to the public, the Chairman's ruling on requests for the opportunity to present oral statements and the time allotted therefor can be obtained by contacting the cognizant ACRS staff engineer, Mr. Paul A. Boehnert (telephone 301/415–8065) between 7:30 a.m. and 4:15 p.m. (EDT). Persons planning to attend this meeting are urged to contact the above named individual one or two working days prior to the meeting to be advised of any potential changes in the proposed agenda, etc., that may have occurred.

Dated: June 19, 1995.

Sam Duraiswamy,

Chief, Nuclear Reactors Branch.

[FR Doc. 95–15398 Filed 6–22–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–M

Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards Subcommittee Meeting on Planning and Procedures; Notice of Meeting

The ACRS Subcommittee on Planning and Procedures will hold a meeting on July 12, 1995, Room T–2B1, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland.

The entire meeting will be open to public attendance, with the exception of a portion that may be closed pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(c) (2) and (6) to discuss organizational and personnel matters that relate solely to internal personnel rules and practices of ACRS, and matters the release of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.

The agenda for the subject meeting shall be as follows: Wednesday, July 12, 1995—2:30 p.m. until the conclusion of business.

The Subcommittee will discuss proposed ACRS activities and related matters. The purpose of this meeting is to gather information, analyze relevant issues and facts, and to formulate proposed positions and actions, as appropriate, for deliberation by the full Committee.

Oral statements may be presented by members of the public with the concurrence of the Subcommittee Chairman; written statements will be accepted and made available to the Committee. Electronic recordings will be permitted only during those portions of the meeting that are open to the public, and questions may be asked only by members of the Subcommittee, its consultants, and staff. Persons desiring to make oral statements should notify the cognizant ACRS staff person named below five days prior to the meeting, if possible, so that appropriate arrangements can be made.

Further information regarding topics to be discussed, the scheduling of sessions open to the public, whether the meeting has been cancelled or rescheduled, the Chairman's ruling on requests for the opportunity to present oral statements, and the time allotted therefor can be obtained by contacting the cognizant ACRS staff person, Dr. John T. Larkins (telephone: 301/415–7360) between 7:30 a.m. and 4:15 p.m. (edt). Persons planning to attend this meeting are urged to contact the above named individual one or two working days prior to the meeting to be advised of any changes in schedule, etc., that may have occurred.

Dated: June 16, 1995.

Sam Duraiswamy,

Chief, Nuclear Reactors Branch.

[FR Doc. 95–15399 Filed 6–22–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–M

Final NUREG: Issuance, Availability

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) has issued NUREG/CR–6112, ''Impact of Reduced Dose Limits on NRC Licensed Activities—Major Issues in the Implementation of ICRP/NCRP Dose Limit Recommendations,'' as a final report. On May 21, 1991, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) published a revision to 10 CFR Part 20, ''Standards for Protection Against Radiation.'' The rule became effective in June, 1991, and licensees were required to implement the regulations on or before January 1, 1994.

The revised 10 CFR Part 20 is based upon the recommendations of the International Commission on Radiological Protection (ICRP) in Publication 26 (ICRP 1977). In 1991, the ICRP published revised recommendations in Publication 60. These recommendations were based upon revised dosimetry and epidemiology, including the information presented in reports such as the 1988 United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation (UNSCEAR). The new recommendations include a revised occupational dose limitation approach of 100 mSv (10 rem) in 5 years, with the additional limitation that no more than 50 mSv (5 rem) be received in any one year.

In 1991, the National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements (NCRP) recommended a lifetime limit of 10 mSv (1 rem) times age in years (NCRP Report 91). This recommendation was continued in recommendations published in 1993 (NCRP Report 116).

In anticipation of these recommendations, and as a result of the epidemiological and dosimetric information available in the last 5 years, the NRC staff initiated a study by Brookhaven National Laboratory (BNL) to analyze the potential impacts of reduced dose limits on its licensees. The results of this study are contained in this NUREG/CR. During the study period, a relatively small number of licensees responded to questionnaires and surveys, thereby limiting the extent to which the survey results can be assumed to be an accurate representation of the potential impacts of changed dose limits.

The NRC staff published these results in draft form in January 1994 to solicit further comments from interested parties regarding the impacts of the different possible dose limits discussed in the draft NUREG/CR.

NUREG/CR–6112 is not a substitute for NRC regulations, and compliance is not required. The approaches and/or methods described in this NUREG/CR are provided for information only. Publication of the report does not necessarily constitute NRC approval or agreement with the information cited therein.

Copies of NUREG/CR–6112 may be purchased from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, P.O. Box 37082, Washington, DC 20013–7082. Copies are also available from the National Technical Information Service, 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, VA 22161. A copy is also available for inspection and/or copying for a fee in the NRC Public Document Room, 2120 L Street, NW. (Lower Level), Washington, DC.

For further information contact George E. Powers, Radiation Protection and Health Effects Branch, Mail Stop NL/S–139, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, Telephone (301) 415–6212.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 5th day of May 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Bill M. Morris,

Director, Division of Regulatory Applications, Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research.

[FR Doc. 95–15403 Filed 6–22–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–M

[Docket No. 030–01888 License No. 20–06900–01 EA 95–038]

In the Matter of: Elias Charles Dow, M.D. Boston, Massachusetts; Order Imposing a Civil Monetary Penalty

I

Elias Charles Dow, M.D. (Licensee) is the holder of Byproduct Materials License No. 20–06900–01 (License) issued by the Atomic Energy

Commission on November 7, 1960. The License was most recently renewed by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC or Commission) on April 24, 1990, and is currently under timely renewal. The License authorizes the Licensee to possess and use certain byproduct materials in accordance with the conditions specified therein at the Licensee's facility in Brookline, Massachusetts.

II

An inspection of the Licensee's activities was conducted on February 8, and March 1, 1995, at the Licensee's facility located in Brookline, Massachusetts. 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 April 20, 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 one of the violations.

The Licensee responded to the Notice in two letters, both dated April 28, 1995. In its responses, the Licensee denies the violation assessed a civil penalty (Violation I), and requests that the penalty be withdrawn.

III

After consideration of the Licensee's response and the statements of fact, explanation, and argument contained therein, the NRC staff has determined, as set forth in the Appendix to this Order, the Violation I occurred as stated in the Notice. The staff also has determined that an adequate basis was not provided for mitigation of the penalty and that a penalty of $750 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 $750 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 James Lieberman, Director, Office of Enforcement, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland 20852–2738.

The Licensee may request a hearing within 30 days of the date of this Order. 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, PA 19406.

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, 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 Section I of the Notice referenced in Section II above, and

(b) Whether on the basis of such violation, this Order should be sustained.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland this 16th day of June 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

James Lieberman,

Director, Office of Enforcement.

Appendix

Evaluations and Conclusion

On April 20, 1995, a Notice of Violation and Proposed Imposition of Civil Penalty (Notice) was issued for violations identified during a NRC inspection conducted at the Licensee's facility located in Brookline, Massachusetts. The penalty was issued for one violation. The Licensee responded to the Notice in two letters, both dated April 28, 1995. In its responses, the Licensee denies the violation assessed a penalty (Violation I), and requests that the civil penalty be withdrawn. The NRC's evaluation and conclusion regarding the Licensee's requests are as follows:

Restatement of Violation I

10 CFR 20.1801 requires that the licensee secure from unauthorized removal or access licensed materials that are stored in controlled or unrestricted areas. 10 CFR 20.1802 requires that the licensee control and maintain constant surveillance of licensed material that is in a controlled or unrestricted area and that is not in storage. As defined in 10 CFR 20.1003, unrestricted area means an area, access to which is neither limited nor controlled by the licensee.

Contrary to the above, as of February 8, 1995, the licensee did not secure from unauthorized removal or limit access to licensed materials stored in an unrestricted area. Specifically, on numerous occasions, the licensee did not secure diagnostic capsules (each containing between 14 and 129 microcuries of iodine–131(I–131)) located in patients' homes, an unrestricted area, nor did the licensee control and maintain constant surveillance of this licensed material.

Summary of Licensee's Response to Violation I

In its responses, the Licensee denies the violation and requests that the civil penalty be withdrawn.

The Licensee states that the NMSS Licensee Newsletter 95–1 issued in March/April 1995, and the **Federal Register** dated January 25, 1995, both state that the medical administration of any radiation or radioactive material to any individual, including an individual who is not supposed to receive a medical administration, is regulated by the Commission's provisions governing the medical use of byproduct material (10 CFR Part 35) rather than the dose limits in NRC's regulation concerning standards for protection against radiation (10 CFR Part 20). The Licensee states that Part 35 takes precedence over Part 20 because the Licensee's use of I–131 in this instance is a medical use. The Licensee states that the regulation for unrestricted areas does not apply, and asserts that this is stated in 10 CFR 20.1002. The Licensee states that it appears that there should not have been a citation, since the I–131 was used for medical use.

The Licensee also states that the dispensing of I–131 capsules for diagnostic use has never resulted in any harm, and there is no way that capsules containing between 14 and 129 microcuries could have caused unnecessary exposure to members of the public anymore than if the patient had ingested the same capsule prior to leaving the premises. The Licensee further states that there have never been any reports in medical literature of instances of I–131 causing any harm to anyone at this dosage. The Licensee states that it is purely speculative and misleading to state that this could cause any unnecessary exposure to members of the public.

The Licensee further states that a patient who ingests 25 millicuries of I–131 for therapeutic purposes is permitted to go home, be with family, and mingle with the public without restriction. In addition, the licensee states that it seems paradoxical and illogical that the possession of a 100 microcurie capsule, either in the patient's possession or ingested internally, would constitute any public health hazard.

NRC Evaluation of Licensee's Response to Violation I

Notwithstanding the Licensee's contention, the NRC maintains that a violation of 10 CFR Part 20 occurred, and that 10 CFR 20.1801 and 20.1802 required that the I–131 be

secured or controlled until such time as it was administered to a patient. By giving the I–131 capsules to patients to take to their residence for self administration at a later time, the Licensee failed to secure or control the licensed material as required.

With respect to the Licensee's comment regarding the NMSS Licensee Newsletter 95–1 issued March/April 1995, and the Federal Register notice on January 25, 1995 (60 FR 4872), these documents describe a proposed NRC rulemaking concerning errors in administering radiation or radioactive materials for medical purposes. That rulemaking, if adopted in final form, would clarify that the dose limits for individual members of the public in 10 CFR 20.1301 do not apply to the exposure that the individual receives from such an error.[1] There is nothing in the proposed rulemaking that would exempt the medical use of licensed material from 10 CFR 20.1801 and 20.1802, which are the requirements that are cited in the violation. 10 CFR Part 35 does not take precedence over 10 CFR Part 20. 10 CFR 20.1002, ''Scope'', specifically states that the regulations in 10 CFR Part 20 apply to persons licensed pursuant to 10 CFR Parts 30 through 36, which includes 10 CFR Part 35, ''Medical Use of Byproduct Material.'' Similarly, 10 CFR 35.1, ''Purpose and scope'', states that the requirements and provisions of 10 CFR Part 20 apply to licensees subject to 10 CFR Part 35, unless specifically exempted.

Therefore, the NRC maintains that the violation occurred as stated in the Notice.

With respect to the Licensee's statement that dispensing of capsules containing between 14 and 129 microcuries of I–131 could not have caused any unnecessary exposure to members of the public anymore than if the patient had ingested the same capsule prior to leaving the premises, the NRC disagrees. Because of the Licensee's lack of security or control over the capsule (i.e., after the capsule had been given to the patient to take to the patient's home), the capsule could have been ingested inadvertently by someone other than the patient. Such an event would result in an unnecessary radiation exposure to an unintended person far in excess of the regulatory limits for radiation exposure to members of the public. Therefore, the violation was properly categorized at Severity Level III in accordance with the Enforcement Policy because of the potential safety hazard.

NRC Conclusion

The NRC has concluded that the violation assessed a penalty occurred as stated in the Notice. In addition, the NRC has concluded that the Licensee did not provide an adequate basis for withdrawal of the civil penalty. Accordingly, the proposed civil penalty in the amount of $750 should be imposed.

[FR Doc. 95–15402 Filed 6–22–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–M

[1] Currently, 10 CFR 20.1002 provides that the limits of that Part do not apply to doses due to exposure of patients to radiation for the purpose of medical diagnosis or therapy.

[Docket No. 72–1]

General Electric Company; Notice of Issuance of Amendment to Materials License SNM–2500

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has issued Amendment No. 9 to Materials License No. SNM–2500 held by the General Electric Company for the receipt and storage of spent fuel at the Morris Operation, located at 7555 East Collins Road, Morris, Illinois. The amendment is effective as of the date of issuance.

The amendment revises the General Electric Physical Security Plan making administrative changes which do not affect fuel receipt, handling, and storage safety.

The application for the amendment complies with the standards and requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), and the Commission's rules and regulations. The Commission has made appropriate findings as required by the Act and the Commission's rules and regulations in 10 CFR Chapter I, which are set forth in the license amendment. Prior public notice of the amendment was not required since the amendment does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

The Commission has determined that the issuance of the amendment will not result in any significant environmental impact and that, pursuant to 10 CFR 51.22(c)(12), an environmental assessment need not be prepared in connection with issuance of the amendment.

For further details with respect to this action, see (1) the application for amendment dated December 28, 1994, as supplemented by letter dated March 10, 1995, and (2) Amendment No. 9 to Materials License No. SNM–2500 with the Commission's letter to the licensee. All of these items are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, The Gelman Building, Lower Level, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC., and the Local Public Document Room at the Morris Area Public Library District, 604 Liberty Street, Morris, Illinois, 60450.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 16 day of June 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

William D. Travers,

Director, Spent Fuel Project Office, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.

[FR Doc. 95–15401 Filed 6–22–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–M

OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

Federal Salary Council; Meeting

AGENCY: Office of Personnel Management.

ACTION: Notice of meeting.

SUMMARY: According to the provisions of section 10 of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92–463), notice is hereby given that the forty-fifth meeting of the Federal Salary Council will be held at the time and place shown below. At the meeting the Council will continue discussing issues relating to locality based comparability payments authorized by the Federal Employees Pay Comparability Act of 1990 (FEPCA). The meeting is open to the public.

DATE: July 31, 1995, at 9 a.m.

ADDRESS: Office of Personnel Management, 1900 E Street NW., Room 7B09, Washington, DC.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ruth O'Donnell, Chief, Salary Systems Division, Office of Personnel Management, 1900 E Street NW., Room 6H31, Washington, DC 20415–0001. Telephone number: (202) 606–2838.

For the President's Pay Agent.

Lorraine A. Green,

Deputy Director.

[FR Doc. 95–15247 Filed 6–22–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6325–01–M

OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY POLICY

Meeting of the President's Committee of Advisors on Science and Technology

ACTION: Notice of meeting.

SUMMARY: This notice sets forth the schedule and summary agenda for a meeting of the President's Committee of Advisors on Science and Technology (PCAST), and describes the functions of the Committee. Notice of this meeting is required under the Federal Advisory Committee Act.

DATES AND PLACE: July 11 and 12, 1995. The White House Conference Center, Truman Room, Third Floor, 726 Jackson Place NW., Washington, DC 20500.

TYPE OF MEETING: Open.

PROPOSED SCHEDULE AND AGENDA: The President's Committee of Advisors on Science and Technology (PCAST) will meet in open session on Tuesday, July 11, 1995, at approximately 9 a.m. to be briefed on the findings and recommendations of the PCAST Review