Name: Special Emphasis Panel in Engineering Education and Centers.

Date/Time: July 9–10, 1996, 8:00 a.m.–5:30 p.m.

Place: National Science Foundation, Room 375, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, VA 22230.

Type of Meeting: Closed.

Contact Person: Mary Poats, Program Manager, Engineering Education and Centers Division, National Science Foundation, Room 585, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, VA 22230.

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

Agenda: To review and evaluate concept papers submitted to the Combined Research-Curriculum Development Program.

Reason for Closing: The concept papers 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: June 17, 1996.

M. Rebecca Winkler,

Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 96–15784 Filed 6–19–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555–01–M

Committee of Visitors of the Advisory Committee for Geosciences; Notice of meeting

In according 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 for the Geology and Paleontology, Petrology and Geochemistry and Hydrological Sciences Programs (1755).

Date and Time: July 10, 11, & 12, 1996; 8:00 a.m.–6:00 p.m.

Place: Room 730, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, VA.

Type of Meeting: Closed.

Contact Person: Dr. Ian D. MacGregor, Section Head, Special Projects Section, Division of Earth Sciences, Room 785, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, VA 22230. Telephone: (703) 306–1553.

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

Agenda: To provide oversight review of the Geology and Paleontology, Petrology and Geochemistry and Hydrological Sciences Programs.

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 they were 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.

Dated: June 17, 1996.

M. Rebecca Winkler,

Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 96–15785 Filed 6–19–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555–01–M

Special Emphasis Panel in Geosciences: 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).

Date & Time: July 9 and July 10, 1996; 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

Place: Room 680, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, VA 22230.

Type of Meeting: Closed.

Contact Person: Dr. Richard A. Behnke, Head, Upper Atmosphere Research Section; Division of Atmospheric Sciences; Room 775; 4201 Wilson Boulevard; Arlington, VA 22230; telephone number (703) 306–1518.

Purpose of Meeting: To provide and make recommendations concerning the National Space Weather Program (NSWP) proposals.

Agenda: To review and evaluate the National Space Weather Program (NSWP) proposals.

Reason for Closing: The proposals being reviewed include information of a proprietary or confidential nature, including technical information, financial data, and personal information concerning individuals associated with the proposals. These matters are exempted under 5 U.S.C. 552b(c), (4) and (6) of the Government in the Sunshine Act.

Dated: June 17, 1996.

M. Rebecca Winkler,

Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 96–15780 Filed 6–19–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555–01–M

Special Emphasis Panel in Networking & Communications Research & Infrastructure; 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 Networking and Communications Research and Infrastructure (#1207).

Date and Time: June 10–11, 1996; 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

Place: Room 1175.

Type of Meeting: Closed.

Contact Person(s): Mark Luker, CISE/NCRI, Room 1175, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, VA 22230, 703–306–1950.

Purpose of Meeting: The Network Access Point/Routing Arbiters (NAP/RA) Reverse Site Visit is to provide advice and recommendations concerning proposals submitted to NSF for financial support.

Agenda: To review and evaluate Network Access Point/Routing Arbiters (NAP/RA) proposals as part of the selection process for continuing awards.

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

Dated: June 17, 1996.

M. Rebecca Winkler,

Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 96–15782 Filed 6–19–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555–01–M

Advisory Committee for Social, Behavioral & Economic 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 and Committee Code: Advisory Committee for Social, Behavioral & Economic Sciences (#1171).

Date and Time: July 10–11, 1996, 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

Place: Room 970, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, VA 22230.

Type of Meeting: Closed.

Contact Person: Dr. Paul G. Chapin, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, VA 22230. Telephone: (703) 305–1731.

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

Agenda: To provide oversight review of the Linguistic Program.

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 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.

Dated: June 17, 1996.

M. Rebecca Winkler,

Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 96–15781 Filed 6–19–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555–01–M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Docket No. 50–243

Northeast Nuclear Energy 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–49 issued to Northeast Nuclear Energy Company, et al. (the licensee) for operation of the Millstone Nuclear Power Station, Unit No. 3 located in New London County, Connecticut.

The proposed amendment would revise Technical Specifications (TS) Table 3.3–1 to allow Millstone Unit No. 3 to change operational modes with both Shutdown Margin Monitors inoperable, and to revise Action Statements 5(a) and 5(b) to reference the locked valve list in TS 4.1.1.2.2.

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:

The proposed changes do not involve a [significant hazards consideration] SHC because the changes would not:

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

The proposed changes to Technical Specification 3.3.1, Table 3.3–1, Action 5(b) would allow Millstone Unit No. 3 to change Modes with the Shutdown Margin Monitors (SMMs) inoperable while in compliance with the Limiting Condition for Operation (LCO) governing this condition.

The SMMs are used only for the purpose of providing an alarm to allow the operator time to mitigate a boron dilution accident.

The LCO action to lock all dilution flow paths provides adequate protection to preclude a boron dilution event from occurring. The administrative controls placed upon the dilution flow paths per Technical Specification 4.1.1.2.2 are the basis for not having to analyze for a BDE in Mode 6. Consequently, the SMMs are not required to be operable in Mode 6.

With the dilution flow paths locked closed, the SMMs are not required to provide an alarm to the operators to allow them to mitigate the event, and their continued operation provides no added safety benefit. The LCO for both SMMs being inoperable does not require the plant to change Modes and therefore permits continued operation of the facility for an unlimited period of time. The proposed Technical Specification change will allow the plant to invoke Technical Specification 3.0.4 and increase modes while complying with the LCO action statements. These action statements are summarized below:

Positive reactivity operations via dilutions and rod withdrawal are suspended. The intent of this action is to stop any planned dilutions of the RCS [reactor coolant system]. The SMMs are not intended to monitor core reactivity associated with RCS temperature changes. The alarm set point is routinely re-set during the plant heat up due to the increasing count rate. During cooldowns as the count rate decreases, baseline count rates are continually lowered automatically by the SMMs. The Millstone Unit No. 3 boron dilution analysis assumes steady state RCS temperature operation. Plant cool downs, although considered positive reactivity additions, are allowed to be performed with the SMMs inoperable as the SMMs provide no protection during an RCS cool down. The SMMs are designed to monitor for dilution events, not reactivity additions as a result of cool downs. Prohibiting an RCS cool down as a result of entrance into this LCO action statement could prevent the operator from placing the plant into an overall safer condition. As such, all RCS cool downs will be allowed when the plant has entered this action statement in an effort to place the plant in a safer condition. With the administrative controls placed on the dilution flow paths, the BDE [boron dilution event] is precluded and the effects of the cool down are normal, anticipated core reactivity changes are offset by higher RCS boron concentrations.

All dilution flow paths are isolated and placed under administrative control (locked closed). This action provides redundant protection and defense in depth (safety overlap) to the SMMs. In this configuration, a BDE cannot occur. This is the basis for not having to analyze for a BDE in Mode 6. Since the BDE cannot occur with the dilution flow paths isolated, the SMMs are not required to be operable as the event cannot occur and operable SMMs provide no benefit.

Increase the shutdown margin surveillance frequency from every 24 hours to every 12 hours. This action, in combination with the above, provides defense in depth and overlap to the loss of the SMMs.

It is concluded that Millstones Unit No. 3 can heat up from Mode 5 to Mode 3 while complying with the technical specification action statements of Technical Specification 3.3.1, Table 3.3–1, safely and without increasing the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

Thus, this proposed change will not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

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

The proposed change will allow Millstone Unit No. 3 to change modes while complying with the LCO action statements. These action statements provide adequate protection to preclude a BDE from occurring. Changing Modes without the SMM OPERABLE will not create a new or different accident from any previously analyzed. The SMMs are used solely for the purpose of detecting a BDE by providing the operator with 15 minutes of mitigation response time. With the event precluded, (the dilution flow paths locked closed) the SMMs provide no additional safety benefit while in operation. Since their only function is to provide a 15 minute response time, their inoperablity [cannot] create the possibility of a different accident from occurring.

Based on the nature of the change, the change does not introduce any new failure modes or malfunctions and it does not create the potential for a new unanalyzed accident. Thus, this proposed change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

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

The proposed Technical Specification change does not reduce the margin of safety. The proposed change will allow Millstone Unit No. 3 to increase Modes without the SMMs OPERABLE. However the plant would only perform the Mode increase with Technical Specification administrative controls in place that essentially preclude that accident from occurring. In the proposed plant configuration, there is no added safety benefit from having the SMMs OPERABLE during the Mode increase. As such, there is no reduction in the margin of safety.

Thus, this proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in 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 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 20555–0001, 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 July 22, 1996, 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 Learning Resources Center, Three Rivers Community-Technical College, 574 New London Turnpike, Norwich, Connecticut, and the Waterford Library, ATTN: Vince Juliano, 49 Rope Ferry Road, Waterford, Connecticut. 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: Docketing and Services Branch, or may be delivered to the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, by the above date. Where petitions are filed during the last 10 days of the notice period, it is requested that the petitioner promptly so inform the Commission by a toll-free telephone call to Western Union at 1–(800) 248–5100 (in Missouri 1–(800) 342–6700). The Western Union operator should be given Datagram Identification Number N1023 and the following message addressed to Phillip F. McKee: petitioner's name and telephone number, date petition was mailed, plant name, and publication date and page number of this Federal Register notice. 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 Lillian M. Cuoco, Esq., Senior Nuclear Counsel, Northeast Utilities Service Company, P.O. Box 270, Hartford, CT 06141–0270, 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 3, 1996, 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 Learning Resources Center, Three Rivers Community-Technical College, 574 New London Turnpike, Norwich, Connecticut, and the Waterford Library, ATTN: Vince Juliano, 49 Rope Ferry Road, Waterford, Connecticut.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 11th day of June 1996.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Vernon L. Rooney,

Senior Project Manager, Northeast Utilities Project Directorate, Division of Reactor Projects—I/II, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 96–15730 Filed 6–19–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

[Docket No. 50–339]

Virginia Electric and Power Company; Notice of Withdrawal of Application for Amendment to Facility Operating License

The United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has granted the request of Virginia Electric and Power Company (the licensee) to withdraw its October 17, 1995, application for proposed amendment to Facility Operating License No. NPF–7 for the North Anna Power Station, Unit No. 2, located in Louisa County, Virginia.

The proposed amendment would have revised the Technical Specifications pertaining to the minimum number of steam generators required to be inspected during the first inservice inspection following steam generator replacement.

The Commission had previously issued a Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment published in the Federal Register on November 27, 1995 (60 FR 58406). However, by letter dated February 19, 1996, the licensee withdrew the proposed change.

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendment dated October 17, 1995, and the licensee's letter dated February 19, 1996, which withdrew the application for license amendment. The above documents are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, and the Alderman Library, Special Collections Department, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia 22903–2498.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland this 7th day of June 1996.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Bart C. Buckley,

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

[FR Doc. 96–15729 Filed 6–19–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

[Docket No. 50–285]

Omaha Public Power District, Fort Calhoun Station, Unit No. 1; 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. DPR–40, issued to Omaha Public Power District (the licensee), for operation of the Fort Calhoun Station, Unit 1, located in Washington County, Nebraska.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed action would issue an amendment to allow an increase in the initial nominal Uranium-235 (U–235) enrichment limit for fuel assemblies which may be stored in the spent fuel pool. This action would allow the licensee to extend the biennial interval until the first quarter of 1996. The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application for amendment dated February 1, 1996.

The Need for the Proposed Action

The licensee intends to store unirradiated fuel with a maximum initial enrichment of 4.5 w/o U–235 in Region 1 of the spent fuel pool during the next refueling outage (Refuel 17). Spent fuel will be stored in Region 2 of the spent fuel pool. At present, fuel with a maximum initial enrichment up to 4.2 weight percent of U–235 can be stored in Region 1 and Region 2 of the spent fuel pool.

Environmental Impact of the Proposed Action:

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed revision to the technical specifications (TSs) and concludes that the use of fuel with a maximum enrichment of 4.5 w/o U–235 would not significantly increase the probability or consequences of any accident previously analyzed. The proposed amendment would increase the allowable fuel enrichment from 4.2 w/o to 4.5 w/o U–235 in Region 1 of the spent fuel pool and modify the burnup/enrichment restrictions imposed on fuel stored in Region 2 to include fuel with an enrichment up to 4.5 w/o.

The environmental impacts of transportation resulting from the use of higher enrichment and extended irradiation are discussed in the staff assessment entitled ''NRC Assessment of the Environmental Effects of Transportation Resulting from Extended Fuel Enrichment and Irradiation.'' This assessment was published in the Federal Register on August 11, 1988 (53 FR 30355) as corrected on August 24, 1988 (53 FR 32322) in connection with the Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 1: Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact. As indicated therein, the environmental cost contribution of an increase in fuel enrichment of up to 5 weight percent U–235 and irradiation limits of up to 60 Gigawatt Days per Metric Ton (GWD/MT) are either unchanged, or may in fact be reduced from those summarized in Table S–4 as set forth in 10 CFR 51.52(c). These findings are applicable to the proposed amendment for the Ft. Calhoun Station, Unit 1. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that this proposed action would result in no significant radiological environmental impact.

With regard to potential nonradiological impacts, the proposed changes involve systems located within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20. It does not affect nonradiological plant effluents and has no other environmental impact. Therefore, the Commission concludes that there are no significant nonradiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed amendment.

The Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating License, Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity for a Hearing in connection with this action was published in the Federal Register on March 13, 1996 (61 FR 10396).

Alternative to the Proposed Action

Since the Commission concluded that there are no significant environmental effects that would result from the proposed action, any alternative with equal or greater environmental impacts need not be evaluated.