NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

National Council on the Humanities; Meeting

November 4, 1998.

Pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92–463, as amended) notice is hereby given the National Council on the Humanities will meet in Washington, D.C. on November 19–20, 1998.

The purpose of the meeting is to advise the Chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities with respect to policies, programs, and procedures for carrying out his functions, and to review applications for financial support and gifts offered to the Endowment and to make recommendations thereon to the Chairman.

The meeting will be held in the Old Post Office Building, 1100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. A portion of the morning and afternoon sessions on November 19–20, 1998, will not be open to the public pursuant to subsections (c) (4), (6) and (9)(B) of section 552b of Title 5, United States Code, because the Council will consider information that may disclose: trade secrets and commercial or financial information obtained from a person and privileged or confidential; information of a personal nature and disclosure of which will constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy; and information the disclosure of which would significantly frustrate implementation of proposed agency action. I have made this determination under the authority granted me by the Chairman's Delegation of Authority dated July 19, 1993.

The agenda for the session on November 19, 1998 will be as follows:

Committee Meetings

9:00–10:30 a.m.—(Open to the Public) Policy Discussion
Public Programs—Room 420
Preservation and Access/Challenge Grants combined meeting with Federal/State Partnership—Room 527
9:00 a.m.–10:30 a.m.—(Closed to the Public) Discussion of specific grant applications and programs before the Council
Research/Education programs—Room M07
10:30 a.m. until Adjourned—(Open to the Public) Policy Discussion
Research/Education Programs—Room M07
Federal/State Partnership—Room 507
10:30 a.m. until Adjourned—(Closed to the Public) Discussion of specific grant applications and programs before the Council
Public Programs—Room 420
Preservation and Access/Challenge Grants—Room 415
12:30–1:30 p.m.
Jefferson Lecture Committee Meeting—Room 430

The morning session on November 20, 1998 will convene at 8:00 a.m., in the 1st Floor Council Room, M–09, and will be open to the public, as set out below. The agenda for the morning session will be as follows:

Minutes of the Previous Meeting

Reports

A. Introductory Remarks
B. New Directives in Television through Digital Technology
C. Staff Report
D. Reports on Policy & General Matters
1. Overview
2. Research and Education Programs
3. Public Programs
4. Preservation and Access and Challenge Grants
5. Federal/State Partnership
6. Jefferson Lecture

The remainder of the proposed meeting will be given to the consideration of specific applications and closed to the public for the reasons stated above.

Further information about this meeting can be obtained from Ms. Nancy E. Weiss, Advisory Committee Management Officer, Washington, D.C. 20506, or call area code (202) 606–8322, TDD (202) 606–8282. Advance notice of any special needs or accommodations is appreciated.

Nancy E. Weiss,

Advisory Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 98–29934 Filed 11–6–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7536–01–M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50–361 and 50–362]

Southern California Edison Company; Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendments to Facility Operating Licenses, Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity for a Hearing

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of amendments to Facility Operating License Nos. NPF–10 and NPF–15 issued to Southern California Edison Company (the licensee) for operation of the San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station, Unit Nos. 2 and 3 located in San Diego County, California.

The proposed amendments would revise the turbine missile protection calculation methodology in the San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station, Unit Nos. 2 and 3 (SONGS) licensing basis.

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. The proposed change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

This change is in support of a planned replacement of the existing shrunk-on disc turbines with welded-rotor turbines for Units 2 and 3. The new design is believed to be superior to the existing design in terms of the probability of generation of missiles. However, because a new missile strike-and-damage analysis has not been performed, and due to differences in the method of calculation of missile generation probability—for instance, inclusion of stress corrosion cracking as a potential failure mechanism—it is difficult to quantify the change in probability of damage to safety-related equipment due to turbine missile strikes.

However, in order to characterize the effect of the proposed change, a comparison can be made using the current turbine missile methodology for the current design and the proposed methodology for the proposed design. Using the methodology currently approved for San Onofre Units 2 and 3 for the current shrunk-on disc rotor design, the overall probability of damage to safety-related systems, structures, and components is 0.9×10^{-7}.

Using the methodology proposed by this change for the new welded rotor design, the overall probability of damage to safety-related systems, structures, and components is calculated to be 1.7×10^{-8} per year.

Ultimately, the proposed change is acceptable because the overall probability of damage to safety-related systems, structures, and components will be less than or equal to the acceptance criteria of 1×10^{-7} per year stated in Regulatory Guide (RG) 1.115. The difference between the calculated value of 1.7×10^{-8} and the acceptance criteria of 1×10^{-7} is considered margin that is available to account for any future changes to the turbine missile generation analysis.

Therefore, this change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. The proposed change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

Damage to safety-related systems, structures, and components from turbine missiles is currently evaluated in Section 3.5.1.3 of the Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (UFSAR). This proposed change merely provides an alternative method to demonstrate that the overall probability of damage to safety-related systems, structures, and components from turbine missiles will remain less than or equal to the acceptance criterion of 1×10^{-7} per year, which is the current acceptance criterion.

Therefore, this proposed change will not create a new or different kind of accident from any accident that has been previously evaluated.

3. The proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

There is no change to the method of operation of the turbine for Units 2 and 3 as a result of this change. Turbine overspeed protection is unaffected, and provides assurance that the turbine will operate within design limits.

Therefore, there will be no significant reduction in a margin of safety as a result of this change.

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 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 December 9, 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 Main Library, University of California, Irvine, California 92713. 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 Douglas K. Porter, Esquire, Southern California Edison Company, P.O. Box 800, Rosemead, California 91770, 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 June 12, 1998, as supplemented by letter dated October 29, 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 Main Library, University of California, Irvine, California 92713.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 3rd day of November 1998.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

James W. Clifford,

Senior Project Manager, Project Directorate IV–2, Division of Reactor Projects III/IV, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 98–29919 Filed 11–6–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50–498 and 50–499]

STP Nuclear Operating Company (South Texas Project Electric Generating Stations Units 1 and 2); Exemption

I

STP Nuclear Operating Company (the licensee) is the holder of Facility Operating License Nos. NPF–76 and NPF–80, for the South Texas Project, Units 1 and 2 (STP). The licenses provide, among other things, that the licensee is subject to all rules, regulations, and orders of the Commission now or hereafter in effect.

The facility consists of two pressurized water reactors located in Matagorda County, Texas.

II

Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR), Section 50.71 ''Maintenance of records, making of reports,'' paragraph (e)(4) states, in part, that ''Subsequent revisions [to the Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (UFSAR)] must be filed annually or 6 months after each refueling outage provided the interval between successive updates to the FSAR does not exceed 24 months.'' The STP two-unit site shares a common UFSAR; therefore, this rule requires the licensee to update the same document annually or within 6 months after a refueling outage for either unit.

III

Section 50.12(a) of 10 CFR, ''Specific exemptions,'' states that

> The Commission may, upon application by any interested person or upon its own initiative, grant exemptions from the requirements of the regulations of this part, which are:
>
> (1) Authorized by law, will not present an undue risk to the public health and safety, and are consistent with the common defense and security.
>
> (2) The Commission will not consider granting an exemption unless special circumstances are present.

Section 50.12(a)(2)(ii) of 10 CFR states that special circumstances are present when ''Application of the regulation in the particular circumstances would not serve the underlying purpose of the rule or is not necessary to achieve the underlying purpose of the rule. . . .'' The underlying purpose of the rule was to relieve licensees of the burden of filing annual FSAR revisions while assuring that such revisions are made at least every 24 months. The Commission reduced the burden, in part, by permitting a licensee to submit its FSAR revisions 6 months after refueling outages for its facility, but did not provide for multiple unit facilities sharing a common FSAR in the rule. Rather, the Commission stated that ''With respect to . . . multiple facilities sharing a common FSAR, licensees will have maximum flexibility for scheduling updates on a case-by-case basis'' (57 FR 39355 (1992)).

As noted in the staff's Safety Evaluation, the licensee's proposed schedule for UFSAR updates will ensure that the STP UFSAR and Operations Quality Assurance Plan will be maintained current within 24 months of the last revision and the interval for submission of the 10 CFR 50.59 design change report will not exceed 24 months. The proposed schedule fits within the 24-month duration specified by 10 CFR 50.71(e)(4). Revising the FSAR annually or 6 months after refueling outages for each unit, therefore, is not necessary to achieve the underlying purpose of the rule. Accordingly, the Commission has determined that special circumstances are present as defined in 10 CFR 50.12(a)(2)(ii). The Commission has further determined that, pursuant to 10 CFR 50.12, the exemption is authorized by law, will not present an undue risk to the public health and safety and is consistent with the common defense and security, and is otherwise in the public interest. The Commission hereby grants the licensee an exemption from the requirement of 10 CFR 50.71(e)(4) to submit updates to the STP UFSARs within 6 months of each unit's refueling outage. The licensee will be required to submit updates to the STP UFSAR, the Operations Quality Assurance Plan, and the 10 CFR 50.59 safety evaluation summary reports to the NRC no later than 24 calendar months from the previous revision.

Pursuant to 10 CFR 51.32, the Commission has determined that granting of this exemption will have no significant effect on the quality of the human environment (63 FR 57144).

This exemption is effective upon issuance.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 2nd day of November 1998.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Samuel J. Collins,

Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 98–29920 Filed 11–6–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET

Agency Information Collection Under Review by the Office of Management and Budget

AGENCY: Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President.

ACTION: Notice of submission for OMB review; comment request.

SUMMARY: The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has submitted the information collections listed at the end of this notice to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs (OIRA), OMB for review under