

As Commission staff advised the CBT's Task Force during its deliberations, the CBT alternative raises several important issues and it differs from the Commission's in a number of significant respects. The CBT alternative restricts the delivery area to only the northern portion of the Illinois River. Unlike the Commission's suggested Illinois River Shipping Certificate alternative, the CBT river-based delivery area would not be in addition to the existing delivery points on the contracts—including St. Louis and Toledo—but in lieu of them. Moreover, the CBT alternative does not provide for locational price differentials. Finally, unlike the contracts' current specifications for loading against warehouse receipts, the CBT is considering requiring that originators of shipping certificates maintain separate queues, giving takers under the futures contract priority over other load-out commitments.

In order to assist the Commission in its consideration of these issues, the Commission requests written data, views or arguments from interested members of the public. Commenters are requested to analyze and compare the relative merits of the CBT working alternative. Commenters are specifically requested to address the following issues:

1. Does the potential economic deliverable supplies or capacity on the contract under the CBT working alternative meet the requirement of the section 5a(a)(10) notification that the CBT modify the contracts' specifications in order that they "will tend to prevent or diminish price manipulation, market congestion, or the abnormal movement of such commodity in interstate commerce"? In particular, how does the potential increase in delivery supplies or capacity which results from the addition of the Illinois River shipping certificate compare to deletion of deliverable supplies or capacity at Toledo? Is the net result sufficient to prevent market disruption under foreseeable market circumstances?

2. How should the net change in economic deliverable supplies or capacity be measured? How much of the load-out capacity of the barge-loading facilities on the northern Illinois River likely will be made available for delivery, particularly in light of the queuing aspect of the CBT working alternative? In this respect, within the defined delivery area is there a sufficient number of facilities, and is their ownership sufficiently dispersed?

3. Are the regularity eligibility requirements a significant factor in determining the economic delivery

capacity under the CBT working alternative's terms? Are they sufficient or necessary to assure performance on the contract?

4. What are the implications of the working alternative's proposed single delivery area, even if total deliverable supplies or capacity were increased?

5. What are the implications of the absence of locational price differentials? In particular, is the working alternative consistent with the pricing of corn and soybeans in the cash market of the proposed delivery area? What are the implications for the availability of registered certificates?

Issued in Washington, D.C., this 10th day of March 1997, by the Commodity Futures Trading Commission.

Jean A. Webb,

Secretary of the Commission.

[FR Doc. 97-6470 Filed 3-13-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6351-01-P

DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

Sunshine Act Meeting

FEDERAL REGISTER CITATION OF PREVIOUS ANNOUNCEMENT: Published February 24, 1997, 62 FR 8222.

PREVIOUSLY ANNOUNCED TIME AND DATE OF MEETING: 9:00 a.m., March 19, 1997.

PLACE: The Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board, Public Hearing Room, 625 Indiana Avenue, NW, Suite 300, Washington, DC 20004.

STATUS: Open.

CHANGE IN THE MEETING: The meeting has been postponed until 9:00 a.m. on April 16, 1997.

MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED: The Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board will reconvene and continue the open meeting conducted on February 5, 1997, regarding the status of DOE's Implementation Plan for Board Recommendation 95-2, Integrated Safety Management. Specifically, the Board will be given status reports by DOE relative to the Department's efforts to improve the technical expertise necessary to review and implement safety management systems, including establishment of a Core Technical group, and the development of guidance for implementation of the Safety Management System.

CONTACT PERSON FOR MORE INFORMATION: Robert M. Anderson, General Counsel, Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board, 625 Indiana Avenue, NW, Suite 700, Washington, DC 20004, (800) 788-4016. This is a toll-free number.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board

reserves its right to further schedule and otherwise regulate the course of this meeting, to recess, reconvene, postpone or adjourn the meeting, and otherwise exercise its authority under the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended.

Dated: March 11, 1997.

John T. Conway,

Chairman.

[FR Doc. 97-6573 Filed 3-11-97; 4:55 pm]

BILLING CODE 3670-01-M

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Recognition of Accrediting Agencies

AGENCY: Department of Education.

ACTION: Request for comments on an accrediting agency appealing a previous recommendation of the National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Integrity to withdraw its recognition.

DATES: Commentors should submit their written comments by April 14, 1997 to the address below.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Karen W. Kershenstein, Director, Accreditation and State Liaison Division, U.S. Department of Education, 600 Independence Avenue, SW., Room 3915 ROB-3, Washington, DC 20202-5244, telephone: (202) 708-7417.

Individuals who use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) may call the Federal Information Relay Service at 1-800-877-8339 between 8 a.m. and 7 p.m., Eastern time, Monday through Friday.

SUBMISSION OF THIRD-PARTY COMMENTS:

The Secretary of Education is required by law to publish a list of accrediting agencies that he determines to be reliable authorities regarding the quality of education or training offered by institutions or programs they accredit. The National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Integrity (the "Advisory Committee") advises the Secretary on specific accrediting agencies that seek to be recognized by the Secretary.

The National League for Nursing was reviewed by the Advisory Committee at its June 1996 meeting, at which time it recommended that the agency's recognition be withdrawn. The agency appealed that recommendation, in accordance with the provisions set forth in 34 CFR 602.13 of the regulations governing the recognition of accrediting agencies. The Secretary has reviewed the agency's appeal and has decided to remand the matter to the Advisory Committee for review. The Advisory