that was assumed in the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, Section 316(b), entrainment and impingement study performed by the licensee for initial plant licensing.

The licensee also concluded that the increased heat load rejected to the Monticello Reservoir will not cause the thermal component of the effluent to exceed the NPDES condition for maximum surface temperature or maximum plume temperature rise.

The heatload rejected by the cooling tower was calculated by the licensee to be 60.66 MBtu/hr at 100% capacity. The cooling tower effluents, including salt drift and chemical discharges, have been determined by the licensee to have a negligible effect on all VCSNS structures and systems. The dispersant and anti-fouling chemicals added to the cooling tower raw water will be sufficiently diluted to preclude any significant environmental impact. Limits on the release of these chemicals will be determined by the South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control, and will be included in the licensee's NPDES permit. Since circulating water flow is critical for adequate dilution, the licensee will establish procedures to control the release of these chemicals. The required controls are listed in the licensee's March 25, 1996 letter. The cooling tower will be constructed outside the protected area fence in an empty field at the northwest corner of the site. Any environmental effects of the cooling tower construction will be confined to onsite areas previously disturbed during initial plant construction.

The staff previously evaluated the radiological impact of operating at 2900 MWt in a November 18, 1994 safety evaluation (SE) supporting issuance of License Amendment No. 119. This amendment was requested to support the licensee's steam generator (SG) replacement project. The majority of the licensee's SG replacement analyses were written for the planned uprate power of 2900 MWt. The staff discussed the radiological considerations of operation at the uprated power in Section 2.5 of the SE. The staff concluded that "* the doses would not exceed the dose guidelines presently contained in the Standard Review Plans, 10 CFR Part 100 or GDC 19 of 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix A for either offsite locations or control room operators." Therefore, the radiological consequences of the proposed uprate have been previously evaluated by the staff.

The uprate conditions will also result in storage of spent fuel with a higher irradiation. By letter dated, December

13, 1993, as supplemented February 2, and March 11, 1994, the licensee requested a license amendment to allow the use and subsequent storage of fuel with an initial enrichment to 5.0 weight percent Uranium-235. This request was made, in part, to support the core power uprate to 2900 MWt. On August 15, 1994, (59 FR 41799) the staff published its "Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact, which concluded the proposed action will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment. Therefore, the environmental impacts of this aspect of the licensee's power uprate proposal has been previously evaluated by the Commission.

The change will not increase the probability or consequences of accidents, no changes are being made in the types of any effluents that may be released offsite, and there is no significant increase in the allowable individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

Except for heat load, which is bounded by previous analysis as discussed above, the amendment does not significantly affect nonradiological plant effluents and has no other environmental impact. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant nonradiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

Alternatives to the Proposed Action

Since the Commission has concluded there is no significant environmental impact associated with the proposed action, any alternatives with equal or greater environmental impact need not be evaluated. As an alternative to the proposed action, the staff considered denial of the proposed action. Denial of the application would result in no change in current environmental impacts. The environmental impacts of the proposed action and the alternative action are similar.

Alternative Use of Resources

This action does not involve the use of any resources not previously considered in the Final Environmental Statement for the Virgil C. Summer Nuclear Station, Unit 1.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on February 26, 1996, the staff consulted with the South Carolina State official, Mr. Virgil Autry of the Bureau of Solid and Hazardous Waste Management, Department of Health and Environmental Control, regarding the environmental impact of the proposed action. The State official had no comments.

Finding of No Significant Impact

Based upon the environmental assessment, the Commission concludes that the proposed action will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment. Accordingly, the Commission has determined not to prepare an environmental impact statement for the proposed action.

For further details with respect to the proposed action, see the licensee's letters dated August 18, 1995, as supplemented on November 1, 1995 February 14, March 14 (the licensee submitted two supplemental letters dated March 14, 1996) and March 25, 1996, which 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 Fairfield County Library, 300 Washington Street, Winnsboro, SC.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 8th day of April, 1996.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. Frederick J. Hebdon,

Director, Project Directorate II-3, Division of Reactor Projects - I/II, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 96–9144 Filed 4–11–96; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

Proposed Collection; Comment Request

SUMMARY: In accordance with the requirement of Section 3506(c)(2)(A) of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 which provides opportunity for public comment on new or revised data collections, the Railroad Retirement Board (RRB) will publish periodic summaries of proposed data collections.

Comments are invited on: (a) Whether the proposed information collection is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information has practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the RRB's estimate of the burden of the collection of the information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden related to the collection of information on respondents, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

Title and purpose of information collection: Request for Review of Part B Medicare Claim; OMB 3220–0100 Under Section 7(d) of the Railroad Retirement Act (RRA), the RRB administers the Medicare program for persons covered by the railroad retirement system.

The RRB utilizes Forms Ğ–790 and G–791 to provide railroad retirement beneficiaries who are claimants for Part B Medicare benefits with the means for requesting the MetraHealth Insurance Company, the RRB's current Medicare carrier, to review claims determinations or to hold hearings on the review determinations. Completion is required to obtain a benefit. One response is requested of each respondent.

The RRB proposes minor editorial changes to both the G-790 and G-791 to incorporate language required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995. The completion time for both the G-790 and the G-791 is estimated at 15 minutes.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION OR COMMENTS:

To request more information or to obtain a copy of the information collection justification, forms, and/or supporting material, please call the RRB Clearance Officer at (312) 751–3363. Comments regarding the information collection should be addressed to Ronald J. Hodapp, Railroad Retirement Board, 844 N. Rush Street, Chicago, Illinois 60611–2092. Written comments should be received within 60 days of this notice.

Chuck Mierzwa, Clearance Officer.

[FR Doc. 96–9105 Filed 4–11–96; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 7905–01–M

Proposed Collection; Comment Request

SUMMARY: In accordance with the requirement of Section 3506 (c)(2)(A) of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 which provides opportunity for public comment on new or revised data collections, the Railroad Retirement Board (RRB) will publish periodic summaries of proposed data collections.

Comments are invited on: (a) Whether the proposed information collection is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information has practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the RRB's estimate of the burden of the collection of the information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the (d) ways to minimize the burden related to the collection of information on respondents, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

Title and purpose of information collection: Request for Medicare Payment; OMB 3220–0131 Under Section 7(d) of the Railroad Retirement Act, the RRB administers the Medicare program for persons covered by the railroad retirement system. The collection obtains the information needed by the MetraHealth Insurance Company, the Medicare carrier for railroad retirement beneficiaries, to pay claims for payments under Part B of the Medicare program. Authority for collecting the information is prescribed in 42 CFR 424.32.

The RRB currently utilizes Forms G–740B, G–740S and HCFA 1500 to secure the information necessary to pay Part B Medicare Claims. One response is completed for each claim. Completion is required to obtain a benefit.

The RRB proposes to expand the use of Form HCFA-1500, (in accordance with Section 1848(G)(4) of the Social Security Act) which will result in the obsolescence of Form G-740B. Non-burden impacting changes to RRB Form G-740s including the addition of a burden statement are also being proposed.

Estimate of Annual Respondent Burden

The estimated annual respondent burden is as follows:

Form No.(s)	Annual responses	Time (Min.)
G-740S	100	15

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION OR COMMENTS:

To request more information or to obtain a copy of the information collection justification, forms, and/or supporting material, please call the RRB Clearance Officer at (312) 751–3363. Comments regarding the information collection should be addressed to Ronald J. Hodapp, Railroad Retirement Board, 844 N. Rush Street, Chicago, Illinois 60611–2092. Written comments should be received within 60 days of this notice.

Chuck Mierzwa,

Clearance Officer.

[FR Doc. 96-9106 Filed 4-11-96; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 7905-01-M

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Sunshine Act Meeting

AGENCY MEETING: Notice is hereby given, pursuant to the provisions of the Government in the Sunshine Act, Pub. L. 94–409, that the Securities and Exchange Commission will hold the

following open meeting during the week of April 15, 1996.

An open meeting will be held on Tuesday, April 16, 1996, at 10:00 a.m., in Room 1C30.

The subject matter of the open meeting scheduled for Tuesday, April 16, 1996, at 10:00 a.m., will be:

The Commission will meet with representatives from the American Society of Corporate Secretaries to discuss a number of issues of mutual interest, including the shareholder proposal rules, the Report of the Task Force on Disclosure Simplification, the Section 16 rules, proposed disclosure requirements concerning derivative financial instruments, the Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995, developments in electronic communications to shareholders, and company registration. For further information, please contact Joseph P. Babits at (202) 942–2910.

At times, changes in Commission priorities require alterations in the scheduling of meeting items. For further information and to ascertain what, if any, matters have been added, deleted or postponed, please contact:

The Office of the Secretary at (202) 942–7070.

Dated: April 9, 1996.

Jonathan G. Katz,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 96–9230 Filed 4–10–96; 11:26 am]

[Release No. 34–37067; File No. SR-CHX-96-11]

Self-Regulatory Organizations; Notice of Filing of Proposed Rule Change by the Chicago Stock Exchange, Inc. Relating to Examinations

April 4, 1996.

Pursuant to Section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 ("Act"), 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1), notice is hereby given that on March 6, 1996, the Chicago Stock Exchange, Inc. ("CHX" or "Exchange") filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission ("Commission" or "SEC") the proposed rule change, on March 18, 1996, filed Amendment No. 1 to the proposed rule change, 1 and on April 4, 1996, filed Amendment No. 2 to the proposed rule change,² as described in Items I, II and III below, which Items have been prepared by the self-regulatory organization. The Commission is publishing this notice to solicit

¹ See Letter from David T. Rusoff, Foley & Lardner, to Elisa Metzger, SEC dated March 14, 1996 ("Amendment No. 1").

² See Letter from Charles R. Haywood, Foley & Lardner, to Elisa Metzger, SEC dated April 4, 1996 ("Amendment No. 2").