be accomplished when a source range neutron detector is inoperable with the plant shutdown. The proposed wording change will clarify the times and order in which these actions are to be performed.

*Date of issuance:* September 29, 1997

*Effective date:* September 29, 1997, to be implemented within 30 days from the date of issuance.

*Amendment No.:* 111

*Facility Operating License No.* NPF-42: The amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

*Date of initial notice in* **Federal Register:** August 27, 1997 (62 FR 45467) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated September 29, 1997. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

*Local Public Document Room locations:* Emporia State University, William Allen White Library, 1200 Commercial Street, Emporia, Kansas 66801 and Washburn University School of Law Library, Topeka, Kansas 66621

**Wolf Creek Nuclear Operating Corporation, Docket No. 50-482, Wolf Creek Generating Station, Coffey County, Kansas**

*Date of amendment request:* September 6, 1997

*Brief description of amendment:* This amendment allows the testing of certain contacts in the emergency diesel generator load sequencer to be done with the unit at power (Mode 1) and provides an additional 24 hours to the time allowed by TS 4.0.3 to complete the testing.

*Date of issuance:* October 7, 1997

*Effective date:* October 7, 1997

*Amendment No.:* 112

*Facility Operating License No.* NPF-42. The amendment revised the Technical Specifications. Public comments requested as to proposed no significant hazards consideration: Yes (62 FR 49261 dated September 19, 1997). The notice provided an opportunity to submit comments on the Commission's proposed no significant hazards consideration determination. No comments have been received. The notice also provided for an opportunity to request a hearing by October 20, 1997, but indicated that if the Commission makes a final no significant hazards consideration determination any such hearing would take place after issuance of the amendment. The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment, finding of exigent circumstances, and final determination of no significant hazards consideration are contained in a Safety Evaluation dated October 7, 1997.

*Attorney for licensee:* Jay Silberg, Esq., Shaw, Pittman, Potts and Trowbridge, 2300 N Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20037

*Local Public Document Room locations:* Emporia State University, William Allen White Library, 1200 Commercial Street, Emporia, Kansas 66801 and Washburn University School of Law Library, Topeka, Kansas 66621

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

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission

**Elinor G. Adensam,**

*Acting DirectorDivision of Reactor Projects - III/IV, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation*

[Doc. 97-27877 Filed 10–21–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-F

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

**[NUREG–1569]**

## Draft Standard Review Plan For In Situ Uranium Extraction License Applications

**AGENCY:** Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice of availability; opportunity for comment.

**SUMMARY:** The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is soliciting comments on a Draft Standard Review Plan for *in Situ* Uranium Extraction License Applications (NUREG–1569) from interested parties. A NRC source and byproduct material license is required under the provisions of Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Part 40 (10 CFR Part 40), Domestic Licensing of Source Material, to recover uranium by *in situ* leach uranium extraction mining techniques (*in situ* leaching). An applicant for a new operating license, or for the renewal or amendment of an existing license, is required to provide detailed information on the facilities, equipment, and procedures to be used, and if appropriate, an environmental report that discusses the effect of proposed operations on public health and safety and on the environment. This information is used by Nuclear Regulatory Commission staff to determine whether the proposed activities will be protective of public health and safety and be environmentally acceptable. The purpose of this standard review plan is to provide NRC staff with specific guidance on the review of this information and will be used to ensure a consistent quality and uniformity of staff reviews. Each section in the review plan provides guidance on what is to be reviewed, the basis for the review, how the staff review is to be accomplished, what the staff will find acceptable in a demonstration of compliance with the regulations, and the conclusions that are sought regarding the applicable sections in 10 CFR. The review plan is also intended to improve the understanding of the staff review process by interested members of the public and the uranium recovery industry. The draft was developed using input from (1) staff review precedents; (2) staff inspection experiences; (3) public meetings with industry; and (4) experience from the State of Texas, which is an agreement state for uranium recovery and has 15 licensed *in situ* leach operations.

Opportunity to Comment: Interested parties are invited to comment on the review plan. Interested parties are also asked to comment on the level and extent that staff could rely on technical reviews performed by non-agreement states in areas where the NRC and the State have concurrent regulatory authority. These areas include land application, nonradiological soil cleanup, upper control limit, and groundwater restoration reviews. A final review plan will be prepared after the NRC staff has evaluated public comments received on the draft review plan.

**DATES:** Written comments must be received prior to December 8, 1997.

**ADDRESSES:** Comments on the draft review plan should be sent to the Chief, Rules and Directives, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555.

**AVAILABILITY:** A copy of the Draft Standard Review Plan (NUREG–1569) may be obtained by writing to the Printing and Graphics Branch, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. 20555–0001.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 14th day of October 1997.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Joseph J. Holonich,**

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

[FR Doc. 97–28002 Filed 10–21–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

## SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

## Applications, Hearings, Determinations, Etc. Tivoli Industries, Inc.

October 16, 1997.

Issuer Delisting; Notice of Application to Withdraw from Listing and

Registration; (Tivoli Industries, Inc., Common Stock, $.001 Par Value; Redeemable Class A Warrants to Purchase $.001 Par Value Common Stock, expiring Sept. 21, 1997; Redeemable Class B Warrants to Purchase $.001 Par Value Common Stock, expiring Sept. 21, 1997) File No. 1–13338.

Tivoli Industries, Inc. (''Company'') has filed an application with the Securities and Exchange Commission (''Commission''), pursuant to Section 12(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (''Act'') and Rule 12d2–2(d) promulgated thereunder, to withdraw the above specified securities (''Securities'') from listing and registration on the Boston Stock Exchange, Inc. (''BSE'' or ''Exchange'').

The reasons cited in the application for withdrawing the Securities from listing and registration include the following:

The Company's Securities have been listed for trading on both the BSE and Nasdaq Small Cap Stock Market since September 21, 1994.

The Company has complied with the rules of BSE by setting forth in detail to such Exchange the reasons for such proposed withdrawal, and the facts in support thereof. In making the decision to withdraw its Securities from listing on the BSE, the Company considered the direct and indirect costs and expenses attendant on maintaining the dual listing of its Securities on the NASDAQ SmallCap Stock Market and the BSE. The Company does not see any particular advantage in the dual trading of its Securities and believes that dual listing would fragment the market for its securities.

By letter dated September 23, 1997, the BSE has informed the Company that it has no objection to the withdrawal of the Company's Securities from listing on the BSE.

Any interested person may, on or before November 6, 1997, submit by letter to the Secretary of the Securities and Exchange Commission, 450 Fifth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20549, facts bearing upon whether the application has been made in accordance with the rules of the exchange and what terms, if any, should be imposed by the Commission for the protection of investors. The Commission, based on the information submitted to it, will issue an order granting the application after the date mentioned above, unless the Commission determines to order a hearing on the matter.

For the Commission, by the Division of Market Regulation, pursuant to delegated authority.

**Jonathan G. Katz,**

*Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 97–27901 Filed 10–21–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8010–01–M

---

## SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

**[Release No. 39235; File No. SR–CTA/CQ–97–2]**

## Consolidated Tape Association; Notice of Filing and Immediate Effectiveness of Second Charges Amendment to the Second Restatement of the Consolidated Tape Association Plan and First Charges Amendment to the Restated Consolidated Quotation Plan

October 14, 1997.

Pursuant to Rule 11Aa3–2 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (''Act'')[1], notice is hereby given that on September 26, 1997, the Consolidated Tape Association (''CTA'') and the Consolidated Quotation (''CQ'') Plan Participants (''Participants'') filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission (''Commission'' or ''SEC'') amendments to the Restated CTA Plan and CQ Plan. The amendments (a) establish a new Network A fee (*i.e.*, one cent per ''quote packet'') for interrogation services that vendors offer on a pay-for-use basis, (b) eliminate the Network A Class F and Class H program classification charges, (c) reclassify the Network A Class G program classification charge and (d) raise the monthly Network A fee applicable to nonprofessional subscribers from $4.25 to $5.25. In addition, the amendment to the CTA Plan raises the monthly connection fee for delivery of the ticker signal by means of AT&T from $200 to $250.

Pursuant to Rule 11Aa3–2(c)(3)(i), the CTA and CQ Participants have designated the amendments as establishing or changing fees and other charges collected on behalf of all of the sponsors and participants, which renders the amendments effective upon receipt of this filing by the Commission. The Commission is publishing this notice to solicit comments from interested persons on the amendments.

### I. Description and Purpose of the Amendments

*A. Rule 11Aa3–2*

The purpose of the amendments is to allow the Participants under the Plans that make Network A last sale information and quotation information available (''the Network A Participants'') to establish a new and additional pricing alternative for vendors of, and subscribers to, certain Network A market data interrogation services. That pricing alternative has proved popular and successful in the context of a pilot program. In addition, the amendments eliminate two categories of program classification fees, reclassify a third category of program classification fee and increase the monthly nonprofessional subscriber fee by $1. The amendment to the CTA Plan also increases the monthly connection fee that applies for delivery of the ticker signal by AT&T by $50.

1. Usage-Based Charge

a. *One Cent Per Quote.* The Network A Participants propose to establish a fee of one cent for each real-time ''quote packet'' that vendors disseminate to subscribers on a pay-for-use basis during the hours that the Network A Participants are open for trading (a ''per-quote charge''). For the purposes of this charge, a ''quote packet'' refers to a group of one or more data elements relating to the same issue. Last sale price, bid, offer, transaction size, quotation size, opening price, high price, low price, trading volume and net change in price are all examples of data elements that might be part of the same ''quote packet,'' either individually or in combination. An index value qualifies as a ''quote packet'' in and of itself.

In order to take advantage of the per-quote charge, a vendor must document in its Exhibit A that it has the ability to measure accurately the number of quote packets and must have the ability to report aggregate quote packet quantities to the Network A Participants on a monthly basis.

The Network A Participants will impose the per-quote charge only on the dissemination of the real-time market data. Vendors may provide delayed data services in the same manner as they do today.

The per-quote charge is payable on a monthly basis and is payable by the vendor providing the service, rather than the vendor's subscribers. It represents a new and additional alternative to existing rates. That is, vendors may elect to continue to offer monthly display device services subject to the current rates for per-device services (rather than the newly established per-quote charge) and also may elect, either in addition or as a substitute, to disseminate data pursuant to the per-quote charge.

[1] 15 U.S.C. § 78s(b)(1).