463, as amended), the National Science Foundation announces the following meeting.

Name: Advisory Committee for Social, Behavioral & Economic Sciences (1171).

Date and Time: June 2–3, 1997; 9:00 a.m. to 5 p.m.

Place: Room 365, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, VA 22230.

Type of Meeting: Closed.

Contact Persons: Dr. Jonathan W. Leland, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, VA 22230. Telephone: (703) 306–1757.

Purpose of Meeting: To carry out Committee of Visitors (COV) review, including examination of decisions on proposals, reviewer comments, and other privileged materials.

Agenda: To provide oversight review of the Decision, Risk, and Management Science Program.

Reason for Closing: The meeting is closed to the public because the Committee is reviewing proposals actions that will include privileged intellectual property and personal information that could harm individuals if they are disclosed. If discussions were open to the public, these matters that are exempt under 5 U.S.C. 552b(c) (4) and (6) of the Government in the Sunshine Act would be improperly disclosed.

Dated: May 13, 1997.

M. Rebecca Winkler,

Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 97–13013 Filed 5–16–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555–01–M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket 70–7001]

Amendment to Certificate of Compliance GDP–1 for the U.S. Enrichment Corporation, Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant, Paducah, KY

The Director, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, has made a determination that the following amendment request is not significant in accordance with 10 CFR 76.45. In making that determination the staff concluded that: (1) there is no change in the types or significant increase in the amounts of any effluents that may be released offsite; (2) there is no significant increase in individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure; (3) there is no significant construction impact; (4) there is no significant increase in the potential for, or radiological or chemical consequences from, previously analyzed accidents; (5) the proposed changes do not result in the possibility of a new or different kind of accident; (6) there is no significant reduction in any margin of safety; and (7) the proposed changes will not result in an overall decrease in the effectiveness of the plant's safety, safeguards or security programs. The basis for this determination for the amendment request is shown below.

The NRC staff has reviewed the certificate amendment application and concluded that it provides reasonable assurance of adequate safety, safeguards, and security, and compliance with NRC requirements. Therefore, the Director, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, is prepared to issue an amendment to the Certificate of Compliance for the Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant. The staff has prepared a Compliance Evaluation Report which provides details of the staff's evaluation.

The NRC staff has determined that this amendment satisfies the criteria for a categorical exclusion in accordance with 10 CFR 51.22. Therefore, pursuant to 10 CFR 51.22(b), no environmental impact statement or environmental assessment need be prepared for this amendment.

USEC or any person whose interest may be affected may file a petition, not exceeding 30 pages, requesting review of the Director's Decision. The petition must be filed with the Commission not later than 15 days after publication of this **Federal Register** Notice. A petition for review of the Director's Decision shall set forth with particularity the interest of the petitioner and how that interest may be affected by the results of the decision. The petition should specifically explain the reasons why review of the Decision should be permitted with particular reference to the following factors: (1) The interest of the petitioner; (2) how that interest may be affected by the Decision, including the reasons why the petitioner should be permitted a review of the Decision; and (3) the petitioner's areas of concern about the activity that is the subject matter of the Decision. Any person described in this paragraph (USEC or any person who filed a petition) may file a response to any petition for review, not to exceed 30 pages, within 10 days after filing of the petition. If no petition is received within the designated 15-day period, the Director will issue the final amendment to the Certificate of Compliance without further delay. If a petition for review is received, the decision on the amendment application will become final in 60 days, unless the Commission grants the petition for review or otherwise acts within 60 days after publication of this **Federal Register** Notice.

A petition for review must be filed with the Secretary, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001, Attention: Rulemakings and Adjudications Staff, or may be delivered to the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW, Washington, DC, by the above date.

For further details with respect to the action see (1) the application for amendment and (2) the Commission's Compliance Evaluation Report. These items 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.

Date of amendment request: March 31, 1997.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment proposes to broaden the applicability statement for the Technical Safety Requirement (TSR) on the sprinkler system and to correct an editorial error in the TSR on the cylinder scale cart movement prevention system.

Basis for Finding of No Significance

1. The proposed amendment will not result in a change in the types or significant increase in the amounts of any effluents that may be released offsite.

The proposed change to the TSR on the C–310 and C–315 building sprinkler system changes the applicability statement such that the system must be operable at all times, except when the lube oil has been valved off or removed from the equipment. This change is consistent with the accident analysis. The proposed change to the TSR on the cylinder scale cart movement prevention system corrects one word and does not change the intent of the TSR (withdrawal is changed to receiving). These proposed changes will not affect the effluent.

2. The proposed amendment will not result in a significant increase in individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure.

The proposed changes do not relate to controls used to minimize occupational radiation exposures, therefore, the changes will not increase exposure.

3. The proposed amendment will not result in a significant construction impact.

The proposed changes will not result in any construction, therefore, there will be no construction impacts.

4. The proposed amendment will not result in a significant increase in the potential for, or radiological or chemical consequences from, previously analyzed accidents.

The change to the sprinkler system applicability is consistent with the accident analysis assumptions. The

editorial change to the scale cart system maintains the intent of the TSR. The proposed changes do no affect the potential for or radiological or chemical consequences from previously evaluated accidents.

5. The proposed amendment will not result in the possibility of a new or different kind of accident.

The proposed changes would not create new operating conditions or new plant configuration that could lead to a new or different type of accident.

6. The proposed amendment will not result in a significant reduction in any margin of safety.

The proposed change to the applicability statement for the sprinkler system is consistent with the accident analysis. The other change is an editorial change. These changes do not decrease the margins of safety and in fact may increase the margin by eliminating potential misunderstandings about TSR requirements.

7. The proposed amendment will not result in an overall decrease in the effectiveness of the plant's safety, safeguards or security programs.

Implementation of the proposed changes do not change the safety, safeguards, or security programs. Therefore, the effectiveness of the safety, safeguards, and security programs is not decreased.

Effective date: June 18, 1997.

Certificate of Compliance No. GDP–1: Amendment will revise Technical Safety Requirements for the fire protection system and the cylinder scale cart movement prevention system.

Local Public Document Room location: Paducah Public Library, 555 Washington Street, Paducah, Kentucky 42003.

Dated at Rockville, MD., this 9th day of May 1997.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Carl J. Paperiello,

Director, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.

[FR Doc. 97–13025 Filed 5–16–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

PEACE CORPS

Information Collection Requests Under OMB Review

AGENCY: Peace Corps.

ACTION: Notice of public use form review request to the Office of Management and Budget.

SUMMARY: The Associate Director for Management invites comments on information collection requests as required pursuant to the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. chapter 35). This notice announces that the Peace Corps has submitted to the Office of Management and Budget a request for emergency approval of the Peace Corps Television Program Concept Survey. A copy of the information collection may be obtained from Stephen Maroon, Office of Communications, Marketing Department, United States PEACE CORPS, 1990 K Street, NW, Washington, DC 20526. Mr. Maroon may be contacted by telephone at (202) 606–4469. Peace Corps invites comments on whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for proper performance of the functions of the Peace Corps, including whether the information will have practical use; the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used; ways to enhance the quality, utility and clarity of the information to be collected; and, ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of automated collection techniques, when appropriate, and other forms of information technology. Comments on these forms should be addressed to Victoria Becker Wassmer, Desk Officer, Office of Management and Budget, NEOB, Washington, DC 20503.

Information Collection Abstract

Title: Peace Corps Television Program Concept Survey.

Need for and Use of This Information: Peace Corps needs this information in order to develop informational television programs. The information is used to determine what programming and media format is required by local television stations.

Respondents: Television station managers/executives.

Respondents Obligation to Reply: Voluntary.

Burden on the Public:

a. Annual reporting burden:	125 hrs.
b. Annual recordkeeping burden.	0 hrs.
c. Estimated average burden per response.	5 min.
d. Frequency of response	One time.
e. Estimated number of likely respondents.	1500.
f. Estimated cost to respondents	$1.32.

This notice is issued in Washington, DC on May 15, 1997.

Stanley D. Suyat,

Associate Director for Management.

[FR Doc. 97–13072 Filed 5–16–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6051–01–M

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34–38619; File No. SR–CBOE–97–19]

Self-Regulatory Organizations; Notice of Filing of Proposed Rule Change by the Chicago Board Options Exchange, Incorporated Relating to a Minor Rule Violation Plan Amendment With Respect to Position Limit Fines

May 13, 1997.

Pursuant to Section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (''Act''),[1] notice is hereby given that on May 8, 1997, the Chicago Board Options Exchange, Incorporated (''CBOE'' 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 CBOE.[2] 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 text of the proposed rule change is available at the Office of the Secretary, CBOE, 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 CBOE 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 CBOE has prepared summaries, set forth in sections A, B and C below, of the most significant aspects of such statements.

[1] 15 U.S.C. § 78s(b)(1)(1988).

[2] The proposed rule change was originally filed on March 28, 1997. The CBOE submitted Amendment No. 1 to the proposed rule change to revise the review period for multiple position limit violations under CBOE Rule 17.50(g)(1)(b) to a rolling twelve month review period, instead of a calendar year review period. The CBOE has requested that the rolling year review period not become effective until three months after SR–CBOE–97–19 is approved so that CBOE members who may be affected by the change will have a notice period prior to the revision. Letter from Margaret G. Abrams, Senior Attorney, CBOE, to Katherine England, Esq., Assistant Director, Division of Market Regulation—Office of Market Supervision, dated May 8, 1997.