

463, as amended), the National Science Foundation announces the following meeting:

*Name:* Committee on Equal Opportunities in Science and Engineering (CEOSE) (1173).

*Date and Time:* June 28, 1995, 10 a.m.–5 p.m. (Open); June 29, 1995, 8:30 a.m.–5 p.m. (Open); June 30, 1995, 8:30 a.m.–12 Noon (Open).

*Place:* Room 375, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, VA 22230.

*Type of Meeting:* Open.

*Contact Person:* Wanda E. Ward, Executive Secretary, CEOSE, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Room 805, Arlington, VA 22230. Telephone: (703) 306-1604.

*Summary Minutes:* May be obtained from the Executive Secretary at the above address.

*Purpose of Meeting:* To discuss national policy issues, including the importance of science, engineering to the national interest; to discuss future directions of the university for the twenty-first century; and to discuss the participation rates of all segments of society in science and engineering at NSF and in its programs.

*Summary Agenda:* June 28: 10 a.m. to 5 p.m.—Sessions to discuss national policy issues, future directions of the university system and the participation rates of all segments of society at NSF and in its programs; 5 p.m.—Reception, Room 375; June 29: 8:30 a.m. to 5 p.m.—Continuation of sessions to discuss national policy issues, future directions of the university system, and the participation rates of all segments of society at NSF and in its programs; June 30: 8:30 a.m. to 12 Noon—Committee deliberations; discussion of NSF future directions.

Dated: June 5, 1995.

**M. Rebecca Winkler,**

*Committee Management Officer.*

[FR Doc. 95-14094 Filed 6-8-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555-01-M

---

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50-334 and 50-412

**Duquesne Light Company; et al.; Beaver Valley Power Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2; Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact**

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an exemption from certain requirements of its regulations to Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-66 and NPF-73, issued to Duquesne Light Company et al. (the licensee), for operation of the Beaver Valley Power Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, located in Beaver County, Pennsylvania.

### Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application dated February 4, 1994, for exemption from certain requirements of paragraph III.D.2(b)(ii) of 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J. The proposed exemption would allow substitution of local leak rate testing (where the design permits) in lieu of an overall airlock leakage test which would otherwise be required after performing maintenance on the air lock. The air lock components for which this exemption would be applicable would be those where the design of the affected component(s) would permit local leak testing at a pressure of not less than Pa (the calculated peak containment internal pressure related to the design basis accident and specified either in the technical specification or associated bases). The use of the words "where the design permits" is intended to require that two criteria be satisfied if the proposed exemption is applied. The first criterion, is that any component which has had maintenance performed on it have local leak rate test provisions included into its design. The second criterion is that the method for measuring the component's local leak rate must be equivalent to or more conservative than the method which would be used on that component during performance of an overall air lock leakage test.

### The Need for the Proposed Action

Paragraph III.D.2.(b)(ii) of 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J, requires licensees to perform an overall air lock leak test at Pa at the end of periods during which the air lock has been opened when containment integrity was not required. Performance of an overall air lock leak test requires 4 to 6 hours and results in additional occupational radiation exposures. The time required to perform overall tests at the conclusion of a plant shutdown can result in delaying plant restart. Application of the proposed exemption would be applicable only to those air lock components provided with local leak rate testing capabilities and for which the leak rate does not exceed the leak rate that has been measured on that component during performance of previous acceptable overall air lock leakage tests. Therefore, local leak rate tests provide adequate assurance that the offsite doses following a design basis accident will be within acceptable limits.

### Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the licensee's application.

The proposed exemption will not increase the probability or consequences of accidents. The probability of accidents is not increased because the air locks do not affect the initiation of any design basis accident. The consequences of an accident are not increased because the component local leak rates will not be permitted to exceed the leak rate which would be measured on that component during performance of the overall air lock leakage test. No changes are being made in the types of any radioactive effluents that may be released offsite as a result of the proposed exemption, and there is no significant increase in the allowable individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

With regard to potential nonradiological impacts, the proposed action does involve features located entirely within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20. It does not effect nonradiological plant effluents and has no other environmental impact. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant nonradiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

### Alternatives to the Proposed Action

Since the Commission has concluded there is no measurable environmental impact associated with the proposed action, any alternatives with equal or greater environmental impact need not be evaluated. As an alternative to the proposed action, the staff considered denial of the proposed action. Denial of the application would result in no change in current environmental impacts. The environmental impacts of the proposed action and the alternative action are similar.

### Alternative Use of Resources

This action does not involve the use of any resources not previously considered in the Final Environmental Statement for the Beaver Valley Power Station Units Nos. 1 and 2.

### Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on May 9, 1995, the staff consulted with the Pennsylvania State official, Robert C. Maiers of the Bureau of Radiation Protection, Department of Environmental Resources, regarding the environmental impact of the proposed action. The State official had no comments.

**Finding of No Significant Impact**

Based upon the environmental assessment, the Commission concludes that the proposed action will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment. Accordingly, the Commission has determined not to prepare an environmental impact statement for the proposed action.

For further details with respect to the proposed action, see the licensee's letter dated February 4, 1994, which is available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, The Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, and at the local public document room located at the B. F. Jones Memorial Library, 663 Franklin Avenue, Aliquippa, Pennsylvania 15001.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 2nd day of June 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**John F. Stolz,**

*Director, Project Directorate I-2 Division of Reactor Projects—I/II, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 95-14156 Filed 6-8-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

**Proposed Generic Letter; Relocation of the Pressure Temperature Limit Curves and Low Temperature Overpressure System Limits; Correction**

**AGENCY:** Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice of opportunity for public comment, correction.

**SUMMARY:** This document corrects a general notice appearing in the **Federal Register** on June 2, 1995 (60 FR 28805), that requested public comment on a draft generic letter that would allow licensees to voluntarily relocate the pressure temperature limit curves and low temperature overpressure protection system limits from the technical specifications to a licensee-controlled document. This action is necessary to correct the inadvertent omission of a line of document text.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Maggalean W. Weston, Technical Specification Branch, Division of Project Support, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, Telephone (301) 415-3151.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** On page 28807, the first and second sentences of the first full paragraph in the first column are corrected to read as follows:

“As required by Appendix G to Part 50 of title 10 of the *Code of Federal*

*Regulations* (10 CFR), operating P/T limits are calculated and adhered to by plant operations personnel to ensure that fracture toughness requirements for the RCPB are maintained. Further, in accordance with Appendix H to 10 CFR Part 50, specimens of reactor vessel material are installed near the inside reactor vessel wall and are withdrawn on a schedule to provide data on the effects of radiation fluence and the thermal environment on the vessel material.”

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 5th day of June, 1995.

**Michael T. Lesar,**

*Chief, Rules Review Section, Office of Administration.*

[FR Doc. 95-14155 Filed 6-8-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

**POSTAL RATE COMMISSION**

[Docket No. A95-13; Order No. 1061]

**Notice and Order Accepting Appeal and Establishing Procedural Schedule Under 39 U.S.C. 404(b)(5) (Issued June 2, 1995)**

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

In the Matter of: Erwin, South Dakota 57233 (Lois C. Penn, Petitioner).

*Docket Number:* A95-13.

*Name of Affected Post Office:* Erwin, South Dakota 57233.

*Name(s) of Petitioner(s):* Lois C. Penn.

*Type of Determination:* Consolidation.

*Date of Filing of Appeal Papers:* May 30, 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 June 14, 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**

May 30, 1995—Filing of Appeal letter.

June 2, 1995—Commission Notice and Order of Filing of Appeal.

June 26, 1995—Last day of filing of petitions to intervene (see 39 CFR 3001.111(b)).

July 5, 1995—Petitioner's Participant Statement or Initial Brief (see 39 CFR 3001.115(a) and (b)).

July 24, 1995—Postal Service's Answering Brief (see 39 CFR 3001.115(c)).

August 8, 1995—Petitioner's Reply Brief should Petitioner choose to file one (see 39 CFR 3001.115(d)).

August 15, 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).

September 27, 1995—Expiration of the Commission's 120-day decisional schedule (see 39 USC 404(b)(5)).

[FR Doc. 95-14145 Filed 6-8-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7710-FW-P

**SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION**

[Release No. 34-35797; File No. SR-Amex-95-15]

**Self-Regulatory Organizations; Notice of Filing of Proposed Rule Change and Amendment No. 1 to Proposed Rule Change by the American Stock Exchange, Inc. Relating to the Solicitation of Options Transactions**

June 1, 1995.

Pursuant to Section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (“Act”),<sup>1</sup> notice is hereby given that on March 22, 1995, the American Stock Exchange, Inc. (“Amex” or “Exchange”) filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission (“Commission”) the

<sup>1</sup> 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1) (1988).