within 60 days from the date of this notice.

ADDRESSES: A free single copy of the DEIS (NUREG–1531) and DTER (NUREG–1532) may be requested by those considering public comment by writing to the NRC Publications Section, ATTN: Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, P.O. Box 37082, Washington, DC 20013–7082. A copy of each document is also available for inspection and/or copying in the NRC Public Document Room, 2120 L St. NW, Washington, DC.

Any interested party may submit comments on these documents for consideration by the staff. Consistent with its past commitments, NRC is extending the comment period 15 days beyond the required minimum of 45 days. To be certain of consideration, comments on these reports must be received within 60 days from the date of this notice. Comments received after the due date will be considered to the extent practical. Comments on either document should be sent to Chief, High-Level Waste and Uranium Recovery Projects Branch, Mail Stop TWFN 7–J9, Division of Waste Management, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dr. Myron Fliegel, High-Level Waste and Uranium Recovery Projects Branch, Mail Stop TWFN 7–J9, Division of Waste Management, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555. Telephone 301/415–6629.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The NRC, in cooperation with the NPS, has prepared a DEIS regarding the administrative action of approving an amendment to Atlas' NRC license authorizing reclamation of uranium mill tailings at the existing site near Moab, Utah. The uranium mill no longer operates and is currently being dismantled. The nearby 9.52-million-metric-ton (10.5-million-ton), 52.6–ha (130-acre), uranium mill tailings pile needs to be stabilized for long-term disposal. The DEIS describes the evaluation concerning (1) the purpose of and need for the proposed action, evaluated under NEPA and the agencies' implementing regulations, (2) alternatives considered, (3) existing environmental conditions, and (4) environmental consequences of the proposed action and proposed mitigating measures.

Three alternatives were evaluated. Atlas' proposal (Alternative 1) is to reclaim the tailings pile for permanent disposal and long-term custodial care by a government agency in its current location near Moab, prepare the 162-ha (400-acre) site for closure, and depart the site after having its NRC license terminated.

Under Alternative 2, Atlas would transport all of the tailings and other contaminated material to an alternate site. The DEIS considers the Plateau site, located approximately 29 km (18 mi) northwest of Moab, as the primary alternate site. The DEIS considers several alternatives for transporting the tailings to the alternate site.

Under the no-action alternative (Alternative 3), the NRC would make no licensing decision, and Atlas would cease operations involving management of the tailings. Because this alternative would not comply with regulations and is not environmentally acceptable, it is not evaluated in detail in this DEIS.

As documented in the DEIS, the NRC's preliminary conclusion is that Atlas' proposal (reclamation on site) is acceptable with respect to environmental costs and benefits. Alternative 2 (transport to and stabilization at an alternate site) would result in some advantages (primarily by freeing the current site near the Colorado River for other uses and eliminating the potential for impacts to the Colorado River) and disadvantages (primarily related to the transport of tailings to a new site and the longer period of construction) compared to Alternative 1. Alternative 2 would be considerably more expensive than Alternative 1.

The NRC has also prepared a DTER that evaluates Atlas' proposed reclamation of the uranium mill tailings with respect to NRC safety regulations. NRC regulations applicable to reclamation of uranium tailings are primarily in Part 40 of 10 CFR, with specific technical criteria appearing in Appendix A. The DTER is organized by the technical disciplines involved in the assessment of the proposed reclamation, but also provides a criterion by criterion evaluation of Atlas' proposed reclamation with respect to Appendix A. The NRC review identified 20 issues in geology, seismology, geotechnical engineering, erosion protection, water resources protection, and radon attenuation that preclude the NRC from concluding that the applicable regulations would be met under Atlas' proposed reclamation. Atlas can provide further information to try to resolve these issues.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 24th day of January 1996.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Joseph J. Holonich,

Chief, High-Level Waste and Uranium Recovery Projects Branch, Division of Waste Management, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.

[FR Doc. 96–1679 Filed 1–29–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

Consideration of Valve Mispositioning in Pressurized-Water Reactors; Issued

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Notice of issuance.

SUMMARY: The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) has issued Generic Letter 89–10, Supplement 7 to notify licensees of nuclear power reactors that the NRC is removing the recommendation that motor operated valve (MOV) mispositioning be considered by pressurized-water reactor licensees in responding to Generic Letter 89–10, ''Safety-Related Motor-Operated Valve Testing and Surveillance,'' as was done for boiling-water reactor licensees in Supplement 4. Although this generic letter supplement forwards a new NRC position, no specific action or written response is required. This generic letter is available in the Public Document Rooms under accession number 9601190442.

DATES: The generic letter was issued on January 24, 1996.

ADDRESSEES: Not applicable.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: David C. Fischer at (301) 415–2728.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: None.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 24th day of January, 1996.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Dennis M. Crutchfield,

Director, Division of Reactor Program Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 96–1682 Filed 1–29–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

[Docket No. 50–322]

Long Island Power Authority—Shoreham Nuclear Power Station; Closing of Local Public Document Room

Notice is hereby given that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is closing the local public document room (LPDR) for records pertaining to the Long Island Power Authority (LIPA) Shoreham Nuclear Power Station located at the Shoreham-Wading River Public Library, Shoreham, New York.

This LPDR is no longer needed and will close effective March 16, 1996.

The Shoreham Public Library has been the LPDR for the Shoreham Nuclear Power Station since January 1979. Since that time the LPDR has continued to maintain documents on the construction through decommissioning stages of the facility. On April 11, 1995, NRC issued an order terminating License Number NPF–82, releasing the facility and site for unrestricted use. Therefore, effective March 16, 1996, the LPDR will be closed.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 24th day of January 1996.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Carlton Kammerer,

Director, Division of Freedom of Information and Publications Services, Office of Administration.

[FR Doc. 96–1680 Filed 1–29–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

[Docket Nos. 72–14, 50–346, 72–1004 (License No. NPF–3)]

Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station; Toledo Edison Company; Receipt of Petition for Director's Decision Under 10 C.F.R. § 2.206

Notice is hereby given that by a Petition dated December 5, 1995, filed on behalf of the Toledo Coalition for Safe Energy, Alice Hirt, Charlene Johnston, Dini Schut, and William Hoops (Petitioners), the Nuclear Regulatory Commission was requested to immediately issue orders to prevent the loading of spent nuclear fuel into the VECTRA Technologies Inc., NUHOMS–24P dry shielded canisters (DSCs) at the Davis-Besse nuclear power station until an NRC rulemaking and/or license modification hearing is conducted on all safety-related changes which have been made to the canisters, as described in the Safety Analysis Report. Also, the NRC was requested not to authorize any loading of the canisters until a written procedure for unloading in both urgent and nonurgent circumstances is written, approved, and field-tested.

Petitioners contend that the safety of the canisters has been compromised because of reduction in the thickness of the canister welds. In addition, they claim that the NRC administrative process by which permission was granted for VECTRA to deliver the canisters to the Davis-Besse station and for the canisters to be used on site are legally suspect, expressing the belief that agency rulemaking or some other public proceeding is necessary for permission for such a transfer and use to be granted.

The Petition is being treated pursuant to 10 C.F.R. § 2.206 of the Commission's regulations. The Petition has been referred to the Director of the Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards. As provided by Section 2.206, appropriate action will be taken on this Petition within a reasonable time. By letter dated December 18, 1995, the Director denied the Petitioners' request for immediate action on the Petition.

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

Dated at Rockville, Maryland this 23rd day of January 1996.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Carl J. Paperiello,

Director Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.

[FR Doc. 96–1681 Filed 1–29–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–p

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Agency Information Collection Activities; Request For Public Comment

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

Extension: Form 40–F, SEC File No. 270–335, OMB Control No. 3235–0381.

Notice is hereby given that pursuant to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501 et seq.), the Securities and Exchange Commission (''Commission'') is publishing the following summary of collection for public comment.

Form 40–F is used by certain Canadian issuers to register securities pursuant to Section 12 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (''Exchange Act'') or as an annual report pursuant to Section 13(a) or 15(d) of the Exchange Act. An estimated 320 submissions are made pursuant to Form 40–F, resulting in an estimated annual total burden of 640 hours.

Written comments are invited on: (a) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology. Consideration will be given to comments and suggestions submitted in writing within 60 days of this publication.

Direct your written comments to Michael E. Bartell, Associate Executive Director, Office of Information Technology, Securities and Exchange Commission, 450 5th Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20549.

Dated January 23, 1996.

Margaret H. McFarland,

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 96–1671 Filed 1–29–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8010–01–M

[Release No. 34–36763; File No. SR–Philadep–95–11]

Self-Regulatory Organizations; Philadelphia Depository Trust Company; Notice of Filing and Immediate Effectiveness of a Proposed Rule Change To Restate, and Amend Schedule of Fees and Charges

January 24, 1996.

Pursuant to section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (''Act''),[1] notice is hereby given that on December 26, 1995, the Philadelphia Depository Trust Company (''Philadep'') 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 Philadep. The Commission is publishing this notice to solicit comments on the proposed rule change from interested persons.

I. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Terms of Substance of the Proposed Rule Change

The proposed rule change will restate Philadep's schedule of fees and charges with certain amendments.

II. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Purpose of, and Statutory Basis for, the Proposed Rule Change

In its filing with the Commission, Philadep included statements concerning the purpose of and statutory basis for the proposed rule change. The text of these statements may be examined at the places specified in Item IV below. Philadep has prepared summaries, set forth in sections (A), (B),

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