

Brenda S. Dolan 202-482-4115.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Department of Commerce is amending Commerce Department System 5: Freedom of Information and Privacy Request Records to add the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office to the list of bureaus of the Commerce Department. This is not a significant alteration of a system of records under OMB Circular A-130.

—Added under “System location:”

g. For FOIA and PA request records of the PTO: Office of the Solicitor, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, 2121 Crystal Drive, Suite 918, Arlington, VA 22202.

—Added under “System Manager(s) and Address:”

For records at location “g.”: Deputy Solicitor, Box 8, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, Washington, DC 20231.

Authority: 5 U.S.C. 552a.

Dated: March 7, 1997.

Brenda S. Dolan,
Department Freedom of Information and Privacy Act Officer.

[FR Doc. 97-6463 Filed 3-13-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-FA-M

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

[I.D. 030697B]

Western Pacific Fishery Management Council; Public Meeting

AGENCY: National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of public meeting.

SUMMARY: The Western Pacific Fishery Management Council's (Council) Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) will hold its 65th meeting.

DATES: The meeting will be held April 8-10, 1997, from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. each day.

ADDRESSES: The meeting will be held at the Ala Moana Hotel, 410 Atkinson Dr., Ilima Room, Honolulu, HI; telephone: (808) 955-4811.

Council address: Western Pacific Fishery Management Council, 1164 Bishop St., Suite 1405, Honolulu, HI 96813.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Kitty M. Simonds, Executive Director; telephone: (808) 522-8220.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The SSC will discuss and may make recommendations to the Council on the following agenda items:

1. Pelagic fishery issues, including:
 - a. Pelagic Fisheries Research;
 - b. Cross Seamount interaction issue;
 - c. Pelagic data amendment;
 - d. Bycatch issues/incidental take issues (turtles, sharks, albatross);
 - e. Determination of the Total Allowable Level of Foreign Fishing for the Pacific Insular Area Fishery Agreements; and (f) other pelagic issues.
2. Hawaii bottomfish issues, including:
 - a. Status of the State's draft management plan for the Main Hawaiian Islands Onaga and Ehu; and
 - b. Reconsideration of the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands management system;
3. Lobster management, including:
 - a. Summary of review panel's report and summary of Crustacean Plan Team and Hawaii Crustacean Advisory Panel recommendations regarding population size, risk analysis, high grading in the 1996 fishery, economic pros and cons of high grading, and valid sample design to estimate high grading;
 - b. Revised catch report form;
 - c. Consider mandatory Vessel Monitoring System;
 - d. Impact of expanding live fishery product;
 - e. 1997 harvest guideline;
 - f. Trap design study;
 - g. NMFS research activities;
 - h. Concerns of industry; and
 - i. Other crustacean issues;
4. Ecosystem and habitat issues (coral reef resources, whale sanctuary, etc.); and
5. Other business as required.

Special Accommodations

This meeting is physically accessible to people with disabilities. Requests for sign language interpretation or other auxiliary aids should be directed to Kitty M. Simonds, 808-522-8220 (voice) or 808-522-8226 (fax), at least 5 days prior to meeting date.

Dated: March 7, 1997.

Bruce Morehead,
Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service.

[FR Doc. 97-6448 Filed 3-13-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-22-F

COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION

Chicago Board of Trade Futures Contracts in Corn and Soybeans; Notice That Delivery Point Specifications Must Be Amended

AGENCY: Commodity Futures Trading Commission.

ACTION: Notice of, and request for public comment on, response of the Chicago

Board of Trade to notification to amend delivery specifications.

SUMMARY: The Commodity Futures Trading Commission (“Commission”), by letter dated December 19, 1996, notified the Board of Trade of the City of Chicago (“CBT”), under section 5a(a)(10) of the Commodity Exchange Act (“Act”), 7 U.S.C. 7a(a)(10), that the delivery terms of the CBT corn and soybean futures contracts no longer accomplish the objectives of that section of the Act. Under section 5a(a)(10), the CBT was required to respond by March 4, 1997, seventy-five days from the date of the notice.

By letter dated March 4, 1997, from Patrick H. Arbor, to Chairperson Brooksley Born, the CBT responded by providing a status report to the Commission of its actions. In that response, the CBT reported that a “working alternative” had been approved by the exchange board and would be forwarded to the membership for a vote.

The Commission is providing notice of the CBT's working alternative in order to provide the public with an opportunity to comment to the Commission on it. The Commission has determined that publication of the CBT working alternative for public comment is in the public interest, will assist the Commission in considering the views of interested persons, and is consistent with the purposes of the Commodity Exchange Act.

DATES: Comment must be received by March 31, 1997.

ADDRESSES: Comments should be mailed to the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, Three Lafayette Centre, 1155 21st Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20581, attention: Office of the Secretariat; transmitted by facsimile at (202) 418-5521; or transmitted electronically at [secretary@cftc.gov]. Reference should be made to “Corn and Soybean Delivery Points.”

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Blake Imel, Acting Director, or Paul M. Architzel, Chief Counsel, Division of Economic Analysis, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, Three Lafayette Centre, 1155 21st Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20581, (202) 418-5260, or electronically, Mr. Architzel at [PArchitzel@cftc.gov].

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Section 5a(a)(10) of the Act provides that as a condition of contract market designation, boards of trade are required to:

permit the delivery of any commodity, on contracts of sale thereof for future delivery,

of such grade or grades, at such point or points and at such quality and locational price differentials as will tend to prevent or diminish price manipulation, market congestion, or the abnormal movement of such commodity in interstate commerce. If the Commission after investigation finds that the rules and regulations adopted by a contract market permitting delivery of any commodity on contracts of sale thereof for future delivery, do not accomplish the objectives of this subsection, then the Commission shall notify the contract market of its finding and afford the contract market an opportunity to make appropriate changes in such rules and regulations.

The Commission, by letter dated December 19, 1996, notified the CBT under section 5a(a)(10) of the Act that its futures contracts for corn and soybeans no longer were in compliance with the requirements of that section of the Act. The text of the section 5a(a)(10) letter was published in the Federal Register and public comment was requested. 61 FR 67998 (December 26, 1996).

The section 5a(a)(10) letter offered the CBT guidance in meeting the requirements of the Act in the form of four conceptual alternatives to the current delivery specifications. These four alternatives constituted "a range of possibilities which could constitute 'appropriate changes' by providing for the necessary, viable linkage with the cash market." 61 FR 67998, 68013. In offering this guidance, the Commission noted that:

(b)y providing these alternatives, the Commission is not limiting the CBT's ability

to respond to this Section 5a(a)(10) notification, nor is it specifying exact design criteria. Rather, these are examples of various means by which the Commission believes the objectives of the section could be met. In any event, the particular contract specifications proposed by the CBT in response to this notification, in order to meet the statutory requirement, should provide for a linkage with the cash market through specific terms which are in conformity with a substantial segment of that underlying market.

61 FR 68012.

The four alternatives offered by the Commission included a prior CBT alternative that was previously rejected by the exchange membership. This alternative provided for a warehouse receipt contract deliverable at Chicago (at par), Toledo, Milwaukee, East Central Illinois and the Northern Illinois River. The Commission noted, in particular, that any such proposal should be modified to include price differentials reflecting the fact that corn and soybeans become more highly valued the further south the delivery location is on the Northern Illinois River. Another alternative offered was a shipping certificate contract centered on the lower Mississippi River. The Commission also offered cash-settlement as an alternative for consideration.

Finally, the Commission offered the alternative of increasing deliverable supplies by adding to the contract shipping certificates providing for delivery at barge loading locations on the Illinois River and at St. Louis.

Specifically, the Commission suggested that:

(a)n alternative specification that could also result in the necessary increase to deliverable supplies would replace the existing warehouse-receipt-delivery instrument with a shipping certificate and provide for delivery at Illinois River barge loading facilities, in addition to the contracts' existing Chicago, Toledo, and St. Louis delivery points. The Illinois River delivery area could be specified to include all or a substantial part of that River. The contracts' par pricing location could be shifted to a delivery location/area that has an active cash market, with locational price discounts for other delivery points/areas set at levels that fall within the range of commonly observed cash price differences between the specified delivery locations.

61 FR at 68013 (footnote deleted).

In publishing the section 5a(a)(10) letter to the CBT, the Commission requested comment on general issues related to both the cash markets for, and the CBT futures contracts on, corn and soybeans and on the specific, relative merits of these suggested alternatives. The working alternative under consideration by the CBT incorporates portions of one or more of those suggested by the Commission, but is sufficiently distinct that public comment on this additional alternative would aid the Commission in its consideration of these issues.

CBT Working Alternative

The CBT's working alternative includes the following salient features:

FEATURES OF CBT WORKING ALTERNATIVE

Underlying Instrument: (No changes to current quality differentials).	Corn	Soybeans
	U.S. No. 1 +1.5 cents/bu	U.S. No. 1 +6 cents/bu.
	No. 2 par	No. 2 par.
	No. 3 – 1.5 cents/bu	No. 2–3% foreign matter – 6 cents/bu.
Primary Delivery Point	Illinois Waterway from Chicago, IL (including Burns Harbor, IN) to Pekin, IL at river mile marker 151.	
Alternate Delivery Point	None.	
Locational Differentials	None, all locations at par.	
Delivery Instrument	Shipping certificate only.	
Maximum Certificates Allowed to Issue	Lesser of registered daily rate of loading for the shipping station times 30 or 25% of net worth. ¹	
	Corn	Soybeans
Premium to Futures for f.o.b. water conveyance.	4 cents/bu	4 cents/bu.
Premium Charge: (Previously referred to as storage charge)	\$0.0012 per bu. per day in Chicago. \$0.0010 per bu. per day on Illinois River.	
Load-out Rate Barge	At the registered daily rate of loading for the shipping station within 3 business days following receipt of loading orders or within 1 business day of constructive placement whichever occurs later.	
Vessel	300,000 bu. per day with 3 days pre-advise.	
Rail	Takers of delivery in Chicago and Burns Harbor will have the option to receive rail loadout at the rate of 25 cars per day (35 cars per day for batch weights and grades).	
Last Trading Day	The business day prior to the 15th calendar day of the contract month.	
Last Delivery Day	The second business day following last trading day.	
Regularity Eligibility	Minimum \$2 million working capital and minimum \$40 million net worth.	

¹ Current regular warehouses in Chicago and Burns Harbor would be allowed to issue a maximum number of shipping certificates equal to their current regular capacity.

As Commission staff advised the CBT's Task Force during its deliberations, the CBT alternative raises several important issues and it differs from the Commission's in a number of significant respects. The CBT alternative restricts the delivery area to only the northern portion of the Illinois River. Unlike the Commission's suggested Illinois River Shipping Certificate alternative, the CBT river-based delivery area would not be in addition to the existing delivery points on the contracts—including St. Louis and Toledo—but in lieu of them. Moreover, the CBT alternative does not provide for locational price differentials. Finally, unlike the contracts' current specifications for loading against warehouse receipts, the CBT is considering requiring that originators of shipping certificates maintain separate queues, giving takers under the futures contract priority over other load-out commitments.

In order to assist the Commission in its consideration of these issues, the Commission requests written data, views or arguments from interested members of the public. Commenters are requested to analyze and compare the relative merits of the CBT working alternative. Commenters are specifically requested to address the following issues:

1. Does the potential economic deliverable supplies or capacity on the contract under the CBT working alternative meet the requirement of the section 5a(a)(10) notification that the CBT modify the contracts' specifications in order that they "will tend to prevent or diminish price manipulation, market congestion, or the abnormal movement of such commodity in interstate commerce"? In particular, how does the potential increase in delivery supplies or capacity which results from the addition of the Illinois River shipping certificate compare to deletion of deliverable supplies or capacity at Toledo? Is the net result sufficient to prevent market disruption under foreseeable market circumstances?

2. How should the net change in economic deliverable supplies or capacity be measured? How much of the load-out capacity of the barge-loading facilities on the northern Illinois River likely will be made available for delivery, particularly in light of the queuing aspect of the CBT working alternative? In this respect, within the defined delivery area is there a sufficient number of facilities, and is their ownership sufficiently dispersed?

3. Are the regularity eligibility requirements a significant factor in determining the economic delivery

capacity under the CBT working alternative's terms? Are they sufficient or necessary to assure performance on the contract?

4. What are the implications of the working alternative's proposed single delivery area, even if total deliverable supplies or capacity were increased?

5. What are the implications of the absence of locational price differentials? In particular, is the working alternative consistent with the pricing of corn and soybeans in the cash market of the proposed delivery area? What are the implications for the availability of registered certificates?

Issued in Washington, D.C., this 10th day of March 1997, by the Commodity Futures Trading Commission.

Jean A. Webb,

Secretary of the Commission.

[FR Doc. 97-6470 Filed 3-13-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6351-01-P

DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

Sunshine Act Meeting

FEDERAL REGISTER CITATION OF PREVIOUS ANNOUNCEMENT: Published February 24, 1997, 62 FR 8222.

PREVIOUSLY ANNOUNCED TIME AND DATE OF MEETING: 9:00 a.m., March 19, 1997.

PLACE: The Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board, Public Hearing Room, 625 Indiana Avenue, NW, Suite 300, Washington, DC 20004.

STATUS: Open.

CHANGE IN THE MEETING: The meeting has been postponed until 9:00 a.m. on April 16, 1997.

MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED: The Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board will reconvene and continue the open meeting conducted on February 5, 1997, regarding the status of DOE's Implementation Plan for Board Recommendation 95-2, Integrated Safety Management. Specifically, the Board will be given status reports by DOE relative to the Department's efforts to improve the technical expertise necessary to review and implement safety management systems, including establishment of a Core Technical group, and the development of guidance for implementation of the Safety Management System.

CONTACT PERSON FOR MORE INFORMATION: Robert M. Anderson, General Counsel, Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board, 625 Indiana Avenue, NW, Suite 700, Washington, DC 20004, (800) 788-4016. This is a toll-free number.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board

reserves its right to further schedule and otherwise regulate the course of this meeting, to recess, reconvene, postpone or adjourn the meeting, and otherwise exercise its authority under the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended.

Dated: March 11, 1997.

John T. Conway,

Chairman.

[FR Doc. 97-6573 Filed 3-11-97; 4:55 pm]

BILLING CODE 3670-01-M

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Recognition of Accrediting Agencies

AGENCY: Department of Education.

ACTION: Request for comments on an accrediting agency appealing a previous recommendation of the National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Integrity to withdraw its recognition.

DATES: Commentors should submit their written comments by April 14, 1997 to the address below.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Karen W. Kershenstein, Director, Accreditation and State Liaison Division, U.S. Department of Education, 600 Independence Avenue, SW., Room 3915 ROB-3, Washington, DC 20202-5244, telephone: (202) 708-7417.

Individuals who use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) may call the Federal Information Relay Service at 1-800-877-8339 between 8 a.m. and 7 p.m., Eastern time, Monday through Friday.

SUBMISSION OF THIRD-PARTY COMMENTS:

The Secretary of Education is required by law to publish a list of accrediting agencies that he determines to be reliable authorities regarding the quality of education or training offered by institutions or programs they accredit. The National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Integrity (the "Advisory Committee") advises the Secretary on specific accrediting agencies that seek to be recognized by the Secretary.

The National League for Nursing was reviewed by the Advisory Committee at its June 1996 meeting, at which time it recommended that the agency's recognition be withdrawn. The agency appealed that recommendation, in accordance with the provisions set forth in 34 CFR 602.13 of the regulations governing the recognition of accrediting agencies. The Secretary has reviewed the agency's appeal and has decided to remand the matter to the Advisory Committee for review. The Advisory