Arizona Public Service Company, et al., Docket Nos. STN 50-528, STN 50-529, and STN 50-530, Palo Verde Nuclear Generating Station, Units Nos. 1, 2, and 3, Maricopa County, Arizona

Date of application for amendments: May 15, 1996

Brief description of amendments: The amendment revised Surveillance Requirement (SR) 4.5.2.d.2 in Technical Specification 3/4 5.2 to state that the trisodium phosphate (TSP) contained in the storage baskets in containment is in the form of anhydrous TSP, rather than dodecahydrate TSP, as currently specified.

Date of issuance: May 15, 1996

Effective date: May 15, 1996

Amendment Nos.: Unit 1 - 107; Unit 2 - 99; Unit 3 - 79

Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-41, NPF-51, and NPF-74: The amendment revised the Technical Specifications.Public comments requested as to proposed no significant hazards consideration: No.The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments, finding of emergency circumstances, and final determination of no significant hazards consideration are contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 15, 1996.

Local Public Document Room location: Phoenix Public Library, 1221 N. Central Avenue, Phoenix, Arizona 85004

Attorney for licensee: Nancy C. Loftin, Esq., Corporate Secretary and Counsel, Arizona Public Service Company, P.O. Box 53999, Mail Station 9068, Phoenix, Arizona 85072-3999

NRC Project Director: William H. Bateman

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 29th day of May 1996.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission

Steven A. Varga,

Director, Division of Reactor Projects - I/II, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

[Doc. 96–13878 Filed 6–4–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–9

OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE

[Docket No. 301–87]

Notice of Agreement; Monitoring and Enforcement Pursuant to Sections 301 and 306: Canadian Exports of Softwood Lumber

AGENCY: Office of the United States Trade Representative.

ACTION: Notice of monitoring and determination.

SUMMARY: On May 29, 1996, the United States and Canada entered into an agreement on trade in softwood lumber, with effect form April 1, 1996. This agreement is intended to provide a satisfactory resolution to certain acts, policies and practices of the Government of Canada affecting exports to the United States of softwood lumber that were the subject of an investigation initiated by the United States Trade Representative (''USTR'') under section 302(b)(1)(A) of the Trade Act of 1974 (the Trade Act) and that were found to be unreasonable and to burden or restrict U.S. commerce pursuant to section 304(a) on October 4, 1991. The USTR has determined that this agreement will be subject to the provisions of section 306 of the Trade Act and that USTR will monitor Canadian compliance with this agreement pursuant to section 306 of the Trade Act and will take action under section 301(a) if Canada fails to comply with it.

DATES: The U.S.-Canada agreement on trade in softwood lumber was signed on May 29, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Office of the United States Trade Representative, 600 17th Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20508.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Gordana Earp, Deputy Assistant United States Trade Representative for Industry, (202) 395–6160; or William Kane, Associate General Counsel, (202) 395–6800 (for legal issues).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On October 4, 1991, Canada unilaterally terminated a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) dated December 30, 1986, between the United States and Canada under which, among other things, Canada had imposed a 15 percent export charge on certain softwood lumber products exported to the United States. The MOU had been entered into to settle a pending countervailing duty (CVD) proceeding examining subsidies and injury with respect to imports of Canadian softwood lumber. As of October 4, 1991, Canada ceased collecting export charges under that MOU to offset possible injurious subsidies. In response, on October 4, 1991, (a) the U.S. Department of Commerce announced that it would self-initiate a CVD investigation on softwood lumber from Canada, and (b) the USTR initiated an investigation pursuant to section 302(b)(1)(A) of the Trade Act (19 U.S.C. 2412(b)(1)(A)) and pursuant to section 304(a) of the Trade Act determined that Canada's acts, policies and practices regarding the exportation of softwood lumber to the United States were unreasonable and burdened or restricted U.S. commerce. 56 FR 50738 (October 8, 1991) as amended by 46 FR 58944 (November 22, 1991).

USTR further determined that action was appropriate under section 301 of the Trade Act to restore and maintain the *status quo ante* pending issuance of a preliminary CVD determination, and, if warranted, to impose duties to offset any subsidies found in the investigation. Commerce issued its preliminary CVD determination on March 12, 1992 and its final affirmative CVD determination on May 28, 1992.

Both the domestic industry and affected Canadian parties appealed Commerce's final subsidy determination to binational panels established pursuant to Chapter 19 of the U.S.-Canada Free Trade Agreement (FTA). Following completion of the panel proceedings, and a decision by an Extraordinary Challenge Committee (ECC) established pursuant to FTA Article 1904.13 affirming the results of those proceedings, Commerce—although it expressed disagreement with the panel's findings—on August 16, 1994, revoked the CVD order on softwood lumber from Canada. 59 FR 42029 (Aug. 16, 1994). USTR subsequently terminated the action taken under section 301. 59 FR 52846 (October 19, 1994).

In response to the decisions of the binational panel and the ECC, the domestic industry filed a complaint with the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit on September 14, 1994, challenging Chapter 19 of the FTA. On December 15, 1994, in order to create a process that could ultimately settle the dispute arising from the unilateral termination in 1991 of the MOU by Canada, and in conjunction with the domestic industry's withdrawal of its challenge to Chapter 19 of the FTA, the United States and Canada agreed to establish a consultative process regarding trade in softwood lumber. The process included the participation of the U.S. Government, Canadian federal and provincial governments, and where appropriate, industries and other interested parties in both countries.

As a result, on May 29, 1996, the United States and Canada entered into an agreement on trade in softwood lumber, with effect from April 1, 1996. During its five-year term, the agreement will foster stable growth in the North American softwood lumber market and ensure fair and competitive trade for U.S. firms and workers by addressing the disruptive effects of unprecedented high levels of Canadian imports previously found by the U.S. Department of Commerce to be subsidized. The agreement requires

Canada to assess fees on any softwood lumber shipped from its four leading producing provinces in excess of 14.7 billion board feet in each of the next five years. The agreement establishes procedures for export licensing and information collection that will greatly facilitate scrutiny of cross-border lumber trade, and for expedited determinations of whether Canada is carrying out its obligations under the agreement. Copies of the agreement are available to the public in the USTR reading room.

The agreement is intended to provide a satisfactory resolution to the acts, policies and practices of Canada regarding the exportation of softwood lumber to the United States that were the subject of the investigation initiated under section 302(b)(1)(A) of the Trade Act and found to be unreasonable and to burden or restrict U.S. commerce pursuant to section 304(a) on October 4, 1991. Section 306 of the Trade Act (19 U.S.C. 2416) requires the USTR to monitor the implementation of each measure undertaken, or agreement that is entered into to provide a satisfactory resolution of a matter subject to a section 301 investigation. Section 306 further requires that, if the USTR considers that a country is not satisfactorily implementing a measure or agreement, the USTR shall determine what further action to take under section 301(a).

Adherence to the terms of the agreement is vital to the achievement of its objectives. USTR, the Department of Commerce, the U.S. Customs Service, and other agencies as appropriate, will carefully monitor and vigorously enforce this agreement. To that end, Customs will provide USTR and Commerce the data that Customs collects on imports (including province of origin and the type of permit) of softwood lumber from Canada. If data, including data provided by the domestic industry, reveal that export fees called for under the agreement are not being collected, or if other information, including information provided by the domestic industry, reveals that Canada is in material non-compliance with any other of its obligations under the agreement, USTR will invoke the dispute settlement provisions of the agreement. I have determined that if: (a) An audit under the agreement confirms that fees have not been collected, and that action has not been taken subsequently to collect the fees, (b) an arbitral panel finds that Canada is otherwise not in conformity with the agreement, such as by offsetting, reducing, or undercutting its obligations under the agreement, and that the situation has not been cured, or (c) Canada unilaterally suspends its performance of, or terminates, the agreement in a manner inconsistent with the agreement, the USTR pursuant to section 306(b) of the Trade Act will consider that Canada is not satisfactorily implementing the agreement. In response, the USTR will take prompt and effective action under section 301(a) of the Trade Act to remedy Canada's failure to comply with the agreement, including, in the case where the required export fees have not been collected and action has not subsequently been taken to collect the fees, the imposition of duties on softwood lumber from Canada commensurate with Canada's failure to collect the fees under the agreement and sufficient to ensure compliance with the agreement and, as appropriate, other action to enforce or ensure compliance with the agreement.

Ira S. Shapiro,

Ambassador, Senior Counselor and Negotiator.

[FR Doc. 96–13993 Filed 6–4–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3190–01–M

POSTAL RATE COMMISSION

[Docket No. A96–15; Order No. 1113]

Lewiston, Nebraska 68380 (Lois Tegtmeier, Petitioner); Notice and Order Accepting Appeal and Establishing Procedural Schedule Under 29 U.S.C. 404(b)(5)

Issued May 30, 1996.

Docket Number: A96–15.
Name of Affected Post Office: Lewiston, Nebraska 68380.
Name(s) of Petitioner(s): Lois Tegtmeier.
Type of Determination: Consolidate.
Date of Filing of Appeal Papers: May 20, 1996.

Categories of Issues Apparently Raised:

1. Effect on postal services [39 U.S.C. 404(b)(2)(C)].
2. Effect on the community [39 U.S.C. 404(b)(2)(A)].

After the Postal Service files the administrative record and the Commission reviews it, the Commission may find that there are more legal issues than those set forth above. Or, the Commission may find that the Postal Service's determination disposes of one or more of those issues.

The Postal Reorganization Act requires that the Commission issue its decision within 120 days from the date this appeal was filed (39 U.S.C. 404 (b)(5)). In the interest of expedition, in light of the 120-day decision schedule, the Commission may request the Postal Service to submit memoranda of law on any appropriate issue. If requested, such memoranda will be due 20 days from the issuance of the request and the Postal Service shall serve a copy of its memoranda on the petitioners. The Postal Service may incorporate by reference in its briefs or motions, any arguments presented in memoranda it previously filed in this docket. If necessary, the Commission also may ask petitioners or the Postal Service for more information.

The Commission orders:

(a) The Postal Service shall file the record in this appeal by June 4, 1996.

(b) The Secretary of the Postal Rate Commission shall publish this Notice and Order and Procedural Schedule in the Federal Register.

By the Commission.

Margaret P. Crenshaw,

Secretary.

Appendix

May 20, 1996
Filing of Appeal letter
May 30, 1996
Commission Notice and Order of Filing of Appeal
June 14, 1996
Last day of filing of petitions to intervene [*see* 39 CFR § 3001.111(b)]
June 24, 1996
Petitioner's Participant Statement or Initial Brief [*see* 39 CFR § 3001.115 (a) and (b)]
July 15, 1996
Postal Service's Answering Brief [*see* 39 CFR § 3001.115(c)]
July 30, 1996
Petitioner's Reply Brief should Petitioner choose to file one [*see* 39 CFR § 3001.115(d)]
August 6, 1996
Deadline for motions by any party requesting oral argument. The Commission will schedule oral argument only when it is a necessary addition to the written filings [*see* 39 CFR § 3001.116]
September 17, 1996
Expiration of the Commission's 120-day decisional schedule [*see* 39 U.S.C. § 404(b)(5)]

[FR Doc. 96–14006 Filed 6–4–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7710–FW–P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Proposed Collection; Comment Request

Upon Written Request, Copies Available From: Securities and Exchange Commission, Office of Filings and Information Services, Washington, DC 20549.

Extension

Rule 19b–1—SEC File No. 270–312; OMB Control No. 3235–0354.