

days of Revision 0 of Procedure WC-8 (June 20, 1994). In its letter, NNECO stated that no documentation indicating that training was conducted for Procedure WC-8, Rev. 0, had been found. While no training records were located, NNECO stated that the Millstone Unit 1 Maintenance Manager recalled that the procedure was discussed at a Maintenance Department meeting within 60 days of its effective date.

The NRC staff reviewed Procedure DC-1 and determined that since NNECO could not locate the training records for Procedure WC-8, Rev. 0, and that training by the Maintenance Department or the Nuclear Training Department was not conducted within 60 days of the effective date for Procedure WC-8, Rev. 0, NNECO was in violation of Procedure DC-1.

The staff's review of NNECO's April 26, 1995, response to the NRC letter dated February 14, 1995, was documented in IR 95-22. The staff has reviewed NNECO's corrective actions that included NNECO management reemphasizing the importance of training on new or revised procedures and following procedures, the revising of Procedure WC-8, and training on the revised procedure. Based on that review, the staff has determined that the corrective actions the licensee has taken are acceptable. The staff has further determined that since there were no safety consequences as a result of this event, it was not a violation that could reasonably be expected to have been prevented by the licensee's corrective action for a previous violation or a previous licensee finding that occurred within the past 2 years of the inspection at issue, adequate corrective actions were implemented, and the violation was not willful, the violation would have been categorized in accordance with the enforcement policy in effect at the time of the inspection as a non-cited Severity Level V violation and would not have been the subject of formal enforcement action.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>6</sup>The staff has reconsidered this violation in accordance with the guidance in the current enforcement policy and has concluded that the violation is below the level of significance of Severity Level IV violations. This determination is based on the fact that there was negligible impact on safety; the violation does not indicate a programmatic problem that could have safety or regulatory impact; if the violation recurred, it would not be considered a significant concern; and the violation was not willful. Therefore this violation is classified as a minor violation and, as previously discussed, minor violations are not normally the subject of formal enforcement action and are usually not cited in inspection reports. To the extent that such violations are described, they are characterized as non-cited violations.

### III. Conclusion

The institution of a proceeding pursuant to 10 CFR 2.206 is appropriate only if substantial health and safety issues have been raised. See Consolidated Edison Company of New York (Indian Point Units 1, 2, and 3) CLI-75-8, 2 NRC 173, 175 (1975) and Washington Public Power Supply System (WPPSS Nuclear Project No. 2), DD-84-7 19 NRC 899, 924 (1984). This is the standard that has been applied to the concerns raised by the Petitioner to determine whether the action requested by the Petitioner, or other enforcement action, is warranted.

On the basis of the above assessment, I have concluded that, although certain minor procedural violations occurred, no substantial health and safety issues have been raised by the Petition regarding Millstone Unit 1 that would require initiation of enforcement action. Therefore, to the extent that the Petitioner requests that escalated enforcement action be taken against individuals and NU for violations of Procedure WC-8 or failure to train employees on the procedure, the Petition has been denied. However, as described above, the NRC conducted an inspection into the alleged violations of Procedure WC-8 from May 15 through June 23, 1995, and conducted an audit of the custody and usage record sheets. Therefore, to the extent that the Petitioner has requested an NRC "investigation into the above mentioned procedure violations" and for the NRC to "audit the Unit 1 maintenance department, M&TE folders," the Petition has been granted.

As provided in 10 CFR 2.206(c), a copy of this Decision will be filed with the Secretary of the Commission for the Commission's review. This Decision will constitute the final action of the Commission 25 days after issuance unless the Commission, on its own motion, institutes a review of the Decision in that time.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 11th day of February 1997.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.  
Frank J. Miraglia, Jr.,

*Acting Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 97-3888 Filed 2-14-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

### SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

#### Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

*Extension:* Rule 15c1-7 SEC File No. 270-146, OMB Control No 3235-0134.  
*Upon Written Request, Copies Available From:* Securities and Exchange Commission, Office of Filings and Information Services, Washington, DC 20549.

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") has submitted to the Office of Management and Budget requests for approval of extension on the following rule:

Rule 15c1-7 requires broker-dealers to make a record of each transaction it effects for customer accounts over which the broker-dealer has discretion. The Commission estimates that 500 respondents collect information annually under Rule 15c1-7 and that approximately 33,333 hours would be required annually for these collection. The total annual burden hours have been increased from 16,667 hours as a result of the growth in the securities market.

General comments regarding the estimated burden hours should be directed to the Desk Officer for the Securities and Exchange Commission at the address below. Any comments concerning the accuracy of the estimate average burden hours for compliance with Commission rules and forms should be directed to Michael E. Bartell, Associate Executive Director, Office of Information Technology, Securities and Exchange Commission, 450 Fifth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20549 and Desk Officer for Securities and Exchange Commission, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, Room 3208, New Executive Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20503.

Dated: February 10, 1997.

Margaret H. McFarland,

*Deputy Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 97-3917 Filed 2-14-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8010-01-M

#### Issuer Delisting; Notice of Application to Withdraw From Listing and Registration; (Chyron Corporation, Common Stock, \$.01 Par Value) File No. 1-9014

February 12, 1997.

Chyron Corporation ("Company") has filed an application with the Securities