

regard to Petitioner. I conclude that Petitioner's claims of harassment, intimidation, and discrimination have not been substantiated. Accordingly, the request for daily civil penalties is denied.

A copy of this Decision will be filed with the Secretary of the Commission for the Commission to review in accordance with 10 CFR 2.206(c). As provided by that regulation, the decision will constitute final action of the Commission 25 days after issuance, unless the Commission, on its own motion, institutes a review of the Decision within that time.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland this 13th day of September 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.  
James Lieberman,

*Director, Office of Enforcement.*

[FR Doc. 95-23298 Filed 9-19-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

**[Docket Nos. 50-237 and 50-249]**

**Commonwealth Edison Company;  
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. DPR-19 and DPR-25 issued to Commonwealth Edison Company (the licensee) for operation of the Dresden Nuclear Power Station, Units 2 and 3, located in Grundy County, Illinois.

The proposed amendment would upgrade the Dresden TS to the standard Technical Specifications (STS) contained in NUREG-0123. The Technical Specification Upgrade Program (TSUP) is not a complete adaption of the STS. The TS upgrade focuses on (1) integrating additional information such as equipment operability requirements during shutdown conditions, (2) clarifying requirements such as limiting conditions for operation and action statements utilizing STS terminology, (3) deleting superseded requirements and modifications to the TS based on the licensee's responses to Generic Letters (GL), and (4) relocating specific items to more appropriate TS locations. The September 1, 1995, application proposed to upgrade only Section 6.0 (Administrative Controls) of the Dresden TS.

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:

The proposed changes do not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated because:

In general, the proposed amendment represents the conversion of current requirements to a more generic format, or the addition of requirements which are based on the current safety analysis. Implementation of these changes will provide increased reliability of equipment assumed to operate in the current safety analysis, or provide contained assurance that specified parameters remain within their acceptance limits, and as such, will not significantly increase the probability or consequences of a previously evaluated accident.

Some of the proposed changes represent minor curtailments of the current requirements which are based on generic guidance or previously approved provisions for other stations. The proposed amendment for Dresden Station's Technical Specification Section 6.0 are based on STS guidelines or later operating plant's NRC accepted changes. Any deviations from STS requirements do not significantly increase the probability or consequences of any previously evaluated accidents for Dresden Station. The proposed amendment is consistent with the current safety analyses and has been previously determined to represent sufficient requirements for the assurance and reliability of equipment assumed to operate in the safety analysis, or provide continued assurance that specified parameters remain within their acceptance limits. As such, these changes will not significantly increase the probability or consequences of a previously evaluated accident.

Create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated because:

In general, the proposed amendment represents the conversion of current requirements to a more generic format, or the addition of requirements which are based on the current safety analysis. Others represent minor curtailments of the current requirements which are based on generic guidance or previously approved provisions for other stations. These changes do not involve revisions to the design of the station. Some of the changes may involve revision in the operation of the station; however, these

provide additional restrictions which are in accordance with the current safety analysis, or are to provide for additional testing or surveillances which will not introduce new failure mechanisms beyond those already considered in the current safety analyses.

The proposed amendment for Dresden Station's Technical Specification Section 6.0 is based on STS guidelines or later operating plants' NRC accepted changes. The proposed amendment has been reviewed for acceptability at the Dresden Nuclear Power Station considering similarity of system or component design versus the STS or later operating plants. Any deviations from STS requirements do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident previously evaluated for Dresden Station. No new modes of operation are introduced by the proposed changes. The proposed changes maintain at least the present level of operability. Therefore, the proposed changes do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated.

Involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety because:

In general, the proposed amendment represents the conversion of current requirements to a more generic format, or the addition of requirements which are based on the current safety analysis. Others represent minor curtailments of the current requirements which are based on generic guidance or previously approved provisions for other stations. Some of the later individual items may introduce minor reductions in the margin of safety when compared to the current requirements. However, other individual changes are the adoption of new requirements which will provide significant enhancement of the reliability of the equipment assumed to operate in the safety analysis, or provide enhanced assurance that specified parameters remain within their acceptance limits. These enhancements compensate for the individual minor reductions, such that taken together, the proposed changes will not significantly reduce the margin of safety.

The proposed amendment to Technical Specification Section 6.0 implements present requirements, or the intent of present STS. Any deviations from STS requirements do not significantly reduce the margin of safety for Dresden Station. The proposed changes are intended to improve readability, usability, and the understanding of technical specification requirements while maintaining acceptable levels of safe operation. The proposed changes have been evaluated and found to be acceptable for use at Dresden based on system design, safety analysis requirements and operational performance. Since the proposed changes are based on NRC accepted provisions at other operating plants that are applicable at Dresden and maintain necessary levels of system or component reliability, the proposed changes do not involve a significant reduction in the 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 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 Rules Review and Directives Branch, Division of Freedom of Information and Publications Services, Office of Administration, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, and should cite the publication date and page number of this Federal Register notice. Written comments may also be delivered to Room 6D22, Two White Flint North, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, MD, 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 October 20, 1995, 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 Morris Public Library, 604 Liberty Street, Morris, IL 60450. 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, Attention: Docketing and Services Branch, or may be delivered to the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street NW., Washington, DC, by the above date. Where petitions are filed during the last 10 days of the notice period, it is requested that the petitioner promptly so inform the Commission by a toll-free telephone call to Western Union at 1-(800)-248-5100 (in Missouri 1-(800)-342-6700). The Western Union operator should be given Datagram Identification Number N1023 and the following message addressed to Mr. Robert Capra: petitioner's name and telephone number, date petition was mailed, plant name, and publication date and page number of this Federal Register notice. A copy of the petition should also be sent to the Office of the General Counsel, U.S. Nuclear

Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, and to Michael I. Miller, Esquire, Sidley and Austin, One First National Plaza, Chicago, Illinois 60603, 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 September 1, 1995, 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 Morris Public Library, 604 Liberty Street, Morris, IL 60450.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 13th day of September 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.  
 John F. Stang,  
*Project Manager, Project Directorate III-2,  
 Division of Reactor Projects—III/IV, Office of  
 Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*  
 [FR Doc. 95-23285 Filed 9-19-95; 8:45 am]  
**BILLING CODE 7590-01-M**

**PRESIDENT'S COUNCIL ON INTEGRITY AND EFFICIENCY**

**Senior Executive Service Performance Review Board Membership**

**AGENCY:** President's Council on Integrity and Efficiency (PIE).

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** This notice sets forth the names and titles of the current membership of the PCIE Performance Review Board.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** September 20, 1995.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Individual Offices of (the) Inspector General.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**I. Background**

The Inspector General's Act of 1978, as amended, has created independent audit and investigative units—Offices of (the) Inspector General—at 61 Federal agencies. In 1981, the President's Council on Integrity and Efficiency (PCIE) was established by Executive Order as an interagency committee charged with promoting integrity and effectiveness in Federal programs. The PCIE is chaired by the Office of Management and Budget's Deputy Director for Management, and comprised principally of the 29

Presidential appointed Inspectors General (IGs). The primary objectives of the PCIE are (1) mounting collaborative efforts to address integrity, economy and effectiveness issues that transcend individual Federal agencies; and (2) increasing the professionalism and effectiveness of IG personnel throughout the Government.

**II. PCIE Performance Review Board**

Under 5 U.S.C. 4314(c)(1)–(5) and in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Office of Personnel Management, each agency is required to establish one or more Senior Executive Service (SES) performance review boards. The purpose of these boards are to review and evaluate the initial appraisal of a senior executive's performance by the supervisor, along with any recommendations to the appointing authority relative to the performance of the senior executive. The current members of the President's Council on Integrity and Efficiency Performance Review Board are as follows:

| Members   | Title  |
|---|--|
| <b>AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT</b>   |  |
| Everett L. Mosley .....<br>Carol L. Levy .....<br>C. Michael Flannery .....<br>Robert S. Perkins .....  | Deputy Inspector General.<br>Assistant Inspector General for Investigations.<br>Assistant Inspector General for Security.<br>Legal Counsel.  |
| <b>DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE</b>  |  |
| Charles R. Gillum .....<br>Paula F. Hayes .....<br>James R. Ebbitt .....<br>Richard D. Long .....<br>Robert W. Young, Jr .....<br>Craig L. Beauchamp .....<br>Jon E. Novak .....                              | Deputy Inspector General.<br>Assistant Inspector General for Policy Development and Resources Management.<br>Assistant Inspector General for Audit.<br>Deputy Assistant Inspector General for Audit.<br>Deputy Assistant Inspector General for Audit.<br>Assistant Inspector General for Investigations.<br>Deputy Assistant Inspector General for Investigations.   |
| <b>DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE</b>   |  |
| Michael Zimmerman .....<br>John Newell .....  | Deputy Inspector General.<br>Assistant Inspector General for Audits.   |
| <b>DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE</b>  |  |
| Derek J. Vander Schaaf .....<br>Donald Mancuso .....<br>William G. Dupree .....<br>John F. Keenan .....<br>Joel J. Leson .....<br>David A. Brinkman .....<br>Donald E. Davis .....<br>Michael G. Huston ..... | Deputy Inspector General.<br>Assistant Inspector General for Investigations.<br>Deputy Assistant Inspector General for Investigations.<br>Director, Investigative Operations.<br>Assistant Inspector General for Criminal Investigative Policy and Oversight.<br>Assistant Inspector General for Analysis and Follow-up.<br>Assistant Inspector General for Audit Policy and Oversight.<br>Director of Audit Planning and Technical Support. |