amended). During the period August 6 through September 24, 1997, the Special Emphasis Panel in Design manufacturing and Industrial Innovation (1194) will be holding panel meetings to review and evaluate Small Business Innovation research proposals. The dates, types of proposals, contact person and room numbers are as follows:

August 6th

Topic 21—Design Manufacture and Industrial Innovation (8 panels), Dr. M. Leu Topic Program Officer, Ritchie Coryell SBIR Program Manager, Rooms 310, 320, 340, 365, 370, 380, 580, and 410.

August 7th

Topic 16—Computer and Computation Research, Dr. Tripathy, Dr. Anger Topic Program Officers, Dr. Sara Nerlove SBIR Program Manager, Room 310.

August 11th

Topic 23—Hazardous Mitigation, Dr. S. Liu, Topic Program Officer, Dr. G. Patrick Johnson, SBIR Program Manager, Room: 310.

August 14th

Topic 21—Design Manufacture and Industrial Innovation, Dr. Kesh Narayanan, Topic Program Officer, Ritchie Coryell, SBIR Program Manager, (Panel will be held at the University of Texas—Austin).

August 18th

Topic 8—Ocean Sciences, Dr. Rodger Baier Topic Program Officer, Ritchie Coryell SBIR, Program Manager, Room 310.

August 19 & 20th

Topic 3—ElectroCeramics, Dr. Lise Schioler Topic Program Officer, Darryl Gorman SBIR, Program Manager, Room 320.

August 22th

Topic 3—Polymers, Dr. Andrew Lovinger Topic Program Officer, Darryl Gorman SBIR Program Manager, Room 380.

August 25th

Topic 23—Dynamic Systems and Control, Dr. D. Garg Topic Program Officer, Dr. G. Patrick Johnson, SBIR Program Manager, Room 530.

August 26–27th

Topic 3—Structural Ceramics, Dr. Lise Schioler Topic Program Officer, Darryl Gorman SBIR Program Manager, Room 320.

August 28th

- Topic 23–d—Tribology, Dr. J. Larsen-Basse Topic Program Officer, Dr. Patrick Johnson SBIR Program Manager, Room 330 and 340.
- Topic 21 Design Manufacture and Industrial Innovation, Dr. George Hazelrigg and Dr. Lawrence Seiford Topic Program Officers and Ritchie Coryell, SBIR Program Manager, Room 530.

September 3rd

Topic 3—Optical/Photonic Materials, Dr. Lise Schioler Program Officer, Darryl Gorman, SBIR Program Manager, Room 320.

September 8 & 9th

Topic 3—Liquid Crystals, Dr. Lise Schioler, Topic Program Officer, Darryl Gorman, SBIR Program Manager, Room 320.

September 9th

- Topic 23—Materials Structures & Systems, Dr. K. Chong Topic Program Officer, Dr. G. Patrick Johnson, SBIR Program Manager, Room 360.
- Topic 23Bridge Engineering, Dr. K. Chong Topic Program Officer, Dr. G. Patrick Johnson, SBIR Program Manager, Room 365.

September 10th

- Topic 23—Bridge Engineering, Dr. K. Chong Topic Program Officer, Dr. G. Patrick Johnson, SBIR Program Manager, Room 365.
- Topic 23—Materials, Structures, & Systems, Dr. K. Chong Topic Program Officer, Dr. G. Patrick Johnson, SBIR Program Manager, Room 370.

September 11 and 12th (5 panels)

Topic 25—Education & Human Resources, Mr. James LIghtborne, Program Coordinator, Dr. Sara Nerlove, SBIR Program Manager, Rooms 320, 330, 365, 370, 880.

September 15 & 16th (4 panels)

Topic 20—Electrical and Communication system, Dr. K. Baheti, Topic Program Officer and Mr. Tony Centodocati SBIR Program Manager, Rooms: 320, 330, 365, 370.

September 17th

- Topic 22—Thermal, Dr. Emery, Topic Program Officer, Dr. Joseph Hennessey, SBIR Program Manager, Room 320.
- Topic 9—Polar Sciences, Dr. Charles Myers, Topic Program Officer, Mr. Ritchie Coryell, SBIR Program Manager, Room 330.
- Topic 24—Bioengineeing, Dr. George Vermont, Topic Program Officer, Dr. Bruce Hamilton SBIR Program Manager, Room 365.
- Topic 3—Electronic Materials, Dr. Lise Schioler, Topic Program Officer, Mr. Darryl Gorman, SBIR Program Manager, Room 370.

September 18 & 19th

- Topic 20—Electrical and Communication Systems, Dr. K. Baheti Topic Program Officer, Mr. Tony Centodocati, SBIR Program Manager, Room 320 & 330.

September 18th (3 panels)

- Topic 19—Information, Robotics, and Intelligent Systems, Dr. Gary Strong, Topic Program Officer, Dr. Sara Nerlove, SBIR Program Manager, Room 360, 365, 370.
- Topic 22—Chemical and Transport Systems, Dr. Maria Burka, Topic Program Officer, Dr. Joseph Hennessey, SBIR Program Manager, Room 530.

September 19th

- Topic 13—Biological Infrastructure, Dr. Karl Koehler, Topic Program Officer, Dr. Bruce Hamilton, SBIR Program Manager, Room 370.
- Topic 22—Fluids and Particulates, Dr. M. Roco and Dr. Roger Arndt, Topic Program Officers and Dr. Joseph Hennessey, SBIR Program Manager, Room 530.

September 23, 24 & 26th

Topic 26—Next Generation Vehicles, Dr. Paul Werbos, Topic Program Officer, Cheryl Albus, SBIR Program Manager, Room 320.

September 23 & 24th (3 panels)

Topic 2—Chemistry, Dr. Joseph Reed, Topic Program Officer, Dr. Joseph Hennessey, SBIR Program Manager, Room 330, 365, 370.

Times: 8:30 to 5:00 p.m. each day.

Place: National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Blvd., Arlington, Va (unless noted).

Type of Meetings: Closed.

SBIR Program Contact Person: Dr. Cheryl Albus, Program Analyst, DMII, Room 590, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Blvd., Arlington, Va. telephone (703) 306–1390.

Purpose of Meetings: To provide advice and recommendations concerning proposals submitted to NSF for financial support.

Agenda: To review and evaluate proposals submitted to the Small Business Innovative Research (SBIR) Program as part of the selection process for awards.

Reason for Closing: The proposals being reviewed include information of a proprietary or confidential nature, including technical information; financial data, such as salaries, and personal information concerning individuals associated with the proposals. These matters are exempt under 5 U.S.C. 552b(c) (4) and (6) of the Government in the Sunshine Act.

Dated: July 15, 1997.

M. Rebecca Winkler,

Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 97–19102 Filed 7–18–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555–01–M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50–289]

GPU Nuclear Corporation; Three Mile Island Nuclear Generating Station, Unit 1; Exemption

I

GPU Nuclear Corporation (GPU or the licensee) is the holder of Facility Operating License No. DPR–50 for the Three Mile Island Nuclear Generating Station, Unit 1 (TMI–1 or the facility). The facility consists of one pressurized water reactor located at the licensee's site in Dauphin County, Pennsylvania. The license provides, among other things, that it is subject to all rules, regulations and orders of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission or NRC) now and hereafter in effect.

II

Section III.G.2 to Appendix R of 10 CFR part 50 specifies the fire protection requirements for redundant trains of systems necessary to achieve and maintain safe shutdown conditions

when the redundant trains are located within the same fire area. Subsection III.G.2.c requires that automatic fire suppression systems shall be installed in fire areas where redundant circuits required for safe shutdown are separated by fire barriers having a 1-hour rating and have fire detectors installed. By letter dated August 16, 1996, supplemented by letters dated August 28, 1996, and January 3, 1997, the licensee requested an exemption from the requirements of Section III.G.2.c of Appendix R, to the extent that it requires the installation of automatic fire suppression systems. The exemption was requested for fire areas CB–FA–2b, CB–FA–2c, CB–FA–2d, CB–FA–2e, CB–FA–2f, CB–FA–2g, CB–FA–3a, and CB–FA–3b, and fire zone FH–FZ–5 at TMI–1. The licensee is seeking this exemption in accordance with the provisions of 10 CFR 50.12.

The licensee's request encompasses eight fire areas and one fire zone where Thermo-Lag fire barrier systems were installed on electrical raceways to protect circuits required for safe shutdown. The Thermo-Lag barriers were originally installed to provide 3-hour separation between redundant circuits located in the same fire area. As part of the licensee's review of installed Thermo-Lag fire barriers at TMI–1, the licensee identified locations that do not support a 3-hour rating.

The licensee requested the exemption after determining that installation of fire suppression systems in the affected areas was not a viable alternative for meeting the regulatory requirements of Section III.G.2.c. The licensee stated that installation of an automatic suppression system is not desirable because of the potential for electrical equipment damage from a water suppression system and because of personnel hazard concerns from a carbon dioxide suppression system. Halon gas suppression systems cannot be used because of environmental considerations. The licensee determined that modification of the existing Thermo-Lag fire barrier envelopes within the affected fire areas to achieve a 3-hour rating, and thereby eliminating the regulatory requirement for fire suppression systems, represented a substantial hardship without a significant increase in the level of protection provided.

In lieu of installing automatic fire suppression systems, the licensee proposed installing area-wide automatic fire detection systems in each of the affected areas and establishing a minimum 1-hour fire rating for the existing Thermo-Lag fire barriers.

III

The NRC staff has completed its safety evaluation of the licensee's request for exemption from certain requirements of Section III.G.2.c of Appendix R. The staff's review included an evaluation of the fire hazards, the fire protection features and the safe shutdown circuits present in each of the affected fire areas.

The licensee has administrative controls in place for transient combustibles and work in the plant in accordance with Section III.K of Appendix R as documented in an NRC Safety Evaluation dated June 4, 1984. These controls require, in part, that total in-situ plus allowable transient fire loads (or cumulative load) in a given fire area/zone be half of that which would challenge the lowest rated fire barrier in the zone. These limits are documented in licensee procedures that are referenced in and implemented by the licensee's Fire Protection Program.

The licensee completed an evaluation of the Thermo-Lag fire barriers which are the subject in this exemption request in Topical Report #904, ''TMI 1 Evaluation of Thermo-Lag Fire Barriers,'' dated July 10, 1996, and provided in a letter dated August 28, 1996. The licensee found that the subject Thermo-Lag barriers either currently have a fire rating of 1-hour or more (in accordance with an American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) E–119 fire exposure test) or the licensee has committed to upgrade the existing barriers to achieve a 1-hour rating.

For a postulated fire in areas CB-FA–2b, CB-FA–2c, CB-FA–2d, CB-FA–2e, B–FA–2f, CB–FA–2g, CB–FA–3a, and CB–FA–3b, the loss of redundant trains of several different safe shutdown circuits, including reactor make-up and supporting functions, RCS pressure control, steam generator pressure and level functions, source range monitoring, electrical power system function, non-nuclear instrumentation/integrated control system (NNI/ICS) cabinets, and reactor coolant pump (RCP) thermal barrier cooling functions, could occur. These circuits must be maintained functional and free from fire damage to assure shutdown of the plant.

Fires in these eight fire areas are postulated to be slowly developing cable fires, with possible ignition sources, including electrical switchgear, fan motors, or heater controllers. Exposure of the protected envelopes to fire could be expected in some of the fire areas, should a fire occur. Some of the envelopes are in close proximity to heavily loaded cable trays, which could contribute to a postulated fire. The fire loadings for these fire areas range from low to moderate.

The licensee has committed to augmenting the existing detection systems in the eight fire areas listed above with area-wide early warning fire detection systems. The systems to be installed are designed to detect invisible molecules generated during the precombustion phases of an incipient fire and to provide active and continuous sampling of the air. The systems operate independently of air movement and are much more sensitive than conventional ionization detection.

If a fire were to occur in a given fire area, detection by the proposed area-wide detection system would most likely be rapid. The existing heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) smoke detection systems would isolate—5-room ventilation upon detecting smoke in the area. Indication of fire would be received in the control room, and if necessary, the fire brigade would be dispatched. The fire brigade response time to any of the fire areas upon receipt of an alarm has been conservatively estimated at 15 minutes. Manual firefighting equipment (hand-held fire extinguishers and hose stations) is available in, or adjacent to, all of the fire areas. Manual suppression could be brought to bear on a fire within any of these fire areas within 15 minutes.

For fire areas CB–FA–2b, CB–FA–2c, CB–FA–2d, CB–FA–2e, CB–FA–2f, CB–FA–2g, CB–FA–3a, and CB–FA–3b, the exposure threat of the Thermo-Lag protected circuits is low due to the proximity of the Thermo-Lag envelopes to intervening combustibles. Therefore, a 1-hour barrier coupled with an area-wide early warning fire detection system and a rapid fire brigade response meets the defense-in-depth principle. There is reasonable assurance that a fire in any of these fire areas will not adversely affect the ability to achieve and maintain safe shutdown.

The staff does not believe the same assurance has been provided for fire zone FH–FZ–5. The Thermo-Lag protected envelope in fire zone FH–FZ–5 passes directly over switchgear and is in close proximity to cable trays which present a combustible hazard. The combustible loading in this zone is higher than the other eight fire areas, and the area-wide detection is not available on all elevations of this fire zone. Given these factors, there is no reasonable assurance that a fire would not damage cables in the protected envelope. There is only one Thermo-Lag envelope in this zone, made up of protected conduit. The staff does not believe an undue hardship exists with

respect to upgrading this envelope to a 3-hour fire rating.

On the basis of the NRC staff evaluations discussed above, and contingent on the installation of area-wide fire detection systems, upgrading the existing Thermo-Lag fire barriers to ensure a minimum 1-hour fire rating, and continued implementation of the administrative controls previously discussed, the staff has concluded that an exemption from the technical requirements of Section III.G.2.c of Appendix R, to the extent that it requires the installation of automatic fire suppression systems, should be granted for fire areas CB–FA–2b, CB–FA–2c, CB–FA–2d, CB–FA–2e, CB–FA–2f, CB–FA–2g, CB–FA–3a, and CB–FA–3b. The staff has concluded that the licensee's exemption request for fire zone FH–FZ–5 should be denied.

IV

The Commission has determined that, pursuant to 10 CFR 50.12, the exemption requested by the licensee in the letter dated August 16, 1996, supplemented by letters dated August 28, 1996, and January 3, 1997, for fire areas CB–FA–2b, CB–FA–2c, CB–FA–2d, CB–FA–2e, CB–FA–2f, CB–FA–2g, CB–FA–3a, and CB–FA–3b, is authorized by law, will not present an undue risk to public health and safety, and is consistent with the common defense and security. The Commission has further determined that special circumstances are present in that application of the regulation is not necessary to achieve the underlying purpose of the rule, which is to establish fire protection features such that the ability to perform safe shutdown functions in the event of a fire is maintained.

Therefore, contingent on the installation of an area-wide fire detection system in the affected fire areas and upgrading the existing Thermo-Lag fire barriers within the affected fire areas to ensure a minimum 1-hour fire rating, and continued implementation of the administrative controls discussed above, the Commission hereby grants GPU Nuclear Corporation an exemption from the technical requirements of Section III.G.2.c of Appendix R, to the extent that it requires the installation of automatic fire suppression systems, for fire areas CB–FA–2b, CB–FA–2c, CB–FA–2d, CB–FA–2e, CB–FA–2f, CB–FA–2g, CB–FA–3a, and CB–FA–3b, at TMI–1. The request for exemption for fire zone FH–FZ–5, included by the licensee in the same submittal, is denied.

Pursuant to 10 CFR 51.32, the Commission has determined that the granting of this exemption will have no significant impact on the quality of the human environment (62 FR 37082).

This exemption is effective upon issuance.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 11th day of July 1997.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Samuel J. Collins,

Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 97–19063 Filed 7–18–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50–275 and 50–323]

Pacific Gas and Electric Company; Diablo Canyon Power Plant, Unit Nos. 1 and 2; Notice of Withdrawal of Application for Amendments to Facility Operating Licenses

The United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has granted the request of Pacific Gas and Electric Company (the licensee) to withdraw its January 17, 1996, as supplemented by letter dated July 17, 1996, application for proposed amendment to Facility Operating License Nos. DPR–80 and DPR–82 for the Diablo Canyon Power Plant. Unit Nos. 1 and 2, located in San Luis Obispo County, California.

The proposed amendment would have relocated selected technical specifications (TS) in accordance with the Commission's Final Policy Statement (10 CFR 50.36) for relocation of current TS that do not meet any of the screening criteria for retention. These TS would have been relocated to the Diablo Canyon Power Plant Equipment Control Guidelines. This change would also create TS 6.8.4.j, ''Explosive Gas and Storage Tank Radioactivity Monitoring Program.''

The Commission had previously issued a Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment published in the **Federal Register** on April 10, 1996 (61 FR 15991). However, by letter dated July 2, 1997, the licensee withdrew the proposed change.

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendment dated January 17, 1996, as supplemented by letter dated July 17, 1996, and the licensee's letter dated July 2, 1997, which withdrew the application for license amendment. The above documents are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, and the local public document room located at California Polytechnic State University, Robert E. Kennedy Library, Government Documents and Maps Department, San Luis Obispo, California 93407.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland this 15th day of July 1997.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Steven D. Bloom,

Project Manager, Project Directorate IV–2, Division of Reactor Projects III/IV, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 97–19061 Filed 7–18–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Rel. No. IC–22749: File No. 812–10648]

Hotchkis and Wiley Variable Trust, et al.

July 14, 1997.

AGENCY: The Securities and Exchange Commission (the ''Commission'').

ACTION: Notice of application for an exemption pursuant to the Investment Company Act of 1940 (the ''1940 Act'').

APPLICANTS: Hotchkis and Wiley Variable Trust (the ''Trust'') and Merrill Lynch Asset Management, L.P. (''MLAM'').

RELEVANT 1940 ACT SECTIONS: Order requested pursuant to Section 6(c) granting exemptions from the provisions of Sections 9(a), 13(a), 15(a), and 15(b) of the 1940 Act and Rules 6e–2(b)(15) and 6e–3(T)(b)(15) thereunder.

SUMMARY OF APPLICATION: Applicants seek exemptive relief to the extent necessary to permit shares of the Trust and shares of any other investment company or portfolio that is designed to fund insurance products and for which Hotchkis and Wiley (''H&W'') may serve in the future, as investment adviser, administrator, manager, principal underwriter, or sponsor (''Future Trusts,'' together with Trust, ''Trusts'') to be sold to and held by variable annuity and variable life insurance separate accounts of both affiliated and unaffiliated life insurance companies and by qualified pension and retirement plans (''Qualified Plans'' or ''Plans'') outside of the separate account context.

FILING DATE: This application was filed on May 9, 1997.

HEARING OR NOTIFICATION OF HEARING: An order granting the application will be issued unless the Commission orders a hearing. Interested persons may request hearing by writing to the Secretary of the Commission and serving Applicants with a copy of the request, personally or by mail. Hearing requests must be