

Dated: August 19, 1996.
M. Rebecca Winkler,
Committee Management Officer.
[FR Doc. 96-21451 Filed 8-21-96; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 7555-01-M

Special Emphasis Panel in Polar Programs; 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: Special Emphasis Panel in Polar Programs (1209).

Date and Time: September 11-13, 1996, 8:00 am-5:00 pm.

Place: Room 1120, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, VA 22230.

Type of Meeting: Closed.

Contact Person: Julie Palais, Polar Programs, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, VA 22230. Telephone: (703) 306-1033.

Purpose of Meeting: To provide advice and recommendations concerning proposals submitted to NSF for financial support.

Agenda: To review and evaluate Antarctic Glaciology Program proposals as part of the selection process for awards.

Reason for Closing: The proposals being reviewed include information of a proprietary or confidential nature, including technical information; financial data, such as salaries and personal information concerning individuals associated with the proposals. These matters are exempt under 5 U.S.C. 552b(c) (4) and (6) of the Government in the Sunshine Act.

Dated: August 19, 1996.
M. Rebecca Winkler,
Committee Management Officer.
[FR Doc. 96-21452 Filed 8-21-96; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 7555-01-M

Special Emphasis Panel in Social, Behavioral, and Economic Sciences; 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: Special Emphasis Panel in Social, Behavioral, and Economic Sciences (1766).

Date and Time: September 12 and 13, 1996; 8:30 am-5:00 pm.

Place: Room 920, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Blvd., Arlington, VA.

Type of Meeting: Closed.

Contact Persons: Rose Gombay and Christine French, Division of International Programs, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Blvd., Arlington, VA 22230. Telephone: (703) 306-1702.

Purpose of Meeting: To provide advice and recommendations concerning proposals submitted to NSF for financial support.

Agenda: To review and evaluate U.S. research proposals for international collaboration in materials research as part of the selection process for awards.

Reason for Closing: The proposals being reviewed include information of a proprietary or confidential nature, including technical information; financial data, such as salaries; and personal information concerning individuals associated with the proposals. These matters are exempt under 5 U.S.C. 552b(c), (4) and (6) of the Government in the Sunshine Act.

Dated: August 19, 1996.
M. Rebecca Winkler,
Committee Management Officer.
[FR Doc. 96-21453 Filed 8-21-96; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 7555-01-M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50-237 and 50-249]

Commonwealth Edison Company; Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating Licenses, 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 Nos. DPR-19 and DPR-25 issued to Commonwealth Edison Company (the licensee) for operation of the Dresden Nuclear Power Station, Units 2 and 3, respectively, located in Grundy County, Illinois.

The proposed amendment would delay the implementation of an amendment issued on June 28, 1996. The implementation of the June 28, 1996, license amendment was scheduled to take place 90 days after issuance of the amendment, prior to September 26, 1996. The amendment was the last in a series of amendments issued as part of the licensee's Technical Specification Upgrade Program (TSUP). Both Dresden units have been in forced maintenance outages and, as a result, the licensee has not been able to implement all of the Technical Specifications associated with the TSUP program.

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:

The proposed schedule changes do not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated because:

In general, the Technical Specification provisions approved under TSUP represent the conversion of current requirements to a more generic format, or the addition of requirements which are based on the current safety analysis. The delay of implementation of TSUP will result in delay in the incorporation of provisions that provide increased reliability of equipment assumed to operate in the current safety analysis, or provide continued assurance that specified parameters remain within their acceptance limits. A deferral in the implementation of the TSUP will not result in alteration of the precursors associated with the transients and accidents that the current technical specifications and TSUP are based on. Therefore, the deferral of TSUP implementation does not significantly increase the probability or consequences of a previously evaluated accident.

Create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated because:

In general, the Technical Specification provisions approved under TSUP represent the conversion of current requirements to a more generic format, or the addition of requirements which are based on the current safety analysis. TSUP provisions also represent minor curtailments of the current requirements which are based on generic guidance or previously approved provisions for other licensees. The changes to the Technical Specification approved under TSUP have not required design changes to the plant nor will the deferral of TSUP result in the creation of any design changes to Dresden Station. No new modes of equipment operation are introduced by the deferral of TSUP implementation. The deferral of TSUP implementation will maintain at least the present level of operability.

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

Involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety because:

Some individual changes under TSUP included the adoption of new requirements which will provide enhancement of the

reliability of the equipment assumed to operate in the safety analysis, or provide enhanced assurance that specified parameters remain within their acceptance limits. The deferral of TSUP implementation will result in delay of realization of the addition of the enhanced provisions, but in no way creates an inadequacy of the current Technical Specifications to maintain the existing margin of safety. The margin of safety in the current Technical Specifications is adequate and is not reduced by the deferral of TSUP.

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 Chief, Rules Review and Directives Branch, Division of Freedom of Information and Publications Services, Office of Administration, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, 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 September 23, 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 Morris Area Public Library District, 604 Liberty Street, Morris, Illinois 60450. 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 20555-0001, 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 Robert A. Capra: 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 20555-0001, and to Michael I. Miller, Esquire; Sidley and Austin, One First National Plaza, Chicago, Illinois 60603, 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 August 16, 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 Morris Area Public Library District, 604 Liberty Street, Morris, Illinois 60450.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 19th day of August 1996.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.
Robert M. Pulsifer,
*Project Manager, Project Directorate III-2
Division of Reactor Projects—III/IV Office of
Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*
[FR Doc. 96-21403 Filed 8-21-96; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

**Proposed Generic Communication;
Primary Water Stress Corrosion
Cracking of Control Rod Drive
Mechanism and Other Vessel Head
Penetrations**

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Extension of public comment period.

SUMMARY: On August 1, 1996 (61 FR 40253), the NRC published for public comment a proposed generic letter

concerning primary water stress corrosion cracking in control rod drive mechanisms and other vessel head penetrations of nuclear power reactors that requested addressees to describe their program for ensuring the timely inspection of PWR control rod drive mechanism (CRDM) and other vessel head penetrations. The comment period for this proposed generic letter was originally scheduled to expire on September 3, 1996. In a letter dated August 6, 1996, the Nuclear Energy Institute requested a 30-day extension of the comment period to permit sufficient time for the industry to assemble and develop comments. In response to this request, the NRC has decided to extend the comment period 30 days.

DATES: The comment period has been extended and now expires October 3, 1996. Comments submitted after this date will be considered if it is practical to do so, but assurance of consideration cannot be given except for comments received on or before this date.

ADDRESSES: Submit written comments to Chief, Rules Review and Directives Branch, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Mail Stop T-6D-69, Washington, DC 20555-0001. Written comments may also be delivered to 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland, from 7:30 am to 4:15 pm, Federal workdays. Copies of written comments received may be examined at the NRC Public Document Room, 2120 L Street, N.W. (Lower Level), Washington, D.C.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: C. E. (Gene) Carpenter (301) 415-2169.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 14th day of August, 1996.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.
Brian K. Grimes,
*Acting Director, Division of Reactor Program
Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor
Regulation.*
[FR Doc. 96-21405 Filed 8-21-96; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

**SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE
COMMISSION**

[Release No. 34-37576; File No. SR-CHX-96-23]

**Self-Regulatory Organizations; Notice
of Filing and Immediate Effectiveness
of Proposed Rule Change by The
Chicago Stock Exchange, Incorporated
Relating to Limited Partnership
Rollups, Depository Eligibility
Requirements and Nasdaq/NM
Securities**

August 15, 1996.

Pursuant to Section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 ("Act"),¹ notice is hereby given that on August 9, 1996, the Chicago Stock Exchange, Incorporated ("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 CHX proposes to amend Rule 7(J), Article XXVIII of its rules, regarding the listing of securities related to limited partnership rollups and the depository eligibility requirement for issuers of domestic securities. The rule change also proposes to amend the following rules each relating to the trading of Nasdaq/NM Securities (i) Article XX, Rule 2, (ii) Article XX, Rule 37(a), interpretations and policies .01, (iii) Article XX, Rule 43, (iv) Article XXVIII, Rule 18(b), (v) Article XXX, Rule 1, interpretations and policies .02, .03, (vi) Article XXX, Rule 23, interpretations and policies .01, (vii) Article XXXI, Rule 5, interpretations and policies .01, and (viii) Article XXXI, Rule 9(b).

**II. Self-Regulatory Organization's
Statement of the Purpose of, and
Statutory Basis for, the Proposed Rule
Change**

In its filing with the Commission, the self-regulatory organization included statements concerning the purpose of and basis for the proposed rule change and discussed any comments it received on the proposed rule change. The text of these statements may be examined at the places specified in Item IV below. The self-regulatory organization has prepared summaries, set forth in

¹ 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1).