Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995. The proposed information collection is published to obtain comments from the public and affected agencies.

Comments are encouraged and will be accepted until; October 14, 1997. Written comments and suggestions from the public and affected agencies concerning the proposed collection of information should address one or more of the following four points:

(1) Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility;

(2) Evaluate the accuracy of the agencies estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;

(3) Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and

(4) Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, e.g., permitting electronic submission of responses.

Overview of this information collection:

(1) *Type of Information Collection:* Extension of a currently approved collection.

(2) *Title of the Form/Collection:* Employment Eligibility Verification.

(3) *Agency form number, if any, and the applicable component of the Department of Justice sponsoring the collection:* Form I–9. Programs Office, IRAIRA Implementation Team, Immigration and Naturalization Service.

(4) *Affected public who will be asked or required to respond, as well as a brief abstract:* Primary: Individuals or Households. This form was developed to facilitate compliance with Section 274A of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), as amended by the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 (IRCA), which prohibits the knowing employment of unauthorized aliens. The information collected is used by employers or by recruiters for enforcement of provisions of immigration laws that are designed to control the employment of unauthorized aliens.

(5) *An estimate of the total number of respondents and amount of time estimated for an average respondent to respond:* 78,000,000 responses at 9 minutes (.15) per response and 20,000,000 record keepers at 4 minutes (0.066) per filing for record keeping.

(6) *An estimate of the total public burden (in hours) associated with the* collection annual burden hours.

If you have additional comments, suggestions, or need a copy of the proposed information collection instrument with instructions, or additional information, please contact Richard A. Sloan 202–514–3291, Director, Policy Directives and Instructions Branch, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, Room 5307, 425 I Street, NW., Washington, DC 20536. Additionally, comments and/or suggestions regarding the items(s) contained in this notice, especially regarding the estimated public burden and associated response time may also be directed to Mr. Richard A. Sloan.

If additional information is required contact: Mr. Robert B. Briggs, Clearance Officer, United States Department of Justice, Information Management and Security Staff, Justice Management Division, Suite 850, Washington Center, 1001 G Street, NW, Washington, DC 20530.

Dated: August 4, 1997.

Robert B. Briggs,

Department Clearance Officer, United States Department of Justice.

[FR Doc. 97–21225 Filed 8–11–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–18–M

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Sunshine Act Meeting

AGENCY HOLDING MEETING: National Science Foundation, National Science Board.

DATE AND TIME: August 21, 1997, 1:30 p.m., Closed Session. August 21, 1997, 2:15 p.m., Open Session.

PLACE: National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Room 1235, Arlington, Virginia 22230.

STATUS: Part of this meeting will be open to the public. Part of this meeting will be closed to the public.

MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED:

Thursday, August 21, 1997

Closed Session (1:30 p.m.–2:15 p.m.)

—Minutes, May 1997 Meeting
—Personnel
—NSF Budget
—Awards and Agreements

Thursday, August 21, 1997

Open Session (2:15 p.m.–4:15 p.m.)

—Minutes, May 1997 Meeting
—Closed Session Agenda Items for October 1997
—Chairman's Report
—Director's Report
—Reports from Committees
—Concept Paper: Industry Reliance on Publicly-Funded Research
—Working Paper on Federal Support for Scientific Research
—Graduate Education
—Other Business
—Adjourn

Marta Cehelsky,

Executive Officer.

[FR Doc. 97–21353 Filed 8–8–97; 10:25 am]

BILLING CODE 7555–01–M

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

Sunshine Act Meeting

TIME: 9:30 a.m., Tuesday, August 19, 1997.

PLACE: The Grand Ballroom, Loews L'Enfant Plaza Hotel, 480 L'Enfant Plaza, SW., Washington, DC 20024.

STATUS: Open.

MATTERS TO BE DISCUSSED:

6704B Aircraft Accident Report: In-Flight Fire and Impact with Terrain, ValuJet Airlines Flight 592, DC–9–32, N904VJ, Everglades, Miami, Florida, May 11, 1996.

NEWS MEDIA CONTACT: Telephone: (202) 314–6100.

FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT: Bea Hardesty, (202) 314–6065.

Dated: August 8, 1997.

Bea Hardesty,

Federal Register Liaison Officer.

[FR Doc. 97–21386 Filed 8–8–97; 12:05 pm]

BILLING CODE 7533–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50–325 and 50–324]

Carolina Power & Light 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 amendments to Facility Operating License Nos. DPR–71 and DPR–62 issued to the Carolina Power & Light Company (the licensee) for operation of the Brunswick Steam Electric Plant, Units 1 and 2 (BSEP) located in Southport, North Carolina.

NRC Generic Letter (GL) 88–01 outlines the NRC staff's positions on intergranular stress corrosion cracking (IGSCC) in boiling water reactor (BWR) austenitic stainless steel piping. Technical Specification (TS) 4.0.5.f requires that the BSEP Inservice Inspection (ISI) program be performed in accordance with the positions identified in GL 88–01. The proposed amendments would modify TS 4.0.5.f in a manner that would allow exceptions to these positions where specific written relief has been granted by the NRC.

Before issuance of the proposed license amendments, 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 amendments 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 amendments do not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

Technical Specification 4.0.5.f provides inservice inspection requirements (e.g., schedule, methods, personnel, and sampling) for piping covered by the scope of NRC Generic Letter 88–01, ''NRC Staff Position on IGSCC in BWR Austenitic Stainless Steel Piping'' dated January 25, 1988. The proposed revision to Technical Specification 4.0.5.f provides a clarification for this piping regarding the use of alternatives on schedule, methods, personnel, and sampling that have been reviewed and accepted by the NRC staff. The proposed change to Technical Specification 4.0.5.f is an administrative change that clarifies that alternate requirements regarding inspection schedules, methods, personnel, and sample expansion are acceptable provided these alternatives have been reviewed and approved by the NRC staff. The proposed license amendments do not alter the function of existing equipment and will ensure that the consequences of any previously evaluated accident do not increase. As such, the proposed license amendments do not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

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

The proposed revision to Technical Specification 4.0.5.f is an administrative change [that] provides a clarification that alternate requirements for inspection schedules, methods, personnel, and sample expansion for piping susceptible to intergranular stress corrosion cracking (IGSCC) are acceptable for use. Inclusion of this clarification in Technical Specification 4.0.5.f is an administrative change which will not introduce new equipment nor require any existing equipment or systems to perform a different type of function than they are presently designed to perform.

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

As previously stated, the proposed revision to Technical Specification 4.0.5.f provides a clarification allowing inspection of austenitic stainless steel piping using alternatives on schedule, methods, personnel, and sampling that have been reviewed and accepted by the NRC staff. The proposed license amendments do not introduce any new equipment nor do they require any existing equipment or systems to perform a different type of function than they are presently designed to perform. As such, the proposed change to Technical Specification 4.0.5.f is administrative in nature. Therefore, the proposed license amendments do 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 amendments involve 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 September 11, 1997, 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 University of North Carolina at Wilmington, William Madison Randall Library, 601 S. College Road, Wilmington, North Carolina 28403–3297. 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 General Counsel, Carolina Power & Light Company, P.O. Box 1551, Raleigh, North Carolina 27602, 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 July 25, 1997, 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 University of North Carolina at Wilmington, William Madison Randall Library, 601 S. College Road, Wilmington, North Carolina 28403–3297.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 6th day of August 1997.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

David C. Trimble,

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

[FR Doc. 97–21245 Filed 8–11–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50–302]

Florida 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 72, issued to the Florida Power Corporation, (FPC or the licensee), for operation of the Crystal River Nuclear generating Unit 3 (CR3) located in Citrus County, Florida.

The proposed amendment would revise the CR3 technical specifications (TS) to extend the frequency for certain surveillances related to the emergency diesel generators (EDGs). Specifically, TS Surveillance Requirements (SR) 3.3.8.1, and SR 3.8.1.3, would be revised to extend the channel Functional test surveillance frequency and the EDG operation, respectively, from 31 days to 60 days. The proposed TS amendment would be a one time change and applicable until November 23, 1997.

Currently, CR3 is in a voluntary shutdown and is in Mode 5. As part of its EDG load capacity upgrade program, the licensee originally planned to replace the EDG radiator during its cycle 11R outage in 1998. The licensee has now determined that a potential exists for the EDGs to exceed the design basis ambient temperature and as a result, decided to implement the radiator replacement during the current outage. Initially, the planned duration for these radiator modifications was 25 days assuming a pre-fabricated radiator unit could be used as the replacement radiator. As the final design and extent of condition for the EDGs were determined, the licensee has discovered that the pre-fabricated radiator design could not be used and the radiator replacement involved more extensive fabrication than originally anticipated. The licensee estimates that the revised work scope may require 55 days, including the necessary post-modification test for operability. This schedule is based on a continuous work schedule, and contingency for rework, field challenges, or late delivery of parts. Thus, the time required to do the modification work exceeds the present TS surveillance interval.

The licensee believes that while it is possible to perform these surveillances with one EDG inoperable, such an approach, however, would not be