

Foundation, 4201 Wilson Blvd, Arlington, VA, 22230, Telephone (703) 306-1836.

*Purpose of Meetings:* To provide advice and recommendations concerning proposals submitted to NSF for financial support.

*Agenda:* To review and evaluate proposals submitted to the Faculty Early Career Development (CAREER) Program.

*Reason for Closing:* The proposals being reviewed may include information of a proprietary or confidential nature, including technical information, financial data such as salaries, and personal information concerning individuals associated with the proposal. These matters are exempt under 5 U.S.C. 552 b.(c) (4) and (6) of the Government in the Sunshine Act.

Dated: February 5, 1996.

M. Rebecca Winkler,

*Committee Management Officer.*

[FR Doc. 96-2792 Filed 2-8-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555-01-M

### 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 meetings.

*Name and Committee Code:* Special Emphasis in Mathematical Sciences (1204).

*Date and Time:* February 26-27, 1996; 8:30 a.m. until 5:00 p.m.

*Place:* Room 1060, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, VA 22230.

*Type of Meetings:* Closed.

*Contact Person:* Dr. Joe Jenkins, Program Director, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson, Boulevard, Arlington, VA, 22230, Telephone (703) 306-1870.

*Purpose of Meetings:* To provide advice and recommendations concerning proposals submitted to NSF for financial support.

*Agenda:* To review and evaluate the Analysis Program nominations/applications 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: February 5, 1996.

M. Rebecca Winkler,

*Committee Management Officer.*

[FR Doc. 96-2796 Filed 2-8-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555-01-M

### 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 26-27, 1996; 8:30 a.m. until 5:00 p.m.

*Place:* Room 340, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, VA 22230.

*Type of Meeting:* Closed.

*Contact Person:* Dr. Alvin I. 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 proposals submitted to NSF for financial support.

*Agenda:* To review and evaluate proposals concerning the Faculty Early Career Development (CAREER) 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: February 5, 1996.

M. Rebecca Winkler,

*Committee Management Officer.*

[FR Doc. 96-2789 Filed 2-8-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555-01-M

### Special Emphasis Panel in Polar Programs; 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 Polar Programs (#1209).

*Date and Time:* February 29, thru March 1, 1996, 8:00 am to 5:00 pm.

*Place:* Room 730, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, VA 22230.

*Type of Meeting:* Closed.

*Contact Person:* Dr. Michael Ledbetter and Dr. Odile De La Beaujardiere, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, VA 22230. Telephone: (703) 306-1029.

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

*Agenda:* To review and evaluate Arctic Systems and Arctic Natural Sciences proposals 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: February 5, 1996.

M. Rebecca Winkler,

*Committee Management Officer.*

[FR Doc. 96-2790 Filed 2-8-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555-01-M

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 030-32380, License No. 29-28659-01 EA 95-163]

### Canspec Materials Testing, Inc., Middlesex, NJ; Order Imposing Civil Monetary Penalty

I

Canspec Materials Testing, Inc. (Licensee) is the holder of byproduct Materials License No. 29-28659-01 issued by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC or Commission) on August 12, 1991. The license authorizes the Licensee to possess and use byproduct material for industrial radiography and replacement of sources in accordance with the conditions specified therein.

II

An inspection of the Licensee's activities was conducted on July 19 and 25, 1995. The results of this inspection indicated that the Licensee had not conducted its activities in full compliance with NRC requirements. A written Notice of Violation and Proposed Imposition of Civil Penalty (Notice) was served upon the Licensee by letter dated September 13, 1995. The Notice states the nature of the violations, the provisions of the NRC's requirements that the Licensee had violated, and the amount of the civil penalty proposed for the violations.

The Licensee responded to the Notice in two letters, both dated October 11, 1995. In its responses, the Licensee admitted Violations A through D and F through H; denied Violation E; and requested that the proposed civil penalty be reduced if not dismissed.

III

After consideration of the Licensee's response and the statements of fact, explanation, and argument for mitigation contained therein, the NRC staff has determined, as set forth in the Appendix to this Order, that the violations occurred as stated and that the penalty proposed for the violations designated in the Notice should be imposed.

## IV

In view of the foregoing and pursuant to Section 234 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (Act), 42 U.S.C. 2282, and 10 CFR 2.205, *it is hereby ordered* That:

The Licensee pay a civil penalty in the amount of \$5,000 within 30 days of the date of this Order, by check, draft, money order, or electronic transfer, payable to the Treasurer of the United States and mailed to Mr. James Lieberman, Director, Office of Enforcement, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, MD 20852-2738.

## V

The Licensee may request a hearing within 30 days of the date of this Order. 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, D.C. 20555, and include a statement of good cause for the extension. A request for a hearing should be clearly marked as a "Request for an Enforcement Hearing" and shall be addressed to the Director, Office of Enforcement, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. 20555, with a copy to the Commission's Document Control Desk, Washington, D.C. 20555. Copies also shall be sent to the Assistant General Counsel for Hearings and Enforcement at the same address and to the Regional Administrator, NRC Region I, 475 Allendale Road, King of Prussia, Pennsylvania 19406-1415.

If a hearing is requested, the Commission will issue an Order designating the time and place of the hearing. If the Licensee fails to request a hearing within 30 days of the date of this Order (or if written approval of an extension of time in which to request a hearing has not been granted), the provisions of this Order shall be effective without further proceedings. If payment has not been made by that time, the matter may be referred to the Attorney General for collection.

In the event the Licensee requests a hearing as provided above, the issues to be considered at such hearing shall be:

(a) whether the Licensee was in violation of the Commission's requirements as set forth in Violation E of the Notice referenced in Section II above; and

(b) whether, on the basis of such violation, and the additional violations set forth in the Notice that the Licensee

admitted, this Order should be sustained.

For The Nuclear Regulatory Commission.  
James Lieberman,  
*Director, Office of Enforcement.*

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 2nd day of February 1996.

## Appendix—Evaluations and Conclusion

On September 13, 1995, a Notice of Violation and Proposed Imposition of Civil Penalty (Notice) was issued for violations identified during an NRC inspection. Canspec Materials Testing, Inc. (Licensee or CTI) responded to the Notice on October 11, 1995. The Licensee admitted seven violations (Violations A–D and F–H), denied one violation (Violation E) and requested mitigation or dismissal of the civil penalty. The NRC's evaluation and conclusion regarding the licensee's requests are as follows:

1. *Restatement of Violation E*

10 CFR 34.24 requires, in part, that each survey instrument used to conduct physical radiation surveys be calibrated at intervals not to exceed three months and after each instrument servicing.

Contrary to the above,

1. on June 8, 1995, a licensee employee conducted physical radiation surveys with a survey instrument (Serial Number 3369) which was last calibrated on February 17, 1995, an interval exceeding three months.

2. on July 11, 1995, a licensee employee conducted physical radiation surveys with a survey instrument (Serial Number 2015) which was last calibrated on March 28, 1995, an interval exceeding three months.

3. on August 15, 1994, a licensee radiographer conducted physical radiation surveys with a survey instrument (Serial Number 3369) which was last calibrated on April 4, 1994, an interval exceeding three months.

This is a repetitive violation.

2. *Summary of the Licensees Response to Violation E*

The Licensee denied this violation, and stated that there was always a calibrated meter in use for surveys. The Licensee's president stated that he must have misunderstood a conversation he had with an NRC inspector regarding the use of survey instruments. The Licensee's president also stated that he was under the impression that as long as the survey meter used for compliance surveys was calibrated, a second meter could be used for information only.

Further, the Licensee's president stated that when an audit was performed in the field and the equipment was found to be out of calibration they only had to go to "our trailer" to obtain properly calibrated equipment. In addition, the Licensee stated that an NRC inspector allowed them to return to work because there was properly calibrated functional equipment on site for use. The Licensee also stated that the company had the appropriate equipment in place for use. However, the workers did not take the time to check calibration dates before starting to work.

3. *NRC Evaluation of the Licensees Response to Violation E*

10 CFR 34.24 requires, in part, that each survey instrument used to conduct physical radiation surveys be calibrated at intervals not to exceed three months and after each instrument servicing. The inspection findings were based on a review of documentation of survey instrument use and calibration, maintained by the Licensee, which indicated instances where the survey instrument used to show compliance had not been calibrated at the required frequency. While the Licensee may have had in its possession survey instruments which were calibrated as required, the Licensee did not comply with the requirement as stated in 10 CFR 34.24. Specifically, survey meters used by the Licensee to perform physical radiation surveys to ensure compliance with 10 CFR 34.24 on the dates specified in the Notice had not been calibrated within the previous three months as required.

Having appropriately calibrated instruments on site or available for use does not demonstrate compliance with this requirement. It is the licensee's responsibility to assure that the instrument used is calibrated as required. Therefore, the NRC concludes that the Licensee has not provided an adequate basis for withdrawal of the violation.

On November 14, 1995, Mr. Frank Costello, Chief, Nuclear Materials Safety Branch 3, NRC, contacted the Licensee's president by telephone for clarification of the Licensee's statement, in its October 11, 1995 response, concerning an NRC inspector allowing the Licensee to return to work because properly calibrated functional equipment was on site. During the telephone conversation, the Licensee's president stated that the NRC inspector allowed the radiographers to return to work only after assuring that they were using calibrated equipment.

4. *Summary of Licensee's Request for Mitigation*

In its responses, the Licensee requested that the proposed civil penalty be reviewed for reduction if not dismissal. In June of 1995, Canspec was purchased by the current president. The president stated his contention that prior to this purchase, time was not spent where it should have been and now that he has assumed the position of president he will spend the time required to ensure that policy is followed "to the letter." The president stated that now he has greater control over the operation and will be able to spend the time necessary sorting out any problems with individuals and if they fail to conform, they will be replaced. The Licensee also stated its belief that the violations were not entirely the company's responsibility. Further, the president stated that the company had fulfilled the calibration requirements, yet the men made a mistake by not checking the calibration dates before starting to work.

5. *NRC Evaluation of Licensee's Request for Mitigation*

The NRC determined that the violations, given their number, nature, and the fact that three were repetitive, were of significant

regulatory concern and appeared to be indicative of the lack of management control over licensed activities. The lack of management control was evidenced by the fact that 13 violations were identified during the two NRC inspections in 1994. Therefore, the violations were appropriately characterized at Severity Level III in accordance with the "General Statement of Policy and Procedure for NRC Enforcement Actions" (Enforcement Policy), NUREG-1600 (60 FR 34381; June 30, 1995).

As to the president's statements concerning his increased control over the Licensee's operation, the NRC considers that such actions are part of the Licensee's corrective action and expects licensees to exercise adequate management control over licensed activities consistently to ensure the protection of the public and the environment. Regardless of who committed the violations, the Licensee is responsible for the acts of its employees and for assuring that it is in compliance with all applicable regulations.

Therefore, the NRC concludes that the Licensee has not provided an adequate basis for mitigation or withdrawal of the civil penalty.

#### 6. NRC Conclusion

The NRC has concluded that the violation occurred as stated and that an adequate basis for mitigation of the civil penalty was not provided by the Licensee. Consequently, the proposed civil penalty in the amount of \$5,000 should be imposed.

[FR Doc. 96-2838 Filed 2-8-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

[Docket No. 50-354]

### Public Service Electric and Gas Company and Atlantic City Electric 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 No. NPF-57 issued to Public Service Electric and Gas Company and Atlantic City Electric Company (the licensee), for operation of the Hope Creek Generating Station, located on the east shore of the Delaware River in Lower Alloways Creek Township, Salem County, New Jersey.

The proposed amendment would change Hope Creek Generating Station Technical Specifications 4.6.2.2.b, "Suppression Pool Spray," and 4.6.2.3.b, "Suppression Pool Cooling," to include flow through the RHR heat exchanger bypass line (in addition to the RHR heat exchanger) in the Suppression Pool Cooling and

Suppression Pool Spray flow path used during RHR pump testing.

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. 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. Will not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously analyzed.

The proposed amendment request changes Surveillance Requirement (SR) 4.6.2.3.b of Technical Specification (TS) 3.6.2.3, Suppression Pool Cooling, and SR 4.6.2.2.b of TS 3.6.2.2, Suppression Pool Spray, to clarify that the intent of these specific SRs is to confirm Residual Heat Removal (RHR) pump performance during Suppression Pool Cooling (SPC) and Suppression Pool Spray (SPS) operation. The proposed change revises the SRs to include the RHR heat exchanger bypass line, with the bypass valve closed, and the RHR heat exchanger in the SPC and SPS flow path used during performance of the surveillances.

The RHR system is an accident mitigation system. The proposed changes do not change the operation or capabilities of the RHR system in either mode of operation. The proposed changes do not involve any physical changes to the RHR system. The proposed changes merely modify the acceptable flow path for the surveillance tests, the purpose of which is to verify pump performance in these modes of operation. Therefore, the proposed change to the SRs for the SPC and SPS mode of operation of the RHR system will not increase the probability of an accident previously evaluated.

Furthermore, the performance of the RHR system in any of its operational modes will be unchanged by the proposed change. The changes affect only the pump performance SRs for the SPC and SPS modes of RHR system operation. The surveillances being changed only modify the acceptable flow path used during the performance of the

pump performance surveillances. The surveillances still verify that pump performance has not degraded to a point where the accident mitigation function of the system has not been compromised. Therefore, the proposed change will not involve an increase in the consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. Will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated.

The proposed change, a clarification of the SPC and SPS mode flow paths for pump performance testing, does not result in a modification of the RHR system, change the method of SPC or SPS operation, or alter the system's effectiveness. Suppression Pool Cooling and Containment Spray Cooling, of which Suppression Pool Spray is a part, are manually initiated actions. Existing procedures for the initiation of these two modes of operation are unchanged, including the requirement that the Low Pressure Coolant Injection valve is closed before the containment spray valves can be opened. There are no new failure modes created by the proposed changes and no new accident initiating events are created. Therefore, the proposed changes will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated.

3. Will not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The proposed changes do not change the operation of the RHR system in any of its modes of operation. The changes only clarify the fact that the purpose of the SRs is to confirm RHR pump performance through the most restrictive conditions of the flow path while operating in either the SPC or SPS modes. The changed surveillances still verify that pump performance has not degraded to a point where the original design basis can not be met. In order to assure the system meets its original design basis, adequate flow through the heat exchanger during surveillance testing will be maintained. Since the function of all of the operational modes of the RHR system are unaffected by the revised surveillance test flow path, the proposed changes will maintain the existing 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 15 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 15-day notice period. However, should circumstances change during the notice period, such that failure to act in a timely way would