NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Special Emphasis Panel in Mathematical Sciences; 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 and Committee Code: Special Emphasis in Mathematical Sciences (1204).

Date and Time: February 4–6, 1999; 8:30 a.m. until 5:00 p.m.

Place: Room 360, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, VA 22230.

Type of Meeting: Closed.

Contact Person: Dr. Alvin Thaler, Program Director, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, VA 22230. Telephone: (703) 306–1880.

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

Agenda: To review and evaluate proposals concerning the Algebra and Number Theory Program, 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: January 11, 1999.

Linda Allen-Benton,

Acting Director, Division of Human Resource Management.

[FR Doc. 99–863 Filed 1–13–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555–01–M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50–336]

Northeast Nuclear Energy Company, et al., 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–65 issued to Northeast Nuclear Energy Company, et al. (the licensee, or NNECO), for operation of the Millstone Nuclear Power Station, Unit No. 2, located in Waterford, Connecticut.

The proposed amendment would change Technical Specifications (TSs) 3.5.2, ''Emergency Core Cooling Systems—ECCS Subsystems—Tavg [greater than or equal to] 300 [degrees Fahrenheit];'' 3.6.2.1, ''Containment Systems—Depressurization and Cooling Systems—Containment Spray and Cooling Systems;'' 3.7.1.2, ''Plant Systems—Auxiliary Feedwater Pumps;'' 3.7.3.1, ''Plant Systems—Reactor Building Closed Cooling Water System;'' and 3.7.4.1, ''Plant Systems—Service Water System.'' Changes to the acceptance criteria contained in these TSs are necessary based on revised hydraulic analyses and related accident analyses. Also, the bases of the associated TSs will be modified to address the proposed changes.

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:

In accordance with 10CFR50.92, NNECO has reviewed the proposed changes and has concluded that they do not involve a significant hazards consideration (SHC). The basis for this conclusion is that the three criteria of 10CFR50.92(c) are not compromised. The proposed changes do not involve an SHC because the changes would not:

1. Involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The proposed changes to the acceptance criteria of the Technical Specification surveillance requirements for various Engineered Safety Features (ESF) pumps are consistent with the hydraulic and accident analyses. The revised acceptance criteria will ensure that pump degradation, which could adversely impact the accident analyses, will be detected.

The proposed changes to the Technical Specification surveillance requirements and associated Bases will have no adverse effect on plant operation or accident mitigation equipment. The proposed changes can not cause an accident, and they do not affect pump operation. The pumps will continue to operate as assumed in the analyses to mitigate the design basis accidents. Therefore, there will be no significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. Create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

The proposed changes to the acceptance criteria of the Technical Specification surveillance requirements for various ESF pumps are consistent with the hydraulic and accident analyses. The revised acceptance criteria will ensure that pump degradation, which could adversely impact the accident analyses, will be detected.

The proposed changes to the Technical Specification surveillance requirements and associated Bases will not affect the way the pumps are operated during normal plant operations, or how the pumps will operate after an accident. In addition, ESF pump operation is not an accident initiator. Therefore, the proposed changes will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

3. Involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The proposed changes to the acceptance criteria of the Technical Specification surveillance requirements for various ESF pumps are consistent with the hydraulic and accident analyses. The revised acceptance criteria will ensure that pump degradation, which could adversely impact the accident analyses, will be detected.

The proposed changes to the Technical Specification surveillance requirements and associated Bases will have no adverse effect on equipment important to safety. The equipment will continue to function as assumed in the design basis accident analysis. Therefore, there will be no significant reduction in the margin of safety as defined in the Bases for the Technical Specifications affected by these proposed changes.

The NRC has provided guidance concerning the application of standards in 10CFR50.92 by providing certain examples (March 6, 1986, 51 FR 7751) of amendments that are considered not likely to involve an SHC. The minor change from ''psi'' [pounds per square inch] to ''psid'' [pounds per square inch differential] is enveloped by example (i), a purely administrative change to Technical Specifications. The other changes proposed herein are not enveloped by a specific example.

As described above, this License Amendment Request does not impact the probability of an accident previously evaluated, does not involve a significant increase in the consequences of an accident previously evaluated, does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated, and does not result in a significant reduction in a margin of safety. Therefore, NNECO has concluded that the proposed changes do not involve an SHC.

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 February 16, 1999, 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 Learning Resources Center, Three Rivers Community-Technical College, 574 New London Turnpike, Norwich, Connecticut, or the Waterford Public Library, ATTN: Vince Juliano, 49 Rope Ferry Road, Waterford, Connecticut. 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 Lillian M. Cuoco, Esq., Senior Nuclear Counsel, Northeast Utilities Service Company, P.O. Box 270, Hartford, Connecticut, 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 January 4, 1999, 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 Learning Resources Center, Three Rivers Community-Technical College, 574 New London Turnpike, Norwich, Connecticut, and the Waterford Public Library, ATTN: Vince Juliano, 49 Rope Ferry Road, Waterford, Connecticut.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 8th day of January 1999.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Stephen Dembek,

Project Manager, Project Directorate I–2, Division of Reactor Projects—I/II, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 99–829 Filed 1–13–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50–245]

Northeast Nuclear Energy Company, Millstone Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1; Notice of Public Meeting

The NRC will conduct a public meeting at the Waterford Town Hall, 15 Rope Ferry Road, Waterford, Connecticut, on February 9, 1999, to discuss the NRC program for decommissioning Millstone Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1 (MP1) with interested members of the public. The plant is located at a three-unit site operated by Northeast Nuclear Energy Company (NNECO) near the town of Waterford, Connecticut. (The decommissioning activities are for Unit 1 only. Unit 2 is being prepared to resume power operations, and power operations have resumed for Unit 3.) The meeting is scheduled for 7:00–10:00 p.m., and will be chaired by Mr. Tony Sheridan, First Selectman, Town of Waterford. Although this meeting is not a part of the formal decommissioning process defined by NRC regulations, the NRC staff considers it a beneficial practice to meet with the public in the vicinity of the plant early in the decommissioning process. This meeting is intended to provide a forum for the public to have a dialog with the NRC staff on topics deemed by the public to be important for the NRC to consider during its regulatory activities associated with the MP 1 decommissioning. There will be an opportunity for members of the public to ask questions of NRC staff and NNECO representatives and make comments related to decommissioning MP 1. The meeting will be transcribed.

For more information contact Louis L. Wheeler, Non-Power Reactors and Decommissioning Project Directorate, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001; telephone 301–415–1444.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 7th day of January 1999.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Seymour H. Weiss,

Director, Non-Power Reactors and Decommissioning Project Directorate, Division of Reactor Program Management, Office of Nuclear Regulatory Regulation.

[FR Doc. 99–828 Filed 1–13–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards; Meeting Notice

In accordance with the purposes of sections 29 and 182b. of the Atomic Energy Act (42 U.S.C. 2039, 2232b), the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards will hold a meeting on February 3–6, 1999, in Conference Room T–2B3, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland. The date of this meeting was previously published in the **Federal Register** on Wednesday, November 18, 1998 (63 FR 64105).

Wednesday, February 3, 1999

8:30 A.M.–8:45 A.M.: Opening Remarks by the ACRS Chairman (Open)—The ACRS Chairman will make opening remarks regarding the conduct of the meeting.

8:45 A.M.–10:15 A.M.: Status of the Proposed Final Revision to 10 CFR 50.59 (Changes, tests and experiments) (Open)—The Committee will hear presentations by and hold discussions with representatives of the NRC staff regarding the status of the proposed final revision to 10 CFR 50.59 and related matters.

10:30 A.M.–12:00 Noon: Proposed Improvements to the NRC Inspection and Assessment Programs (Open)—The Committee will hear presentations by and hold discussions with representatives of the NRC staff regarding proposed improvements to the NRC Inspection and Assessment Programs, including initiatives related to the development of performance indicators and a risk-based inspection program.

1:00 P.M.–1:40 P.M.: Preparation for Meeting with the NRC Commissioners (Open)—The Committee will discuss the following items for meeting with the Commissioners:

- Proposed Revisions to 10 CFR 50.59 (Changes, tests and experiments).
- Options to Make 10 CFR Part 50 Risk Informed.
- Status of ACRS Activities Associated with License Renewal.
- Proposed Rulemaking on the Use of the Revised Source Term.
- Use of PRA Results and Insights in the Regulatory Process.*
- Elevation of Core Damage Frequency to a Fundamental Safety Goal and Possible Revision of the Commission's Safety Goal Policy Statement.*
- NRC Safety Research Program.*

[*Time permitting, these items will be discussed]

2:00 P.M.–3:30 P.M.: Meeting with the NRC Commissioners, Commissioners' Conference Room, One White Flint North (Open)—The Committee will meet with the NRC Commissioners to discuss the items listed above.

4:00 P.M.–7:00 P.M.: Preparation of ACRS Reports (Open)—The Committee will discuss proposed ACRS reports, including those on the NRC Safety Research Program, lessons learned from the review of the AP600 design, and the role of frequency-consequence curves in risk-informed decisionmaking.

Thursday, February 4, 1999

8:30 A.M.–8:35 A.M.: Opening Remarks by the ACRS Chairman (Open)—The ACRS Chairman will make opening remarks regarding the conduct of the meeting.

8:35 A.M.–10:00 A.M.: Proposed Final Revision to 10 CFR 50.65 (a)(3) of the Maintenance Rule (Open)—The Committee will hear presentations by and hold discussions with representatives of the NRC staff and the Nuclear Energy Institute regarding the proposed final revision to the Maintenance Rule, which would require that the licensees perform safety assessments prior to performing maintenance activities.

10:15 A.M.–11:45 A.M.: SECY–98–244, NRC Human Performance Plan (Open)—The Committee will hear presentations by and hold discussions with representatives of the NRC staff regarding the NRC Human Performance Plan.

12:45 P.M.–2:15 P.M.: Proposed Resolution of Generic Safety Issue (GSI) B–61, Allowable ECCS Equipment Outage Periods (Open)—The Committee will hear presentations by and hold discussions with representatives of the NRC staff regarding the proposed resolution of GSI B–61 concerning the allowable outage periods for emergency core cooling system (ECCS) equipment.

2:30 P.M.–4:00 P.M.: Fire Protection Issues (Open)—The Committee will hear presentations by and hold discussions with representatives of the NRC staff regarding the fire protection issues, including the results of Pilot Fire Protection Functional Inspections.

4:15 P.M.–7:00 P.M.: Preparation of ACRS Reports (Open)—The Committee will discuss proposed ACRS reports,.

Friday, February 5, 1999

8:30 A.M.–8:35 A.M.: Opening Remarks by the ACRS Chairman (Open)—The ACRS