

employees of the employer maintaining the plan and their beneficiaries;

(2) These exemptions are supplemental to and not in derogation of, any other provisions of the Act and/or the Code, including statutory or administrative exemptions and transactional rules. Furthermore, the fact that a transaction is subject to an administrative or statutory exemption is not dispositive of whether the transaction is in fact a prohibited transaction; and

(3) The availability of these exemptions is subject to the express condition that the material facts and representations contained in each application accurately describes all material terms of the transaction which is the subject of the exemption.

Signed at Washington, D.C., this 19th day of November, 1996.

Ivan Strasfeld,

*Director of Exemption Determinations,
Pension and Welfare Benefits Administration,
U.S. Department of Labor.*

[FR Doc. 96-29901 Filed 11-21-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-29-M

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Proposed Collection; Comment Request

Title of Proposed Collection: An Evaluation of Design and Manufacturing Research Program Awards made in FY1986.

In compliance with the requirements of Section 3506(c)(2)(A) of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, for opportunity for public comment on proposed data collection projects, the National Science Foundation (NSF) is publishing this announcement of its intention to collect evaluation data from Principal Investigators receiving awards under the Design, Manufacture and Industrial Innovation (DMII) program for the fiscal year cited above. To request more information on the proposed project, or to obtain a copy of the data collection plans and instruments, call Herman Fleming, NSF Clearance officer, at (703) 306-1243.

Comments are invited on (a) whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information from respondents, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

Proposed Project: An Evaluation of DMII Awards made in FY 1986. The ability of the National Science Foundation to continue a high level of support for university-based research is becoming increasingly dependent on the ability of the NSF and its research partners to explain the impact of funded research on the lives of the U.S. citizens who provide those funds. While NSF has anecdotal accounts of manufacturing-related NSF projects that ultimately led to major new technologies with a significant impact on commerce, the Foundation has no systematic evidence regarding the frequency of such events, nor the process by which these outcomes may have occurred. Therefore, the NSF Director has requested that a pilot project be initiated to perform an exhaustive study of the outcomes of design and manufacturing-related awards made in FY1986.

Some 200 Principal Investigators who were recipients of an award from DMII in FY1986 will be asked to provide a one-page narrative describing the impact of their work. They will need to consider their project in light of their knowledge of progress in the broad field in which it may have been applied. For instance, did their work provide key insights which led to important follow-on projects, in their lab or at other labs, carried out by the PI, by his or her students or industry engineers with whom they consulted? If so, they will be asked to describe the chain of discovery in their narrative.

The DMII is asking that PIs assist in this evaluation by providing the following information:

(1) a brief one page narrative regarding the outcomes and impacts of the project;

(2) citations to no more than 3 key journal articles, books or patents that resulted from the project, or in which the project played an important role;

(3) the names, addresses and telephone numbers of between 3 and 5 other individuals who are familiar with the work carried out under the project, and who could provide additional insights as to its outcomes and impacts; and

(4) one hard copy of each of the journal articles and patent(s) that are cited. With regard to the narrative materials, the following information will be requested:

(A) Complete project title.

(B) PI, Co-PI and institutional affiliations.

(C) Time frame during which project was conducted.

(D) Principal outputs or results of the project.

(E) Longer term outcomes and follow-on impacts of the project.

(F) The PI's best assessment of the impact of this NSF-funded research on the current (1996) state of design and manufacturing technology, including any known commercial implementations.

(G) Any other observations that the PI wishes to make (e.g., regarding the promotion of a significant discovery, creation of a significant research capability, promotion of new knowledge flowing to society).

The narratives, citations, and names of others knowledgeable about the project may be submitted using the Internet or regular mail.

The DMII will organize a panel of experts in the field who are knowledgeable about the types of projects funded, and the nature of innovations that have occurred over the past decades. The expert panel's first assignment will be to conduct a thorough review and assessment of the narratives submitted by the PIs. Once the narratives have been reviewed, a subset of 20 outstanding examples of awards with significant impacts will be chosen, and brief case studies will be prepared by the contractor in order to better understand the process by which the impacts occurred.

Under the final phase of this evaluation, the expert panel will then review the case studies and, based upon findings from both the project narratives and the individual case studies, prepare an overall assessment of the contributions made by these awards.

The DMII program staff will then review the findings and assess their implications for future program priorities and actions.

DMII has contracted with Abt Associates Inc. of Cambridge, Massachusetts, to assist it in the survey and reports preparation process.

Use of Information: The information collected will be used to assist the Foundation in the evaluation of this program, and in considering various program priorities and selection procedures for future projects in this area. NSF will also consider how best to satisfy the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) in reporting outcomes and impacts of programs of this type. Finally, NSF will determine how to improve future evaluation activities applied to subsequent awards made under this program.

Confidentiality: Copies of the narratives will be reviewed by a panel of experts selected by NSF. The subsequent case studies will also be reviewed by this expert panel. Some materials may be disseminated by NSF

as a part of the program evaluation process. No sensitive information is being requested in the survey.

Burden on the Public: The Foundation estimates that, on average, two hours will be required to prepare the narratives, or a total of 400 hours for all PIs. In addition, it anticipates 4 hours of interviews for each of 20 case studies, or 80 hours. Thus, total burden is estimated at 480 hours.

Send comments to Herman Fleming, Clearance Office, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 485, Arlington, VA 2230. Written comments should be received by January 22, 1997.

Dated: November 19, 1996.

Herman G. Fleming,

Reports Clearance Officer.

[FR Doc. 96-29876 Filed 11-21-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555-01-M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-483]

Callaway Plant, Unit 1, Union Electric Company; Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering approval under 10 CFR 50.80(a) of the application concerning the corporate merger agreement between Union Electric Company (the licensee), holder of Facility Operating License No. NPF-30, issued for operation of the Callaway Plant, Unit 1, located in Callaway County, Missouri, and CIPSCO Incorporated.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed action would approve the application concerning the merger agreement between Union Electric Company (UEC) and CIPSCO Incorporated (CIPSCO), which would provide for UEC to become a wholly-owned operating company of Ameren Corporation (Ameren), which is now owned equally by UEC and CIPSCO. Ameren would hold all common stock in UEC upon completion of the merger. UEC would continue to remain the owner/operator of Callaway Plant, Unit 1. The proposed action is in accordance with UEC's application dated February 23, 1996, as supplemented by letter dated April 24, 1996.

The Need for the Proposed Action

The proposed action is required to enable UEC to consummate the merger

agreement with CIPSCO as described above. UEC has submitted that the merger will enable UEC and CIPSCO to reduce the combined operating costs for UEC and CIPSCO, that both companies have been aggressively pursuing cost reductions to remain competitive, and have reached the practical limits of that strategy, and that by combining utility operations, both companies have an opportunity to achieve more cost efficiency than either company could achieve independently.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed corporate merger and concludes that there will be no physical or operational changes to the Callaway Plant. The corporate merger will not affect the qualifications or organization affiliation of the personnel who operate the facility, as UEC will continue to be responsible for the operation of the Callaway Plant, Unit 1.

The Commission has evaluated the environmental impact of the proposed action and has determined that the probability or consequences of accidents would not be increased by the merger, and that post-accident radiological releases would not be greater than previously determined. Further, the Commission has determined that the corporate merger would not affect routine radiological plant effluents and would not increase occupational radiological exposure. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

With regard to potential nonradiological impacts, the merger would not affect nonradiological plant effluents and would have no other environmental impact. Therefore, the Commission concludes that there are no significant nonradiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

Alternative to the Proposed Action

Since the Commission concluded that there are no significant environmental effects that would result from the proposed action, any alternative with equal or greater environmental impacts need not be evaluated.

The principal alternative would be to deny the requested action. Denial of the application would result in no change in current environmental impacts. The environmental impacts of the proposed action and the alternative action are identical.

Alternative Use of Resources

This action does not involve the use of any resources not previously considered in the Final Environmental Statement for the Callaway Plant, dated March 1975.

Agencies and Persons Contacted

In accordance with its stated policy, on October 30, 1996, the staff consulted with the Missouri State official, Tom Lange, for the Department of Natural Resources, regarding the environmental impact of the proposed action. The State official had no comments.

Finding of No Significant Impact

Based upon the environmental assessment, the Commission concludes that the proposed action will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment. Accordingly, the Commission has determined not to prepare an environmental impact statement for the proposed action.

For further details with respect to the proposed action, see the licensee's application dated February 23, 1996, as supplemented by letter dated April 24, 1996, which 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 located at the Callaway County Public Library, 710 Court Street, Fulton, Missouri 65251.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 18th day of November 1996.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Kristine M. Thomas,

Project Manager, Project Directorate IV-2, Division of Reactor Projects III/IV, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 96-29899 Filed 11-21-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

[Dockets Nos. 50-335 and 50-389]

Florida Power & Light Co., St. Lucie, Units 1 and 2; Issuance of Director's Decision Under 10 CFR 2.206

Notice is hereby given that the Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, has taken action with regard to a Petition for action under 10 CFR 2.206 dated June 12, 1996, by Mr. Thomas J. Saporito, Jr. and on behalf of the National Litigation Consultants. The Petition pertains to St. Lucie, Units 1 and 2.

The Petitioners requested the Commission (1) to issue a confirmatory order requiring that the Florida Power and Light Company (Licensee) not operate the St. Lucie Nuclear Station, Unit 1 above 50% of its power level