted to the Division of Public Programs, for projects beginning after July 1, 1995.

4. *Date:* March 2–3, 1995.

Time: 9 a.m. to 5:30 p.m.

Room: 315

Program: This meeting will review proposals submitted to the January 15, 1995 deadline in the Higher Education Program, for projects beginning after June 1, 1995.

5. *Date:* March 3, 1995.

Time: 8:30 a.m. to 5 p.m.

Room: 415

Program: This meeting will review applications for Library and Archival Preservation and Access Projects, submitted to the Division of Preservation and Access, for projects beginning after July 1, 1995.

6. *Date:* March 9–10, 1995.

Time: 9 a.m. to 5 p.m.

Room: 430

Program: The meeting will review proposals submitted to the January 15, 1995 deadline in the Higher Education Program, submitted to the Division of Education Programs, for projects beginning after June 1, 1995.

7. *Date:* March 16–17, 1995.

Time: 8 a.m. to 5:30 p.m.

Room: 415

Program: This meeting will review applications for Dissertation Grants, submitted to the Division of Research Programs, for projects beginning after June 1, 1995.

8. *Date:* March 21, 1995

Time: 9 a.m. to 5:30 p.m.

Room: 315 & 415

Program: This meeting will review proposals submitted to the February 1, 1994 deadline in the Higher Education Program, for projects beginning after October 1, 1995.

9. *Date:* March 28, 1995.

Time: 9 a.m. to 5:30 p.m.

Room: 315

Program: This meeting will review proposals submitted to the February 1, 1995 deadline in the Higher Education Program, for projects beginning after October 1, 1995.

10. *Date:* March 30, 1995.

Time: 9 a.m. to 5:30 p.m.

Room: 315 & 415

Program: This meeting will review proposals submitted to the February 1, 1995 deadline in the Higher Education Program, for projects beginning after October 1, 1995.

11. *Date:* March 31, 1995.

Time: 9 a.m. to 5:30 p.m.

Room: 315

Program: This meeting will review proposals submitted to the February 1, 1995 deadline in the Higher Education Program, for projects beginning after October 1, 1995.

David C. Fisher,

Advisory Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 95–3738 Filed 2–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7536–01–M

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Special Emphasis Panel in Geosciences 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 Panel in Geosciences (#1756)

Dates and Times: March 3, 1995 from 8 a.m. to 8 p.m.

Place: Room 360, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, VA.

Type of Meeting: Closed.

Contact Person: Dr. Odile de la Beaujardiere, Program Director for Magnetospheric Physics Program, Division of Atmospheric Science, Room 775, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Blvd, Arlington, VA 22230, Tel: (703) 306–1519.

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

Agenda: To review and evaluate the Geospace Environment Modeling (GEM) 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 within exemptions (4) and (6) of 5 U.S.C. 552b(c), the Government in the Sunshine Act.

Dated: February 10, 1995.

M. Rebecca Winkler,

Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 95–3741 Filed 2–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555–01–M

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

Public Hearing in Indianapolis, Indiana: Aviation Accident

In connection with its investigation of the Simmons Airlines, dba (American Eagle), Flight 4181, Aerospatiale, ATR–72–210, N401AM, accident at Roselawn, Indiana, October 31, 1994, the National Transportation Safety Board will convene a public hearing at 12 p.m., (est) on February 27, 1995, in the Hall of Champions Ballroom of the Adam's Mark Hotel, Located at 2544 Executive Drive, Indianapolis, Indiana 46241. For more information, contact Pat Cariseo, Office of Public Affairs, Washington, D.C. 20594, telephone (202) 382–0660.

Dated: February 10, 1994.

Bea Hardesty,

Federal Register Liaison Officer.

[FR Doc. 95–3734 Filed 2–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7533–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50–416]

Entergy Operations, Inc.; Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an amendment to Facility Operating License No. NPF–29, issued to Entergy Operations, Inc. (the licensee), for operation of the Grand Gulf Nuclear Station, Unit 1 (GGNS), located in Claiborne County, Mississippi.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed amendment will replace the existing Technical Specifications (TSs) in their entirety with the Improved Technical Specifications (ITSs).

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's amendment request dated October 15, 1993, as supplemented by letters dated April 15, and November 10, 1994.

The Need for the Proposed Action

It has been recognized that nuclear safety in all plants would benefit from improvement and standardization of the TSs. The "NRC Interim Policy Statement on Technical Specification Improvements for Nuclear Power Reactors," (**Federal Register** 52 FR 3788, February 6, 1987) and later the Final Policy Statement, formalized this need.

To facilitate the development of individual ITSs, each reactor vendor owners group (OG) and the NRC staff developed Standard TSs. For General Electric (GE) plants, the Standard TSs (STS) are NUREG-1433 for BWR/4 reactor facilities and NUREG-1434 for BWR/6 facilities. NUREG-1434 formed the basis of the GGNS ITSs.

Description of the Proposed Change

The proposed revision to the TSs is based on NUREG-1434 and on guidance provided in the Policy Statement. Its objective is to completely rewrite, reformat, and streamline the existing TSs. Emphasis is placed on human factors principles to improve clarity and understanding. The Bases section has been significantly expanded to clarify and better explain the purpose and foundation of each specification. In addition to NUREG-1434, portions of the existing TSs were also used as the basis for the ITSs. Plant-specific issues (unique design features, requirements, and operating practices) were discussed at length with the licensee, and generic matters with the GE and other OGs.

The proposed changes from the existing TSs can be grouped into four general categories, as follows:

1. Non-technical (administrative) changes, which were intended to make the ITSs easier to use for plant operations personnel. They are purely editorial in nature or involve the movement or reformat of requirements without affecting technical content. Every section of the GGNS TSs has undergone these types of changes. In order to ensure consistency, the NRC staff and the licensee have used NUREG-1434 as guidance to reformat and make other administrative changes.
2. Relocation of requirements, which includes items that were in the existing GGNS TSs but did not meet the criteria set forth in the Policy Statement for inclusion in the TSs. In general, the proposed relocation of items in the GGNS TSs to the Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (UFSAR), appropriate plant-specific programs procedures and ITS Bases follows the guidance of the BWR/6 STS, NUREG-1434. Once these items have been relocated by removing them from the TSs to other licensee-controlled documents, the licensee may revise them under the provisions of 10 CFR 50.59 or other NRC staff-approved control mechanisms which provide appropriate procedural means to control changes.

3. More restrictive requirements, which consist of proposed GGNS ITS items that are either more conservative than corresponding requirements in the existing GGNS TSs, or are additional

restrictions which are not in the existing GGNS TSs but are contained in NUREG-1434. Examples of more restrictive requirements include: placing a Limiting Condition of Operation (LCO) on plant equipment, which is not required by the present TSs to be operable; more restrictive requirements to restore inoperable equipment; and more restrictive surveillance requirements.

4. Less restrictive requirements, which are relaxations of corresponding requirements in the existing GGNS TSs which provided little or no safety benefit and placed unnecessary burden on the licensee. These relaxations were the result of generic NRC action or other analyses. They have been justified on a case-by-case basis for GGNS as described in the safety evaluation to be issued with the license amendment, which will be noticed in the **Federal Register**.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed revision to the TSs. Changes which are administrative in nature have been found to have no effect on technical content of the TSs, and are acceptable. The increased clarity and understanding these changes bring to the TSs are expected to improve the operator's control of the plant in normal and accident conditions.

Relocation of requirements to other licensee-controlled documents does not change the requirements themselves. Future changes to these requirements may be made by the licensee under 10 CFR 50.59 or other NRC-approved control mechanisms, which assures continued maintenance of adequate requirements. All such relocations have been found to be in conformance with the guidelines of NUREG-1434 and the Policy Statement, and, therefore, to be acceptable.

Changes involving more restrictive requirements have been found to be acceptable.

Changes involving less restrictive requirements have been reviewed individually. When requirements have been shown to provide little or no safety benefit or to place unnecessary burden on the licensee, their removal from the TSs was justified. In most cases, relaxations previously granted to individual plants on a plant-specific basis were the result of a generic NRC action, or of agreements reached during discussions with the OG and found to be acceptable for GGNS. Generic relaxations contained in NUREG-1434 have also been reviewed by the NRC

staff and have been found to be acceptable.

In summary, the proposed revision to the TSs was found to provide control of plant operations such that reasonable assurance will be provided that the health and safety of the public will be adequately protected.

These TS changes will not increase the probability or consequences of accidents, no changes are being made in the types of any effluent that may be released offsite, and there is not significant increase in the allowable individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed TS amendment.

With regard to potential non-radiological impacts, the proposed amendment involves features located entirely within the restricted areas as defined in 10 CFR Part 20. It does not affect nonradiological plant effluents and has no other environmental impact. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant nonradiological impacts associated with the proposed amendment.

Alternatives to the Proposed Action

Since the Commission has concluded there is no measurable environmental impact associated with the proposed amendment, any alternatives with equal or greater environmental impact need not be evaluated. As an alternative to the proposed amendment, the staff considered denial of the amendment. Denial of the amendment would result in no change in current environmental impacts. The environmental impacts of the proposed amendment and the alternative action are similar.

Alternative Use of Resources

This action does not involve the use of resources not previously considered in the Final Environmental Statement for the Grand Gulf Nuclear Station, Unit 1.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, the staff consulted with the Mississippi State official regarding the environmental impact of the proposed action. The State official had no comments.

Finding of No Significant Impact

Based upon the environmental assessment, the Commission concludes that the proposed action will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment. Accordingly, the Commission has determined not to

prepare an environmental impact statement for the proposed amendment.

For further details with respect to this proposed action, see the licensee's letter dated October 15, 1993, as supplemented by letters dated April 15, and November 10, 1994, 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 Judge George W. Armstrong Library, 220 S. Commerce Street, Natchez, Mississippi 39120.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland this 9th day of February 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

James R. Hall,

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

[FR Doc. 95-3772 Filed 2-14-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

Applications and Amendments to Facility Operating Licenses Involving No Significant Hazards Considerations; Biweekly Notice

I. Background

Pursuant to Public Law 97-415, the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission or NRC staff) is publishing this regular biweekly notice. Public Law 97-415 revised section 189 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), to require the Commission to publish notice of any amendments issued, or proposed to be issued, under a new provision of section 189 of the Act. This provision grants the Commission the authority to issue and make immediately effective any amendment to an operating license upon a determination by the Commission that such amendment involves no significant hazards consideration, notwithstanding the pendency before the Commission of a request for a hearing from any person.

This biweekly notice includes all notices of amendments issued, or proposed to be issued from January 20, 1995, through February 3, 1995. The last biweekly notice was published on February 1, 1995 (60 FR 6296).

Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendments to Facility Operating Licenses, Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity for a Hearing

The Commission has made a proposed determination that the following 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. The basis for this proposed determination for each amendment request is shown below.

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 before action is taken. 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, 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 a hearing and petitions for leave to intervene is discussed below.

By March 17, 1995, 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 for the particular facility involved. 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 a 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 a 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