

result in no significant radiological environmental impact.

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 affect 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 exemption.

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 proposed exemption does not involve the use of any resources not previously considered in the Final Environmental Statement for the Limerick Generating Stations, Units 1 and 2, dated April 1984 as supplemented on August 1989.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on September 26, 1995, the staff consulted with the Pennsylvania State official, David Ney of the Bureau of Radiation Protection, Department of Environmental Protection, 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 exemption 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 exemption.

For further details with respect to the proposed action, see the licensee's letter dated June 20, 1995, 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

Pottstown Public Library, 500 High Street, Pottstown, Pennsylvania 19464.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 9th day of November 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. 95-28311 Filed 11-15-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-1-P

[Docket Nos. 50-220 and 50-410]

Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation; Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendments to Facility Operating License, Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity for a Hearing

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of amendments to Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-63 and NPF-69 issued to Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation for operation of the Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, respectively, located in Oswego County, New York.

The proposed amendments would change position titles and reassign responsibilities at the upper management level.

Before issuance of the proposed license amendments, the Commission will have made findings required by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act) and the Commission's regulations.

The Commission has made a proposed determination that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration. Under the Commission's regulations in 10 CFR 50.92, this means that operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; or (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

The operation of Nine Mile Point Unit 1 [and Unit 2], in accordance with the proposed amendment[s], will not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequence of an accident previously evaluated.

None of the accidents previously evaluated are affected by the proposed corporate management position title changes or by the reassignment of responsibilities. The revised

organizational structure will not affect the design of systems, structures, or components; the operation of plant equipment or systems; nor maintenance, modification, or testing activities. The revised management reporting structure and assignment of responsibilities does not involve accident precursors or initiators previously evaluated and does not create any new failure modes that would affect any previously evaluated accidents. Therefore, operation in accordance with the proposed amendment[s] will not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The operation of Nine Mile Point Unit 1 [and Unit 2], in accordance with the proposed amendment[s], will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

The revised organizational structure will not affect the design of systems, structures, or components; the operation of plant equipment or systems; nor maintenance, modification or testing activities. The proposed position title changes and responsibility assignments do not create any new failure modes or conditions that would create a new or different kind of accident. Therefore, operation in accordance with the proposed amendment[s] will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated.

The operation of Nine Mile Point Unit 1 [and Unit 2], in accordance with the proposed amendment[s], will not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The proposed amendment[s] define the lines of authority, responsibility, and communication necessary to ensure operation of the facility in a safe manner. The present Executive Vice President—Nuclear will assume the responsibilities of Chief Nuclear Officer. The present Vice President—Nuclear Generation will assume the responsibilities of Vice President and General Manager—Nuclear. These assignments provide the highest level of management expertise and experience in the operation of Nine Mile Point Unit 1 [and Unit 2] and assure that adequate operational safety is maintained. Therefore, the proposed organizational restructuring will not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

As determined by the analysis, the proposed amendment[s] involve no significant hazards consideration.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analyses and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the proposed amendments involve no significant hazards consideration.

The Commission is seeking public comments on this proposed determination. Any comments received within 30 days after the date of publication of this notice will be considered in making any final determination.

Normally, the Commission will not issue the amendments until the

expiration of the 30-day notice period. However, should circumstances change during the notice period such that failure to act in a timely way would result, for example, in derating or shutdown of the facility, the Commission may issue the license amendments before the expiration of the 30-day notice period, provided that its final determination is that the amendments involve no significant hazards consideration. The final determination will consider all public and State comments received. Should the Commission take this action, it will publish in the Federal Register a notice of issuance and provide for opportunity for a hearing after issuance. The Commission expects that the need to take this action will occur very infrequently.

Written comments may be submitted by mail to the Rules Review and Directives Branch, Division of Freedom of Information and Publications Services, Office of Administration, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, and should cite the publication date and page number of this Federal Register notice. Written comments may also be delivered to Room 6D22, Two White Flint North, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland, from 7:30 a.m. to 4:15 p.m. Federal workdays. Copies of written comments received may be examined at the NRC Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC.

The filing of requests for hearing and petitions for leave to intervene is discussed below.

By December 18, 1995, the licensee may file a request for a hearing with respect to issuance of the amendments to the subject facility operating licenses and any person whose interest may be affected by this proceeding and who wishes to participate as a party in the proceeding must file a written request for a hearing and a petition for leave to intervene. Requests for a hearing and a petition for leave to intervene shall be filed in accordance with the Commission's "Rules of Practice for Domestic Licensing Proceedings" in 10 CFR Part 2. Interested persons should consult a current copy of 10 CFR 2.714 which is available 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 Reference and Documents Department, Penfield Library, State University of New York, Oswego, New York 13126. If a request for a hearing or petition for leave to intervene is filed by the above date, the Commission or an Atomic Safety and

Licensing Board, designated by the Commission or by the Chairman of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, will rule on the request and/or petition; and the Secretary or the designated Atomic Safety and Licensing Board will issue a notice of hearing or an appropriate order.

As required by 10 CFR 2.714, a petition for leave to intervene shall set forth with particularity the interest of the petitioner in the proceeding, and how that interest may be affected by the results of the proceeding. The petition should specifically explain the reasons why intervention should be permitted with particular reference to the following factors: (1) The nature of the petitioner's right under the Act to be made party to the proceeding; (2) the nature and extent of the petitioner's property, financial, or other interest in the proceeding; and (3) the possible effect of any order which may be entered in the proceeding on the petitioner's interest. The petition should also identify the specific aspect(s) of the subject matter of the proceeding as to which petitioner wishes to intervene. Any person who has filed a petition for leave to intervene or who has been admitted as a party may amend the petition without requesting leave of the Board up to 15 days prior to the first prehearing conference scheduled in the proceeding, but such an amended petition must satisfy the specificity requirements described above.

Not later than 15 days prior to the first prehearing conference scheduled in the proceeding, a petitioner shall file a supplement to the petition to intervene which must include a list of the contentions which are sought to be litigated in the matter. Each contention must consist of a specific statement of the issue of law or fact to be raised or controverted. In addition, the petitioner shall provide a brief explanation of the bases of the contention and a concise statement of the alleged facts or expert opinion which support the contention and on which the petitioner intends to rely in proving the contention at the hearing. The petitioner must also provide references to those specific sources and documents of which the petitioner is aware and on which the petitioner intends to rely to establish those facts or expert opinion. Petitioner must provide sufficient information to show that a genuine dispute exists with the applicant on a material issue of law or fact. Contentions shall be limited to matters within the scope of the amendment under consideration. The contention must be one which, if proven, would entitle the petitioner to relief. A petitioner who fails to file such

a supplement which satisfies these requirements with respect to at least one contention will not be permitted to participate as a party.

Those permitted to intervene become parties to the proceeding, subject to any limitations in the order granting leave to intervene, and have the opportunity to participate fully in the conduct of the hearing, including the opportunity to present evidence and cross-examine witnesses.

If a hearing is requested, the Commission will make a final determination on the issue of no significant hazards consideration. The final determination will serve to decide when the hearing is held.

If the final determination is that the amendment requests involve no significant hazards consideration, the Commission may issue the amendments and make them immediately effective, notwithstanding the request for a hearing. Any hearing held would take place after issuance of the amendments.

If the final determination is that the amendment requests involve a significant hazards consideration, any hearing held would take place before the issuance of any amendments.

A request for a hearing or a petition for leave to intervene must be filed with the Secretary of the Commission, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, Attention: Docketing and Services Branch, or may be delivered to the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, by the above date. Where petitions are filed during the last 10 days of the notice period, it is requested that the petitioner promptly so inform the Commission by a toll-free telephone call to Western Union at 1-(800) 248-5100 (in Missouri 1-(800) 342-6700). The Western Union operator should be given Datagram Identification Number N1023 and the following message addressed to Ledyard B. Marsh: petitioner's name and telephone number, date petition was mailed, plant name, and publication date and page number of this Federal Register notice. A copy of the petition should also be sent to the Office of the General Counsel, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, and to Mark J. Wetterhahn, Esquire, Winston and Strawn, 1400 L Street, NW, Washington, DC. 20005-3502, attorney for the licensee.

Nontimely filings of petitions for leave to intervene, amended petitions, supplemental petitions and/or requests for hearing will not be entertained absent a determination by the Commission, the presiding officer or the presiding Atomic Safety and Licensing

Board that the petition and/or request should be granted based upon a balancing of the factors specified in 10 CFR 2.714(a)(1)(i)-(v) and 2.714(d).

For further details with respect to this action, see the applications for amendments dated October 25, 1995, which are 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 Reference and Documents Department, Penfield Library, State University of New York, Oswego, New York 13126.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 7th day of November 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Gordon E. Edison,

Senior Project Manager, Project Directorate I-1, Division of Reactor Projects—I/II, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 95-28312 Filed 11-15-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34-36464; International Series Release No. 879; File No. SR-CBOE-95-54]

Self-Regulatory Organizations; Notice of Filing of Proposed Rule Change by the Chicago Board Options Exchange, Inc. Relating to Currency Warrants Based on the Value of the U.S. Dollar in Relation to the Brazilian Real

November 8, 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 September 13, 1995, the Chicago Board Options Exchange, Inc. ("CBOE" 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 self-regulatory organization. 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 proposes to approve for listing and trading currency warrants based upon the value of the U.S. dollar in relation to the Brazilian Real. The text of the proposed rule change is available at the Office of the Secretary, CBOE 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, CBOE 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 CBOE 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

The Exchange is permitted to list and trade currency warrants under CBOE Rule 31.5(E). The Exchange is now proposing to list and trade currency warrants based upon the value of the U.S. dollar in relation to the Brazilian Real ("Brazilian Real warrants"). The listing and trading of currency warrants relating to the Brazil Real will comply in all respects with CBOE Rule 31.5(E).

1. Currency Warrant Trading

Brazilian Real warrants will be unsecured obligations of their issuers and will be cash-settled in U.S. dollars. The warrants will be either exercisable throughout their life (*i.e.*, American style) or exercisable only on their expiration date (*i.e.*, European style). Upon exercise, the holder of a warrant structured as a "put" would receive payment in U.S. dollars to the extent that the value of the Brazilian Real has declined in relation to the U.S. dollar below a pre-stated base price. Conversely, holders of a warrant structured as a "call" would, upon exercise, receive payment in U.S. dollars to the extent that the value of the Brazilian Real in relation to the U.S. dollar has increased above the pre-stated base price. Warrants that are out-of-the-money at the time of expiration will expire worthless.

2. Warrant Listing Standards and Customer Safeguards

In SR-CBOE-90-08,¹ the Exchange established generic listing standards for currency warrants, which are contained in CBOE Rule 31.5(E). On August 29, 1995, the Commission approved SR-CBOE-94-34,² which amended Rule

31.5(E) and established customer protection and margin requirements for currency warrants.

CBOE Rule 31.5(E) sets forth the criteria applicable to listing currency warrants. Any issue of Brazilian Real warrants will conform to the listing criteria under Rule 31.5(E) which provide that: (1) The issuer shall have minimum tangible net worth in excess of \$150,000,000 and otherwise substantially exceed the size and earnings requirements in Rule 31.5(A); (2) the term of the warrants shall be for a period ranging from one to five years from date of issuance; and (3) the minimum public distribution of such issues shall be 1,000,000 warrants, together with a minimum of 400 public holders, and have a minimum aggregate market value of \$4,000,000. In addition, where an issuer has a minimum tangible net worth in excess of \$150,000,000 but less than \$250,000,000, the Exchange shall not list Brazilian Real warrants of the issuer if the value of such warrants plus the aggregate value, based upon the original issuing price, of all outstanding stock index, currency index and currency warrants of the issuer (and its affiliates) that are listed for trading on a national securities exchange or traded through the facilities of the National Association of Securities Dealers Automated Quotation System ("NASDAQ") exceeds 25% of the issuer's net worth.

Among the consequences of the recently approved rule amendments, Brazilian Real warrants may be sold only to customers whose accounts have been approved for options trading pursuant to Exchange Rule 9.7. Moreover, the suitability standards of Exchange Rule 9.9 apply to recommendations in currency warrants. Also, the standards of Rule 9.10(a), regarding discretionary orders, will be applicable to currency warrants.

3. Margin Requirements

Recently approved SR-CBOE-94-34 also establishes margin requirements for currency warrants. New Exchange Rule 30.53 requires minimum margin on any currency warrant carried "short" in a customer's account to be 100% of the current market value of each such warrant plus an "add-on" percentage of the produce of the units of underlying currency per warrant and the spot price for such currency. The Exchange has calculated frequency distributions reflecting percentage price returns for all one (1) and five (5) day periods for the Brazilian Real for the period of September 1, 1992 through August 30, 1995. These distributions demonstrate that more than 97.5% of all five (5) day

¹ See Securities Exchange Act Release No. 28556 (October 19, 1990), 55 FR 43233 (October 26, 1990).

² See Securities Exchange Act Release No. 36169 (August 29, 1995), 60 FR 46644 (September 7, 1995).