1. A description of evaluations that have been completed that provide justification for the use of Cycle 15 operating limits, as established in the Cycle 15 Core Operating Limits Report, using methods approved for Maine Yankee and without reliance on the RELAP5YA computer code for SBLOCA analysis and assuming a reactor thermal rating of 2440 MWt. Details related to analyses performed, significant assumptions, and conclusions drawn shall be provided;

2. A description of all other applications where RELAP5YA is relied on for Cycle 15 operation identifying the details of the application, and conclusions drawn with respect to any facility modifications or procedure changes. For each application, document the determination that operability, as defined in Maine Yankee Technical Specifications, of affected structures, systems and components is maintained. For plant procedures required by Maine Yankee Technical Specifications that rely on RELAP5YA analysis for operator action, document the determination as to why the affected operator action continues to be appropriate or, if necessary, evaluate the affected procedures in accordance with 10 CFR Section 50.59 and provide a summary of that evaluation. If any procedures are changed, confirm that appropriate training has been provided;

3. A description of measures taken to limit reactor operation to a maximum thermal power of 2440 MWt (90.37% of 2700 MWt);

4. A description of measures taken to limit containment internal operating pressure to a maximum of 2 psig;

5. A SBLOCA analysis that is specific to Maine Yankee for operation at power levels up to 2700 MWt. The analysis must meet the requirements of 10 CFR Section 50.46, ''Acceptance criteria for emergency core cooling systems for light water nuclear power reactors,'' and NUREG–0737, ''Clarification of TMI Action Plan Requirements,'' Items II.K.3.30 and 31, ''SBLOCA Methods'' and ''Plant-specific Analysis,'' respectively, and NUREG–0737, Item II.K.3.5, ''Automatic Trip of Reactor Coolant Pumps During LOCA;''

6. An integrated containment analysis, accounting for relevant changes to the facility (e.g., spray system changes, power uprates, and containment maximum temperature and pressure changes), during a DBA that demonstrates the maximum calculated DBA containment pressure meets the design basis pressure for Maine Yankee (55 psig). Assumptions used for these analyses that are different from those specified in NUREG–0800, the NRC Standard Review Plan, Section 6.2.1.1.A, shall be described.

Information required by items 1, 2, 3, and 4, above, shall be documented and submitted to the NRC prior to criticality. Detailed files and supporting computer analyses shall be available on site or at the corporate office.

A schedule for producing the information required by items 5 and 6 above, shall be provided to the NRC within 30 days of the date of the Demand for Information.

Copies of the response regarding items 1, 2, 3, and 4, and the schedule for producing the information required by items 5 and 6, shall also be sent to the Assistant General Counsel for Hearings and Enforcement at the same address, and to the Regional Administrator, NRC Region I, 475 Allendale Road, King of Prussia, PA 19406–1415.

After reviewing your response, the NRC will determine whether further action is necessary to ensure compliance with regulatory requirements.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 3rd day of January 1996.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

William T. Russell,

Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 96–348 Filed 1–9–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Request For Public Comment

Upon Written Request, Copies Available From: Securities and Exchange Commission, Office of Filings and Information Services, Washington, DC 20549.

Extension:

Rule 236, SEC File No. 270–118, OMB Control No. 3235–0095

Reg. B, SEC File No. 270–102, OMB Control No. 3235–0093

Notice is hereby given that pursuant to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*), the Securities and Exchange Commission (''Commission'') is publishing the following summaries of collections for public comment.

Rule 236, a rule promulgated pursuant to the Securities Act of 1933 (''Securities Act''), that requires issuers wishing to rely upon an exemption from registration from the Securities Act for the issuance of fractional shares, scrip certificates or order forms, in connection with a stock dividend, stock split, reverse stock split, conversion, merger or similar transaction, to furnish specified information to the Commission in writing at least ten days prior to the offering. The information is needed to provide notice that an issuer is relying on the exemption. An estimated ten submissions are made pursuant to Rule 236 annually, resulting in an estimated annual total burden of 15 hours.

Regulation B provides exemptions from the Securities Act relating to fractional undivided interests in oil or gas rights. Persons offering securities under this exemption, as conditions to the exemption, are still required to file basic prescribed documents with the Commission containing certain material information and to provide prospective investors with this information with respect to such securities. A report on Form 1–G must be filed with the Commission on or before the 15th day after the expiration of each effective offering sheet pursuant to Regulation B, or the termination of sales, whichever comes first. Not later than three calendar months after the termination of the offering, the offeror must file with the Commission and send to purchasers of interests a report on Form 3–G. An estimated 5 submissions are made pursuant to Regulation B annually, resulting in an estimated total annual reporting burden of 205 hours.

Written comments are invited on: (a) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology. Consideration will be given to comments and suggestions submitted in writing within 60 days of this publication.

Direct your written comments to Michael E. Bartell, Associate Executive Director, Office of Information Technology, Securities and Exchange Commission, 450 5th Street, NW., Washington, DC 20549.

Dated: January 2, 1996.

Margaret H. McFarland,

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 96–362 Filed 1–9–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8010–01–M

[Release No. 34–36683; File No. S7–3–96]

EDGAR Request For Information

AGENCY: Securities and Exchange Commission.

ACTION: Request for comments.

SUMMARY: The Securities and Exchange Commission is publishing alternative system architectures for possible use in preparing a Request for Proposals which will be used to recompete the contract for its electronic filing system known as EDGAR. Comments and information received will assist the agency and the Congress in making decisions as to how EDGAR filings will be structured, presented, formatted, filed, processed and disseminated. Information received will also be used to make determinations as to whether certain portions of the EDGAR system can or should be privatized.

DATES: Comments should be received on or before January 22, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Comments should be submitted to Jonathan G. Katz, Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, 450 Fifth Street, NW., Washington, DC 20549. Comments should refer to File No. S7–3–96. All comments will be available for public inspection and copying in the Commission's Public Reference Room, 450 Fifth Street, NW., Washington, DC.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Michael Bartell or David Copenhafer, Office of Information Technology, Securities and Exchange Commission at (202) 942–8800.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) is publishing this second Request for Information (RFI) from companies and individuals with experience, capabilities or interests relating to the SEC's electronic filing system known as EDGAR. The need for this second RFI arises from SEC wishes to supplement the thoughtful and helpful comments received in response to the first request, and as a result of recent SEC discussions held internally, with industry and academic experts, and with the Congress.

This request solicits comment on several potential EDGAR system architectures, the characteristics of which are described below. Comment is solicited not just from a technical point of view, or from the perspective of potential bidders, but also from filers and the many users of SEC disclosure information as well. Comment on the legal and commercial implications of each architecture are also sought.

Respondents should note that their comments will be considered public information by the SEC, and that the SEC will not be able to honor any requests for comments to be kept confidential.

This notice, as published, cannot accommodate drawings of the architectures being considered. Respondents who wish to make reference to the SEC's diagrams depicting the interrelationships among the various elements of the system can secure copies from the SEC's World Wide Web site (http://www.sec.gov) or by requesting them at the address shown at the beginning of this notice.

Brief descriptions of each principal model the SEC has under consideration are provided below. The order of presentation is not intended to convey any preference for one approach over another. All models also assume the SEC will retain its Internet site and continue to offer the current level of EDGAR document dissemination service (one day delay and FTP bulk download capability).

I. Evolve the Current Model

A. All filings come to the SEC for receipt and acceptance.

B. Filings are disseminated, as received, through a single, high volume, high speed, high reliability, commercial point of distribution.

C. The Commission requests comment on three possible dissemination pricing structures:

(1) Subscriber pricing based upon the cost and agreed-upon rate of return of a privatized, single point of dissemination similar to the approach used currently.

(2) Alternatively, the SEC could ask for and accept a bid from a vendor offering the lowest cost to subscribers based upon a bid, fixed schedule of prices. Comment is sought on the appropriate duration of such a contract (*e.g.*, 1, 2, or 3 years).

(3) As a third alternative within this Model I, the SEC could bring the first tier disseminator ‘‘in house’’ and have the cost paid by the SEC. The SEC would establish the price of each of the services offered to the second tier and would apply revenues to offset a variety of system costs (assuming the establishment of a suitable mechanism to permit the agency to retain such revenues).

D. Document structure would evolve from the current ASCII-SGML structure. The first addition would be to permit attached, standardized, image files of a specified maximum size. Later changes would move toward a richer text format which would not impose any undue burdens on the filer, the SEC, or the dissemination and public viewing structures. This richer text probably would be achieved through the addition of certain, allowable HTML commands or possibly through conversion to PDF format. The SEC might limit by rule the type of information that would be permitted to be filed inside an image file. Issuers also would be free to enhance the electronic information they distribute to shareholders and investors.

E. Contracting would be done through separate contracts for: (1) Receipt and Acceptance, and (2) Dissemination.

The fundamental advantages of this Model I and its variants are: (1) It preserves the existing financial investment in SEC systems; (2) it allows for needed (albeit slow, evolutionary) changes for solving the image and document format concerns; and (3) it minimizes ‘‘end to end’’ costs of the system (i.e., for all parties) in the short term, in that it does not require any significant new investment on the part of filers, the SEC, disseminators or document users. Long term cost-benefits of this option are not clear.

The disadvantages of Model I are: (1) Filers are still faced with the cost and difficulty of having to convert their documents to ASCII; (2) ASCII is retained throughout the system, and information users are denied (for the immediate future) a more attractive document; and (3) financing alternative 3 would require the SEC to invest in the design, construction and operation of the first tier dissemination capability.

II. Multiple Dissemination Points Model

A. Receipt and Acceptance would remain as described in Model I above.

B. The approach to dissemination would be modified such that the SEC would disseminate EDGAR data to possibly three, high speed, high volume, high reliability, commercial distribution points instead of one. These disseminators would sell Level I and Level II services to large end users and resellers.

C. The disseminators would be selected through a bid process.

D. Each disseminator would have a separate contract, and would pay the SEC either an agreed-upon fixed fee or possibly a percentage of revenues derived from the sale of EDGAR data.

One advantage of Model II beyond those stated for Model I is that the dissemination process may be improved as a result of competition among multiple depositories/disseminators. Its disadvantage is that the SEC might be required to slightly enhance its current dissemination capabilities to handle three recipients instead of one.

III. Single Depository Filing and Dissemination Point Model

A. Filers would have a choice of filing directly, at no cost other than existing filing fees, with the SEC in ASCII, or through an approved depository which would accept documents in a number of native word processing formats for which a fee could be charged.

B. The depository would convert the documents it receives to ASCII for official transmission to the SEC.

C. The SEC would provide the depository with a copy of every ASCII file received directly from a registered entity.

D. (1) Within one variant of Model III, the SEC would provide an acceptance message to the depository service upon SEC acceptance of a filing in order to let the service know the document was available for dissemination. (2) Within a second variant, the depository would assume the responsibility for official acceptance, in which case, no acceptance message would be necessary.

E. The depository would be responsible for all dissemination outside of the SEC's Internet offering and would recover the cost of its document conversions and dissemination services through dissemination fees and fees to filers.

F. One criterion used to select the single depository would be the duration of the contract. By keeping the contract duration short, the depository would remain under competitive pressure to keep prices low and to remain innovative.

Advantages of Model III are: (1) It offers filers a new, and possibly lower cost, option for having filings converted to ASCII; (2) having an approved, commercial entity involved in document conversion to ASCII might stimulate efforts to improve ASCII conversions generally; (3) it achieves an efficiency in the dissemination structure in that the point of document receipt is also the first point of commercial dissemination for all documents except those received directly from filers by the SEC; (4) adopting a privatized depository structure would enable the SEC to respond more quickly and effectively to changes in technology beneficial to the filers in meeting their document preparation and submission needs; and (5) a final advantage may lie with the fact that the depository could supplement the standard ASCII dissemination stream with native word processing documents.

Disadvantages of this Model III are that: (1) It requires an investment to construct a new (somewhat duplicative) system ''front end'' to serve as the receipt point for the thousands of EDGAR filers. (The SEC might experience some cost savings to the extent it could reduce the size of its own front end requirements—although it would still have to receive and accept every filing.) (2) During the contract period, there would be no competition within this structure. This would be mitigated by keeping the contract period as short as possible.

IV. Multiple Depositories Model

A. All aspects of this model are as described above in Model III, with the exception that there would be multiple depositories which would compete for document conversion and dissemination business.

B. The SEC would provide copies of the ASCII files it receives directly from registrants to each of the depositories for their use in providing dissemination services.

C. The multiple depositories would be directed to create an acceptable dissemination strategy. This could possibly be achieved by having the depositories create a single, physical database for dissemination purposes. Alternatively, they could each disseminate their separate inventories through a single point of interconnection which would serve the wholesale subscriber community, but would not maintain a separate dissemination database. Comment is sought on these and other approaches.

The primary advantages of Model IV, in addition to those stated for Model III, are: (1) It creates competition among the depositories to the extent that depositories, under certain circumstances, would be willing to pay issuers to file with them; and (2) the filing community would have not only a new document conversion alternative, it would also benefit from the competition which will take place among the depositories for possible value-added services unrelated to SEC filing.

The disadvantage is the dissemination structure is complicated by the fact that documents are held by several recipients.

Respondents are asked to examine all aspects of each model and any internal variants and provide the SEC with their views of the perceived ''advantages'' and ''disadvantages'' stated for each model. The Commission requests comment on whether it should provide EDGAR filings on a real-time basis or continue its current dissemination activities on a day-delayed basis. Comment should address policy and technical issues. Should the operators of the depositories described in Models III and IV be required to offer at no charge via the Internet the raw filings they receive for conversion? Issues of liability with respect to document conversions are another area where respondents are asked to focus their comments. Rating each model from 1 through 5, with 5 signifying the highest rating, would also assist the agency in its deliberations. Finally, the SEC again asks for alternatives to ASCII which: (1) Facilitate filer document preparation and submission; (2) assist the SEC with storing and word searching filings; and (3) are easily handled and displayed by the dissemination and document viewing communities.

Comments should be received by the SEC by January 22, 1996. All responses will be reviewed, and the submitter will be added to the bidders' list. Comments will be placed in the SEC's Public Reference Room at the SEC headquarters building located at 450 5th Street, NW. in Washington, DC. No telephone inquiries will be accepted. In addition to the mailing address provided above, the SEC will accept electronic comments directed via Internet e-mail to: webtech@sec.gov.

Dated: January 5, 1996.

Margaret H. McFarland,

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 96–370 Filed 1–9–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8010–01–P

[Release No. 34–36680; International Series No. 913; File No. SR–OPRA–95–6]

Options Price Reporting Authority; Notice of Filing and Immediate Effectiveness of Amendment to the National Market System Plan of the Options Price Reporting Authority

January 4, 1996.

Pursuant to Rule 11Aa3–2 under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (''Exchange Act''), notice is hereby given that on December 12, 1995, the Options Price Reporting Authority (''OPRA'')[1] submitted to the Securities and Exchange Commission (''SEC'' or ''Commission'') an amendment to the Plan for Reporting of Consolidated Options Last Sale Reports and

---

[1] OPRA is a National Market System Plan approved by the Commission pursuant to Section 11A of the Exchange Act and Rule 11Aa3–2 thereunder. Securities Exchange Act Release No. 17638 (Mar. 18, 1981).

The Plan provides for the collection and dissemination of last sale and quotation information on options that are traded on the five member exchanges. The five exchanges which agreed to the OPRA Plan are the American Stock Exchange (''AMEX''); the Chicago Board Options Exchange (''CBOE''); the New York Stock Exchange (''NYSE''); the Pacific Stock Exchange (''PSE''); and the Philadelphia Stock Exchange (''PHLX'').