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.[6]

[6] 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

and Exchange Commission (''Commission''), pursuant to Section 12(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (''Act'') and Rule 12d2–2(d) promulgated thereunder, to withdraw the above specified security (''Security'') from listing and registration on the Chicago Stock Exchange, Inc. (''CHX'').

The reasons alleged in the application for withdrawing the Security from listing and registration include the following:

According to the Company, the Security is currently listed both on the Chicago Stock Exchange and the New York Stock Exchange. The Security involved is the common stock of the Company traded on the CHX. The Company filed this application because it no longer wishes its Security to be listed on the CHX. The reasons alleged in the application include the fact that the Company wishes to avoid the direct and indirect costs of dual listings.

Any interested person may, on or before March 6, 1997, submit by letter to the Secretary of the Securities and Exchange Commission, 450 Fifth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20549, facts bearing upon whether the application has been made in accordance with the rules of the exchanges and what terms, if any, should be imposed by the Commission for the protection of investors. The Commission, based on the information submitted to it, will issue an order granting the application after the date mentioned above, unless the Commission determines to order a hearing on the matter.

For the Commission, by the Division of Market Regulation, pursuant to delegated authority.

Jonathan G. Katz,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 97–3914 Filed 2–14–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8010–01–M

Sunshine Act 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 February 17, 1997.

An open meeting will be held on Tuesday, February 18, 1997, at 10 a.m., in Room 1C30.

The subject matter of the open meeting scheduled for Tuesday, February 18, 1997, at 10 a.m., will be:

(1) The commission will consider whether to issue a release adopting amendments shortening the holding periods under Rule 144.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION, PLEASE CONTACT: Martin P. Dunn or Elizabeth M. Murphy, Office of Chief Counsel, Division of Corporation Finance, at (202) 942–2900.

(2) The Commission will consider whether to issue a release proposing amendments to the Regulation S safe harbor procedures and related changes for offshore sales of equity securities.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION, PLEASE CONTACT: Paul M. Dudek or Walter G. Van Dorn, Jr., Office of International Corporate Finance, Division of Corporation Finance, at (202) 942–2990.

Commissioner Hunt, as duty officer, determined that no earlier notice thereof was possible.

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: February 13, 1997.

Jonathan G. Katz,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 97–4090 Filed 2–13–97; 3:57 pm]

BILLING CODE 8010–01–M

SECRUTIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34–38262; File No. SR–CBOE–97–05]

Self-Regulatory Organizations; Notice of Filing and Immediate Effectiveness of Proposed Rule Change by the Chicago Board Options Exchange, Incorporated Relating to Waiver of Transaction Charges for FLEX Equity Options

February 10, 1997.

Pursuant to Section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (''Act''),[1] notice is hereby given that on January 30, 1997, the Chicago Board Options Exchange, Incorporated (''CBOE'' or ''Exchange'') filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission (''Commission'' or ''SEC'') the proposed rule change as described in Items I, II, and III below, which Items have been prepared by the CBOE. 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 CBOE proposes to extend its waiver of Exchange fees on transactions in Equity FLEX options traded on the Exchange until further notice. 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.

A. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Purpose of and Statutory Basis for, Proposed Rule Change

Purpose

In conjunction with the start of trading of FLEX Equity options, the Exchange waived Exchanges fees related to transactions in Equity FLEX until January 31, 1997. The Exchange has now determined to extend the waiver of the transaction fees because the Exchange believes that the waiver will encourage trading in this new product and will place the Exchange in a position to compete effectively for business in Equity FLEX options with other exchanges trading the same product.

The Exchange intends to establish transaction charges for FLEX Equity options at some time in the future.[2] However, the Exchange is now proposing to waive the transaction fees until further notice. The fees affected and the amount of the fees absent any reduction or rebate[3] are: (1) Exchange transaction fees, which are $.05 per contract side for market-makers, $.06 for member firm proprietary trades, $.15 for customer trades for options under $1, and $.30 for customer trade for options of $1 or more; (2) trade match fees, which are $.04 per contract side for all trades; and (3) floor broker fees, which are $.03 per contract side for all trades. The forgoing fee changes are being

[1] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1).

[2] The Commission notes that any imposition of transaction charges for FLEX Equity Options would have to be submitted to the Commission pursuant to Section 19(b) of the Act.

[3] The fees may actually be less than these amounts pursuant to the Exchange's Prospective Fee Reduction Schedule, the Customer Large Trade Discount Program, and rebate programs that have been filed with the Commission as part of the Exchange's fee schedule.