between 25 and 200 parts per million produce transient irritation. The potential for this release to occur for an extended period of time is low because CPM would take response actions in accordance with their Preparedness, Prevention, and Contingency Plan.

Alternative to the Proposed Action

An alternative to the proposed action is non-renewal of the license. In this case, CPM would shut down the processes that involve source material, and would decontaminate and decommission (D&D) the site in accordance with an approved plan. Cabot would do a thorough survey of the site grounds and buildings and prepare a detailed D&D Plan. The environmental impacts of the D&D activities would be assessed during NRC review of the detailed D&D Plan.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

During the preparation of the EA, various state and local agencies were contacted for gathering information. These contacts included the Tri-County Area Chamber of Commerce for employment information, the Pennsylvania Department of Conservation and Natural Resources for threatened and endangered species information, the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection for air quality information, and the Pennsylvania Registry of Historic Places for cultural resources information.

Conclusion

The staff concludes that the impact to the environment and to human health and safety from operations at this facility has been and is expected to remain minimal. Results of the environmental monitoring program conducted during the previous license period indicate no significant impact to the environment as a result of site operations. Radioactive materials in effluents released to the environment are well below regulatory limits. The total whole body dose received by the maximally exposed individual is below federal regulatory limits.

Finding of No Significant Impact

The NRC has prepared an EA related to the renewal of source Material License SMB–920. On the basis of this assessment, the NRC has concluded that environmental impacts that would be created by the proposed licensing action would not be significant and do not warrant the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement. Accordingly, it has been determined that a finding of no significant impact is appropriate.

Opportunity for a Hearing

Any person whose interest may be affected by the renewal of this license may file a request for a hearing. Any request for hearing must be filed with the Office of the Secretary, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. 20555, within 30 days of the publication of this notice in the Federal Register; must be served on the NRC staff (Executive Director for Operations, One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, MD 20852) and on the licensee (Cabot Performance Materials, County Line Road, Boyertown, PA 19512); and must comply with the requirements for requesting a hearing set forth in the Commission's regulation 10 CFR Part 2, Subpart L, ''Informal Hearings Procedures for Adjudications in Materials Licensing Proceedings.''

These requirements, which the requestor must address in detail, are:

1. The interest of the requestor in the proceeding;

2. How that interest may be affected by the results of the proceeding, including the reasons why the requestor should be permitted a hearing;

3. The requestor's area of concern about the licensing activity that is the subject matter of the proceeding; and

4. The circumstances establishing that the request for hearing is timely, that is, filed within 30 days of the date of this notice.

In addressing how the requestor's interest may be affected by the proceeding, the request should describe the nature of the requestor's right under the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, to be made a party to the proceeding; the nature and extent of the requestor's property, financial, or other (e.g., health, safety) interest in the proceeding; and the possible effect of any order that may be entered in the proceeding upon the requestor's interest.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 25 day of September 1996.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Robert C. Pierson,

Chief, Licensing Branch, Division of Fuel Cycle Safety and Safeguards, NMSS.

[FR Doc. 96–25175 Filed 10–1–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Rel. No. IC–22252; 811–7027]

Putnam Research Analysts Fund; Notice of Application

September 26, 1996.

AGENCY: Securities and Exchange Commission (''SEC'').

ACTION: Notice of Application for Deregistration under the Investment Company Act of 1940 (the ''Act'').

APPLICANT: Putnam Research Analysts Fund.

RELEVANT ACT SECTION: Order requested under section 8(f).

SUMMARY OF APPLICATION: Applicant requests an order declaring that it has ceased to be an investment company.

FILING DATES: The application was filed on October 3,1995 and amended on April 2, 1996 and September 17, 1996.

HEARING OR NOTIFICATION OF HEARING: An order granting the application will be issued unless the SEC orders a hearing. Interested persons may request a hearing by writing to the SEC's Secretary and serving applicant with a copy of the request, personally or by mail. Hearing requests should be received by the SEC by 5:30 p.m. on October 22, 1996, and should be accompanied by proof of service on the applicant, in the form of an affidavit or, for lawyers, a certificate of service. Hearing requests should state the nature of the writer's interest, the reason for the request, and the issues contested. Persons may request notification of a hearing by writing to the SEC's Secretary.

ADDRESSES: Secretary, SEC, 450 Fifth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20549. Applicant, One Post Office Square, Boston, Massachusetts 02109.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Elaine M. Boggs, Staff Attorney, at (202) 942–0572, or Alison E. Baur, Branch Chief, at (202) 942–0564 (Division of Investment Management, Office of Investment Company Regulation).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The following is a summary of the application. The complete application may be obtained for a fee from the SEC's Public Reference Branch.

Applicant's Representations

1. Applicant is a registered open-end management investment company under the Act and is organized as a business trust under the laws of Massachusetts. Applicant registered under the Act and filed a registration statement on Form N–1A on August 19,

1992. On November 2, 1992, the registration statement was declared effective and applicant commenced its initial public offering.

2. On January 6, 1995, applicant's board of trustees authorized applicant's liquidation based on then current market conditions. Putnam Investment Management, Inc., applicant's investment adviser (the ''Adviser'') owned a substantial majority of applicant's outstanding shares.

3. On or about February 6, 1995, applicant liquidated all of its 309,549.746 shares to its shareholders of record at net asset value for a total cash distribution of $2,587,834.96. After the final liquidation, $488 remained which applicant used to reimburse its Adviser for management fees and reimbursements. No expenses were incurred in connection with the liquidation and unamortized organization expenses were paid by the Adviser. Applicant disposed of its portfolio securities in the normal course of business incurring brokerage commissions in the amount of $1,902.90.

4. There are no securityholders to whom distributions in complete liquidation of their interests have not been made. Applicant has retained no assets. Applicant has no debts or other liabilities that remain outstanding. Applicant is not a party to any litigation or administrative proceeding.

5. Applicant is not now engaged, nor does it propose to engage, in any business activities other than those necessary for the winding up of its affairs.

6. On August 15, 1995, applicant filed the necessary documentation with Massachusetts authorities to terminate its existence as a Massachusetts business trust.

For the SEC, by the Division of Investment Management, under delegated authority.

Margaret H. McFarland,

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 96–25224 Filed 10–1–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8010–01–M

[Release No. 34–37726; File No. SR–Amex–96–29; SR–CBOE–96–56; and SR–PSE–96–31]

Self-Regulatory Organizations; Proposed Rule Changes: American Stock Exchange, Inc., et al.

September 25, 1996

Self-Regulatory Organizations; Order Approving a Proposed Rule Change and Notice of Filing and Order Granting Accelerated Approval of Amendment No. 1 by the American Stock Exchange, Inc., Relating to Restrictions on the Available Exercise Prices for FLEX Equity Call Options and Elimination of the Requirement that Members Sign the Trade Sheet to Create a Binding FLEX Contract and Notice of Filing and Order Granting Accelerated Approval of Proposed Rule Changes, as Amended, by Chicago Board Options Exchange, Incorporated and Pacific Stock Exchange, Inc. Relating to Restrictions on the Available Exercise Prices for FLEX Equity Call Options

I. Introduction

On July 29, August 20, and August 26, 1996, the American Stock Exchange, Inc. (''Amex''), the Chicago Board Options Exchange, Inc. (''CBOE''), and the Pacific Stock Exchange, Inc. (''PSE'') (collectively the ''Exchanges'') respectively filed proposed rule changes with the Securities and Exchange Commission (''SEC'' or ''Commission''), pursuant to Section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (''Act'')[1] and Rule 19b–4 thereunder,[2] to restrict the available exercise prices for FLEX equity call options. The Amex further proposes to eliminate the requirement that members sign the Trade Sheet when creating a binding FLEX contract.

Notice of the Amex's proposal was published for comment and appeared in the Federal Register on August 9, 1996.[3] No comment letters were received on the Amex's proposed rule change. The CBOE submitted to the Commission Amendment No. 1 on August 30, 1996.[4] The Amex submitted to the Commission Amendment No. 1 on August 29, 1996.[5] The Commission is approving the Amex's and CBOE's proposal, as amended, and the PSE's proposal. The Commission is also publishing this notice to solicit comments on the CBOE's proposed rule change, as amended, PSE's proposed rule change, and Amex's Amendment No. 1 to its proposed rule change from interested persons, and granting accelerated approval to the foregoing.

II. Description of the Proposal

On February 14, 1996[6] and June 19, 1996,[7] the Exchanges received approval to list and trade flexible options on individual stocks known as FLEX equity options. Similar to the FLEX index options, investors will be able to set the specific terms of each FLEX equity option contract. Among the terms that can be specified are: (1) The expiration date of the option; (2) the exercise price of the option; and (3) the exercise style of the option (American or European). The Exchanges, however, impose some limitations on these flexible terms. For example, the Exchange does not permit the expiration date of a FLEX option to be any business day that falls on or within two business days of the expiration date for standardized non-FLEX equity options.

Although the Exchanges have received approval to trade these products, they have not done so due to a concern that the flexible exercise price feature could result in an available call option that would not be eligible to be a qualified covered call (''QCC'') under Section 1092(c)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code, thus jeopardizing a modest tax benefit currently enjoyed by writers of standardized non-FLEX equity call options. Under the straddle rules of Section 1092 of the Internal Revenue Code, a loss on one position in a straddle is taken into account for tax purposes only to the extent that the amount of the loss exceeds unrecognized gain on the other position(s) in the straddle. In addition, if a taxpayer has held stock for less than the long-term holding period at the time the taxpayer acquires an offsetting position with respect to the stock, the taxpayer's holding period in the stock is forfeited until disposing of the position offsetting the stock.

Although stock and an offsetting option (*e.g.*, a short call) constitute a straddle for purposes of Section 1092, a straddle consisting solely of stock and a QCC has been exempted from these rules provided, among other things, that the call option is not ''deep-in-the-money.'' Under certain conditions a ''deep-in-the-money'' call option is defined to mean an option having an exercise price lower than the highest

---

[1] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1).

[2] 17 CFR 240.19b–4.

[3] *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 37522 (August 9, 1996), 61 FR 41669.

[4] In Amendment No. 1, the CBOE clarifies in Interpretation .01 to CBOE Rule 24A.4(c)(2) that the available exercise price intervals for FLEX equity call options are limited to the same exercise price intervals that are available for Non-FLEX equity call options pursuant to Rule 5.5 and Interpretations and Policies thereunder. *See* Letter from Michael Meyer, Attorney, Schiff Hardin & Waite, to John Ayanian, Attorney, Office of Market Supervision (''OMS''), Division of Market Regulation (''Market Regulation''), Commission, dated August 28, 1996 (''CBOE Amendment No. 1'').

[5] In Amendment No. 1, the Amex proposed a technical clarification to its proposed rule change. Specifically, the Exchange makes clear that the available exercise prices available for FLEX equity call options, are those available pursuant to Amex Rule 903 for Non-FLEX equity call options. *See* Letter from Claire McGrath, Managing Director and Special Counsel, Derivative Securities, Amex, to Ivette Lopez, Assistant Director, OMS, Market Regulation, Commission, dated August 28, 1996 (''Amex Amendment No. 1'').

[6] *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 36841 (February 14, 1996), 61 FR 6666 (February 21, 1996) (order approving SR–CBOE–95–43 and SR–PSE–95–24).

[7] *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 37336 (June 19, 1996), 61 FR 33558 (June 27, 1996) (order approving SR–Amex–95–57).