

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(b)(4) and (6) of the Government in the Sunshine Act.

Dated: January 19, 2001.

Karen J. York,

Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 01-2158 Filed 1-23-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555-01-M

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Special Emphasis Panel in Graduate Education; 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 Graduate Education (57).

Date/Times: March 19 and 20, 2001; 8:30 a.m. to 5 p.m.

Place: National Science Foundation, Room 555, 4121 Wilson Blvd., Arlington, VA.

Type of Meeting: Closed.

Contact Persons: Dr. P. Wyn Jennings and Ms. Yvette Jackson, Division of Graduate Education and Dr. Lawrence Goldberg, Division of Electrical & Communications Systems, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Blvd., Rooms 907N and 675S, Arlington, VA 22230. Telephone: (703) 292-8696.

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

Agenda: To review and evaluate applications submitted to the NSF Integrated Graduate Education and Research Traineeship (IGERT) as part of the process for awards.

Reason for Closing: The applications 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: January 19, 2001.

Karen J. York,

Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 01-2159 Filed 1-23-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555-01-M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-286]

Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc.; 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-64 issued to Entergy Nuclear Indian Point 3 and Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc., for operation of the Indian Point Nuclear Generating Unit No. 3 (IP3) located in Westchester County, New York.

The proposed amendment would allow a one time exception to the 10-year frequency of the performance-based leakage rate testing program for Type A tests as required by Nuclear Energy Institute (NEI) guidance in NEI 94-01, revision 0, "Industry Guideline For Implementing Performance-Based Option of 10 CFR part 50, appendix J", and endorsed by 10 CFR part 50, appendix J, option B. The one time exception would allow an integrated leak rate test (ILRT) to be performed at a frequency of up to 15 years from the last test performed on December 2, 1990.

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

The proposed revision to Technical Specifications adds a one time extension to the current interval for Type A testing. The

current test interval of 10 years, based on past performance, would be extended on a one time basis to 15 years from the last Type A test. The proposed extension to Type A testing cannot increase the probability of an accident previously evaluated since the containment Type A testing extension is not a modification and the test extension is not of a type that could lead to equipment failure or accident initiation. The proposed extension to Type A testing does not involve a significant increase in the consequences of an accident since research documented in NUREG-1493 has found that, generically, very few potential containment leakage paths are not identified by Type B and C tests. The NUREG concluded that reducing the Type A (ILRT) testing frequency to one per twenty years was found to lead to an imperceptible increase in risk. IP3 provides a high degree of assurance through testing and inspection that the containment will not degrade in a manner detectable only by Type A testing. The last four Type A tests show leakage to be below acceptance criteria, indicating a very leak tight containment. Inspections required by the maintenance rule and ASME [American Society of Mechanical Engineers] code are performed in order to identify indications of containment degradation that could affect that leak tightness. The weld channel system will monitor the leak tightness of liner plate welds in the containment during plant operation as required by Technical Specifications. Type B and C testing required by Technical Specifications will identify any containment opening such as valves that would otherwise be detected by the Type A tests. These factors show that an IP3 Type A test extension will not represent a significant increase in the consequences of an accident.

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

The proposed revision to Technical Specifications adds a one time extension to the current interval for Type A testing. The current test interval of 10 years, based on past performance, would be extended on a one time basis to 15 years from the last Type A test. The proposed extension to Type A testing cannot create the possibility of a new or different type of accident since there are no physical changes being made to the plant and there are no changes to the operation of the plant that could introduce a new failure mode creating an accident or affecting the mitigation of an accident.

3. Does the proposed amendment involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety?

The proposed revision to Technical Specifications adds a one time extension to the current interval for Type A testing. The current test interval of 10 years, based on past performance, would be extended on a one time basis to 15 years from the last Type A test. The proposed extension to Type A testing will not significantly reduce the margin of safety. The NUREG 1493 generic study of the effects of extending containment leakage testing found that a 20 year extension in Type A leakage testing resulted in an imperceptible increase in risk to the public. NUREG-1493 found that, generically, the