NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND HUMANITIES

Cooperative Agreement for a Series of Forums on Issues Affecting Urban Design and Development

AGENCY: National Endowment for the Arts.

ACTION: Notification of availability.

SUMMARY: The National Endowment for the Arts will request proposals leading to the award of a Cooperative Agreement for the continuation of the project titled: ''The Urban Forum.'' The Urban Forum is a series of symposia and lectures on issues affecting the design and development of American cities. Responsibilities under the Cooperative Agreement will include the development, coordination, administration, and evaluation of the sessions. Available funding for the Cooperative Agreement is limited to $50,000, which is expected to support three or four forums. Additional private or public funding or in-kind contributions will be welcomed. Those interested in receiving the Solicitation should reference Program Solicitation PS 97–04 in their written request and include two (2) self-addressed labels. Verbal requests for the Solicitation will not be honored.

DATES: Program Solicitation PS 97–04 is scheduled for release approximately September 2, 1997 with proposals due on October 2, 1997.

ADDRESSES: Requests for the Solicitation should be addressed to National Endowment for the Arts, Grants & Contracts Office, Room 618, 1100 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W. Washington, D.C. 20506.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: William I. Hummel, Grants & Contracts Office, National Endowment for the Arts, 1100 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W. Washington, D.C. 20506 (202/682–5482).

William I. Hummel,

Coordinator, Cooperative Agreements and Contracts.

[FR Doc. 97–21459 Filed 8–13–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7537–01–M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Agency Information Collection Activities: Proposed Collection; Comment request

AGENCY: U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC).

ACTION: Notice of pending NRC action to submit an information collection request to OMB and solicitation of public comment.

SUMMARY: The NRC is preparing a submittal to OMB for review of continued approval of information collections under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35).

Information pertaining to the requirement to be submitted:

1. The title of the information collection: Survey of Steel Mills: Support for a Risk Assessment of General- and Specific-Licensed Devices.

2. Current OMB approval number: None.

3. How often the collection is required: The survey requires a one-time response.

4. Who is required or asked to report: Steel mills in the United States.

5. The number of annual respondents: 300 steel mills.

6. The number of hours needed annually to complete the requirement or request: Each questionnaire is expected to take about 3 hours to complete. The total burden for the industry is 900 hours. An additional 40 hours will be expended by trade organizations in distributing and collecting the questionnaires.

7. Abstract: NRC is conducting a survey to obtain information for a comprehensive assessment of the risk associated with radioactive material which has entered the scrap stream due to loss of control of the material by licensed users. Steel mills that have accidentally smelted the radioactive material that has been found in the metal recycling stream have incurred large expenses to decontaminate plants and unnecessary exposures also have occurred due to handling the radioactive material. The information from the survey will assist NRC in determining the probability of identifying radioactive material in the scrap stream and the likely radiation exposures to members of the public.

Submit, by October 14, 1997 comments that address the following questions:

1. Is the proposed collection of information necessary for the NRC to properly perform its functions? Does the information have practical utility?

2. Is the burden estimate accurate?

3. Is there a way to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected?

4. How can the burden of the information collection be minimized, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology?

A copy of the draft supporting statement may be viewed free of charge at the NRC Public Document Room, 2120 L Street NW, (lower level), Washington, DC. Members of the public who are in the Washington, DC, area can access this document via modem on the Public Document Room Bulletin Board (NRC's Advance Copy Document Library), NRC subsystem at FedWorld, 703–321–3339. Members of the public who are located outside of the Washington, DC, area can dial FedWorld, 1–800–303–9672, or use the FedWorld Internet address: fedworld.gov (Telnet). The document will be available on the bulletin board for 30 days after the signature date of this notice. If assistance is needed in accessing the document, please contact the FedWorld help desk at 703–487–4608. Additional assistance in locating the document is available from the NRC Public Document Room, nationally at 1–800–397–4209, or within the Washington, DC, area at 202–634–3273.

Comments and questions about the information collection requirements may be directed to the NRC Clearance Officer, Brenda Jo. Shelton, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, T6F33, Washington, DC, 20555–0001, by telephone at (301) 415–7233, or by Internet electronic mail at BJS1@NRC.GOV.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 1st day of August, 1997.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Arnold E. Levin,

Acting Designated Senior Official for Information Resources Management.

[FR Doc. 97–21518 Filed 8–13–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Houston Lighting & Power Company; City Public Service Board of San Antonio; Central Power and Light Company; City of Austin, Texas; Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating License, Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity for a Hearing

[Docket Nos. 50–498 and 50–499]

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an amendment to Facility Operating License Nos. NPF–76 and NPF–80 issued to Houston Lighting & Power Company, et. al., (the licensee) for operation of the South Texas Project, Units 1 and 2, located in Matagorda County, Texas.

The proposed amendment would revise Technical Specification (TS)

Table 2.2–1 and 3/4.2.5 to allow the reactor coolant system (RCS) total flow to be determined using cold leg elbow tap differential pressure measurements. The proposed amendment was initially submitted via letter dated July 16, 1997. The July 16, 1997, submittal contained proprietary information that had not been properly identified. The July 16, 1997, submittal was retrieved and discarded from all NRC files by the NRC staff. Notification of the July 16, 1997, submittal was made in the **Federal Register** on July 30, 1997, (62 FR 40850). This notice supersedes the one previously published on July 30, 1997.

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:

Pursuant to 10[]CFR[]50.92 each application for amendment to an operating license must be reviewed to determine if the proposed change involves a Significant Hazards Consideration. The amendment, as defined below, describing the Technical Specification change associated with the change has been reviewed and determined to not involve Significant Hazards Considerations. The basis for this determination follows.

Proposed Change: The current Technical Specification Table 2.2–1 (page 2–4) ''Reactor Trip System Instrumentation Trip Setpoints,'' provides the Trip Setpoint and Allowable Value for the RCS Flow-Low trip. The Allowable Value will be changed to reflect the increased uncertainty associated with the correlation of the elbow taps to a previous baseline calorimetric. In addition, Technical Specification 3.2.5 (page 3/4.2–11), ''Power Distribution Limits, DNB Parameters,'' will be changed to allow the RCS total flow to be measured by the elbow tap delta p method. These changes will include the modification of surveillance requirement 4.2.5.3, which currently requires performance of a precision heat balance every 18 months, to allow use of the elbow tap delta p method for RCS flow measurement. Appropriate Technical Specification Bases sections will also be revised to reflect use of the elbow tap delta p method for flow measurement and to provide clarification. The revised Technical Specifications are in Appendix C.

Background: The 18-month total RCS flow surveillance is typically satisfied by a secondary power calorimetric-based RCS flow measurement. In recent cycles, South Texas Project has experienced apparent decreases in flow rates which have been attributed to variations in hot leg streaming effects. These effects directly impact the hot leg temperatures used in the precision calorimetric, resulting in the calculation of low RCS flow rates. The apparent flow reduction has become more pronounced in fuel cycles which have implemented aggressive low leakage loading patterns. Evidence that the flow reduction was apparent, but not actual, was provided by elbow tap measurements. The results of this evaluation, including a detailed description of the hot leg streaming phenomenon, are documented in Westinghouse report SAE/FSE–TGX–0152, ''RCS Flow Verification Using Elbow Taps.''

South Texas Project intends to begin using an alternate method of measuring RCS flow using the elbow tap delta p measurements. For this alternate method, the RCS elbow tap measurements are correlated to precision calorimetric measurements performed during earlier cycles which decreased the effects of hot leg streaming.

The purpose of this evaluation is to assess the impact of using the elbow tap delta p measurements as an alternate method for performing the 18-month RCS flow surveillance on the licensing basis and demonstrate that it will not adversely affect the subsequent safe operation of the plant. This evaluation supports the conclusion that implementation of the elbow tap delta p measurement as an alternate method of determining RCS total flow rate does not represent a significant hazards consideration as defined in 10[]CFR[]50.92.

Evaluation: Use of the elbow tap delta p method to determine RCS total flow requires that the delta p measurements for the present cycle be correlated to the precision calorimetric flow measurement which was performed during the baseline cycle(s). A calculation has been performed to determine the uncertainty in the RCS total flow using this method. This calculation includes the uncertainty associated with the RCS flow baseline calorimetric measurement, as well as uncertainties associated with delta p transmitters and indication via QDPS [qualified display processing system] or the plant process computer. The uncertainty calculation performed for this method of flow measurement is consistent with the methodology recommended by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NUREG/CR–3659, PNL–4973, 2/85). The only significant difference is the assumption of correlation to a previously performed RCS flow calorimetric. However, this has been accounted for by the addition of instrument uncertainties previously considered to be zeroed out by the assumption of normalization to a calorimetric performed each cycle. Based on these calculations, the uncertainty on the RCS flow measurement using the elbow tap method is 2.6% flow which results in a minimum RCS total flow of 391,500 gpm and must be measured via indication with QDPS or the plant process computer at approximately 100% power.

The specific calculations performed were for Precision RCS Flow Calorimetrics for the specified baseline cycles, Indicated RCS Flow (either QDPS or the plant process computer), and the Reactor Coolant Flow—Low reactor trip. The calculations for Indicated RCS Flow and Reactor Coolant Flow—Low reactor trip reflect correlation of the elbow taps to baseline precision RCS Flow Calorimetrics. As discussed above, additional instrument uncertainties were included for this correlation.

The uncertainty associated with the RCS Flow—Low trip increased slightly. It was determined that due to the availability of margin in the uncertainty calculation, no change was necessary to either the Trip Setpoint (91.8% flow) or to the current Safety Analysis Limit (87% flow) to accommodate this increase. The Allowable Value is to be modified to allow for the increased instrument uncertainties associated with the delta p to flow correlation.

Since the flow uncertainty did not increase over the currently analyzed value, no additional evaluations of the reactor core safety limits must be performed. In addition, it was determined that the current minimum Measured Flow (MMF) assumed in the safety analyses (389,200 gpm) bounds the required MMF calculated for the elbow tap method (391,500 gpm).

Based on these evaluations, the proposed change would not invalidate the conclusions presented in the UFSAR [Updated Final Safety Analysis Report].

1. Does the proposed modification involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated?

Sufficient margin exists to account for all reasonable instrument uncertainties; therefore, no changes to installed equipment or hardware in the plant are required, thus the probability of an accident occurring remains unchanged.

The initial conditions for all accident scenarios modeled are the same and the conditions at the time of trip, as modeled in the various safety analyses, are the same. Therefore, the consequences of an accident will be the same as those previously analyzed.

2. Does the proposed modification create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated?

The proposed change revises the method for RCS flow measurement, and therefore does not introduce any new accident indicators or failure mechanisms.

No new accident scenarios have been identified. Operation of the plant will be consistent with that previously modeled, i.e., the time of reactor trip in the various safety analyses is the same, thus plant response will be the same and will not introduce any different accident scenarios that have not been evaluated.

3. Does the proposed modification involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety [?]

There are no changes to the Safety Analysis assumptions. Therefore, the margin of safety will remain the same.

The proposed change does not impact the results from any accidents analyzed in the safety analysis.

Conclusion: Based on the preceding information, it has been determined that this proposed change to allow an alternate RCS total flow measurement based on elbow tap delta p measurements does not involve a Significant Hazards Consideration as defined by 10 CFR 50.92(c).

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 Chief, 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 15, 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 Wharton County Junior College, J. M. Hodges Learning Center, 911 Boling Highway, Wharton, TX. 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 Jack R. Newman, Esq., Morgan, Lewis & Bockius, 1800 M Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20036–5869, 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 August 6, 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 Wharton County Junior College, J. M. Hodges Learning Center, 911 Boling Highway, Wharton, TX.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 8th day of August 1997.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Thomas W. Alexion,

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

[FR Doc. 97–21517 Filed 8–13–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50–29]

Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, Yankee Atomic Electric Co., Yankee Nuclear Power Station; Notice of Receipt of and Availability for Comment on the Facility License Termination Plan

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is in receipt of and is making available for public inspection and comment the facility License Termination Plan (LTP) for the Yankee Nuclear Power Station (YNPS or the plant). A meeting on the LTP at which the public will be able to make comments or question the NRC or Yankee Atomic Power Company attendees will be the subject of a future notice. A proposed time period for this meeting is fall 1997 and to be held in the vicinity of the plant. The plant is located in Rowe Township, Franklin County, Massachusetts. In addition to the future notice in the **Federal Register**, the NRC will place advance notices in local newspapers identifying the date, time, and place of the meeting.

YNPS was permanently shut down on October 1, 1991. Since that time, the licensee has performed substantial decontamination and dismantlement at the plant with the intent to restore the site to ''greenfield'' conditions. The LTP was submitted in conformance to NRC regulations 10 CFR 50.82(a) (9) and (10). The LTP would be approved by the NRC through a license amendment; this process will offer an opportunity for a hearing.

The LTP is available for public inspection at the YNPS Local Public Document Room (LPDR), located in the Library of the Greenfield Community College Library, 1 College Drive, Greenfield, Massachusetts, 01301 and at the Commission Public Document Room, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC 20037. The YNPS LTP is dated May 15, 1997, and can be located in the public document rooms under Accession Number 9705210388.

Comments regarding the LTP or a proposed meeting date may be submitted within the 45 day from the issuance of this notice, in writing, to Mr. Morton B. Fairtile, MS: O11–B20, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001. He can be reached at 301–415–1442.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 8th day of August 1997.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Marvin M. Mendonca,

Acting Director, Non-Power Reactors and Decommissioning Project Directorate, Division of Reactor Program Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 97–21516 Filed 8–13–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Advisory Committee on Nuclear Waste; Notice of Meeting

The Advisory Committee on Nuclear Waste (ACNW) will hold its 94th meeting on September 23 and 25, 1997, at the Mirage Hotel, Grand Ballroom B and C, 3400 Las Vegas Boulevard South, Las Vegas, Nevada.

The entire meeting will be open to public attendance.

The schedule for this meeting is as follows: *Tuesday, September 23, 1997—8:30 a.m. until the conclusion of business.*

Preparation of ACNW Reports—The Committee will discuss proposed reports including NRC high-level waste performance assessment capability, application of probabilistic methods to performance assessment, and approaches to implement multiple barriers and defense-in-depth in 10 CFR 60.

Thursday, September 25, 1997—8:30 a.m. until the conclusion of business.

A. *Viability Assessment*—The Committee will discuss the status of the Viability Assessment including design options, total systems performance assessment, cost estimates, and schedule. The Committee may also hear an update on the progress of the Preliminary Integrated Safety Assessment (PISA).

B. *Enhanced Site Characterization*—The Committee will discuss the progress of the enhanced site characterization program, including the status of Cl–36 sampling, and description of the east-west drift. Additional topics may include the Amargosa Valley population survey, waste retrievability, and DOE's interim High Level Waste Disposal Standard.

C. *Public Comments*—The Committee will hear comments from members of the public, representatives from the State of Nevada and affected local counties, and Tribal Nations on concerns related to nuclear waste disposal.

D. *Preparation of ACNW Reports*—The Committee will discuss proposed reports including NRC high-level waste performance assessment capability, application of probabilistic methods to performance assessment, and approaches to implement multiple barriers and defense-in-depth in 10 CFR 60.

E. *Committee Activities/Future Agenda*—The Committee will consider topics proposed for future consideration by the full Committee and Working Groups. The Committee will discuss ACNW-related activities of individual members.

F. *Miscellaneous*—The Committee will discuss miscellaneous matters related to the conduct of Committee activities and organizational activities and complete discussion of matters and specific issues that were not completed during previous meetings, as time and availability of information permit.

Procedures for the conduct of and participation in ACNW meetings were published in the **Federal Register** on October 8, 1996 (61 FR 52814). In accordance with these procedures, oral or written statements may be presented