

100 guidelines and are a small fraction of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) "Protection Action Guidelines" (PAG). The NRC staff's Safety Evaluation of the FSV DP (NRC Decommissioning Order dated November 23, 1992) confirmed PSC's conclusion. Because the risk of an accident requiring reactor stabilization or extensive decontamination of the reactor facility does not exist at FSV, the annual cost of \$250,000 per year for insurance is unwarranted and poses an undue hardship on FSV.

The NRC will not consider granting an exemption unless special circumstances warrant it. In the licensee's letter of August 2, 1993, these special circumstances were addressed as follows:

* * * (ii) Application of the regulation in the particular circumstances would not serve the underlying purpose of the rule; or (iii) Compliance would result in undue hardship or other costs that are significantly in excess of those incurred by others similarly situated * * *.

In addition, for the FSV worst-case accident previously analyzed in Section 3.4.10 of the NRC approved Decommissioning Plan, the radiological release from the accident would result in a whole-body dose to an individual of 8.30 mrem. This dose is considerably less than 1 percent of the EPA PAG dose of 1000 mrem that requires protective action.

IV

The staff has reviewed the licensee's requests and finds that sufficient bases have been presented for NRC's approval of the request for exemption from 10 CFR 50.54(w) requirements to continue to maintain onsite property insurance.

The staff finds that the special circumstances presented by PSC satisfy the requirements of 10 CFR 50.12(a)(2) (ii) and (iii), and it would serve no purpose to meet a requirement that relates primarily to an operating reactor, where costs to stabilize and decontaminate a facility are significant in contrast to a defueled reactor such as FSV that is 65 percent decommissioned. To continue to maintain onsite property insurance would result in undue hardship to the licensee and costs in excess of those contemplated when the regulation was adopted.

Based on the above evaluation, the NRC has determined that pursuant to 10 CFR 50.12(a)(1), this exemption is authorized by law, will not present an undue risk to the public health and safety, and is consistent with the common defense and security.

Accordingly, NRC hereby grants an exemption from 10 CFR 50.54(w). The

exemption deletes the requirement to continue to maintain onsite property damage insurance.

Pursuant to 10 CFR 51.32, NRC has determined that the granting of this exemption will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment (May 22, 1995, 60 FR 27140).

A copy of the licensee's request for the exemption and supporting documentation dated February 16, 1995, and the NRC staff's Safety Evaluation, included in the exemption, are available for public inspection at the NRC's Public Document Room, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC 20037, and at the Weld Library District—Downtown Branch, 919 7th Street, Greeley, CO 80631.

This exemption will become effective on issuance.

Dated at Rockville, MD, this 7th day of June, 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
John T. Greeves,
*Director, Division of Waste Management,
Office of Nuclear Material Safety and
Safeguards.*

[FR Doc. 95-14503 Filed 6-13-95; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

[Docket No. 30-32493-CivP EA 93-072;
ASLBP No. 95-709-02-CivP]

Radiation Oncology Center at Marlton (ROCM) Marlton, NJ, (Byproduct Materials License No. 29-28685-01); Notice of Hearing

June 7, 1995.

Notice is hereby given that, by Memorandum and Order dated June 7, 1995, the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board has granted the request of Radiation Oncology Center of Marlton (Licensee or ROCM) for a hearing in the above-titled proceeding. The hearing concerns the Order Imposing a Civil Monetary Penalty, issued by the NRC Staff on April 24, 1995 (published at 60 FR 21570, May 2, 1995). The parties to the proceeding are the Licensee and the NRC Staff.

The issues to be considered at the hearings are (a) whether the Licensee was in violation of the Commission's requirements as set forth in the violation in the Notice of Violation and Proposed Imposition of Civil Penalty, dated May 31, 1994, and the following specific examples given with the violation: Examples A.1, A.2, A.4, B.1, B.2, C and D; and (b) whether, on the basis of the violation set forth in the Notice of Violation, this Order should be sustained.

Materials concerning this proceeding are on file at the Commission's Public Document Room, 2120 L St. NW., Washington, DC 20555, and at the Commission's Region I Office, 475 Allendale Road, King of Prussia, Pennsylvania 19406-1415.

During the course of this proceeding, the Licensing Board, as necessary, will conduct one or more prehearing conferences and evidentiary hearing sessions. The time and place of these sessions will be announced in later Licensing Board Orders. Members of the public will be invited to attend any such in-person sessions.

Rockville, MD, June 7, 1995.

For the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board,

Charles Bechhoefer,

Chairman, Administrative Judge.

[FR Doc. 95-14504 Filed 6-13-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE

Generalized System of Preferences (GSP); Notice of an "Emergency" Review to Consider Requests for "De Minimis" Waivers of the Competitive Need Limits for Buffalo Leather From Thailand and for Aluminum Conductor From Venezuela; Request for Comments

AGENCY: Office of the United States Trade Representative.

ACTION: Initiation of an "emergency" review and solicitation of public comments with respect to requests for "de minimis" waivers of the competitive need limits for buffalo leather from Thailand and for aluminum conductor from Venezuela.

SUMMARY: This notice initiates an expedited review and solicits public comments with respect to requests for "de minimis" waivers for the competitive need limits for buffalo leather from Thailand and for aluminum conductor from Venezuela.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: GSP Subcommittee, Office of the United States Trade Representative, 600 17th Street, NW., Room 518, Washington, DC 20506. The telephone number is (202) 395-6971.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Section 504(d)(2) of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended ("Trade Act") (19 U.S.C. 2464(d)(2)) authorizes the President to disregard the 50-percent competitive need limit, which is provided for in section 504(c)(1)(B) of the Trade Act (19 U.S.C. 2464(c)(1)(b)), with respect to any

eligible GSP article from any beneficiary country if the value of total imports of the article during the most recent calendar year did not exceed \$5 million, adjusted annually to reflect the nominal growth in U.S. GNP since 1979. The so-called adjusted "de minimis" limit for 1994 is \$13,346,358.

In 1994, imports of buffalo leather from Thailand and imports of aluminum conductor cable from Venezuela each exceeded the competitive need limits because they accounted for more than 50 percent of total U.S. imports. However, total imports of each article were below the "de minimis" limit for 1994. Therefore, they are each eligible to be granted a "de minimis" waiver of the competitive need limits.

On April 17, 1995, the Lackawanna Leather Company filed a request for urgent consideration with the GSP Subcommittee, pursuant to 15 CFR 2007.3(b), requesting a "de minimis" waiver of the competitive need limits for buffalo leather from Thailand that is classified in subheading 4104.39.20 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTS). On May 3, 1995, the General Cable Corporation filed a request for urgent consideration with the GSP Subcommittee, pursuant to 15 CFR 2007.3(b), requesting a "de minimis" waiver of the competitive need limits for aluminum conductor from Venezuela that is classified in HTS subheading 7614.90.20.

The GSP Subcommittee has decided to accept these requests for urgent consideration. Accordingly, this notice initiates an expedited review to consider these requests. The GSP Subcommittee invites submission in support of, or in opposition to, the requests that are the subject of this notice. All such submissions should conform to 15 CFR part 2007 *et seq.* Interested parties must submit an original and fourteen (14) copies of a written statement, in English, with respect to the articles under consideration. This will be the only opportunity to submit written comments.

All submissions should be sent to the Chairman of the GSP Subcommittee, 600 17th Street, NW., Room 518, Washington, DC 20506. Comments must be received no later than 5 p.m. on Wednesday, July 19, 1995. Information submitted will be subject to public inspection by appointment only with the staff of the USTR Public Reading Room, except for information granted "business confidential" status pursuant to 15 CFR 2003.6 and other qualifying information submitted in confidence pursuant to 15 CFR 2007.7. If the petition contains business confidential

information, an original and fourteen (14) copies of a nonconfidential version of the submission along with an original and fourteen (14) copies of the confidential version must be submitted. In addition, each copy of the submission containing confidential information should be clearly marked "confidential" at the top and bottom of each page of the submission. Each copy of the version that does not contain business confidential information (the public version) should also be clearly marked at the top and bottom of each page (either "public version" or "nonconfidential").

Frederick L. Montgomery,
Chairman, Trade Policy Staff Committee.
[FR Doc. 95-14572 Filed 6-13-95; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 3190-01-M

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34-35777; File No. SR-PSE-95-10]

Self-Regulatory Organizations; Notice of Filing of Proposed Rule Change and Amendment No. 1 to Proposed Rule Change by the Pacific Stock Exchange, Incorporated, Relating to its Procedure for Evaluating Options Trading Crowd Performance

May 30, 1995.

Pursuant to Section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 ("Act"), 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1), notice is hereby given that on April 7, 1995, the Pacific Stock Exchange, Incorporated ("PSE" or "Exchange") 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 by the Exchange. The Exchange subsequently filed Amendment No. 1 on May 25, 1995.¹ The Commission is publishing this notice to solicit comments on the proposed rule change and Amendment No. 1 from interested persons.

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

The PSE is proposing to change its procedure for evaluating options trading

¹In Amendment No. 1, the Exchange proposes to amend Rule 6.82(b)(4)(i) to provide that the Lead Market Maker ("LMM") Appointment Committee shall review LMM appointments at least semi-annually. The rule currently provides that the LMM Appointment Committee must review LMM appointments at least quarterly. See Letter from Michael D. Pierson, Senior Attorney, Market Regulation, PSE, to James McHale, Attorney, Division of Market Regulation, Commission, dated May 23, 1995 ("Amendment No. 1").

crowd performance by specifying that floor broker questionnaires will be distributed semi-annually rather than quarterly.² The text of the proposed rule change is available at the Office of the Secretary, PSE and 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 IV below. 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

Options Floor Procedure Advice ("OFPA") B-13 requires the Options Allocation Committee ("Committee") of the Exchange to evaluate periodically the options trading crowds³ to determine whether each has fulfilled performance standards relating to, among other things, quality of markets, competition among market makers, observance of ethical standards, and administrative factors.⁴ In conducting its evaluation, the Committee may consider any relevant information, including but not limited to, the results of a trading crowd evaluation questionnaire. The questionnaires are distributed to and completed by floor brokers on the Options Trading Floor on

²While PSE's Options Floor Procedure Advice B-13 currently requires the trading crowd evaluation questionnaire to be distributed to and completed by the floor brokers on a three-month periodic basis, the Commission staff understands that the Exchange began distributing the questionnaire on a semi-annual basis, beginning with the questionnaire dated October 17, 1994, covering the six (6) month period between April and September 1994. Telephone conversation between Michael D. Pierson, Senior Attorney, Market Regulation, PSE, and James T. McHale, Staff Attorney, Division of Market Regulation, Commission, on May 9, 1995.

³Pursuant to Rule 6.82, the program is also used to conduct evaluations of LMMs on the Options Trading Floor. The Exchange, through Amendment No. 1, also proposes to amend Rule 6.82(b)(4)(i) to require the LMM Appointment Committee to review LMM appointments on a semi-annual basis. See Amendment No. 1, *supra* note 1.

⁴The Commission approved the Exchange's Options Trading Crowd Performance Evaluation Pilot Program on a permanent basis on December 30, 1993. See Exchange Act Release No. 33407, 59 FR 1043 (January 7, 1994).