Agenda: Open session: April 22, 1998, 10:30 a.m. to 11:30 a.m.—discussion on research trends, opportunities and assessment procedures in Integrative Plant Biology.

Closed session: April 20, 1998, 8:30 a.m.–6:00 p.m., April 21, 1998, 8:30 a.m.–6:00 p.m., April 22, 1998, 8:30 a.m. to 10:30 a.m. and 11:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. To review and evaluate Integrative Plant Biology proposals as part of the selection process for awards.

Reason for closing: The proposals 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: March 30, 1998.

M. Rebecca Winkler,

Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 98–8626 Filed 4–1–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555–01–M

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Advisory Committee for Polar Programs; 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: Advisory Committee for Polar Programs, (1130).

Date and time: April 23, 1998, 9:00 am–5:30 pm; April 24, 1998, 9:00 am–4:00 pm.

Place: Room 1295.

Type of meeting: Open.

Contact person: Mr. Darren Dutterer, Room 755, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, VA 22230. Telephone: (703) 306–1030. For easier building access, individuals planning to attend should contact Dr. Dutterer by April 20 so that your name can be added to the building access list.

Minutes: May be obtained from the contact person listed above.

Purpose of meeting: Serves to provide expert advice to the Office of Polar Programs, including advise on science programs, polar operations support, budgetary planning and polar coordination and information.

Agenda: The OPP Advisory Committee will meet to discuss the following agenda topics—External Panel Recommendations and Responses, GPRA Performance Evaluation, Foundation-wide Arctic Activities and Plans, Long Range Planning, Future Science Directions, and Education and Outreach.

Dated: March 30, 1998.

M. Rebecca Winkler,

Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 98–8633 Filed 4–1–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555–01–M

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Advisory Panel for Social and Political Science; Notice of Meetings

In accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92–463, and amended), the National Science Foundation announces the following meetings:

Name: Advisory Panel for Social and Political Science (#1761).

Date and time: April 20–21, 1998; 9 a.m. to 5 p.m.

Place: National Science Foundation; 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Room 970; Arlington, VA 22230.

Contact person: Dr. Frank Scioli and Dr. Rick Wilson, Program Directors for Political Science, National Science Foundation. 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, VA 22230. Telephone: (703) 306–1761.

Agenda: To review and evaluate the political science proposals as part of the selection process for awards.

Date and time: April 30–May 1, 1998; 9 a.m. to 5 p.m.

Place: National Science Foundation, Stafford Place, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Room 920, Arlington, VA 22230.

Contact person: Dr. Harmon Hosch, Program Director, Law and Social Science, National Science Foundation. Telephone (703) 306–1762.

Agenda: To review and evaluate the Law and Social Science Proposals as a part of the selection process for awards.

Date and time: May 7–8, 1998, 9 a.m. to 5 p.m.

Place: National Science Foundation, Stafford Place, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Room 370, Arlington, VA 22230.

Contact person: Dr. Barry Markovsky and Dr. William S. Bainbridge, National Science Foundation, Telephone (703) 306–1756.

Agenda: To review and evaluate the Sociology proposals as a part of the selection process for awards.

Type of meeting: Closed.

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

Reason for closing: The proposals 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) of the Government in the Sunshine Act.

Dated: March 30, 1998.

M. Rebecca Winkler,

Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 98–8639 Filed 4–1–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555–01–M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50–445 AND 50–446]

Texas Utilities Electric; Correction to Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating License, Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity for a Hearing

On March 27, 1998, the **Federal Register** published a Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating License, Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity for a Hearing. On page 14975, under Texas Utilities Electric Company, Docket Nos. 50–445 and 50–446, first column, second paragraph, ''By April 13, 1998, the licensee may file a request for hearing * * *'' correct to read ''By April 27, 1998, the licensee may file a request for hearing * * *''.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 27th day of March 1998.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Timothy J. Polich,

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

[FR Doc. 98–8676 Filed 4–1–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50–445 and 50–446]

Texas Utilities Electric; 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 Nos. NPF–87 and NPF–89, issued to Texas Utilities Electric Company, (TU Electric, the licensee), for operation of the Comanche Peak Steam Electric Station, Units 1 and 2, located in Somervell County, Texas.

The proposed amendment would allow on a one time basis, crediting performance of Surveillance Requirements (SR) 4.8.1.1.2f.4(a) and 4.8.1.1.2f.6(a), during POWER OPERATIONS as opposed to ''during shutdown''. Note that the bus tie breaker for MCC XEB4–3 for Unit 2 was not tested during the last surveillance test and was the subject of previous enforcement discretion dated February 24, 1998, and License Amendment

Request 98–002. The failure to perform the surveillance was promptly reported to the NRC at the time of discovery and prompt action to remedy the situation was taken.

The licensee requested a Notice of Enforcement Discretion (NOED) by letter dated March 13, 1998. The NRC orally issued the NOED at 3:10 pm EST on March 13, 1998. Pursuant to the NRC's policy regarding exercise of discretion for an operating facility, set out in Section VII.c, of the ''General Statement of Policy and Procedures for NRC Enforcement Actions'' (Enforcement Policy), NUREG–1600, the letter documenting the issuance of the NOED was dated March 17, 1998. The NOED was to be effective for the period of time it takes the NRC staff to process the proposed change to the TSs on an exigent bases.

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.

Pursuant to 10 CFR 50.91(a)(6) for amendments to be granted under exigent circumstances, the NRC staff must determine 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. Do the proposed changes involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated?

Crediting the at power performance of the portions of surveillance testing necessary to demonstrate the OPERABILITY of the undervoltage relays, will not increase the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated. The conclusion has been reached that the probability of initiating an abnormal perturbation in the A.C. electrical distribution system is not created via the crediting of the tests. As the testing was conducted on only one train per unit at a given time, no increase in consequences, other than those previously postulated, are considered credible.

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

Perturbations in the A.C. electrical distribution system have been fully considered within the Final Safety Analysis Report. No new or different kind of perturbation or accident is deemed credible from crediting the performance of the testing.

3. Do the proposed changes involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety?

Crediting the required testing at power does not create any new failure scenarios or abnormal A.C. electrical distribution perturbations. As such, there is no reduction in any 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 14 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 14-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 14-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. 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 and Directives Branch, Division of Administrative 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 6D59, 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 May 4, 1998, 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 Texas at Arlington Library, Government Publications/Maps, 702 College, P.O. Box 19497, Arlington, TX 76019. 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 a 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 the amendment is issued before the expiration of the 30-day hearing period, the Commission will make a final determination on the issue of no significant hazards consideration. If a hearing is requested, 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, 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 George L. Edgar, Esq., Morgan, Lewis and Bockius, 1800 M Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20036, 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 March 18, 1998, 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 Texas at Arlington Library, Government Publications/ Maps, 702 College, P.O. Box 19497, Arlington, TX 76019

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 30th day of March, 1998.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Timothy J. Polich,

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

[FR Doc. 98–8677 Filed 4–1–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50–397]

In the Matter of Washington Public Power Supply System; Nuclear Project No. 2; Confirmatory Order Modifying License

Effective date: March 25, 1998.

I

Washington Public Power Supply System, WPPSS, (WPPSS or the Licensee) is the holder of Facility Operating License No. NPF–21, which authorizes operation of Nuclear Project No. 2 (WNP–2) located in Richland, Washington, at steady state reactor core power levels not in excess of 3485 megawatts thermal (rated power).

II

The staff of the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) has been concerned that Thermo-Lag 330–1 fire barrier systems installed by licensees may not provide the level of fire endurance intended and that licensees that use Thermo-Lag 330–1 fire barriers may not be meeting regulatory requirements. During the 1992 to 1994 time frame, the NRC staff issued Generic Letter (GL) 92–08, ''Thermo-Lag 330–1 Fire Barriers'' and subsequent requests for additional information that requested licensees to submit plans and schedules for resolving the Thermo-Lag issue. The NRC staff has obtained and reviewed all licensees' corrective plans and schedules. The staff is concerned that some licensees may not be making adequate progress toward resolving the plant-specific issues, and that some implementation schedules may be either too tenuous or too protracted. For example, several licensees informed the NRC staff that their completion dates had slipped by 6 months to as much as 3 years. For plants that have completion action scheduled beyond 1997, the NRC staff has met with these licensees to discuss the progress of the licensees' corrective actions and the extent of licensee management attention regarding completion of Thermo-Lag corrective actions. In addition, the NRC staff discussed with licensees the possibility of accelerating their completion schedules.

WPPSS was one of the licensees with which the NRC staff held meetings. At these meetings, the NRC staff reviewed with WPPSS the schedule of Thermo-Lag corrective actions described in the WPPSS submittals to the NRC dated April 13, 1993, February 11, 1994, November 9, 1994, April 27, 1995, and September 26, 1997. Based on the information submitted by WPPSS and provided during the meetings, the NRC staff has concluded that the schedules presented by WPPSS are reasonable. This conclusion is based on the (1) amount of installed Thermo-Lag; (2) the complexity of the plant-specific fire barrier configurations and issues; (3) the need to perform certain plant modifications during outages as opposed to those that can be performed while the plant is at power; and (4) integration with other significant, but unrelated issues that WPPSS is addressing at its plant. In order to remove compensatory measures such as