

grants an exemption from the additional testing requirements of Section III.A.6(b) of Appendix J to 10 CFR Part 50 to allow the licensee to resume the Type A test interval of Section III.D for LaSalle, Unit 2, and an exemption from the requirements of Section III.D.1(a) of Appendix J to allow the licensee to decouple the Type A testing and the first 10-year plant inservice inspections for LaSalle, Unit 2.

Pursuant to 10 CFR 31.32, the Commission determined that the granting of this exemption will have no significant impact on the quality of the human environment (60 FR 13187).

Dated at Rockville, Maryland this 10th day of March 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Elinor G. Adensam,

Acting Director, Division of Reactor Projects III/IV, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.
[FR Doc. 95-6616 Filed 3-16-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

Licensing Support System Advisory Review Panel

ACTION: Change in meeting location.

SUMMARY: This is to announce a change in location of the next meeting of the Licensing Support System Advisory Review Panel (LSSARP). The meeting will be held in Las Vegas, Nevada, on March 22 and 23, 1995, as previously announced in the **Federal Register** on March 3, 1995 (60 FR 11998). The location of the meeting has been moved to a facility on the campus of the University of Nevada at Las Vegas (UNLV). The Panel will be using the Student Lounge, Room A-207, in the Thomas Beam Engineering Building. The building may be reached from the Claymont Road entrance to the campus.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

John C. Hoyle, Office of the Secretary, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555; telephone 301-415-1969.

Dated at Washington, DC this 15th day of March, 1995.

Andrew L. Bates,

Advisory Committee Management Officer.
[FR Doc. 95-6796 Filed 3-16-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

POSTAL RATE COMMISSION

[Order No. 1047 and Docket No. A95-6]

Notice and Order Accepting Appeal and Establishing Procedural Schedule Under 39 U.S.C. § 404(b)(5)

Before Commissioners: Edward J. Gleiman, Chairman; W.H. "Trey" LeBlanc III, Vice-Chairman; George W. Haley; H. Edward Quick, Jr.; Wayne A. Schley.

Issued: March 13, 1995.

Docket Number: A95-6

Name of Affected Post Office: DeGraff, Minnesota 56233

Name(s) of Petitioner(s): Helen Byrne, et al.

Type of Determination: Consolidation
Date of Filing of Appeal Papers: March 7, 1995

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 March 22, 1995.

(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

March 7, 1995—Filing of Appeal letter
March 13, 1995—Commission Notice and Order of Filing of Appeal

April 3, 1995—Last day of filing of petitions to intervene [see 39 CFR 3001.111(b)]

April 11, 1995—Petitioners' Participant Statements or Initial Brief [see 39 CFR 3001.115(a) and (b)]

May 1, 1995—Postal Service's Answering Brief [see 39 CFR 3001.115(c)]

May 16, 1995—Petitioners' Reply Brief should Petitioners choose to file one [see 39 CFR 3001.115(d)]

May 23, 1995—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]

July 5, 1995—Expiration of the Commission's 120-day decisional schedule [see 39 U.S.C. 404(b)(5)]

[FR Doc. 95-6579 Filed 3-16-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7710-FW-P

[Order No. 1046, and Docket No. A95-5]

Notice and Order Accepting Appeal and Establishing Procedural Schedule Under 39 U.S.C. § 404(b)(5)

Before Commissioners: Edward J. Gleiman, Chairman; W.H. "Trey" LeBlanc III, Vice-Chairman; George W. Haley; H. Edward Quick, Jr.; Wayne A. Schley.

Issued: March 13, 1995.

Docket Number: A95-5

Name of Affected Post Office: Oak, Nebraska 68964

Name(s) of Petitioner(s): Tom Jensen

Type of Determination: Consolidation
Date of Filing of Appeal Papers: March 3, 1995

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 March 20, 1995.

(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

March 3, 1995—Filing of Appeal letter

March 13, 1995—Commission Notice and Order of Filing of Appeal

March 28, 1995—Last day of filing of petitions to intervene [see 39 CFR 3001.111(b)]

April 7, 1995—Petitioners' Participant Statements or Initial Brief [see 39 CFR 3001.115 (a) and (b)]

April 27, 1995—Postal Service's Answering Brief [see 39 CFR 3001.115(c)]

May 12, 1995—Petitioners' Reply Brief should Petitioners choose to file one [see 39 CFR 3001.115(d)]

May 19, 1995—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]

July 1, 1995—Expiration of the Commission's 120-day decisional schedule [see 39 U.S.C. 404(b)(5)]

[FR Doc. 95-6580 Filed 3-16-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7710-FW-P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34-35474; File No. SR-BSE-95-03]

Self-Regulatory Organizations; Notice of Filing and Order Granting Accelerated Approval to Proposed Rule Change by Boston Stock Exchange, Inc. Relating to an Extension of a Pilot Program for Stopping Stock in Minimum Variation Markets

March 10, 1995.

Pursuant to Section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 ("Act"),¹ and Rule 19b-4 thereunder,²

notice is hereby given that on February 13, 1995, the Boston Stock Exchange, Inc. ("BSE" or "Exchange") filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission ("Commission" or "SEC") the proposed rule change as described in Items I and II below, which Items have been prepared by the self-regulatory organization. On February 28, 1995, the BSE submitted to the Commission Amendment No. 1 to the proposed rule change in order to clarify certain language in the original filing and to request accelerated approval of the proposal.³ 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 Exchange seeks a four month extension of its pilot program regarding stopping stock in minimum variations markets.⁴ The text of the proposed rule change is available at the Commission.

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

In its filing with the Commission, the self-regulatory organization included statements concerning the purpose of and basis for the proposed rule change and discussed any comments it received on the proposed rule change. The text of these statements may be examined at the places specified in Item III below.

³ See letter from Karen A. Aluise, Assistant Vice President, BSE, to Beth A. Stekler, Attorney, Division of Market Regulation, SEC, dated February 28, 1995 ("Amendment No. 1").

⁴ The Commission initially approved the BSE's proposal to codify procedures for stopping stock and to establish a pilot program permitting specialists to stop stock in minimum variation markets in Securities Exchange Act Release No. 35068 (December 8, 1994), 59 FR 64717 (December 15, 1994) (File No. SR-BSE-94-09) ("1994 Pilot Approval Order"). See also Ch. II, Sec. 38 of the BSE Rules.

Independent of the BSE's request for an extension of its pilot program, the Commission has received a comment letter regarding permanent approval of the New York Stock Exchange's procedures for stopping stock in minimum variation markets. See letter from Junius W. Peake, Monfort Professor of Finance, University of Northern Colorado, to Secretary, SEC, dated March 1, 1995. The comment letter addresses the broader issue of whether stopping stock is consistent with the specialist's agency obligations and recommends that the Commission not grant permanent approval to the minimum variation market pilot programs. The current BSE filing, however, merely extends its pilot program for four months to permit additional information to be gathered and reviewed. The Commission believes that it would be more appropriate to address the issues raised by the comment letter in the context of proposals requesting permanent approval of the exchanges' stopping stock pilot programs.

The self-regulatory organization has prepared summaries, set forth in Sections A, B, and C below, of the most significant aspects of such statements.

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

1. Purpose

The purpose of the proposed rule change is to extend the SEC-approved pilot provision regarding the execution of stopped orders in minimum variation markets for an additional four months. The pilot provision expires on March 21, 1995, and this proposal would extend the pilot until July 21, 1995.

The pilot rule requires the execution of stopped orders in minimum variation markets (a) after a transaction takes place on the primary market at the stop price or higher in the case of a buy order (lower in the case of a sell order), (b) after the applicable Exchange share volume is exhausted or (c) at any time prior to (a) or (b) if filled at an improved price.⁵ In no event will a stopped order be executed at a price inferior to the stop price. The Exchange states that, as in the case of greater than minimum variation markets, the proposed rule will continue to benefit customers because they might receive a better price than the stop price, yet it also protects prior-entered same-price limit orders on the book.

2. Statutory Basis

The proposed rule change is consistent with Section 6(b)(5) of the Act in that it furthers the objectives to promote just and equitable principles of trade, to foster cooperation and coordination with persons engaged in regulating, clearing, settling, processing information with respect to and

⁵ The Commission notes that, in certain narrow circumstances, a BSE specialist may execute a stopped order before limit order interest on the Exchange is exhausted. To do so, however, the specialist must make the determination that such action is necessary, in his or her professional judgment, to prevent an execution that would create a new high or new low, a double up or down tick or an out-of-range print.

Moreover, the specialist must follow certain procedures designed to ensure that the BSE's limit order book is adequately protected. First, the specialist must split any contra-side order flow between the stopped order and limit orders with priority at the better price. In addition, if the specialist elects to fill a stopped order at a price better than the stop price before it is otherwise due an execution, he or she must allocate an equal number of shares, up to a maximum of 500 shares, to orders at that price on the limit order book. Finally, if any portion of a stopped order remains unexecuted at the end of the trading day, the specialist must fill such order in its entirety and, as described above, allocate an appropriate number of shares to the book.

¹ 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1) (1988).

² 17 CFR 240.19b-4 (1991).