ongoing assessments of environmental impacts.

The staff also conducted an analysis of plant operation with severe accident mitigation design alternatives (SAMDAs) and concluded that none of the SAMDAs, beyond three procedural changes that the applicant committed to implement, would be cost-beneficial for further mitigating environmental impacts.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 21 day of April 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Scott F. Newberry,

Director, License Renewal and Environmental Review Project Directorate, Associate Director for Advanced Reactors and License Renewal, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 95–10610 Filed 4–28–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–M

[Docket Nos. 50–498 and 50–499]

Houston Lighting & Power Co., City Public Service Board of San Antonio, Central Power & Light Co., City of Austin, TX, South Texas Project, Unit Nos. 1 and 2; Notice of Issuance and Availability of NUREG

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has issued NUREG–1517, ''Report of the South Texas Project Allegations Review Team.'' This report provides the results of the South Texas Project Allegations Review Team.

This team was formed to obtain and review allegations from individuals associated with three attorneys who had contacted congressional staff members from the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations of the U.S. House of Representatives' Committee on Energy and Commerce. The allegers were employed in various capacities at Houston Lighting and Power Company's, et al., South Texas Project Electric Generating Station, and therefore, the allegations are confined to this site.

Copies of the report have been placed in the NRC's Public Document Room, 2120 L Street, NW., Lower Level, Washington, DC 20555 and at the Local Public Document Room for the South Texas Project, Units 1 and 2, Wharton County Junior College, J.M. Hodges Learning Center, 911 Boling Highway, Wharton, Texas 77488. Copies of the report may be purchased from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Post Office Box 37082, Washington, DC 20013–7082. GPO deposit account holders may charge their order by calling 202/275–2060. Copies are also available from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 25th day of April 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Lawrence E. Kokajko, Team Leader,

Project Directorate, IV–1, Division of Reactor Projects III/IV, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 95–10609 Filed 4–28–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–M

[Docket Nos. 50–424–OLA–3 50–425–OLA–3; ASLBP No. 96–671–01–OLA–3]

In the Matter of: Georgia Power Company, et al. (Vogtle Electric Generating Plant, Units 1 and 2); Evidentiary Hearing; Atomic Safety and Licensing Board

Before Administrative Judges: Peter B. Bloch, Chair, Dr. James H. Carpenter, Thomas D. Murphy.

Pursuant to 10 CFR 2.752, the public evidentiary hearing will continue at 9 am on May 15–18, 1995, at the Hearing Room (T 3 B45), Two White Flint North, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland.

The purpose of the hearing is to hear motions concerning the admissibility of evidence and to receive evidence concerning alleged misrepresentations about diesel generators at the Vogtle Nuclear Power Plant. The hearing is expected to continue at 1 pm in Augusta, Georgia on May 22 at a place to be designated. It will continue in session for several weeks, in Augusta, Georgia and in Rockville, Maryland until the hearing is completed.

For the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board.

Peter B. Bloch,

Chair.

[FR Doc. 95–10611 Filed 4–28–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–M

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34–35642; File No. SR–NASD–95–11]

Self-Regulatory Organizations; National Association of Securities Dealers Inc.; Notice of Filing of Proposed Rule Change Relating to Requiring Use of the Facilities of a Registered Clearing Agency for the Clearance of Transactions in Corporate Debt Securities

April 24, 1995.

Pursuant to section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (''Act''),[1] notice is hereby given that on April 10, 1995, the National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc. (''NASD'') filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission (''Commission'') a proposed rule change as described in Items I, II, and III below, which items have been prepared primarily by the NASD. 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 NASD is proposing to amend its Uniform Practice Code (''UPC'') to add a new section 72 to require members that are participants in a registered clearing agency to use the facilities of a registered clearing agency for the clearance of securities transactions between members in corporate debt securities.

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 NASD 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 IV below. Summaries of the most significant aspects of such statements are set forth in sections (A), (B), and (C) below.

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

The NASD has observed that approximately thirty percent of all transactions in corporate bonds are being compared, cleared, and settled broker-to-broker or ex-clearing (*i.e.*, without the use of the facilities of a registered clearing agency). Clearing such transactions broker-to-broker is labor intensive, requires more time to complete, and results in more fails than transactions processed through a clearing agency. The labor intensive nature of broker-to-broker processing introduces errors into the process from keystroke errors, manual document handling errors, delivery errors, and payment errors. Because such broker-to-broker clearance is labor intensive, it also generally requires more time to complete. Finally, both of these factors increase the systemic clearance risk by

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