the guard should be requested to telephone the Division of Contracts (415–7314) for pick-up of the application.

Nothing in this solicitation should be construed as committing the NRC to dividing available funds among all qualified applicants.

Dated Rockville, MD this 20th day of December, 1994.

For the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Mary Mace,

3Grants Officer, Division of Contracts, Office of Administration.

[FR Doc. 94–32301 Filed 12–30–94; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–M

[Docket Nos. 50–295 and 50–304]

Commonwealth Edison Company, Zion Nuclear Power Station, Receipt of Petition for Director's Decision Under 10 CFR 2.206

Notice is hereby given that by a letter dated November 3, 1994, and a signed petition, Robert K. Rutherford and other Zion Nuclear Power Station security guards (Petitioners) request that the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) take action with regard to the new response team member (RTM) security plan at Zion Nuclear Power Station.

Petitioners request that the NRC reassess and withdraw its approval of the new RTM security plan and require greater justification from both the licensee and the security contractor about reduction of armed guards and the defense of the plant to what Petitioners characterize as a minimum state of operational readiness. As bases for the request, Petitioners assert that the new RTM security plan degrades actual plant security; that the proposed qualifications in the plan are causing employee turnover, undue stress, labor problems, and inconsistency in plant defense; that monetary considerations should not take priority over plant defense and administrative jobs should not replace front-line security guards; that the total disarming of the Zion owner-controlled area and the Zion-protected area is highly detrimental to plant defense and public safety; and that modern armaments and increased hostility among the general public as well as terrorist threats from either domestic and/or international sources have not abated.

The letter and enclosed petition are being treated as a Petition pursuant to 10 CFR 2.206 of the Commission's regulations. The Petition has been referred to the Director of the Office of Nuclear Regulatory Regulation (NRR). As provided by 10 CFR 2.206, appropriate action will be taken on the Petition within a reasonable time.

A copy of the Petition is available for inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room at 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland this 22nd day of December 1994.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

William T. Russell,

Director, Office of Nuclear Regulatory Regulation.

[FR Doc. 94–32302 Filed 12–30–94; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–M

Rosemount Nuclear Instruments, Inc.; Receipt of Petition for Director's Decision

Notice is hereby given that by Petition dated November 21, 1994, Paul M. Blanch (Petitioner) has requested that the NRC take ''prompt'' action with regard to Rosemount Nuclear Instruments, Inc. Specifically, the Petitioner requests that: (1) Rosemount ''immediately'' inform all users of safety related transmitters pursuant to Part 21 of Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations (10 CFR Part 21) of the shelf life limitations of the fill oil and that the oil may crystallize if the transmitters are exposed to temperatures of less than 70 degrees Fahrenheit (°F), and provide all available information to each licensee for evaluation as applicable to each facility; (2) the NRC take ''prompt and vigorous'' enforcement against Rosemount for both its failure to report to users of the transmitters the shelf life limitations of the fill oil and its failure to report the potential of the oil to crystallize when exposed to temperatures of less than 70 °F, and that a ''separate violation must be issued'' for each defect and each day of failure to provide the required notice; and (3) the NRC consider escalated enforcement action due to the repetitive nature of these violations. As a basis for his request, the Petitioner asserts that, contrary to 10 CFR Part 21, although Rosemount was aware of a defect that may create a substantial safety hazard, it failed to report this defect to the affected licensees within five working days for evaluation. Specifically, the Petitioner alleged that, although the NRC informed Rosemount by letter dated June 2, 1994, that the fill oil did not meet the specified performance requirements to assure operability of transmitters under normal operating conditions in that crystallization may occur when the transmitters are subjected to temperatures of less than 70 °F, which may inhibit the operation of many transmitters, Rosemount withheld this information from licensees. The Petitioner asserts further that this is a ''repetitive'' violation in that on November 15, 1994, the NRC assessed a Severity Level II violation against Rosemount for failing to properly inform licensees of a potential for a sensor cell oil-loss problem in violation of 10 CFR 21.21.

The request is being treated pursuant to 10 CFR § 2.206 of the Commission's regulations. The request has been referred to the Director of the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation. The request that Rosemount ''immediately'' inform all users of safety related transmitters of the shelf life limitations of the fill oil and the potential for crystallization has been denied. As provided by Section 2.206, action will be taken on the Petitioner's remaining requests within a reasonable time.

A copy of the Petition is available for inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room at 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC 20555–0001.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 22nd day of December, 1994.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

William T. Russell,

Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 94–32303 Filed 12–30–94; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–M

[Docket No. 50–298]

Nebraska Public Power District; 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–46, issued to the Nebraska Public Power District (the licensee) for operation of the Cooper Nuclear Station (CNS) located in Nemaha County, Nebraska.

The proposed amendment is a Line Item Technical Specifications Improvement and would revise the CNS Technical Specifications, definition 1.0.J. concerning entering an operational condition consistent with the wording proposed in NRC Generic Letter 87–09, ''Sections 3.0 and 4.0 of the Standard Technical Specifications on the Applicability of Limiting Conditions for Operation and Surveillance Requirements,'' dated June 4, 1987.

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. Does the proposed license amendment involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated?

Evaluation

The proposed change does not affect plant operation or the design. The change provides specific applicability requirements to the Limiting Conditions for Operation (LCO). The proposed change incorporates only those applicability requirements and exceptions denoted by Generic Letter 87–09, concerning entering an operational condition. Invoking the proposed change in LCO definition does not impact nor alter any LCO Action Requirements in the Technical Specifications. Those LCO Action Statements which do not require shutdown provide acceptable compensatory safety measures for the affected function, and therefore, operational conditions need not be restricted further. Since conformance to these LCO Action Requirements provide an acceptable level of safety for continued operation of the facility, entry into an operational condition or other specified conditions would not increase the probability or consequences of an accident as long as the remedial Action Requirements are met.

Furthermore, the proposed change does not affect any accident or safety analysis event initiator as analyzed in the Updated Safety Analysis Report (USAR), nor involve any modification to equipment. The proposed change is administrative in nature and primarily serves to provide plant personnel with clear guidance regarding compliance with LCOs and Action Requirements under all operating conditions. Therefore, no significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously analyzed would occur.

2. Does the proposed License Amendment create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated?

Evaluation

The proposed change does not affect any equipment design or configuration, nor does the change introduce a new mode of operation therefore, no new or different type of failures are created. The proposed change serves to strengthen the existing Cooper Nuclear Station (CNS) Technical Specifications (TS) requirements by eliminating some areas of confusion and interpretation, and providing a clear statement of the specification's (1.0.J) intent. The proposed change will ensure that appropriate administrative requirements are invoked prior to any change in an operational condition.

The proposed change does not affect the testing methodology for any systems. There will be no change in the types or increase in the amount of effluents released offsite. Since there are no changes to the function, operation, or surveillance test methodology of any system, equipment, or component, the possibility of a new or different kind of accident is not created.

3. Does the proposed change create a significant reduction in the margin of safety?

Evaluation

The proposed change does not reduce the margin of safety because it has no impact on any safety analysis assumption. The proposed change clarifies the LCO definition concerning entry into an operational condition. The proposed change ensures that the appropriate administrative requirements are met prior to any change in an operational condition. The proposed change serves to strengthen the philosophy of compliance with the Technical Specifications. The change is administrative in nature and provides explanatory information which does not impact any safety analysis. Therefore, the proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in the 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 February 2, 1995, 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 Auburn Public Library, 118 15th Street, Auburn, Nebraska 68305. 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 D. Beckner: 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 Mr. G.D. Watson, Nebraska Public Power District, Post Office Box 499, Columbus, Nebraska 68602–0499, 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 December 22, 1994, 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 Auburn Public Library, 118 15th Street, Auburn, Nebraska 68305.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 27th day of December 1994.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

William D. Beckner,

Director, Project Directorate IV–1, Division of Reactor Projects–III/IV, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 94–32304 Filed 12–30–94; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–M

PROSPECTIVE PAYMENT ASSESSMENT COMMISSION

Meeting

Notice is hereby given of the meetings of the Prospective Payment Assessment Commission on Tuesday and Wednesday, January 17–18, 1995 at the Madison Hotel, 15th & M Streets, Northwest, Washington, DC.

The Full Commission will convene at 9:00 a.m. on January 17, 1995, and adjourn at approximately 5:00 p.m. On Wednesday, January 18, 1995, the meeting will convene at 9:00 a.m. and adjourn at noon. The meetings will be held in Executive Chambers 1, 2, and 3 each day.

All meetings are open to the public.

Donald A. Young,

Executive Director.

[FR Doc. 94–32240 Filed 12–30–94; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6820–BW–M

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34–35148; File No. SR–NSCC–94–19]

Self-Regulatory Organizations; National Securities Clearing Corporation; Notice of Filing of Proposed Rule Change To Settle Certain Mutual Fund Services Transactions in Same Day Funds

December 23, 1994.

Pursuant to Section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (''Act'') [1] notice is hereby given that on November 8, 1994, the National Securities Clearing Corporation (''NSCC'') 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 primarily by NSCC. The Commission is publishing this notice to solicit comments on the proposed rule change from interested persons.

[1] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1) (1988).