Agenda: To review and evaluate International Research Fellow Award proposals

8. Special Emphasis Panel in Materials Research (1203)
Date: January 26 & 31, 1996
Contact: Lorretta Inglehart at 703–306–1817
Agenda: To review and evaluate Instrumentation proposals

Date: February 9, 1996
Contact: Andrew Lovinger at 703–306–1839
Agenda: To review and evaluate DMR 1996 Faculty Early Career Development Program proposals

9. Special Emphasis Panel in Mathematical Sciences (1204)
Date: January 22–23 & February 5–6 1996
Contact: Joe Jenkins at 703–306–1879
Agenda: To review and evaluate the Analysis Program nominations and applications

Date: January 22–23 & February 8–9, 1996
Contact: Deborah Lockhart at 703–306–1882
Agenda: To review and evaluate proposals in the Applied and Computational Mathematics Programs

Date: January 25–26, 1996
Contact: Alvin Thaler at 703–306–1880
Agenda: To review and evaluate proposals concerning Algebraic Geometry

10. Special Emphasis Panel in Civil & Mechanical Systems (1205)
Date: January 30 and February 1–2, 1996
Contact: Priscilla Nelson at 703–306–1361
Agenda: To review and evaluate civil and mechanical systems proposals

11. Special Emphasis Panel in Undergraduate Education
Date: January 30–31, 1996
Contact: Herbert Levitan at 703–306–1669
Agenda: To review and evaluate proposals submitted to the Institution Reform of Undergraduate Education Program.

12. Special Emphasis Panel in Biological Sciences (1754)
Date: January 22–23, 1996.
Contact: Carter Kimsey at 703–306–1469
Agenda: To review and evaluate proposals concerning Molecular Evolution

Date: February 12–14, 1996
Contact: Carter Kimsey at 703–306–1469
Agenda: To review and evaluate proposals concerning Biosciences related to the environment

Times: 8:30 to 5:00 p.m. each day.
Place: National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Blvd., Arlington, VA. 22230.
Type of Meetings: Closed.
Purpose of Meeting: To provide advice and recommendations concerning proposals submitted to NSF for financial support.
Reason for Closing: The proposals being reviewed include information of a proprietary or confidential nature, including technical information; financial data, such as salaries, and personal information concerning individuals associated with the proposals. These matters are exempt under 5 USC 552b(c)(4) and (6) of the Government in the Sunshine Act.

Dated: January 18, 1996.

M. Rebecca Winkler,

Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 96–908 Filed 1–23–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555–01–M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards Subcommittee Meeting on Planning and Procedures; Meeting

The ACRS Subcommittee on Planning and Procedures will hold a meeting on February 7, 1996, Room T–2B1, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland.

The entire meeting will be open to public attendance, with the exception of a portion that may be closed pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(c) (2) and (6) to discuss organizational and personnel matters that relate solely to internal personnel rules and practices of ACRS, and matters the release of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.

The agenda for the subject meeting shall be as follows:

Wednesday, February 7, 1996—1:30 Noon until 4 p.m.

The Subcommittee will discuss proposed ACRS activities and related matters. The purpose of this meeting is to gather information, analyze relevant issues and facts, and to formulate proposed positions and actions, as appropriate, for deliberation by the full Committee.

Oral statements may be presented by members of the public with the concurrence of the Subcommittee Chairman; written statements will be accepted and made available to the Committee. Electronic recordings will be permitted only during those portions of the meeting that are open to the public, and questions may be asked only by members of the Subcommittee, its consultants, and staff. Persons desiring to make oral statements should notify the cognizant ACRS staff person named below five days prior to the meeting, if possible, so that appropriate arrangements can be made.

Further information regarding topics to be discussed, the scheduling of sessions open to the public, whether the meeting has been cancelled or rescheduled, the Chairman's ruling on requests for the opportunity to present oral statements, and the time allotted therefor can be obtained by contacting the cognizant ACRS staff person, Dr. John T. Larkins (telephone: 301/415–7360) between 7:30 a.m. and 4:15 p.m. (EDT). Persons planning to attend this meeting are urged to contact the above named individual one or two working days prior to the meeting to be advised of any changes in schedule, etc., that may have occurred.

Dated: January 18, 1996.

Sam Duraiswamy,

Chief, Nuclear Reactors Branch.

[FR Doc. 96–963 Filed 1–23–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

[Docket Nos. 50–317 and 50–318]

Baltimore Gas and Electric Co.; Withdrawal of Application for Amendment to Facility Operating License

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has granted the request of Baltimore Gas and Electric Company (BGE or the licensee) to withdraw its July 13, 1995, application for proposed amendments to Facility Operating License Nos. DPR–53 and DPR–69 for the Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, located in Lusby, Maryland.

The proposed amendment would have revised the Technical Specification 5.2.1, Fuel Assemblies, to allow the use of cladding materials other than Zircaloy or ZIRLO.

The Commission had previously issued a Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendments published in the Federal Register on August 30, 1995 (60 FR 45174). However, by letter dated December 21, 1995, the licensee withdrew the proposed change.

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendment dated July 13, 1995, and the licensee's letter dated December 21, 1995, which withdrew the application for the license amendments. The above documents 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 Calvert County Library, Prince Frederick, Maryland 20678.

Dated at Rockville, Md., this 17th day of January 1996.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Daniel G. McDonald,

Senior Project Manager, Project Directorate, Division of Reactor Projects—Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 96–964 Filed 1–23–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

[Docket No. 50–029–DCOM; ASLBP No. 96–713–01–DCOM]

Yankee Atomic Electric Company; Establishment of Atomic Safety and Licensing Board

Pursuant to delegation by the Commission dated December 29, 1972, published in the Federal Register, 37 F.R. 28710 (1972), and Sections 2.105, 2.700, 2.702, 2.714, 2.714a, 2.717, 2.721 and 2.772(j) of the Commission's Regulations, all as amended, an Atomic Safety and Licensing Board is being established in the following proceeding to rule on petitions for leave to intervene and/or requests for hearing and supplemental petitions to intervene and to preside over the proceeding in the event that a hearing is ordered:

YANKEE ATOMIC ELECTRIC COMPANY
Yankee Nuclear Power Station
Decommissioning Plan

This Board is being established pursuant to a notice published by the Commission on October 27, 1995, in the Federal Register (60 F.R. 55069). The petitioners, Citizens Awareness Network and New England Coalition on Nuclear Pollution, seek to intervene and request a hearing. The Commonwealth of Massachusetts has also filed a notice of participation in the proceeding.

The Board is comprised of the following administrative judges:

G. Paul Bollwerk III, Chairman, Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. 20555

Dr. Jerry R. Kline, Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. 20555

Dr. Thomas S. Elleman, 704 Davidson Street, Raleigh, NC 27609

All correspondence, documents and other materials shall be filed with the Judges in accordance with 10 CFR 2.701.

Issued at Rockville, Maryland, this 17th day of January 1996.

B. Paul Cotter, Jr.,

Chief Administrative Judge, Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel.

[FR Doc. 96–962 Filed 1–23–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34–36726; File No. SR–Amex–95–54]

Self-Regulatory Organizations; Notice of Filing of Proposed Rule Change by the American Stock Exchange, Inc. Relating to Restrictions on Specialists

January 17, 1996.

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 December 19, 1995, the American Stock Exchange, Inc. (''Amex'' 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 Amex. 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 amend Exchange Rules 190 and 950 regarding restrictions on specialists.

The text of the proposed rule change is available at the Office of the Secretary, the Amex, 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 Exchange 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 Amex 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

The Amex adopted most of its restrictions on the activities of specialists in the early 1960s. The effect of these restrictions was to limit the business activities of specialists (and their affiliates) to acting as a ''broker's broker'' and as a dealer on the Exchange Floor. These restrictions also precluded specialists from making public statements regarding their specialty securities. In 1973, the Exchange added a gloss on the public statement restriction, prohibiting specialists from making, ''an advertisement identifying a firm as a specialist in any security.'' [1] Even though the New York Stock Exchange (''NYSE'') and Amex generally have comparable rules with respect to restrictions on specialists, the NYSE never adopted the 1973 gloss.

In 1975, with the implementation of trading in standardized options, the Exchange generally extended the restriction on stock specialists to options specialists. It modified, however, the prohibition on business transactions between specialists and the issuer of a specialty security (Rule 190(a)), to prohibit business transactions between an options specialist and the issuer of the security underlying a specialty option (Rule 950(k)).[2]

In 1987, the Chicago Board Options Exchange (''CBOE'') instituted its Designated Primary Market-Maker (''DPM'') system for trading listed options.[3] While the CBOE adopted a number of the restrictions applicable to Amex options specialists, it did not apply any of the restrictions applicable to Amex specialist communications to its DPMs.[4]

The discrepancy between the rules of the Amex and the CBOE regarding specialist communications had little practical significance prior to the general implementation of multiple options trading. The Exchange is now finding, however, that the disparate regulation of specialists and DPMs has placed it at a disadvantage in the competition for order flow in a multiple trading environment. The Amex, accordingly, proposes to amend its rules to lift the prohibition against ''popularizing'' an option or a derivative

[1] See Commentary to Amex Rule 190.

[2] Since the Options Clearing Corporation (''OCC'') is the issuer of all listed options and the ''business transaction'' prohibition was intended as a prophylactic measure to prevent the passage of non-public information between specialist and issuer, the policy reason behind Rule 190(a) would not have been advanced had the Exchange simply prohibited business transactions between the OCC and an options specialist.

[3] Like a specialist, a DPM has primary market making responsibilities.

[4] See CBOE Rules 8.80 and 8.81, and Securities Exchange Act Release Nos. 24934 (September 22, 1987), 52 FR 36122 (September 25, 1987) and 25151 (November 23, 1987), 52 FR 45417 (November 27, 1987). The CBOE's rules provide that an integrated broker-dealer affiliated with a DPM must establish an exchange approved ''Chinese Wall'' between the upstairs firm and the DPM and make certain disclosures if it intends to issue recommendations or research reports regarding DPM securities and the underlying. There are no specific restrictions, however, on DPM communications regarding their specialty securities.