

national experts. The second goal is to assess impacts of the GRFP on graduate school experiences through a follow-up study of GRFP award recipients and other applicants. The third goal is to assess impacts of the GRFP on career and professional outcomes through analysis of GRFP participants and comparable national populations. The fourth goal is to assess the benefits of the GRFP on institutions that enroll GRFP Fellows. The evaluation is designed to address research questions that explore the influences of the GRFP on the following broad sets of variables:

- Educational decisions, experiences, and graduate degree attainment of STEM graduate students.
- Career preparation and aspirations.
- Career activities, progress, and job characteristics following graduate school.
- Professional productivity.
- Workforce participation and career outcomes.
- Graduate school institutions and student recruitment at GRFP-sponsoring institutions.
- Faculty attitudes at GRFP-sponsoring institutions.
- Diversity of students participating in STEM fields at GRFP-sponsoring institutions.

This survey would address two separate components of the planned GRFP evaluation. First, this component will assess the influence of GRFP awards on recipients' graduate school experience and outcomes, which includes program of study and institution attended, professional productivity (*e.g.*, publishes papers, conference presentations, etc.) during graduate schools and career aspirations. Second, the survey will evaluate the impact of participation in the in the GRFP on subsequent career options, progress and contributions to respondents' professional fields. This will be conducted as a web-based survey.

Estimate of Burden: Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 30 minutes for current graduate students and 40 minutes per graduates.

Respondents: Individuals.

Estimated Number of Responses per Form: 2,826 graduate students; 6,429 graduates.

Estimated Total Annual Burden on Respondents: 5,699 hours (2,826 graduate student respondents at 30 minutes per response = 1,413 hours + 6,429 graduate respondents at 40 minutes per response = 4,286 hours).

Frequency of Response: One time.

Comments: Comments are invited on (a) whether the proposed collection of

information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the NSF, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the NSF'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; (d) ways to 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.

Dated: June 22, 2010.

Suzanne H. Plimpton,

Reports Clearance Officer, National Science Foundation.

[FR Doc. 2010-15569 Filed 6-25-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555-01-P

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Committee Management Renewals

The NSF management officials having responsibility for the advisory committees listed below have determined that renewing these groups for another two years is necessary and in the public interest in connection with the performance of duties imposed upon the Director, National Science Foundation (NSF), by 42 U.S.C. 1861 *et seq.* This determination follows consultation with the Committee Management Secretariat, General Services Administration.

Committees

- Committee on Equal Opportunities in Science and Engineering, 1173
- Advisory Committee for Computer and Information Science and Engineering, 1115
- Advisory Committee for GPRA Performance Assessment, 13853
- Advisory Committee for Mathematical and Physical Sciences, 66
- Advisory Committee for Social, Behavioral, and Economic Sciences, 1171
- Business and Operations Advisory Committee, 9556
- Proposal Review Panel for Astronomical Sciences, 1186
- Proposal Review Panel for Chemical, Bioengineering, Environmental, and Transport Systems, 1189
- Proposal Review Panel for Chemistry, 1191

- Proposal Review Panel for Civil, Mechanical, and Manufacturing Innovation, 1194
 - Proposal Review Panel for Computer and Network Systems, 1207
 - Proposal Review Panel for Computing & Communication Foundations, 1192
 - Proposal Review Panel for Cyberinfrastructure, 1185
 - Proposal Review Panel for Electrical Communications and Cyber Systems, 1196
 - Proposal Review Panel for Engineering Education and Centers, 173
 - Proposal Review Panel for Experimental Programs to Stimulate Competitive Research, 1198
 - Proposal Review Panel for Graduate Education, 57
 - Proposal Review Panel for Human Resource Development, 1199
 - Proposal Review Panel for Information and Intelligent Systems, 1200
 - Proposal Review Panel for Materials Research, 1203
 - Proposal Review Panel for Mathematical Sciences, 1204
 - Proposal Review Panel for Physics, 1208
 - Proposal Review Panel for Polar Programs, 1209
 - Proposal Review Panel for Undergraduate Education, 1214
- Effective date for renewal is July 1, 2010. For more information, please contact Susanne Bolton, NSF, at (703) 292-7488.

Dated: June 23, 2010.

Susanne Bolton,

Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 2010-15565 Filed 6-25-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[NRC-2010-0229]

Draft Regulatory Guide: Issuance, Availability

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Notice of Issuance and Availability of Draft Regulatory Guide, DG-1216, "Plant-Specific Applicability of Transition Break Size Specified in 10 CFR 50.46a."

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Robert L. Tregoning, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, telephone: (301) 251-7662, e-mail Robert.Tregoning@nrc.gov, or, Richard Jervey, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, telephone: (301) 251-7404, e-mail Richard.Jervey@nrc.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**I. Introduction**

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is issuing for public comment a draft guide in the agency's "Regulatory Guide" series. This series was developed to describe and make available to the public such information as methods that are acceptable to the NRC staff for implementing specific parts of the NRC's regulations, techniques that the staff uses in evaluating specific problems or postulated accidents, and data that the staff needs in its review of applications for permits and licenses.

The draft regulatory guide (DG), entitled "Plant-Specific Applicability of Transition Break Size Specified in 10 CFR 50.46a," is temporarily identified by its task number, DG-1216, which should be mentioned in all related correspondence. DG-1216 is a proposed new regulatory guide written to support implementation of proposed rulemaking setting forth an alternate approach for evaluating the performance of an emergency core cooling system (ECCS). The proposed rule, 10 CFR 50.46a, "Risk-Informed Changes to Loss-of-Coolant Accident Technical Requirements," was published in the **Federal Register** on August 10, 2009, (74 FR 40006). The NRC regulatory framework for nuclear power plants consists of a number of regulations and supporting guidelines, including, but not limited to, General Design Criterion (GDC) 35, "Acceptance Criteria for Emergency Core Cooling Systems for Light-Water Nuclear Power Reactors," as set forth in Appendix A, "General Design Criteria for Nuclear Power Plants," to 10 CFR part 50, "Domestic Licensing of Production and Utilization Facilities" and 10 CFR 50.46a. GDC 35 states, in part, that the licensee must calculate ECCS cooling performance in accordance with an acceptable evaluation model. Furthermore, the licensee must calculate ECCS cooling performance for a number of postulated loss-of-coolant accidents (LOCAs) of different sizes, locations, and other properties sufficient to provide assurance that the evaluation considered the most severe postulated LOCAs. The proposed 10 CFR 50.46a would provide an alternative to the existing, conservatively-set deterministic requirements for evaluating the performance of ECCS systems.

Section 50.46a would contain alternative requirements for ECCS at nuclear power reactors established by using risk information based on the likelihood of pipe breaks of different

sizes. The rule would divide all coolant piping breaks currently considered in emergency core cooling requirements into two size groups: breaks up to and including a "transition break size," and breaks larger than the transition size up to the largest pipe in the reactor coolant system. Selection of the transition size was based upon pipe break frequency estimates, the associated uncertainties, and the need to provide regulatory stability to guard against changes resulting from any future increases in the LOCA frequency estimates. Because pipe breaks smaller than the transition break size are considered more likely they would be analyzed using existing criteria for ensuring the reactor core stays cool during and after an accident. Larger breaks are considered less likely and would be analyzed with less conservative methods, but plants would still have to mitigate the effects of failure of the largest pipe and maintain core cooling. After the final rule is issued, power plant operators could make plant design changes that could enhance safety and/or provide operational benefits. The rule also specifies risk acceptance criteria to ensure that modified designs would continue to provide adequate protection of public health and safety.

This draft guide describes a method that the staff of the NRC considers acceptable for demonstrating that the generic transition break size (TBS) specified in the proposed 10 CFR 50.46a is applicable to a specific plant. The proposed rule would require a licensee to conduct the evaluation described herein either before, or as part of, the initial application to modify a nuclear power plant under the proposed rule. The proposed rule would also require a more limited evaluation to demonstrate the continued applicability of the TBS after each subsequent plant modification. The entire evaluation is greatly simplified for plants that the NRC has approved for license renewal. The evaluation is also simplified for plants that the NRC has approved for leak before break (LBB) or that have applied for license renewal.

This guide only applies to light-water reactor designs that have received a construction permit or operating license prior to January 1, 2000. This guide does not apply to new light-water (*i.e.*, evolutionary and passive) or to non-light water (*i.e.*, high temperature gas or liquid metal) reactor designs. Supplemental guidance for applying 10 CFR 50.46a to these reactor designs will be developed at a later date as needed.

The NRC staff is currently soliciting feedback on whether a pilot program should be conducted to demonstrate the

use of this draft guide. Information gained from a pilot program would be used in the development of the final regulatory guide and the final 10 CFR 50.46a rule. The NRC staff is also seeking one or more pilot plants to participate in such a program. One or more public meetings may be arranged to discuss a possible pilot program and support public input to the guidance development process. Comments related to the need for, or suggestions for, pilot plants are encouraged at this time.

II. Further Information

The NRC staff is soliciting comments on DG-1216. Comments may be accompanied by relevant information or supporting data and should mention DG-1216 in the subject line. Comments submitted in writing or in electronic form will be made available to the public in their entirety through the NRC's Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS).

Because your comments will not be edited to remove any identifying or contact information, the NRC cautions you against including any information in your submission that you do not want to be publicly disclosed.

The NRC requests that any party soliciting or aggregating comments received from other persons for submission to the NRC inform those persons that the NRC will not edit their comments to remove any identifying or contact information, and therefore, they should not include any information in their comments that they do not want publicly disclosed. You may submit comments by any of the following methods:

1. *Mail comments to:* Rules, Announcements, and Directives Branch Mail Stop: TWB-05-B01M, Office of Administration, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001.

2. *Federal e-Rulemaking Portal:* Go to <http://www.regulations.gov> and search for documents filed under Docket ID [NRC-2010-0229] Address questions about NRC dockets to Carol Gallagher, 301-492-3668; e-mail Carol.Gallagher@nrc.gov.

3. *Fax comments to:* Rules, Announcements, and Directives Branch, Office of Administration, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission at (301) 492-3446.

Comments would be most helpful if received by August 25, 2010. Comments received after that date will be considered if it is practical to do so, but the NRC is able to ensure consideration only for comments received on or before this date. Although a time limit is given, comments and suggestions in

connection with items for inclusion in guides currently being developed or improvements in all published guides are encouraged at any time. Requests for technical information about DG-1216 may be directed to the NRC contact: Robert L. Tregoning, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, telephone: (301) 251-7662, e-mail Robert.Tregoning@nrc.gov, or, Richard Jervey, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, telephone: (301) 251-7404, e-mail Richard.Jervej@nrc.gov.

Electronic copies of DG-1216 are available through the NRC's public Web site under Draft Regulatory Guides in the "Regulatory Guides" collection of the NRC's Electronic Reading Room at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/doc-collections/>. Electronic copies are also available in ADAMS (<http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html>), under Accession No. ML100430356. The regulatory analysis may be found in ADAMS under Accession No. ML101530472.

In addition, regulatory guides are available for inspection at the NRC's Public Document Room (PDR) located at 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland. The PDR's mailing address is USNRC PDR, Washington, DC 20555-0001. The PDR can also be reached by telephone at (301) 415-4737 or (800) 397-4205, by fax at (301) 415-3548, and by e-mail to pdr.resource@nrc.gov.

Regulatory guides are not copyrighted, and Commission approval is not required to reproduce them.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, June 17, 2010.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Andrea D. Valentin,

Chief, Regulatory Guide Development Branch, Division of Engineering, Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research.

[FR Doc. 2010-15629 Filed 6-25-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-289; NRC-2010-0221]

Exelon Generation Company, LLC; Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit 1; Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is considering issuance of an exemption from Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations (10 CFR) part 50, Appendix R, Section III.G, "Fire Protection of Safe Shutdown Capability," for the use of an operator manual action in lieu of the

requirements specified in Appendix R, Section III.G.2, for Renewed Facility Operating License No. DPR-50, issued to Exelon Generation Company, LLC (the licensee), for operation of Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit 1 (TMI-1), located in Dauphin County, Pennsylvania. Therefore, as required by 10 CFR 51.21, the NRC performed an environmental assessment. Based on the results of the environmental assessment, the NRC is issuing a finding of no significant impact.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed action would grant an exemption to the requirements of 10 CFR part 50, appendix R, section III.G.2, based on an operator manual action contained in the licensee's Fire Hazards Analysis Report (FHAR), which is part of the TMI-1 Updated Final Safety Analysis Report. The licensee's FHAR requires that the identified operator manual action be performed outside of the control room to achieve safe shutdown following a fire in Fire Zone AB-FZ-6 (Deminerizer and "A" Motor Control Center Area). The licensee states that the manual action was subjected to a manual action feasibility review for TMI-1 that determined that the manual action is feasible and can be reliably performed.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application dated March 3, 2009, as supplemented by letter dated March 15, 2010 (Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS) Accession Nos. ML090630134 and ML100750093, respectively).

The Need for the Proposed Action

The proposed exemption modifies an existing exemption which was granted by letter dated December 30, 1986 (ADAMS Accession No. 8701090216). The proposed modified exemption involves an operator manual action to open the supply breaker for the motor control center which powers valve MU-V-36, and then locally ensure that MU-V-36 is open. The proposed exemption specifies a reduced (40 minute) time frame to perform these actions as compared to one hour in the original exemption. The reduced timeframe is being specified because recent plant testing has shown that the backup air supply to seal injection valve MU-V-20 would only allow the valve to stay open for approximately 75 minutes under the postulated conditions. With MU-V-20 closed, ensuring that valve MU-V-36 is open provides a minimum recirculation flow path for the makeup pumps. By

maintaining a minimum recirculation flow path, the makeup pumps will not be susceptible to pump damage from operation in a "deadheaded" condition. The recent test results on MU-V-20 necessitate a time reduction for the specified operator manual action to maintain sufficient time margin in order to prevent potential operation of the makeup pumps in a "deadheaded" condition.

The proposed exemption is necessary because the crediting of operator manual actions to achieve and maintain hot shutdown is not addressed in 10 CFR part 50 appendix R, section III.G.2, and an exemption is therefore required in accordance with 10 CFR 50.12.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The NRC has completed its evaluation for the proposed action and concludes that the operator manual action addressed in the application is feasible and can be reliably performed. Further, the NRC concludes that there is sufficient defense-in-depth within the fire protection program to ensure that a redundant train necessary to achieve and maintain safe shutdown of the plant will remain free of fire damage in the event of a fire in the postulated area.

The details of the staff's safety evaluation will be provided in the exemption that will be issued as part of the letter to the licensee approving the exemption to 10 CFR part 50, appendix R, section III.G.2.

As described in the staff's safety evaluation that will be provided to the licensee with the exemption, the proposed action will not significantly increase the probability or consequences of accidents. Since the change being evaluated in this assessment involves only a change to the time allotted to accomplish a previously approved operator manual action, no changes are being made in the types of effluents that may be released off-site. Likewise, there is no significant increase in the amount of any effluent released off-site because the time change has no impact on any effluent release path or duration. There is no significant increase in occupational radiation exposure because, as described in the staff's safety evaluation, the areas of consideration for the operator manual action are expected to have dose rates of less than 10 millirem per hour. Since there is no impact to any radiological effluents or in-plant dose rates from the operator manual action time change, there is no impact to public radiation exposure. Therefore, there are no significant radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.