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: September 14, 1995.

Sam Duraiswamy,

Chief, Nuclear Reactors Branch.

[FR Doc. 95–23327 Filed 9–19–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–M

Correction to Bi-Weekly Notice Application and Amendments to Operating Licenses Involving No Significant Hazards Consideration

In the Federal Register published on August 30, 1995, page 45175, first column, under Commonwealth Edison Company, the sixth through eighth lines which read, ''Docket Nos. 50–237 and 50–249, Dresden Nuclear Power Station, Units 2 and 3, Grundy County, Illinois'' should be corrected to read, ''Docket Nos. 50–10, 50–237 and 50–249, Dresden Nuclear Power Station, Units 1, 2 and 3, Grundy County, Ilinois.''

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. 95–23286 Filed 9–19–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–M

[Docket Nos. 50–390, 50–391; License Nos. CPPR–91, CPPR–92]

Tennessee Valley Authority (Watts Bar); Issuance of Director's Decision Under 10 CFR 2.206

Notice is hereby given that the Director, Office of Enforcement, has issued a decision concerning the Petition filed by Mr. George M. Gillilan (Petitioner) dated February 25, 1994 as supplemented by letters dated June 16, June 28, July 6, 1994, and February 24 and February 28, 1995. The Petition requested that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC or Commission) (1) immediately impose a $25,000 per day fine on TVA until all reprisal, intimidation, harassment and discrimination actions involving Gillilan are settled to his satisfaction, and (2) appoint an independent arbitration board to review all past DOL suits and EEO complaints filed against TVA concerning Watts Bar. Since the latter remedy is beyond the scope of the Commission's authority, it was denied in a letter to Petitioner dated April 7, 1994, which acknowledged receipt of the Petition. In that letter, the Petitioner was also informed that the request for immediate action was denied.

Based on a review of Petitioner's request and supplemental submissions, the Licensee's response dated May 20, 1994, the report of NRC's Office of Investigations (OI Report No. 2–94–042), the results of investigations of the TVA Inspector General and the decisions of the Department of Labor on Petitioner's complaints, the Director, Office of Enforcement, has denied this Petition. The reasons for the denial are explained in the ''Director's Decision under 10 CFR 2.206'' (DD–95–20) which is available for public inspection in the Commission's Public Document Room at 2120 L Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20555.

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

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

James Lieberman,

Director, Office of Enforcement.

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

Attachment to: Issuance of Director's Decision Under 10 CFR 2.206, Tennessee Valley Authority.

I. Introduction

On February 25, 1994, George M. Gillilan (Petitioner) filed a request for enforcement action pursuant to 10 CFR 2.206 (Petition). The Petitioner requested that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC or Commission): (1) Immediately impose a $25,000 per day fine on Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA or Licensee) until all reprisal, intimidation, harassment and discrimination actions involving Petitioner are settled to his satisfaction, and (2) appoint an independent arbitration board to review all past DOL suits and EEO complaints filed against TVA concerning Watts Bar. Since the latter remedy is beyond the scope of the Commission's authority, it was denied in a letter to Petitioner dated April 7, 1994, which acknowledged receipt of the Petition.[1]

Petitioner supplemented his Petition by letter dated June 16, 1994, rebutting the Licensee's May 20, 1994 letter responding to the Petition. On June 28 and July 6, 1994, Petitioner reiterated his allegation that the Licensee was continuing to discriminate against him and described the Licensee's actions to deny Petitioner his nuclear plant access security clearance. In a letter dated February 24, 1995, Petitioner stated that TVA's continued pattern of harassment and intimidation had resulted in Petitioner's being ''blackballed'' in the nuclear industry. In a letter dated February 28, 1995, Petitioner advised the NRC that he had been terminated by TVA.

II. Background

As the basis for his February 25, 1994 request, Petitioner asserted that he had reported safety concerns to the Commission and that, as a result, TVA management had subjected him to continuous intimidation, harassment, discrimination and reprisal actions, that his name had been placed on a blackball list that had been circulated nationwide preventing him from obtaining suitable employment outside of TVA, and that these actions by TVA had affected his mental and physical health. In a letter dated February 28, 1995, Petitioner asserted that TVA's pattern of harassment and intimidation had culminated in the termination of his employment with TVA.

III. Discussion

Specific Allegations

Petitioner bases his requests for sanctions on his assertion that he was a victim of unlawful discrimination pursuant to 10 CFR 50.7. Petitioner alleges a general pattern of discrimination, and mentions several specific acts by TVA: (1) putting his name on TVA's list of whistleblowers (Petitioner's February 24, 1995 letter), (2) failure to select Petitioner for a position (Petitioner's June 16, 1994 letter), (3) denying him plant access by withholding his security clearance (Petitioner's June 28 and July 6, 1994 letters), and (4) terminating him (Petitioner's February 28, 1995 letter).

The allegation that Petitioner was subjected to discrimination by having his name put on a list of whistleblowers[2] by TVA was investigated by the TVA Inspector General (TVA/IG) which concluded that the creation of this list was not discriminatory. Furthermore, the Department of Labor (DOL) investigated a complaint with respect to the same list filed by another individual and found that creation of the list of individuals who had filed complaints under Section 210/211 of the Energy Reorganization Act (ERA) with DOL did not constitute discrimination

[1] The letter also denied Petitioner's request for immediate action.

[2] The list was a status report of complaints filed by TVA employees with the Department of Labor.