

The information collected on reviewer background questionnaire (NSF 428A) is used by managers to maintain an automated database of reviewers for the many disciplines represented by the proposals submitted to the Foundation. Information collected on gender, race, and ethnicity is used in meeting NSF needs for data to permit response to Congressional and other queries into equity issues. These data also are used in the design, implementation, and monitoring of NSF efforts to increase the participation of various groups in science, engineering, and education.

Confidentiality

When a decision has been made (whether an award or a declination), verbatim copies of reviews, excluding the identities of the reviewers, and summaries of review panel deliberations, if any, are provided to the PI. A proposer also may request and obtain any other releasable material in NSF's file on his or her proposal. Everything in the file except information that directly identifies either reviewers or other pending or declined proposals is usually releasable to the proposer.

While listings of panelists' names are released, the names of individual reviewers, associated with individual proposals, are not released.

The Foundation collects information regarding race, ethnicity, disability, and gender, as noted above. The FOIA and the Privacy Act protect this information from public disclosure.

Burden on the Public

The Foundation estimates that anywhere from one hour to twenty hours may be required to review a proposal. It is estimated that approximately five hours are required to review an average proposal. Each proposal receives an average of 6.3 reviews, with a minimum requirement of three reviews.

Dated: February 2, 2005.

Suzanne H. Plimpton,

Reports Clearance Officer, National Science Foundation.

[FR Doc. 05-2301 Filed 2-4-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555-01-M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50-266 and 50-301]

Nuclear Management Company; Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendments 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. DPR-24 and DPR-27 issued to Nuclear Management Company (the licensee) for operation of the Point Beach Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2, located in Two Rivers, Wisconsin.

The proposed amendment would revise the Point Beach Nuclear Plant (PBNP), Units 1 and 2, Updated Final Safety Analysis Report to reflect the Commission staff's approval of the WCAP-14439-P, Revision 2 analysis entitled, "Technical Justification for Eliminating Large Primary Loop Pipe Rupture as the Structural Design Basis for the Point Beach Nuclear Plant Units 1 and 2 for the Power Uprate and License Renewal Program."

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 Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations (10 CFR), Section 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. Operation of PBNP in accordance with the proposed amendments does not result in a significant increase in the probability or consequences of any accident previously evaluated.

The proposed change revises the analysis supporting the PBNP dynamic effects design basis for primary loop piping. The proposed change does not adversely affect accident initiators or precursors nor alter the design

assumptions, conditions, or the manner in which the plant is operated and maintained. The proposed change does not alter or prevent the ability of structures, systems, and components from performing their intended function to mitigate the consequences of an initiating event within the assumed acceptance limits. The proposed change does not affect the source term, containment isolation, or radiological release assumptions used in evaluating the radiological consequences of an accident previously evaluated. Further, the proposed change does not increase the types or amounts of radioactive effluent that may be released offsite, nor significantly increase individual or cumulative occupational/public radiation exposures. The proposed change is consistent with safety analysis assumptions and resultant consequences. Therefore, it is concluded that this change does not significantly increase the probability of occurrence of an accident previously evaluated.

2. Operation of PBNP in accordance with the proposed amendments does not result in a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

The proposed change revises the analysis supporting the PBNP dynamic effects design basis for primary loop piping. The changes do not impose any new or different requirements or eliminate any existing requirements. The changes do not alter assumptions made in the safety analysis. The proposed changes are consistent with the safety analysis assumptions and current plant operating practice. Therefore, the proposed change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated.

3. Operation of PBNP in accordance with the proposed amendments does not result in a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The proposed change revises the analysis supporting the PBNP dynamic effects design basis for primary loop piping. All the recommended margins regarding leak-before-break conditions (margin on leak rate, margin on flaw size, and margin on loads) are satisfied for the primary loop piping. The proposed change does not alter the manner in which safety limits, limiting safety system settings or limiting conditions for operation are determined. The setpoints at which protective actions are initiated are not altered by the proposed changes. Sufficient equipment remains available to actuate upon demand for the purpose of mitigating an analyzed event.

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 60 days after the date of publication of this notice. The Commission may issue the license amendment before expiration of the 60-day period provided that its final determination is that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration. In addition, the Commission may issue the amendment prior to the expiration of the 30-day comment period should circumstances change during the 30-day comment period such that failure to act in a timely way would result, for example in derating or shutdown of the facility. Should the Commission take action prior to the expiration of either the comment period or the notice period, it will publish in the **Federal Register** a notice of issuance. Should the Commission make a final No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, any hearing will take place 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. Documents may be examined, and/or copied for a fee, at the NRC's Public Document Room, located at One White Flint North, Public File Area O1 F21, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland.

The filing of requests for hearing and petitions for leave to intervene is discussed below.

Within 60 days after the date of publication of this notice, 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 2.309, which is available at the Commission's PDR, located at One White Flint North,

Public File Area 01F21, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland. Publicly available records will be accessible from the Agencywide Documents Access and Management System's (ADAMS) Public Electronic Reading Room on the Internet at the NRC Web site, <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/doc-collections/cfr/>. If a request for a hearing or petition for leave to intervene is filed by the above date, the Commission or a presiding officer designated by the Commission or by the Chief Administrative Judge of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, will rule on the request and/or petition; and the Secretary or the Chief Administrative Judge of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board will issue a notice of a hearing or an appropriate order.

As required by 10 CFR 2.309, 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 general requirements: (1) The name, address and telephone number of the requestor or petitioner; (2) the nature of the requestor's/petitioner's right under the Act to be made a party to the proceeding; (3) the nature and extent of the requestor's/petitioner's property, financial, or other interest in the proceeding; and (4) the possible effect of any decision or order which may be entered in the proceeding on the requestors/petitioner's interest.

The petition must also identify the specific contentions which the petitioner/requestor seeks to have litigated at the proceeding.

Each contention must consist of a specific statement of the issue of law or fact to be raised or controverted. In addition, the petitioner/requestor shall provide a brief explanation of the bases for 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/requestor 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. The petition must include 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/requestor who fails to satisfy 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.

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.

Nontimely requests and/or petitions and contentions will not be entertained absent a determination by the Commission or the presiding officer of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board that the petition, request and/or the contentions should be granted based on a balancing of the factors specified in 10 CFR 2.309(a)(1)(I)-(viii).

A request for a hearing or a petition for leave to intervene must be filed by: (1) First class mail addressed to the Office of the Secretary of the Commission, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, Attention: Rulemaking and Adjudications Staff; (2) courier, express mail, and expedited delivery services: Office of the Secretary, Sixteenth Floor, One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland, 20852, Attention: Rulemaking and Adjudications Staff; (3) E-mail addressed to the Office of the Secretary, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, HEARINGDOCKET@NRC.GOV; or (4) facsimile transmission addressed to the Office of the Secretary, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC, Attention: Rulemakings and Adjudications Staff at (301) 415-1101, verification number is (301) 415-1966. A copy of the request for hearing and petition for leave to intervene should also be sent to the Office of the General Counsel, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, and it is requested that copies be

transmitted either by means of facsimile transmission to 301-415-3725 or by email to OGCMailCenter@nrc.gov. A copy of the request for hearing and petition for leave to intervene should also be sent to Jonathan Rogoff, Esquire, Vice President, Counsel & Secretary, Nuclear Management Company, LLC, 700 First Street, Hudson, WI 54016, attorney for the licensee.

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendment dated November 5, 2003, which is available for public inspection at the Commission's PDR, located at One White Flint North, File Public Area O1 F21, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland. Publicly available records will be accessible from the Agencywide Documents Access and Management System's (ADAMS) Public Electronic Reading Room on the Internet at the NRC Web site, <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html>. Persons who do not have access to ADAMS or who encounter problems in accessing the documents located in ADAMS, should contact the NRC PDR Reference staff by telephone at 1-800-397-4209, 301-415-4737, or by e-mail to pdr@nrc.gov.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 31st day of January 2005.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Deirdre W. Spaulding,

Project Manager, Section 1, Project Directorate III, Division of Licensing Project Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 05-2242 Filed 2-4-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-U

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 070-07001, Certificate No. GDP-1, EA-04-123]

United States Enrichment Corporation, Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant, Paducah, KY; Confirmatory Order Modifying License (Effective Immediately)

The United States Enrichment Corporation (USEC or Corporation) is the holder of NRC Certificate of Compliance No. GDP-1 issued by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC or Commission) pursuant to 10 CFR Part 76. The certificate authorizes USEC to receive, and licensees shall be authorized to transfer to the Corporation, byproduct material, source material, or special nuclear material to the extent permitted under the Certificate of Compliance. The certificate was issued November 26, 1996, was most recently amended on

June 30, 2004, and is due to expire on December 31, 2008.

On December 16, 2002, the NRC's Office of Investigations (OI) started an investigation to determine whether a Quality Control (QC) Manager at USEC's Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant (PGDP) was discriminated against by being suspended and later terminated for raising safety concerns. On May 12, 2003, OI expanded its investigation to determine whether the same QC Manager was discriminated against, in retaliation for the previously raised safety concerns, by not being considered for a position with a contractor performing work for USEC at PGDP. OI, in OI report No. 3-2002-040, did not substantiate that the QC Manager was suspended or terminated because of raising safety concerns. However, based on the facts and circumstances described in OI Report Number 3-2002-040, the NRC was concerned that the former QC Manager may have been discriminated against by not being considered for a contract position. By letter dated September 29, 2004, the NRC identified to USEC the NRC's concern. The September 29th letter offered USEC the opportunity either to attend a predecisional enforcement conference (PEC) or to request alternative dispute resolution (ADR) in which a neutral mediator with no decision-making authority would facilitate discussions between the NRC and USEC and, if possible, assist the NRC and USEC in reaching an agreement on resolving the concern. USEC chose to participate in ADR. On November 22, 2004, the NRC and USEC met at USEC headquarters in Bethesda, Maryland in an ADR session mediated by a professional mediator, arranged through Cornell University's Institute on Conflict Resolution.

By letter dated December 6, 2004, USEC enumerated the actions it has already taken and additional actions it agreed to take in order to enhance its Safety Conscious Work Environment at the PGDP. The agreed-upon additional actions noted in Section IV of this Confirmatory Order focus on Safety Conscious Work Environment training for managers of USEC contractors at the PGDP and USEC managers who are principal points of contact for USEC contractors at the PGDP.

On January 24, 2005, USEC consented to the NRC issuing this Confirmatory Order with the commitments, as described in Section IV below. USEC further agreed in its January 24, 2005, letter that this Confirmatory Order is to be effective upon issuance and that it has waived its right to a hearing. The NRC has concluded that its concerns

can be resolved through effective implementation of USEC's commitments.

I find that USEC's commitments as set forth in Section IV are acceptable and necessary and conclude that with these commitments the public health and safety are reasonably assured. In view of the foregoing, I have determined that the public health and safety require that USEC's commitments be confirmed by this Order. Based on the above and USEC's consent, this Order is immediately effective upon issuance. USEC is required to provide the NRC with a letter summarizing its actions when all of the Section IV requirements have been completed.

Accordingly, pursuant to Sections 81, 161b, 161i, 161o, 182, 186 and 1710 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and the Commission's regulations in 10 CFR 2.202 and 10 CFR Part 76, it is hereby ordered, effective immediately, that Certificate of Compliance No. GDP-1 is modified as follows:

1. By no later than March 31, 2005, USEC shall develop and conduct initial Safety Conscious Work Environment training for: (a) Managers of USEC contractors at the PGDP; and (b) USEC personnel who are principal points of contact for USEC contractors at the PGDP.

2. By no later than June 30, 2005, USEC shall develop Safety Conscious Work Environment refresher training for the managers of USEC contractors at the PGDP and revise its training program requirements to conduct on-going refresher training at a frequency consistent with USEC's General Employee Training at the PGDP.

3. By no later than June 30, 2005, USEC shall revise its training program requirements to conduct initial Safety Conscious Work Environment training for: (a) New managers of USEC contractors at the PGDP; and (b) USEC personnel who become principal points of contact for USEC contractors at the PGDP, within ninety day of their assumption of these duties.

The Director, Office of Enforcement, may relax or rescind, in writing, any of the above conditions upon a showing by USEC of good cause.

Any person adversely affected by this Confirmatory Order, other than the Certificate holder, may request a hearing within 20 days of its issuance. Where good cause is shown, consideration will be given to extending the time to request a hearing. A request for extension of time must be made in writing to the Director, Office of Enforcement, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, and include a