

Dated: June 27, 1996.

Gerald B. Lindrew,

Director, Pension and Welfare Benefits Administration, Office of Policy and Legislative Analysis.

[FR Doc. 96-17045 Filed 7-2-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-29-M

Working Group on Guidance for Selecting and Monitoring Service Providers Advisory Council on Employee Welfare and Pension Benefits Plans; Meeting

Pursuant to the authority contained in section 512 of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (ERISA), 29 U.S.C. 1142, a public meeting of the Working Group on Guidance for Selecting and Monitoring Service Providers of the Advisory Council on Employee Welfare and Pension Benefits Plans will be held on July 16, 1996, in Room S3215 A & B, U.S. Department of Labor Building, Third and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20210.

The purpose of the meeting, which will run from 9:30 a.m. to noon and from 1 to 3:30 p.m., is for the group to determine whether its focus will be on what type of general guidance would be useful to fiduciaries who must select and monitor service providers for plans or whether its focus should be narrowed to specific service providers such as investment consultants and investment managers.

The group also plans to conduct an informal survey on codes of conduct in the plan community to establish current industry practices.

Members of the public are encouraged to file a written statement pertaining to any topic concerning ERISA by submitting 20 copies on or before July 5, 1996, to Sharon Morrissey, acting executive secretary, ERISA Advisory Council, U.S. Department of Labor, Room N-5677, 200 Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20210. Individuals or representatives of organizations wishing to address the Working Group on Guidance for Selecting and Monitoring Service Providers should forward their request to the acting executive secretary or telephone (202) 219-8753. Oral presentations will be limited to 10 minutes, but an extended statement may be submitted for the record. Individuals with disabilities, who need special accommodations, should contact Sharon Morrissey by July 10, 1996, at the address indicated in this notice.

Organizations or individuals may also submit statements for the record without testifying. Twenty (20) copies of such statements should be sent to the

Acting Executive Secretary of the Advisory Council at the above address. Papers will be accepted and included in the record of the meeting if received on or before July 5.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 27th day of June 1996.

Olena Berg,

Assistant Secretary, Pension and Welfare Benefits Administration.

[FR Doc. 96-17046 Filed 7-2-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-29-M

NATIONAL BANKRUPTCY REVIEW COMMISSION

Meeting

AGENCY: National Bankruptcy Review Commission

ACTION: Notice of Public Meeting

TIME AND DATES: Thursday, July 18, 1996; 9 A.M. to 4:45 P.M. and Friday, July 19, 1996; 8:30 A.M. to 2:30 P.M.

PLACE: Thurgood Marshall Federal Judiciary Building, Federal Judicial Center/Education Center, One Columbus Circle, NE., Washington, DC 20544. The public should enter through the South Lobby entrance of the Thurgood Marshall Federal Judiciary Building.

STATUS: The meeting will be open to the public.

MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED: General administrative matters for the Commission, including substantive agenda; Commission working groups will consider the following substantive matters: improving jurisdiction and procedure; consumer bankruptcy; Chapter 11: uses and consequences; small businesses and partnerships: a special case?; government as creditor or debtor; mass torts, future claims, and bankruptcy; service to the estate: ethical and economic choices; the global economy: preparing for transnational insolvencies. An open forum for public participation will be held on July 18, 1996 from 11:15 a.m. to 12 p.m.

CONTACT PERSONS FOR FURTHER

INFORMATION: Contact Susan Jensen-Conklin or Carmelita Pratt at the National Bankruptcy Review Commission, Thurgood Marshall Federal Judiciary Building, One Columbus Circle, NE., Suite G-350, Washington, DC 20544; Telephone Number: (202) 273-1813.

Susan Jensen-Conklin,
Deputy Counsel.

[FR Doc. 96-17017 Filed 7-2-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6820-36-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50-348 and 50-364]

Southern Nuclear Operating Company, Inc.; Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating Licenses, 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. NPF-2 and NPF-8, issued to Southern Nuclear Operating Company, Inc. (the licensee), for operation of the Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2 located in Houston County, Alabama.

The proposed amendments would revise Technical Specification (TS) Table 4.3-1 to delete the requirement for surveillance of the manual safety injection to the reactor trip circuitry until the next unit shutdown, following which, this testing will be performed prior to Mode 2 entry. This change is applicable only during Unit 1, cycle 14 and Unit 2, cycle 11.

This requested TS change is a followup to a Notice of Enforcement Discretion (NOED) granted to the licensee that is in effect from the time of issuance on June 21, 1996, until approval of this exigent TS. NRC Inspection Manual, Part 9900, "Operations—Notice of Enforcement Discretion," requires that a followup TS amendment be issued within 4 weeks from the issuance of the NOED.

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

Pursuant to 10 CFR 50.91(a)(6) for amendments to be granted under exigent circumstances, the NRC staff must determine 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: