

the guard should be requested to telephone the Division of Contracts (415-7314) for pick-up of the application.

Nothing in this solicitation should be construed as committing the NRC to dividing available funds among all qualified applicants.

Dated Rockville, MD this 20th day of December, 1994.

For the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Mary Mace,

3Grants Officer, Division of Contracts, Office of Administration.

[FR Doc. 94-32301 Filed 12-30-94; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

[Docket Nos. 50-295 and 50-304]

Commonwealth Edison Company, Zion Nuclear Power Station, Receipt of Petition for Director's Decision Under 10 CFR 2.206

Notice is hereby given that by a letter dated November 3, 1994, and a signed petition, Robert K. Rutherford and other Zion Nuclear Power Station security guards (Petitioners) request that the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) take action with regard to the new response team member (RTM) security plan at Zion Nuclear Power Station.

Petitioners request that the NRC reassess and withdraw its approval of the new RTM security plan and require greater justification from both the licensee and the security contractor about reduction of armed guards and the defense of the plant to what Petitioners characterize as a minimum state of operational readiness. As bases for the request, Petitioners assert that the new RTM security plan degrades actual plant security; that the proposed qualifications in the plan are causing employee turnover, undue stress, labor problems, and inconsistency in plant defense; that monetary considerations should not take priority over plant defense and administrative jobs should not replace front-line security guards; that the total disarming of the Zion owner-controlled area and the Zion-protected area is highly detrimental to plant defense and public safety; and that modern armaments and increased hostility among the general public as well as terrorist threats from either domestic and/or international sources have not abated.

The letter and enclosed petition are being treated as a Petition pursuant to 10 CFR 2.206 of the Commission's regulations. The Petition has been referred to the Director of the Office of Nuclear Regulatory Regulation (NRR). As provided by 10 CFR 2.206,

appropriate action will be taken on the Petition within a reasonable time.

A copy of the Petition is available for inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room at 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland this 22nd day of December 1994.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

William T. Russell,

Director, Office of Nuclear Regulatory Regulation.

[FR Doc. 94-32302 Filed 12-30-94; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

Rosemount Nuclear Instruments, Inc.; Receipt of Petition for Director's Decision

Notice is hereby given that by Petition dated November 21, 1994, Paul M. Blanch (Petitioner) has requested that the NRC take "prompt" action with regard to Rosemount Nuclear Instruments, Inc. Specifically, the Petitioner requests that: (1) Rosemount "immediately" inform all users of safety related transmitters pursuant to Part 21 of Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations (10 CFR Part 21) of the shelf life limitations of the fill oil and that the oil may crystallize if the transmitters are exposed to temperatures of less than 70 degrees Fahrenheit (°F), and provide all available information to each licensee for evaluation as applicable to each facility; (2) the NRC take "prompt and vigorous" enforcement against Rosemount for both its failure to report to users of the transmitters the shelf life limitations of the fill oil and its failure to report the potential of the oil to crystallize when exposed to temperatures of less than 70 °F, and that a "separate violation must be issued" for each defect and each day of failure to provide the required notice; and (3) the NRC consider escalated enforcement action due to the repetitive nature of these violations. As a basis for his request, the Petitioner asserts that, contrary to 10 CFR Part 21, although Rosemount was aware of a defect that may create a substantial safety hazard, it failed to report this defect to the affected licensees within five working days for evaluation. Specifically, the Petitioner alleged that, although the NRC informed Rosemount by letter dated June 2, 1994, that the fill oil did not meet the specified performance requirements to assure operability of transmitters under normal operating conditions in that crystallization may occur when the transmitters are subjected to temperatures of less than 70 °F, which may inhibit the operation of many transmitters, Rosemount withheld

this information from licensees. The Petitioner asserts further that this is a "repetitive" violation in that on November 15, 1994, the NRC assessed a Severity Level II violation against Rosemount for failing to properly inform licensees of a potential for a sensor cell oil-loss problem in violation of 10 CFR 21.21.

The request is being treated pursuant to 10 CFR § 2.206 of the Commission's regulations. The request has been referred to the Director of the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation. The request that Rosemount "immediately" inform all users of safety related transmitters of the shelf life limitations of the fill oil and the potential for crystallization has been denied. As provided by Section 2.206, action will be taken on the petitioner's remaining requests within a reasonable time.

A copy of the Petition is available for inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room at 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC 20555-0001.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 22nd day of December, 1994.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

William T. Russell,

Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 94-32303 Filed 12-30-94; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

[Docket No. 50-298]

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

The proposed amendment is a Line Item Technical Specifications Improvement and would revise the CNS Technical Specifications, definition 1.0.J. concerning entering an operational condition consistent with the wording proposed in NRC Generic Letter 87-09, "Sections 3.0 and 4.0 of the Standard Technical Specifications on the Applicability of Limiting Conditions for Operation and Surveillance Requirements," dated June 4, 1987.

Before issuance of the proposed license amendment, the Commission will have made findings required by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended