

Dated: July 18, 2001.

Marilyn J. Kretsinger,

Assistant General Counsel.

[FR Doc. 01-18338 Filed 7-20-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 1410-33-P

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Agency Information Collection Activities: Proposed Collection; Comment Request

AGENCY: National Science Foundation.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The National Science Foundation (NSF) is announcing plans to request renewed clearance of this collection. In accordance with the requirement of Section 3506(c)(2)(A) of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, we are providing opportunity for public comment on this action. After obtaining and considering public comment, NSF will prepare the submission requesting OMB clearance of this collection for no longer than 3 years.

Comments are invited on: (a) whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Agency, including whether the information shall have 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; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

DATES: Written comments should be received by September 21, 2001 to be assured of consideration. Comments received after that date will be considered to the extent practicable.

ADDRESSES: Written comments regarding the information collection and requests for copies of the proposed information collection request should be addressed to Suzanne Plimpton, Reports Clearance Officer, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Blvd., Rm. 295, Arlington, VA 22230, or by e-mail to splimpto@nsf.gov.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Suzanne Plimpton on (703) 292-7556 or send email to splimpto@nsf.gov. Individuals who use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) may call the Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) at 1-800-877-8339 between 8 a.m. and 8 p.m., Eastern time, Monday through Friday.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Title of Collection: Survey of Industrial Research and Development

OMB Control No.: 3145-0027.

Expiration Date of Approval: December 31, 2001.

1. Abstract

The proposed continuing information collection involves the estimation of the expenditures on research and development performed within the United States by industrial firms. A mail survey, the Survey of Industrial Research and Development, has been conducted annually since 1953. Industry accounts for over 70 percent of total U.S. R&D each year and since its inception, the survey has provided continuity of statistics on R&D expenditures by major industry groups and by source of funds. The survey is the industrial component of the NSF statistical program that seeks to "provide a central clearinghouse for the collection, interpretation, and analysis of data on the availability of, and the current and projected need for, scientific and technical resources in the United States, and to provide a source of information for policy formulation by other agencies of the Federal government" as mandated in the National Science Foundation Act of 1950. Statistics from the survey are published in NSF's annual publication series Research and Development in Industry. The proposed collection will continue the survey for three years.

2. Expected Respondents

The survey will be mailed to a statistical sample of approximately 24,200 companies to collect information on the amount and sources of funds for and character of R&D performed and contracted out by industrial firms, and information on sales and employment of the firms themselves.

3. Burden on the Public

To minimize burden, over 90-percent of the companies selected for the Survey of Industrial Research and Development are asked to respond to the Form RD-1A, the abbreviated version of the basic survey questionnaire, Form RD-1. Further, only companies with five paid employees or more are asked to participate in the survey and extensive use is made of the descriptive codes and information on the establishment list that is the source of the survey sample to avoid sampling firms in industries that traditionally do not perform R&D. NSF, with input from the Bureau of the Census, the collection and compiling agent for the survey, estimates that the average annual reporting and record

keeping burden on each Form RD-1A respondent will be 1 hour and on Form RD-1 respondents will be 18 hours. The total annual burden is estimated at 51,400 hours, calculated as follows:

RD-1A respondents: 22,600 respondents \times 1 response \times 1 burden Hour = 22,600 hours/year.

RD-1 respondents: 1,600 respondents \times 1 response \times 18 burden hours = 28,800 hours/year.

All respondents: 22,600 + 28,800 = 51,400 burden hours/year during 2002, 2003, and 2004.

Dated: July 17, 2001.

Suzanne H. Plimpton,

NSF Reports Clearance Officer.

[FR Doc. 01-18223 Filed 7-20-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555-01-M

NORTHEAST DAIRY COMPACT COMMISSION

Notice of meeting

AGENCY: Northeast Dairy Compact Commission.

ACTION: Notice of Meeting.

SUMMARY: The Compact Commission will hold its regular monthly meeting to consider matters relating to administration and enforcement of the price regulation. This meeting will be held in Mystic, Connecticut, continuing the Commission's program of holding a meeting in each of the Compact states. In addition to receiving reports and recommendations of its standing Committees, the Commission will receive a number of informational reports about the impact of the over-order price regulation in Connecticut.

DATES: The meeting will begin at 10 a.m. on Wednesday, August 8, 2001.

ADDRESSES: The meeting will be held at the Best Western Hotel, 9 Whitehall Avenue, Mystic, Connecticut 06355.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Daniel Smith, Executive Director, Northeast Dairy Compact Commission, 64 Main Street, Room 21, Montpelier, VT 05602. Telephone (802) 229-1941.

Authority: 7 U.S.C. 7256.

Dated: July 17, 2001.

Daniel Smith,

Executive Director.

[FR Doc. 01-18289 Filed 7-20-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 1650-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50–269, 50–270, and 50–287]

Duke Energy Corporation; Oconee Nuclear Station, Units 1, 2, and 3; Exemption

1.0 Background

The Duke Energy Corporation (the licensee) is the holder of Facility Operating License Nos. DPR–38, DPR–47, and DPR–55, which authorize operation of the Oconee Nuclear Station, Units 1, 2, and 3 (ONS). The licenses provide, among other things, that the facilities are subject to all rules, regulations, and orders of the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC, the Commission) now or hereafter in effect.

The facility consists of three pressurized water reactors located in Seneca County in South Carolina.

2.0 Request/Action

By letter dated July 26, 2000, Duke Energy Corporation, licensee for the ONS, requested an exemption from certain requirements of 10 CFR 50.44, 10 CFR part 50, Appendix A, General Design Criterion 41, and 10 CFR part 50, Appendix E, Section VI pertaining to the hydrogen control system requirements (*i.e.*, recombiners and containment post-accident hydrogen monitors) and the removal of these requirements from the ONS design basis.

Regulatory requirements for the hydrogen control system are specified in 10 CFR 50.44 and 10 CFR part 50, Appendix A, (General Design Criteria 41, 42, and 43). Additional staff guidance is provided in Regulatory Guide (RG) 1.7. Staff review and acceptance criteria are specified in Section 6.2.5 of the Standard Review Plan. With regard to combustible gas control system requirements, ONS is subject to the requirements of 10 CFR 50.44(g).

3.0 Discussion

Pursuant to 10 CFR 50.12, the Commission may, upon application by any interested person or upon its own initiative, grant exemptions from the requirements of 10 CFR part 50, when (1) the exemptions are authorized by law, will not present an undue risk to public health or safety, and are consistent with the common defense and security; and (2) when special circumstances are present.

For this exemption, these special circumstances include consideration that the quantity of hydrogen prescribed

by 10 CFR 50.44(d) and RG 1.7 which necessitated the need for hydrogen recombiners would be bounded by the hydrogen generated during a severe accident. As shown in the attached safety evaluation, the staff has found that the relative importance of hydrogen combustion for large, dry containments with respect to containment failure is quite low. This finding supports the argument that the hydrogen recombiners are not risk significant from a containment integrity perspective and that the risk associated with hydrogen combustion is not from design basis accidents but from severe accidents. Studies have shown that the majority of risk to the public is from accident sequences that lead to containment failure or bypass, and that the contribution to risk from accident sequences involving hydrogen combustion is actually quite small for large, dry containments such as Oconee's. This is true despite the fact that the hydrogen produced in these events is substantially larger than the hydrogen production postulated by 10 CFR 50.44(d) and RG 1.7. Hydrogen combustion sequences that could lead to early containment failure typically involve up to 75 percent core metal-water reaction. Hydrogen combustion sequences that could lead to late containment failure involve additional sources of hydrogen due to the interaction of corium and the concrete basemat after vessel breach. Although the recombiners are effective in maintaining the RG 1.7 hydrogen concentration below the lower flammability limit of 4 volume percent, they are overwhelmed by the larger quantities of hydrogen associated with severe accidents that would typically be released over a much shorter time period (*e.g.*, 2 hours). However, NUREG/CR–4551 states that hydrogen combustion in the period before containment failure is considered to present no threat to large, dry containments. Table A.4–5 of NUREG/CR–4551 shows that the contribution of hydrogen combustion to late containment failure is also very small. Therefore, the relative importance of hydrogen combustion for large, dry containments with respect to containment failure has been shown to be quite low.

The recombiners can, however, prevent a subsequent hydrogen burn if needed due to radiolytic decomposition of water and corrosion in the long term. Analysis performed in accordance with the methodology of RG 1.7 shows that the hydrogen concentration will not reach 4 volume percent for 15 days after

initiation of a design basis Loss of Coolant Accident (LOCA). Additionally, as described in the attached safety evaluation, hydrogen concentrations on the order of 6 percent or less are bounded by hydrogen generated during a severe accident and would not be a threat to containment integrity since there is ample time between burns to reduce elevated containment temperatures using the installed containment heat removal systems. The ONS Individual Plant Examination (IPE) concluded that containment survival is almost certain following hydrogen combustion when the Reactor Building Cooling Units and the Reactor Building Spray System are operating.

The underlying purpose of 10 CFR 50.44 is to show that, following a LOCA, an uncontrolled hydrogen-oxygen recombination would not take place, or that the plant could withstand the consequences of uncontrolled hydrogen-oxygen recombination without loss of safety function. Based on the analysis, which includes the staff's evaluation of the risk from hydrogen combustion, resolution of Generic Issue 121, "Hydrogen Control for PWR Dry Containments," and the ONS IPE, the plant could withstand the consequences of uncontrolled hydrogen-oxygen recombination without loss of safety function without credit for the hydrogen recombiners for not only the design basis case, but the more limiting severe accident with up to 100 percent metal-water reaction. Therefore, the requirements for hydrogen recombiners as part of the ONS design basis are unnecessary and their removal from the design basis is justified. Additionally, elimination of the hydrogen recombiners from the Emergency Operating Instructions would simplify operator actions in the event of an accident and, therefore, would be a safety benefit. Consequently, pursuant to 10 CFR 50.12(a)(2)(ii), application of the regulation is not necessary to achieve the underlying purpose of the rule.

In the submittal, the licensee also requested an exemption from the functional requirement for hydrogen monitoring as promulgated in part 50, Appendix E, Section VI, "Emergency Response Data System (ERDS)," or any commitments made in regard to NUREG–0737, Item II.F.1, Attachment 6, "Containment Hydrogen Monitor." In the Statement of Considerations for Appendix E to part 50, the Commission stated that the ERDS data (which includes the continuous hydrogen monitors) provides the data required by the NRC to perform its role during an emergency. This conclusion is still valid