ACTION: Notice of meeting.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act, Pub. L. 92–463, as amended, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration announces a forthcoming meeting of the Aerospace Safety Advisory Panel.

DATES: Thursday, November 12, 1998, 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.

ADDRESSES: National Aeronautics and Space Administration, 300 E Street, SW, Room 5W40, Washington, DC 20546.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Notify Mr. Norman B. Starkey, Code Q-1, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, DC 20546, 202/358–4453, if you plan to attend.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Aerospace Safety Advisory Panel will meet to deliberate topics for inclusion in its Annual Report for 1998. This is pursuant to carrying out its statutory duties for which the Panel reviews, identifies, evaluates, and advises on those program activities, systems, procedures, and management activities that can contribute to program risk. Priority is given to those programs that involve the safety of human flight. The Aerospace Safety Advisory Panel is currently chaired by Richard D. Blomberg and is composed of 9 members and 6 consultants. The meeting will be open to the public up to the capacity of the room (approximately 40 persons including members of the Panel).

Dated: September 21, 1998.

Matthew M. Crouch,

NASA Advisory Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 98–25902 Filed 9–28–98; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 7510–01–P

THE NATIONAL FOUNDATION FOR THE ARTS AND HUMANITIES

Proposed Collection, Comment Request; Institute of Museum and Library Services

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Institute of Museum and Library Services as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, conducts a preclearance consultation program to provide the general public and federal agencies with an opportunity to comment on proposed and/or continuing collections of information in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (PRA95) [44 U.S.C. 3508(2)(A)]. This program helps to ensure that requested data can be

provided in the desired format, reporting burden (time and financial resources) is minimized, collection instruments are clearly understood, and the impact of collection requirements on respondents can be properly assessed. Currently the Institute of Museum and Library Services is soliciting comments concerning the proposed Conservation Assessment Program evaluation questionnaires.

A copy of the proposed information collection request can be obtained by contacting the individual listed below in the addresses section of this notice. **DATES:** Written comments must be submitted to the office listed in the **ADDRESSES** section below on or before November 30, 1998.

IMLS is particularly interested in comments that help the agency to:

- Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility;
- Evaluate the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;
- Enhance the quality, utility and clarity of the information to be collected: and
- Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, e.g., permitting electronic submissions of responses.

ADDRESSES: Send comments to: Dr. Rebecca Danvers, Director of the Office of Research and Technology, Institute of Museum and Library Services, 1100 Pennsylvania Ave., NW, Room 802, Washington, D.C. 20506. Dr. Danvers can be reached on (202) 606–2478 or at rdanvers@imls.fed.us.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

The Museum and Library Services Act, Pub. L. 104–208 enacted on September 30, 1996, authorized the IMLS to make grants to improve library and museum services. As part of its continuing efforts to ensure that all grant programs achieve their goals, the Institute has embarked on a project to evaluate all of its grant programs. This evaluation focuses on the Conservation Assessment Program (CAP) provides eligible museums with a source of general conservation survey grants. The

general conservation survey or assessment provides an overview of all of the museum's collections, as well as its environmental conditions, and policies and procedures relating to collections care. The assessment report assists the institution by:

 Providing recommendations and priorities for conservation actions, both immediate and long-term;

- Facilitating the development of long-range institutional plans for the care and preservation of the collections; and
- Serving as a fundraising tool for future conservation projects.

II. Current Actions

This is a new information collection. The data collection is needed to assess the effectiveness of the Conservation Assessment Program.

Agency: Institute of Museum and Library Services.

Title: Conservation Assessment Program Data Collection. OMB Number: n/a.

Agency Number: 3137. Frequency: One time only.

Affected Public: Museum personnel, conservation professionals.

Number of Respondents: 2500.
Estimated Time Per Respondent: 1
hour average per respondent.
Total Burden Hours: 2500.
Total Annualized capital/startup

Total Annualized capital/startup costs: 0.

Total Annual costs: 0.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Mamie Bittner, Director of Public and Legislative Affairs, Institute of Museum and Library Services, 1100 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20506, telephone (202) 606–4648.

Mamie Bittner,

Director of Public and Legislative Affairs. [FR Doc. 98–25921 Filed 9–28–98; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 7036–01–M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[IA-98-047]

In the Matter of MR. David Milas; Order Prohibiting Involvement in NRC-Licensed Activities

ſ

Mr. David Milas (Mr. Milas) was formerly employed by the Commonwealth Edison Company (ComEd or Licensee) at the Dresden Nuclear Station (Dresden or facility) and was an applicant for a reactor operator's (RO) license at that facility. ComEd is the holder of License Nos. DPR-19 and DPR-25 issued by the Nuclear

Regulatory Commission (NRC or Commission) pursuant to 10 CFR Part 50. These licenses authorize ComEd to operate Dresden Units 2 and 3 in accordance with the conditions specified therein.

TT

On July 1, 1996, officials at Dresden notified the Commission that the NRC examination for reactor operator licenses, due to be administered at Dresden on July 8, 1996, appeared to have been compromised, as portions of that examination had been found in a copy machine. The NRC Office of Investigations (OI) immediately began an investigation into this matter. The OI investigation indicated that the NRC examination was compromised and originally identified only one individual that was involved, an applicant for an NRC senior reactor operator's (SRO) licensee. Upon further investigation, OI also identified Mr. Milas, an applicant for an NRC RO license, as being directly involved with the compromise of the NRC examination.

The OI investigation found that on June 29, 1996, Mr. Milas and the SRO license applicant were studying for their respective examinations in the Dresden Training Building. During that day, they entered the unlocked office of the Dresden licensing instructors to look for written evaluations that their instructors had made of them. According to both individuals, instructors had previously informed their class that study materials could be found in the instructors' office, and the instructors had indicated where the keys could be found for locked cabinets and desks in their office. The two individuals obtained the necessary keys in the instructors' office, unlocked desks and cabinets, and found the NRC operator licensing examination. The SRO applicant photocopied the NRC examination, while Mr. Milas posted himself at a window to watch for anyone entering the training building.

OI also determined that Mr. Milas returned to the same photocopy machine on June 30, 1996, and made another copy of the examination from the copy he had obtained on June 29, 1996

The OI investigators coordinated the results of their investigation with the U.S. Attorney, Chicago, Illinois, and Mr. Milas was subsequently prosecuted for compromising the NRC examination. On May 14, 1998, Mr. Milas pleaded guilty in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois to a criminal charge involving the compromise of a written examination for NRC reactor operators' licenses. As a part of his guilty plea, Mr. Milas

agreed to never reapply for a position as a reactor operator at any facility under the jurisdiction, administration, or control of the NRC.

III

The NRC must be able to rely on a facility licensee and its employees to comply with all NRC rules and regulations. Based on the OI investigation and the criminal conviction, the NRC has concluded that Mr. Milas violated the NRC's rules prohibiting deliberate misconduct at nuclear power facilities and the compromise of the integrity of NRC examinations. Specifically, 10 CFR 50.5(a)(1), "Deliberate Misconduct," prohibits any employee of an NRC licensee (ComEd) from engaging in deliberate misconduct that causes or. but for detection would have caused, a licensee to be in violation of any rule or regulation issued by the Commission. Additionally, 10 CFR 55.49, "Integrity of Examinations and Tests," provides in part that applicants for NRC RO and SRO licenses and facility licensees (ComEd) shall not engage in any activity that compromises the integrity of any test or examination required by 10 CFR Part 55, "Operator's Licenses." The NRC has concluded that Mr. Milas" actions constituted deliberate misconduct and also constituted a deliberate violation of 10 CFR 55.49. Mr. Milas' deliberate actions have raised serious doubt as to whether he can be relied upon to comply with NRC requirements and to refrain from deliberately violating NRC rules and regulations.

Consequently, I lack the requisite reasonable assurance that licensed activities can be conducted in compliance with the Commission's requirements and that the health and safety of the public will be protected if Mr. Milas were permitted at this time to be involved in NRC-licensed activities. Therefore, the public health, safety, and interest require that Mr. Milas be prohibited from any involvement in NRC-licensed activities for a period of five years from the effective date of this Order. If Mr. Milas is involved with another licensee in NRC-licensed activities on the effective date of this Order, he must immediately cease such activities, and inform the NRC of the name, address and telephone number of the employer, and provide a copy of this Order to the employer. Additionally, Mr. Milas is required to notify the NRC of his first employment in NRC-licensed activities in the five years following the prohibition period.

IV

Accordingly, pursuant to sections 57, 63, 81, 161b, 161i, 161o, 182 and 186 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and the Commission's regulations in 10 CFR 2.202, 10 CFR 50.5, and 10 CFR 150.20, *It is hereby ordered that:*

1. David Milas is prohibited for five years from the effective date of this Order from engaging in NRC-licensed activities. NRC-licensed activities are those activities that are conducted pursuant to a specific or general license issued by the NRC, including, but not limited to, those activities of Agreement State licensees conducted pursuant to the authority granted by 10 CFR 150.20.

2. If Mr. Milas is involved with another licensee in NRC-licensed activities on the effective date of this Order, he must immediately cease such activities, and inform the NRC of the name, address and telephone number of the employer, and provide a copy of this

Order to the employer.

3. For a period of five years after the five-year period of prohibition has expired, Mr. Milas shall, within 20 days of his acceptance of each employment offer involving NRC-licensed activities or his becoming involved in NRClicensed activities, as defined in Paragraph IV.1 above, provide notice to the Director, Office of Enforcement, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, of the name, address, and telephone number of the employer or the entity where he is, or will be, involved in the NRC-licensed activities. In the first notification, Mr. Milas shall include a statement of his commitment to compliance with regulatory requirements and the basis why the Commission should have confidence that he will now comply with applicable NRC requirements.

The Director, Office of Enforcement, may, in writing, relax or rescind any of the above conditions upon demonstration by Mr. Milas of good cause.

V

In accordance with 10 CFR 2.202, David Milas must, and any other person adversely affected by this Order may, submit an answer to this Order, and may request a hearing on this Order, within 20 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, DC 20555, and include a statement of good cause

for the extension. The answer may consent to this Order. Unless the answer consents to this Order, the answer shall. in writing and under oath or affirmation, specifically admit or deny each allegation or charge made in this Order and shall set forth the matters of fact and law on which Mr. Milas or other person adversely affected relies and the reasons as to why the Order should not have been issued. Any answer or request for a hearing shall be submitted to the Secretary, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, ATTN: Chief, Rulemaking and Adjudications, Washington, DC 20555. Copies also shall be sent to the Director, Office of Enforcement, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, to the Deputy Assistant General Counsel for Enforcement at the same address, to the Regional Administrator, NRC Region III, 801 Warrenville Road, Lisle, IL 60532-4351, and to Mr. Milas, if the answer or hearing request is by a person other than Mr. Milas. If a person other than Mr. Milas requests a hearing, that person shall set forth with particularity the manner in which his interest is adversely affected by this Order and shall address the criteria set forth in 10 CFR 2.714(d).

If a hearing is requested by Mr. Milas or a person whose interest is adversely affected, the Commission will issue an Order designating the time and place of any hearing. If a hearing is held, the issue to be considered at such hearing shall be whether this Order should be sustained.

In the absence of any request for hearing, or written approval of an extension of time in which to request a hearing, the provisions specified in Section IV above shall be final 20 days from the date of this Order without further order or proceedings. If an extension of time for requesting a hearing has been approved, the provisions specified in Section IV shall be final when the extension expires if a hearing request has not been received.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland this 18th day of September 1998.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

William D. Travers,

Deputy Executive Director for Regulatory Effectiveness

[FR Doc. 98–25996 Filed 9–28–98; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket 70-7001]

Notice of Amendment to Certificate of Compliance GDP-1 for the U.S. Enrichment Corporation Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant, Paducah, KY

The Director, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, has made a determination that the following amendment request is not significant in accordance with 10 CFR 76.45. In making that determination, the staff concluded that: (1) there is no change in the types or significant increase in the amounts of any effluents that may be released offsite; (2) there is no significant increase in individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure; (3) there is no significant construction impact; (4) there is no significant increase in the potential for, or radiological or chemical consequences from, previously analyzed accidents; (5) the proposed changes do not result in the possibility of a new or different kind of accident; (6) there is no significant reduction in any margin of safety; and (7) the proposed changes will not result in an overall decrease in the effectiveness of the plant's safety, safeguards or security programs. The basis for this determination for the amendment request is shown below.

The NRC staff has reviewed the certificate amendment application and concluded that it provides reasonable assurance of adequate safety, safeguards, and security, and compliance with NRC requirements. Therefore, the Director, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, is prepared to issue an amendment to the Certificate of Compliance for the Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant. The staff has prepared a Compliance Evaluation Report which provides details of the staff's evaluation.

The NRC staff has determined that this amendment satisfies the criteria for a categorical exclusion in accordance with 10 CFR 51.22. Therefore, pursuant to 10 CFR 51.22(b), no environmental impact statement or environmental assessment need be prepared for this amendment.

USEC or any person whose interest may be affected may file a petition, not exceeding 30 pages, requesting review of the Director's Decision. The petition must be filed with the Commission not later than 15 days after publication of this **Federal Register** Notice. A petition for review of the Director's Decision shall set forth with particularity the interest of the petitioner and how that interest may be affected by the results of the decision. The petition should

specifically explain the reasons why review of the Decision should be permitted with particular reference to the following factors: (1) the interest of the petitioner; (2) how that interest may be affected by the Decision, including the reasons why the petitioner should be permitted a review of the Decision; and (3) the petitioner's areas of concern about the activity that is the subject matter of the Decision. Any person described in this paragraph (USEC or any person who filed a petition) may file a response to any petition for review, not to exceed 30 pages, within 10 days after filing of the petition. If no petition is received within the designated 15-day period, the Director will issue the final amendment to the Certificate of Compliance without further delay. If a petition for review is received, the decision on the amendment application will become final in 60 days, unless the Commission grants the petition for review or otherwise acts within 60 days after publication of this Federal Register Notice.

A petition for review must be filed with the Secretary, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001, Attention: Rulemakings and Adjudications Staff, or may be delivered to the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW, Washington, DC, by the above date.

For further details with respect to the action see (1) the application for amendment and (2) the Commission's Compliance Evaluation Report. These items are 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.

Date of amendment request: May 29, 1998.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment proposes to revise the Technical Safety Requirement (TSR) for the Feed Facility Autoclave Manual Isolation System. USEC proposes to add a specific condition and required action to TSR 2.2.4.13 that specifies the actions to be taken if the actuation device located in the Area Control Room (ACR) is inoperable. The autoclave manual isolation system provides a mechanism to remotely isolate all the autoclaves in the feed facility in the event of a uranium hexafluoride release from piping outside the autoclave.

Basis for Finding of No Significance

1. The proposed amendment will not result in a change in the types or significant increase in the amounts of