

practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

Proposed Project: Program Evaluation of the Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research (EPSCoR). EPSCoR is an ongoing initiative of the National Science Foundation (NSF)—and, in parallel, of six other federal agencies—to increase the research competitiveness of faculty and universities in selected states. The design calls for five sub-studies drawn from the broader framework of the program's objectives, structure, and strategies, which was developed in conjunction with several workgroups. New, non-archival data collections in subsidies 3, 4, and 5 are being submitted for OMB review. The studies are:

Substudy No. 1: Has There Been an Increase in Funded Research?

The substudy will be conducted for each EPSCoR state, across EPSCoR states, and between EPSCoR and non-EPSCoR states. The study will be conducted using total levels of external awards, disaggregated by sector (federal/state/industry), and within the federal sector by agency. These data are currently available from existing NSF databases for the period from EPSCoR's inception through FY 1992.

Substudy No. 2: How Competitive Was EPSCoR Research at the Time of Award?

The data for Substudy No. 2 will come from the archival records maintained by NSF. The results of each round of reviews have been kept in a separate notebook, reflecting the applications and their components, the nature of the peer review, and the disposition of the review. From these notebooks and the award jackets, the evaluation team will reconstruct the peer review outcomes for the last two program announcements: EPSCoR's Advanced Development Program awards (n=17) and the Systemic Improvement awards (n=19) made between 1992 and 1995.

Substudy No. 3: How Competitive Was EPSCoR-Funded Research Later On?

Substudy No. 3 will involve three complementary data collection activities at the level of the individual research investigator and research group. The first of these activities consists of a citation analysis utilizing data from the NSF Database of EPSCoR Projects. The

second two activities, which utilize the sample from the citation analysis, are a mail survey and a telephone survey.

Sampling. As of 1994, according to the NSF EPSCoR Database, an estimated 1,184 faculty were participating in the EPSCoR program. Using the database, a random sample (with replacement in case of 0 publications) of 10 researchers from the 13 states will be drawn. To allow for the practice of co-principal investigators in many fields, the second author, where practical, will also be included as a separate, independent researcher. Thus, an initial list of between 130 to 260 faculty (13 states × 10 (or 20) researchers), will be identified. From this list, up to three publications per faculty member will be selected, for a total number of between 130 and 780 observations, with the actual number likely to be between 390 and 780. The article is the unit of analysis.

Mail Survey: Editors of the journals in which EPSCoR researchers have published will be invited to conduct qualitative assessments of the article authored by the EPSCoR faculty member with the comparison article by the non-EPSCoR author plus an additional number of articles that appeared in the same journal issue.

This comparison will be made for a 10 percent sample of the articles selected above (n=390 to 780 articles or 39–78 journals). The review protocol will be structured and brief to minimize burden and facilitate response.

Telephone Survey. The lead authors of the same 10 percent sample will be contacted telephonically, to determine whether (or not) their own research and the research of colleagues in a research cluster have thrived over time. This will involve telephone discussions with a sample of the investigators, to determine their post-EPSCoR experiences, both as individuals and as part of a research cluster. The authors will be asked to respond to a brief, structured interview protocol.

Substudies No. 4 and 5: Have Universities Implemented Research-Supporting Changes? and Have States Initiated Research-Supporting Changes?

Both field-based studies will involve the same five sites, with separate site visits approximately one year apart. The fieldwork for both studies is to be conducted by COSMOS.

Field-Based Studies. The site visits for each year will consist of structured and consistent—but not identical—interviews at the same 5 states. In year one, interviews will be held with university officials (provosts, vice

presidents for research, deans, department heads, and sponsored program officers) involved in formulating and implementing institutional policies. In year two, the focus is on state technology development, inter-institutional coordination, and state financing and regulation of university activities. These structured interviews will be held with state officials. It is anticipated that 10 individuals will be interviewed at each site.

Burden estimates across all data collections are as follows:

Year	Re-spond-ents	Burden hours
1996	50	100
1997	128	228

Send comments to Herman Fleming, Clearance Officer, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 485, Arlington, VA 22230. Written comments should be received within 60 days of publication.

Dated: October 17, 1995.

Herman G. Fleming,

NSF Reports Clearance Officer.

[FR Doc. 95–26229 Filed 10–23–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555–01–M

Advisory Panel for Science, Technology and Society; Notice of Meeting

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

Name: Advisory Panel for Science, Technology and Society (#1760).

Date and Time: November 10, 1995, 9 a.m. to 5 p.m.; November 11, 1995, 9 a.m. to 12 noon.

Place: Galleria Park Hotel—The Palm Room/Second Floor, 191 Sutter Street, San Francisco, CA 94104, Telephone: (415) 781–3060—FAX (415) 433–4409.

Contact Person: Dr. Ronald J. Overmann, Senior Staff Assistant/SBER, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, VA 22230, Telephone (703) 306–1743, Room 995.

Agenda: To review and evaluate science and technology studies proposals as part of the selection process for awards.

Date and Time: November 16–17, 1995—8:30 a.m. to 5 p.m.

Place: National Science Foundation, Room 970—4201 Wilson Blvd.—Arlington, VA.

Contact Person: Dr. Rachelle D. Hollander, Program Director for Ethics and Values Studies, National Science Foundation, Room 995, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, VA 22230, Telephone (703) 306–1743 Ext. 6991.

Agenda: To review and evaluate ethics and values studies proposals as part of the selection process for awards.

Type of Meetings: Closed.

Purpose of Meeting: To provide advice and recommendations concerning support for research proposals submitted to the National Science Foundation for financial support.

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), Government in the Sunshine Act.

Dated: October 19, 1995.

M. Rebecca Winkler,

Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 95-26298 Filed 10-23-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555-01-M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-443]

North Atlantic Energy Service Company, et al.; 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-86 issued to North Atlantic Energy Service Corporation (the licensee) for operation of the Seabrook Station, Unit No. 1 located in Rockingham County, New Hampshire.

The proposed amendment would modify the Appendix A Technical Specifications for the Engineered Safety Features Actuation System (ESFAS) Instrumentation. Specifically, the proposed amendment would revise the Seabrook Station Technical Specifications to relocate Functional Unit 6.b, "Feedwater Isolation—Low RCS T_{avg} Coincident with a Reactor Trip" from Technical Specification 3.3.2, "Engineered Safety Features Actuation System Instrumentation" to the Seabrook Station Technical Requirements Manual which is a licensee controlled document.

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 proposed changes do not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The change considered for the relocation of the feedwater isolation setpoint from the Technical Specifications does not impose any new performance requirements on any system or component which could subsequently cause associated design criteria to be exceeded. The structural and functional integrity of the plant's structures, systems and components is maintained. This change does not affect the initiators of any transients evaluated in the Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (UFSAR).

The sequence of obtaining feedwater isolation on low T_{avg} coincident with reactor trip is not credited in any of the LOCA and non-LOCA accidents evaluated in the UFSAR. Feedwater isolation is initiated for other reasons such as a Safety Injection (SI) actuation. This change is administrative in nature, in that it relocates the function from the Technical Specifications to the Seabrook Station Technical Requirements Manual and there are no changes to the plant's structures, systems and components.

Since, for the reasons given above, the results of the UFSAR analyses are not affected by the implementation of the change, there is, therefore, no adverse impact on the radiological consequences of accidents reported in the UFSAR. Furthermore, this change does not degrade fission product barriers assumed in the dose consequence analysis such as the fuel cladding, the reactor pressure vessel, and containment. The performance and integrity of accident mitigating structures, systems and components such as the Emergency Feedwater and Safety Injection systems, are not affected by the change. Consequently, the ability of these systems to limit radiological consequences as described in the UFSAR is not adversely affected. Based on the above, the proposed changes do not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

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

The proposed change does not create any new failure modes for any structure, system or component. All design and performance

criteria will continue to be met and no new single failure scenario is created that is not bounded by the accidents described in the UFSAR. The proposed change to the Technical Specifications does not introduce any new challenges to structures, systems and components that could introduce a new type of accident. Therefore the proposed changes do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

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

The accidents analyzed in the UFSAR have been reviewed relative to the feedwater isolation on low RCS T_{avg} coincident with reactor trip. The applicable design criteria and the pertinent licensing basis acceptance criteria continue to be met. The margin of safety as defined in the Bases to the Technical Specifications is not reduced and the design and safety analysis limits remain applicable.

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 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 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