responsibility provisions of section 404 of the Act, which among other things require a fiduciary to discharge his duties respecting the plan solely in the interest of the participants and beneficiaries of the plan and in a prudent fashion in accordance with section 404(a)(1)(b) of the act; nor does it affect the requirement of section 401(a) of the Code that the plan must operate for the exclusive benefit of the employees of the employer maintaining the plan and their beneficiaries;

(2) Before an exemption may be granted under section 408(a) of the Act and/or section 4975(c)(2) of the Code, the Department must find that the exemption is administratively feasible, in the interests of the plan and of its participants and beneficiaries and protective of the rights of participants and beneficiaries of the plan;

(3) The proposed exemptions, if granted, will be supplemental to, and not in derogation of, any other provisions of the Act and/or the Code, including statutory or administrative exemptions and transitional rules. Furthermore, the fact that a transaction is subject to an administrative or statutory exemption is not dispositive of whether the transaction is in fact a prohibited transaction; and

(4) The proposed exemptions, if granted, will be subject to the express condition that the material facts and representations contained in each application are true and complete, and that each application accurately describes all material terms of the transaction which is the subject of the exemption.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 26th day of November, 1996.

Ivan Strasfeld,

Director of Exemption Determinations, Pension and Welfare Benefits Administration, U.S. Department of Labor.

[FR Doc. 96–30720 Filed 12–2–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–29–P

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

[Notice 96–137]

NASA Advisory Council, Life and Microgravity Sciences and Applications Advisory Committee, NASA–NIH Advisory Subcommittee on Behavioral and Biomedical Research; Meeting

AGENCY: National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

ACTION: Notice of meeting.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act, Pub. L. 92–463, as amended, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration announces a meeting of the NASA Advisory Council, Life and Microgravity Sciences and Applications Advisory Committee, NASA–NIH Advisory Subcommittee on Behavioral and Biomedical Research.

DATES: December 19, 1996, 8:30 a.m. to 5:30 p.m.; and December 20, 1996, 8:00 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.

ADDRESSES: NASA Headquarters, Room 7H46, 300 E Street SW, Washington, DC 20546.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Diana P. Hoyt, Code UP, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, DC 20546, 202/358–1893.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The meeting will be closed to the public on Thursday, December 19, 1996, from 5:00 p.m. to 5:30 p.m. in accordance with 5 U.S.C. 552b (c)(6), to allow for discussion on qualifications of individuals being considered for membership to the Committee. The remainder of the meeting will be open to the public up to the seating capacity of the room. The agenda for the meeting is as follows:

—Review of the office of Life and Microgravity Sciences and Applications Status
—Status of NASA–NIH Activities
—Neurolab
—Behavioral Studies
—Pharmacology
—Global Health and Remote Sensing
—Update on Centrifuge
—NASA–Mir Studies
—ISS Prioritization
—Science Institute
—Committee Discussion Regarding Future Activities

It is imperative that the meeting be held on these dates to accommodate the scheduling priorities of the key participants. Visitors will be requested to sign a visitor's register.

Dated: November 25, 1996.

Leslie M. Nolan,

Advisory Committee Management Officer, National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

[FR Doc. 96–30771 Filed 12–2–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7510–01–M

NATIONAL CREDIT UNION ADMINISTRATION

Notice of Meeting; Sunshine Act

TIME AND DATE: 5:00 p.m., Friday, December 6, 1996.

PLACE: Board Room, 7th Floor, Room 7047, 1775 Duke Street, Alexandria, VA 22314–3428.

STATUS: Open.

MATTER TO BE CONSIDERED:

1. Request from a Federal Credit Union to Convert to a Community Charter.
2. Request from a Federal Credit Union to Convert to a Group Community Charter.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Becky Baker, Secretary of the Board, Telephone 703–518–6304.

Beckey Baker,

Secretary of the Board.

[FR Doc. 96–30905 Filed 11–29–96; 2:37 pm]

BILLING CODE 7535–01–M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[DOCKET No. 50–368]

Arkansas Nuclear One, Unit 2; Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment 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 an amendment to Facility Operating License No. NPF–6 issued to Entergy Operations, Inc. for operation of Arkansas Nuclear One, Unit 2 (ANO–2) located in Pope County, Arkansas.

The proposed amendment would change the Small-Break Loss-of-Coolant Accident (SBLOCA) evaluation code CENPD–137, Supplement 1–P, as the preferred evaluation method. This methodology has been applied with a steam generator tube plugging limit of 30% and an associated 10% reduction in Reactor Coolant System (RCS) flow.

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.

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:

Criterion 1—Does Not Involve a Significant Increase in the Probability or Consequences of an Accident Previously Evaluated.

The proposed change to reference CENPD–137, Supplement 1–P is administrative in nature. The current referenced SBLOCA methodology is being supplemented with a more recently approved methodology which has demonstrated acceptable results with respect to 10 CFR 50.46 for the ANO–2 SBLOCA analysis. CENPD–137, Supplement 1–P has been independently reviewed and approved by the NRC. Technical specifications will continue to require operation within the core operational limits for each cycle reload calculated by the approved reload design methodologies. Cycle-specific evaluations performed in accordance with 10 CFR 50.59 demonstrate that changes in fuel cycle design do not involve an unreviewed safety question. Although there is an increase in the results (PCT, maximum cladding oxidation, and core-wide cladding oxidation) of the SBLOCA analysis, the increase is primarily due to the methodology change. The more recently approved methodology allows steam generator tube plugging up to 30% for SBLOCA analysis, but the increase in the results due to steam generator tube plugging is very small when compared to the increase due to the methodology change. The safety analyses will continue to be performed utilizing NRC-approved methodologies, and specific reload changes will be evaluated per 10 CFR 50.59.

Therefore, this change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of any accident previously evaluated.

Criterion 2—Does Not Create the Possibility of a New or Different Kind of Accident from any Previously Evaluated.

The proposed change to reference the current NRC-approved SBLOCA methodology is administrative in nature. The more recently approved methodology has demonstrated acceptable results for ANO–2. No changes to plant operating procedures or operating parameters are proposed. The safety analyses will continue to be performed utilizing NRC-approved methodologies, and specific reload changes will be evaluated per 10 CFR 50.59. No new equipment is being introduced, and no equipment is being operated in a manner inconsistent with its design.

Therefore, this change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated.

Criterion 3—Does Not Involve a Significant Reduction in the Margin of Safety.

The proposed change to reference the NRC-approved CENPD–137, Supplement 1–P SBLOCA methodology is administrative in nature. The margin of safety as defined by 10 CFR 50.46 has not been significantly reduced. There is an increase in the results (PCT, maximum cladding oxidation, and core-wide cladding oxidation) of the SBLOCA analysis utilizing this methodology; however, the increase is primarily due to the methodology change and remains within the limits specified in 10 CFR 50.46. The more recently approved methodology allows steam generator tube plugging up to 30% for SBLOCA analysis, but the increase in the results due to steam generator tube plugging is very small when compared to the increase due to the methodology change.

The development of limits for a particular cycle will continue to conform to the methods described in NRC-approved documentation. Technical specifications will continue to require that the core be operated within these limits and specify appropriate actions to be taken if the limits are violated. Each reload undergoes a 10 CFR 50.59 safety review to assure that operation of the unit within the cycle-specific limits will not involve an unreviewed safety question. The safety analyses will continue to be performed utilizing NRC-approved methodologies.

Therefore, this change does not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety.

Therefore, based upon the reasoning presented above and the previous discussion of the amendment request, Entergy Operations has determined that the requested change does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis 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 amendment request involves 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 amendment 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 amendment before the expiration of the 30-day notice period, provided that its final determination is that the amendment involves 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 Chief, Rules Review and Directives Branch, Division of Freedom of Information and Publications Services, Office of Administration, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001, 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 January 2, 1997, the licensee may file a request for a hearing with respect to issuance of the amendment to the subject facility operating license 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 Tomlinson Library, Arkansas Tech University, Russellville, Arkansas 72801. 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 request involves no significant hazards consideration, the Commission may issue the amendment and make it immediately effective, notwithstanding the request for a hearing. Any hearing held would take place after issuance of the amendment.

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

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 20555–0001, 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 William D. Beckner, Director, Project Directorate IV–1: 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 20555–0001, and to Mr. Nicholas S. Reynolds, Winston & 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 application for amendment dated November 24, 1996, 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 Tomlinson Library, Arkansas Tech University, Russellville, Arkansas 72801.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 26th day of November 1996.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Kombiz Salehi,

Acting Project Manager, Project Directorate IV–1, Division of Reactor Projects III/IV, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 96–30712 Filed 12–2–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

[Docket No. 50–498]

Houston Lighting and Power Company, City Public Board of San Antonio, Central Power and Light Company, City of Austin, Texas; Notice of Withdrawal of Application for Amendment to Facility Operating License

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has granted the request of Houston Lighting & Power Company, et al., (the licensee) to withdraw its February 29, 1996, application for proposed amendment to Facility Operating License No. NPF–76 for the South Texas Project, Unit No. 1, located in Matagorda County, Texas.

The proposed amendment would have included the addition of Technical Specification 3.10.8 to allow a one-time only extension of the standby diesel generator (SDG) allowed outage time for a cumulative of 21 days on ''A'' train SDG. In addition, it would have also allowed a one-time only extension of the allowed outage time on ''A'' train essential cooling water loop for a cumulative 7 days. This one-time only change would have become effective on April 10, 1996, and expire on May 15, 1996.

The Commission had previously issued a Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment published in the Federal Register on March 8, 1996 (61 FR 9502). However, by letter dated November 5, 1996, the licensee withdrew the proposed change.

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendment dated February 29, 1996, and the licensee's letter dated November 5, 1996, which withdrew the application for license amendment. 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 Wharton County Junior College, J. M. Hodges Learning Center, 911 Boling Highway, Wharton, TX 77488.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 25th day of November 1996.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Thomas W. Alexion,

Project Manager, Project Directorate IV–1, Division of Reactor Projects III/IV, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 96–30711 Filed 12–2–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

Sunshine Act Meeting

DATE: Weeks of December 2, 9, 16 and 23, 1996.