

**ACTION:** Notice of meeting.

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act, Public Law 92-463, as amended, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration announces a meeting of the NASA Advisory Council.

**DATES:** Wednesday, July 10, 2002, 9 a.m. to Noon.

**ADDRESSES:** National Aeronautics and Space Administration, James F. Webb Memorial Auditorium (West Lobby), 300 E Street, SW., Washington, DC 20546.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Dr. Donald Miller, Code IC, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, DC 20546, 202/358-1647.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The meeting will be conducted by teleconference in a room accessible to the public. The agenda for the meeting is for the Research Maximization Prioritization (REMAP) Task Force to present its findings and recommendations to the NAC for its deliberations prior to submission of the report to the NASA Administrator.

Dated: June 21, 2002.

**Sylvia K. Kraemer,**

*Advisory Committee Management Officer,  
National Aeronautics and Space Administration.*

[FR Doc. 02-16315 Filed 6-27-02; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7510-01-P**

## NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

### Committee Management; Notice of Establishment

The Deputy Director of the National Science Foundation has determined that the establishment of the Advisory Committee for GPRA Performance Assessment is necessary and in the public interest in connection with the performance of duties imposed upon the National Science Foundation (NSF), by 42 U.S.C. 1861 *et seq.* This determination follows consultation with the Committee Management Secretariat, General Services Administration.

*Name of Committee:* Advisory Committee for GPRA Performance Assessment (#13853).

*Purpose:* Advise NSF on GPRA planning, procedures and assessment as they relate to the Foundation's long-term strategic outcome goals, and provide NSF with a report that contains recommendations related to GPRA reporting by NSF.

*Responsible NSF Official:* Thomas N. Cooley, Chief Financial Officer, National Science Foundation, 4201

Wilson Boulevard, Suite 405, Arlington, VA 22230. Telephone: 703/292-8200.

Dated: June 24, 2002.

**Susanne Bolton,**

*Committee Management Officer.*

[FR Doc. 02-16314 Filed 6-27-02; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7555-01-M**

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-298]

### Cooper Nuclear Station; 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-46, issued to Nebraska Public Power District (the licensee), for operation of the Cooper Nuclear Station (CNS) located in Nemaha County, Nebraska.

The proposed amendment would revise the Technical Specifications (TSs) to support increase in reactor equipment cooling water temperature limits of service water (SW) and ultimate heat sink (UHS).

On May 20, 2002, the licensee submitted its application for change, and requested that the application be reviewed and approved by July 10, 2002. During telephone conversations with the licensee, the NRC staff explained that **Federal Register** notice requirements of 30 day comment period would push the earliest approval date to July 25, 2002. The licensee stated that anticipated low Missouri River (UHS for CNS) water flows and warm summer temperatures are likely to lead to the river water temperature to exceed the current UHS temperature limit of the TS, which would require a plant shutdown. Therefore, by a letter dated June 19, 2002, the licensee has asked that its application of May 20, 2002, be processed as an exigent request, pursuant to 10 CFR 50.91(a)(6), so as to avoid unnecessary shutdown of the CNS.

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?

No. The effects of the proposed increase in the SW and reactor equipment cooling (REC) temperatures on the likelihood of postulated accidents have been considered. These temperature parameters are not precursors or initiators of any analyzed Design Basis Events (DBEs). Furthermore, there are no plant hardware changes or new operator actions associated with this proposed change that could serve to initiate a DBE. Accordingly, there is no increase in the probability of an accident previously evaluated.

The potential impact of the proposed increase in the SW and REC temperatures on the ability of the plant to mitigate postulated accidents has been analyzed. This includes analysis of the following fourteen (14) areas: (1) The ability of the containment to provide adequate long term (greater than 10 minutes) cooling following a design basis loss-of-coolant accident (LOCA); (2) the ability to safely shutdown the plant from outside the control room after a fire; (3) the ability of the plant to mitigate an Anticipated Transient Without Scram (ATWS) event; (4) the adequacy of the water source at the suction of the Emergency Core Cooling System (ECCS) pumps [i.e. the availability of adequate Net Positive Suction Head (NPSH)]; (5) the ability of the suppression pool to provide a source of water for the ECCS pumps without allowing ingestion of steam bubbles by the pumps; (6) small steam line break; (7) Diesel Generator cooling; (8) ability of SW to remove heat from REC and ability of REC to provide ECCS area cooling; (9) SW as a source of backup water to REC; (10) ability to meet requirements of environmental qualification of electrical equipment; (11) the adequacy of the water source (i.e. availability of adequate NPSH) at the suction of the SW and REC pumps; (12) impact on ECCS piping; (13) impact on the seals in the Residual Heat Removal and Core Spray pumps; and (14) common mode failure analysis on SW pump room maximum allowed temperature.

These analyses demonstrate that adequate cooling can be achieved and postulated accidents can be properly mitigated with the SW and REC systems at the proposed increased temperatures. In some analyzed accidents the proposed increased SW and