beneficiaries of the plan and in a prudent fashion in accordance with section 404(a)(1)(B) of the Act; nor does it affect the requirement of section 401(a) of the Code that the plan must operate for the exclusive benefit of the 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 29th day of March, 1996.

Ivan Strasfeld,

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

[FR Doc. 96–8137 Filed 4–2–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–29–P

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Collection of Information Submission for OMB Review; Comments Requested by April 16, 1996, Title of Proposed Collection, ''Science Resources Studies Customer Satisfaction Survey''

In compliance with the requirement of Section 3506(c)(2)(A) of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, on Tuesday, April 11, 1995, Federal Register, Vol. 60, No. 69 18427, the National Science Foundation (NSF) published, for public comment, a proposed generic clearance for collection of information, ''generic Clearance—NSF Surveys to Measure Customer Satisfaction.'' *No Public comments were received.* A proposed collection to be considered under that generic clearance is being forwarded to the Office of Management and Budget for consideration. Comments on the proposed data collection plans and instruments may be directed to OMB at the following address: Office of Management and Budget, IRA, ATTN.: Jonathan Winer, New Executive Office Building, Room 3208, Washington, DC 20503.

Written comments should be received by April 16, 1996.

Abstract: This survey is to be directed at actual and potential users of NSF's science and engineering data and analyses. It is not intended to develop a national sampling frame representing this entire community. Instead, it shall focus on a smaller group of actual and potential users with some well defined pertinent characteristics. The primary objective of this survey is to determine the kind and quality of science and engineering policy information desired by these users and their level of satisfaction with existing information.

Respondents and burden hours: 200 respondents at approximately 30 minutes per response.

Dated: March 28, 1996.

Herman G. Fleming,

NSF Clearance Officer.

[FR Doc. 96–8073 Filed 4–2–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555–01–M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Agency Information Collection Activities: Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC).

ACTION: Notice of the OMB review of information collection and solicitation of public comment.

SUMMARY: The NRC has recently submitted to OMB for review the following proposal for the collection of information under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35). The NRC hereby informs potential respondents that an agency may not conduct or sponsor, and that a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number.

1. Type of submission, new, revision, or extension: Revision/Extension.

2. The title of the information collection: 10 CFR Part 100, Appendix A, ''Seismic and Geologic Siting Criteria for Nuclear Power Plants.''

3. The form number if applicable: Not applicable.

4. How often the collection is required: As necessary in order for NRC to assess the adequacy of proposed seismic design bases and the design bases for other geological hazards for nuclear power plants constructed and licensed in accordance with 10 CFR Part 50 and the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended.

5. Who will be required or asked to report: Applicants and licensees for nuclear power plants.

6. An estimate of the number of responses: 1.

7. The estimated number of annual respondents: 2.

8. An estimate of the total number of hours needed annually to complete the requirement or request: 10,000.

9. An indication of whether Section 3507(d), Pub. L. 104–13 applies: Not applicable.

10. Abstract: Utilities that propose to build and operate nuclear power plants are required to design, construct, and maintain those plants to withstand geologic hazards, such as faulting, seismic hazards, and the maximum credible earthquake, to protect the health and safety of the public and the environment. NRC uses the information required by 10 CFR Part 100, Appendix A, to assess the adequacy of proposed seismic design bases and the design bases for other geological hazards for nuclear power plants.

A copy of the submittal may be viewed free of charge at the NRC Public Document Room, 2120 L Street, NW (Lower Level), Washington, DC. Members of the public who are in the Washington, DC, area can access the submittal via modem on the Public Document Room Bulletin Board (NRC's Advanced Copy Document Library) NRC subsystem at FedWorld, 703–321–3339. Members of the public who are located outside of the Washington, DC, area can dial FedWorld, 1–800–303–9672, or use the FedWorld Internet address: fedworld.gov (Telnet). The document will be available on the bulletin board for 30 days after the signature date of this notice. If assistance is needed in accessing the document, please contact the FedWorld help desk at 703–487–4608. Additional assistance in locating the document is available from the NRC Public Document Room, nationally at 1–800–397–4209, or within the Washington, DC, area at 202–634–3273.

Comments and questions should be directed to the OMB reviewer by May 3, 1996: Peter Francis, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs (3150–0093), NEOB–10202, Office of Management and Budget, Washington, DC 20503.

Comments can also be submitted by telephone at (202) 395–3084.

The NRC Clearance Officer is Brenda Jo Shelton, (301) 415–7233.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 27th day of March 1996.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Gerald F. Cranford,

Designated Senior Official for Information Resources Management.

[FR Doc. 96–8102 Filed 4–2–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

Agency Information Collection Activities: Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC).

ACTION: Notice of the OMB review of information collection and solicitation of public comment.

SUMMARY: The NRC has recently submitted to OMB for review the following proposal for the collection of information under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35). The NRC hereby informs potential respondents that an agency may not conduct or sponsor, and that a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number.

1. Type of submission, new, revision, or extension: Revision/Extension.

2. The title of the information collection: Exercise of Discretion for an Operating Facility, NRC Enforcement Policy (NUREG–1600).

3. The form number if applicable: Not applicable.

4. How often the collection is required: On occasion.

5. Who will be required or asked to report: Nuclear power reactor licensees.

6. An estimate of the number of responses: 1.

7. The estimated number of annual respondents: 36.

8. An estimate of the total number of hours needed annually to complete the requirement or request: 2,160.

9. An indication of whether Section 3507(d), Pub. L. 104–13 applies: Not applicable.

10. Abstract: The NRC's revised Enforcement Policy includes the circumstances in which the NRC may exercise enforcement discretion. This enforcement discretion is designated as a Notice of Enforcement Discretion (NOED) and relates to circumstances which may arise where a licensee's compliance with a Technical Specification Limiting Condition for Operation or with other license conditions would involve an unnecessary plant transient or performance of testing, inspection, or system realignment that is inappropriate for the specific plant conditions, or unnecessary delays in plant startup without a corresponding health and safety benefit. A licensee seeking the issuance of a NOED must provide a written justification, which documents the safety basis for the request and provides whatever other information the NRC staff deems necessary to decide whether or not to exercise discretion.

A copy of the submittal may be viewed free of charge at the NRC Public Document Room, 2120 L Street, NW (Lower Level), Washington, DC. Members of the public who are in the Washington, DC, area can access the submittal via modem on the Public Document Room Bulletin Board (NRC's Advanced Copy Document Library) NRC subsystem at FedWorld, 703–321–3339. Members of the public who are located outside of the Washington, DC, area can dial FedWorld, 1–800–303–9672, or use the FedWorld Internet address: fedworld.gov (Telnet). The document will be available on the bulletin board for 30 days after the signature date of this notice. If assistance is needed in accessing the document, please contact the FedWorld help desk at 703–487–4608. Additional assistance in locating the document is available from the NRC Public Document Room, nationally at 1–800–397–4209, or within the Washington, DC, area at 202–634–3273.

Comments and questions should be directed to the OMB reviewer by May 3, 1996: Peter Francis, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs (3150–0136), NEOB–10202, Office of Management and Budget, Washington, DC 20503.

Comments can also be submitted by telephone at (202) 395–3084.

The NRC Clearance Officer is Brenda Jo. Shelton, (301) 415–7233.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 27th day of March 1996.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Gerald F. Cranford,

Designated Senior Official for Information Resources Management.

[FR Doc. 96–8103 Filed 4–2–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

[Docket Nos. 50–498 and 50–499]

Houston Lighting and Power Company, City Public Service Board of San Antonio Central Power and Light Company, City of Austin, Texas; Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendments to Facility Operating Licenses; Proposed Involves 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. NPF–76 and NPF–80, issued to Houston Lighting & Power Company, et. al., (the licensee) for operation of the South Texas Project, Units 1 & 2, located in Matagorda County, Texas. The original application dated May 30, 1995, was previously published in the Federal Register on July 19, 1995 (60 FR 37092). That application was supplemented by letter dated February 8, 1996.

The proposed amendment would increase the spent fuel pool heat load licensing basis to provide greater flexibility for normal refueling practices.

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

(a) The Spent Fuel Pool conditions are not indicative of accident initiators.

(b) Design and operability requirements of equipment important to safety are not affected.

(c) Spent Fuel Pool boiling will not occur and the Spent Fuel Pool components will remain within their design bases.

(d) The complete loss of Spent Fuel Pool cooling event has previously been analyzed and described in Supplement 6 to the Safety Evaluation Report, Appendix BB. The dose consequences for this event have been evaluated and the safety evaluation is described in Updated Final Safety Analysis Report Section 9.1.3.3.4. The results of the evaluation show that the Spent Fuel Pool components would remain within their design bases. Also, the dose consequences of iodine release as a result of Spent Fuel Pool boiling are significantly below the allowable dose limits of 10 CFR 100.

2. The proposed changes do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously because: