

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION**Advisory Committee for Engineering;
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: Advisory Committee for Engineering (1170).

Date and Time: February 22; 9:00 a.m.–4:00 p.m.

Place: National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Room 970, Arlington, VA 22230.

Type of Meeting: Closed.

Contact Person: Janie M. Fouke, Division Director, Division of Bioengineering and Environmental Systems, Room 565, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, VA 22230, Telephone: (703) 306-1320.

Purpose of Meeting: To carry out Committee of Visitors (COV) review, including examination of decisions on proposals, reviewer comments, and other privileged materials.

Agenda: To provide oversight review of the Bioengineering and Environmental Systems Division.

Reason for Closing: The meeting is closed to the public because the Committee is reviewing proposal actions that will include privileged intellectual property and personal information that could harm individuals if they were disclosed. If discussions were open to the public, these matters that are exempt under 5 U.S.C. 552b(c) (4) and (6) of the Government in the Sunshine Act would be improperly disclosed.

Dated: January 29, 1996.

M. Rebecca Winkler,

Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 96-2147 Filed 1-13-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555-01-M

**NUCLEAR REGULATORY
COMMISSION****The Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995**

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: President Clinton recently signed into law the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (the "Act"), which requires some individuals and entities who lobby "covered" Federal officials to register with Congress and file semiannual reports describing their lobbying activities.

For purposes of the Act, NRC "covered" officials are limited to the Members of the Commission and their personal staffs, the Inspector General, the Executive Director for Operations, the General Counsel and the Directors of

the Offices of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards and Nuclear Regulatory Research.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Daryl M. Shapiro, Office of the General Counsel at 301-415-1600.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 25th day of January, 1996.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

John C. Hoyle,

Secretary of the Commission.

[FR Doc. 96-1862 Filed 1-31-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

[Docket No. 50-275]**Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant,
Unit No. 1; 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. DPR-80 issued to Pacific Gas and Electric Company (the licensee) for operation of the Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant, Unit No. 1, located in San Luis Obispo County, California.

The proposed amendment would revise the combined Technical Specifications (TS) for the Diablo Canyon Power Plant, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, to allow operation of Unit 1 in Mode 3 (Hot Standby) during installation of a replacement nonvital auxiliary transformer 1-1. Specifically, TS 3/4.8.1.1, "Electrical Power Systems—A.C. Sources—Operating," Action Statement (a), would be revised to permit a one-time extension of the allowed outage time (AOT) from 72 hours to 120 hours.

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.

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. The proposed change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

A probabilistic risk assessment (PRA) evaluation shows that the probability of a loss of off site power duration is increased slightly by the allowed outage time (AOT) increase from 72 to 120 hours. The core damage probability is 1.2 E-7 for the total 120 hour AOT. Based on EPRI/NEI [Electric Power Research Institute/Nuclear Energy Institute] guidance, this increase is not considered significant.

The consequences of the 230 kV system loss are not affected by increasing the AOT of the 500 kV system. Additionally, the consequences of the potential event are mitigated by the compensatory measures taken to assure the reliability of the remaining power sources.

Therefore, the proposed change does not significantly increase the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. The proposed change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

The proposed change does not affect the method of operating any equipment at Diablo Canyon Power Plant. Additionally, the proposed extension of the AOT does not result in a physical modification to any equipment.

Therefore, the proposed change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

3. The proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

A PRA evaluation has shown that the impact of extending the AOT has no significant impact on core damage frequency. Additionally, compensatory measures have been implemented to minimize the potential of losing the 230 kV system.

Therefore, the proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in a 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 30 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 30-day notice period.

However, should circumstances change during the notice period such that failure to act in a timely way would result, for example, in derating or shutdown of the facility, the Commission may issue the license amendment before the expiration of the 30-day notice period, provided that its final determination is that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration. The final determination will consider all public and State comments received. Should the Commission take this action, it will publish in the Federal Register a notice of issuance and provide for opportunity for a hearing after issuance. The Commission expects that the need to take this action will occur very infrequently.

Written comments may be submitted by mail to the Rules Review and Directives Branch, Division of Freedom of Information and Publications Services, Office of Administration, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, and should cite the publication date and page number of this Federal Register notice. Written comments may also be delivered to Room 6D22, Two White Flint North, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland, from 7:30 a.m. to 4:15 p.m. Federal workdays. Copies of written comments received may be examined at the NRC Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC.

The filing of requests for hearing and petitions for leave to intervene is discussed below.

By March 4, 1996, the licensee may file a request for a hearing with respect to issuance of the amendment to the subject facility operating license and any person whose interest may be affected by this proceeding and who wishes to participate as a party in the proceeding must file a written request for a hearing and a petition for leave to intervene. Requests for a hearing and a petition for leave to intervene shall be filed in accordance with the Commission's "Rules of Practice for Domestic Licensing Proceedings" in 10 CFR part 2. Interested persons should consult a current copy of 10 CFR 2.714 which is available at the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, and at the local public document room located at the California Polytechnic State University, Robert E. Kennedy Library, Government Documents and Maps Department, San Luis Obispo, California 93407. If a request for a hearing or petition for leave to intervene is filed by the above date, the Commission or an Atomic

Safety and Licensing Board, designated by the Commission or by the Chairman of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, will rule on the request and/or petition; and the Secretary or the designated Atomic Safety and Licensing Board will issue a notice of hearing or an appropriate order.

As required by 10 CFR 2.714, a petition for leave to intervene shall set forth with particularity the interest of the petitioner in the proceeding, and how that interest may be affected by the results of the proceeding. The petition should specifically explain the reasons why intervention should be permitted with particular reference to the following factors: (1) the nature of the petitioner's right under the Act to be made party to the proceeding; (2) the nature and extent of the petitioner's property, financial, or other interest in the proceeding; and (3) the possible effect of any order which may be entered in the proceeding on the petitioner's interest. The petition should also identify the specific aspect(s) of the subject matter of the proceeding as to which petitioner wishes to intervene. Any person who has filed a petition for leave to intervene or who has been admitted as a party may amend the petition without requesting leave of the Board up to 15 days prior to the first prehearing conference scheduled in the proceeding, but such an amended petition must satisfy the specificity requirements described above.

Not later than 15 days prior to the first prehearing conference scheduled in the proceeding, a petitioner shall file a supplement to the petition to intervene which must include a list of the contentions which are sought to be litigated in the matter. Each contention must consist of a specific statement of the issue of law or fact to be raised or controverted. In addition, the petitioner shall provide a brief explanation of the bases of the contention and a concise statement of the alleged facts or expert opinion which support the contention and on which the petitioner intends to rely in proving the contention at the hearing. The petitioner must also provide references to those specific sources and documents of which the petitioner is aware and on which the petitioner intends to rely to establish those facts or expert opinion. Petitioner must provide sufficient information to show that a genuine dispute exists with the applicant on a material issue of law or fact. Contentions shall be limited to matters within the scope of the amendment under consideration. The contention must be one which, if proven, would entitle the petitioner to relief. A petitioner who fails to file such

a supplement which satisfies these requirements with respect to at least one contention will not be permitted to participate as a party.

Those permitted to intervene become parties to the proceeding, subject to any limitations in the order granting leave to intervene, and have the opportunity to participate fully in the conduct of the hearing, including the opportunity to present evidence and cross-examine witnesses.

If a hearing is requested, the Commission will make a final determination on the issue of no significant hazards consideration. The final determination will serve to decide when the hearing is held.

If the final determination is that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration, the Commission may issue the amendment and make it immediately effective, notwithstanding the request for a hearing. Any hearing held would take place after issuance of the amendment.

If the final determination is that the amendment request involves a significant hazards consideration, any hearing held would take place before the issuance of any amendment.

A request for a hearing or a petition for leave to intervene must be filed with the Secretary of the Commission, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, Attention: Docketing and Services Branch, or may be delivered to the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, by the above date. Where petitions are filed during the last 10 days of the notice period, it is requested that the petitioner promptly so inform the Commission by a toll-free telephone call to Western Union at 1-(800) 248-5100 (in Missouri 1-(800) 342-6700). The Western Union operator should be given Datagram Identification Number N1023 and the following message addressed to William H. Bateman, Director, Project Directorate IV-2: petitioner's name and telephone number, date petition was mailed, plant name, and publication date and page number of this Federal Register notice. A copy of the petition should also be sent to the Office of the General Counsel, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, and to Christopher J. Warner, Esq., Pacific Gas and Electric Company, P.O. Box 7442, San Francisco, California 94120, attorney for the licensee.

Nontimely filings of petitions for leave to intervene, amended petitions, supplemental petitions and/or requests for hearing will not be entertained absent a determination by the Commission, the presiding officer or the

presiding Atomic Safety and Licensing Board that the petition and/or request should be granted based upon a balancing of the factors specified in 10 CFR 2.714(a)(1)(i)-(v) and 2.714(d).

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendment dated January 18, 1996, which is 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 located at the California Polytechnic State University, Robert E. Kennedy Library, Government Documents and Maps Department, San Luis Obispo, California 93407.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 26th day of January 1996.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.
Steven D. Bloom,
*Project Manager, Project Directorate IV-2;
Division of Reactor Projects—III/IV, Office of
Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*
[FR Doc. 96-2049 Filed 1-31-96; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

[Docket Nos. 50-445 and 50-446]

Comanche Peak Steam Electric Station, Units 1 and 2; Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating License, Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination and Opportunity for a Hearing; Correction

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment: Correction.

SUMMARY: This document corrects a notice appearing in the Federal Register on January 22, 1996 (61 FR 1651), that states the Commission is considering issuance of an amendment to Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-87 and NPF-89, issued to Texan Utilities Electric Company (TU Electric, the licensee), for operation of the Comanche Peak Steam Electric Station, Units 1 and 2 located on Somervell County, Texas. The action is necessary to correct the 30-day filing date.

On page 1652, in the first paragraph in the first column, the date "February 20, 1996," should read "February 21, 1996."

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 26th day of January, 1996.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.
Michael T. Lesar,
*Chief, Rules Review Section, Rules Review
and Directives Branch.*
[FR Doc. 96-2050 Filed 1-31-96; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

Agency Forms Submitted for OMB Review

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35), the Railroad Retirement Board has submitted the following proposal(s) for the collection of information to the Office of Management and Budget for review and approval.

SUMMARY OF PROPOSAL(S):

- (1) *Collection title:* Repayment of Debt (ORSP).
- (2) *Form(s) submitted:* G-421f.
- (3) *OMB Number:* 3220-0169.
- (4) *Expiration date of current OMB clearance:* February 29, 1996.
- (5) *Type of request:* Extension of a currently approved collection.
- (6) *Respondents:* Individuals or households.
- (7) *Estimated annual number of respondents:* 300.
- (8) *Total annual responses:* 300.
- (9) *Total annual reporting hours:* 25.
- (10) *Collection description:* Section 2 of the Railroad Retirement Act provides for payment of annuities to retired or disabled railroad employees, their spouses, and eligible survivors. When the RRB determines that an overpayment of RRA benefits has occurred, it initiates prompt action to notify the claimant of the overpayment and to recover the amount owed. The collection obtains information needed to allow for repayment by the claimant by credit card, in addition to the customary form of payment by check or money order.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION OR COMMENTS:

Copies of the form and supporting documents can be obtained from Chuck Mierzwa, the agency clearance officer (312-751-3363). Comments regarding the information collection should be addressed to Ronald J. Hodapp, Railroad Retirement Board, 844 North Rush Street, Chicago, Illinois 60611-2092 and the OMB reviewer, Laura Oliven, (202-395-7316), Office of Management and Budget, Room 10230, New Executive Office Building, Washington, DC 20503. Chuck Mierzwa,
Clearance Officer.

[FR Doc. 96-2137 Filed 1-31-96; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 7905-01-M

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34-36777; File No. SR-CHX-96-01]

Self-Regulatory Organizations; Notice of Filing and Immediate Effectiveness of Proposed Rule Change by the Chicago Stock Exchange, Inc. Relating to MAX

January 26, 1996.

Pursuant to Section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 ("Act"), 15 U.S.C. § 78s(b)(1), notice is hereby given that on January 25, 1996, the Chicago Stock Exchange, Inc. ("CHX" or "Exchange") filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission ("Commission") the proposed rule change as described in Items I, II, and III below, which Items have been prepared by the self-regulatory organization. The Commission is publishing this notice to solicit comments on the proposed rule change from interested persons.

I. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Terms of Substance of the Proposed Rule Change

The exchange proposes to amend subsection (e) of Rule 37 of Article XX relating to the CHS's MAX System. The text of the proposed rule change is as follows [new text is italicized; deleted text is bracketed]:

Article XX

Rule 37

(e) The Exchange's Enhanced SuperMAX program shall be an automatic execution program within MAX in which a Specialist may voluntarily choose to participate on a stock-by-stock basis. A Specialist shall decide if his or her stock will be eligible for Enhanced SuperMAX treatment. In the event that a stock is eligible for Enhanced SuperMAX treatment (pursuant to paragraph (e) of this Rule) and SuperMAX treatment (pursuant to paragraph (c) of this Rule) at the same time, the size of the order and the inclusion of security in the S&P 500™ Index will determine which program will be followed for execution. *If a stock is not included in the S&P 500™ Index, an order of 299 shares or less will execute according to the SuperMAX program and an order from 300 shares up to and including 1099 shares (or such greater size specified by the specialist and approved by the Exchange) will execute according to the Enhanced SuperMAX program. If a stock is included in the S&P 500™ Index, or if a specialist in a non-S&P 500™ Index issue so chooses, a[A]n order of 599 shares or less will execute according to the SuperMAX program and an order from 600 shares up to and including 1099 shares (or such greater size specified by the specialist and approved by the Exchange) [greater than 599] will execute according to the Enhanced SuperMAX program. In the*