

percent uranium-235, and because commercial nuclear plant licensees have procedures and features that are designed to prevent inadvertent criticality, the staff has determined that it is unlikely that an inadvertent criticality could occur due to the handling of special nuclear material at a commercial power reactor. Therefore, the requirements of 10 CFR 70.24 are not necessary to ensure the safety of personnel during the handling of special nuclear materials at commercial power reactors.

#### *Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action*

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that inadvertent or accidental criticality will be precluded through compliance with the James A. FitzPatrick Technical Specifications, the design of the fuel storage racks providing geometric spacing of fuel assemblies in their storage locations, and administrative controls imposed on fuel handling procedures.

The proposed exemption would not result in an increase in the probability or consequences of accidents, affect radiological plant effluents, or result in a change in occupational or offsite dose. Therefore, there are no radiological impacts associated with the proposed exemption.

The proposed exemption would not result in a change in nonradiological effluents and will have no other nonradiological environmental impact.

Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

#### *Alternatives to the Proposed Action*

Since the Commission has concluded that 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 exemption, the staff considered denial of the requested exemption. Denial of the request 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 related to the operation of the James A. FitzPatrick Nuclear Power Plant dated March 1973.

#### *Agencies and Persons Consulted*

In accordance with its stated policy, on June 4, 1998, the staff consulted with the New York State Official, Jack Spath, of the New York State Research and Development Authority 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 letter dated April 24, 1998, which is available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room located at the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, and at the local public document room located at the Reference and Documents Department, Penfield Library, State University of New York, Oswego, New York.

Dated at Rockville, Md., this 17th day of June 1998.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.  
**S. Singh Bajwa,**  
*Director, Project Directorate I-1, Division of Reactor Projects—I/II, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 98-16647 Filed 6-22-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

---

## **PENSION BENEFIT GUARANTY CORPORATION**

### **Proposed Submission of Information Collections for OMB Review; Comment Request; Multiemployer Plan Regulations**

**AGENCY:** Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation.

**ACTION:** Notice of intention to request extension of OMB approval.

**SUMMARY:** The Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation (PBGC) intends to request that the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) extend approval, under the Paperwork Reduction Act, of collections of information in the PBGC's regulations on multiemployer plans under the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (ERISA). This notice informs the public of the PBGC's intent and solicits public comment on the collections of information.

**DATES:** Comments must be submitted by August 24, 1998.

**ADDRESSES:** Comments may be mailed to the Office of the General Counsel, suite 340, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, 1200 K Street, NW., Washington, DC 20005-4026, or delivered to that address between 9 a.m. and 4 p.m. on business days. Written comments will be available for public inspection at the PBGC's Communications and Public Affairs Department, suite 240 at the same address, between 9 a.m. and 4 p.m. on business days.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Deborah C. Murphy, Attorney, Office of the General Counsel, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, 1200 K Street, NW., Washington, DC 20005-4026, 202-326-4024. (For TTY/TDD users, call the Federal relay service toll-free at 1-800-877-8339 and ask to be connected to 202-326-4024.)

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number. OMB has approved and issued control numbers for the collections of information, described below, in the PBGC's regulations relating to multiemployer plans. (The regulations may be accessed on the PBGC's web site at <http://www.pbgc.gov>.) The PBGC intends to request that OMB extend its approval of these collections of information for three years.

The PBGC is soliciting public comments to—

- Evaluate whether the proposed collections of information are necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility;

- Evaluate the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collections of information, including the validity of the methodologies and assumptions used;

- Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and

- Minimize the burden of the collections of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, e.g., permitting electronic submission of responses.

Comments should identify the specific part number(s) of the regulation(s) they relate to.

The collections of information for which the PBGC intends to request extension of OMB approval are as follows:

**1. Termination of Multiemployer Plans (29 CFR Part 4041A) (OMB Control Number 1212-0020)**

Section 4041A(f)(2) of ERISA authorizes the PBGC to prescribe reporting requirements for and other "rules and standards for the administration of" terminated multiemployer plans. Section 4041A(c) and (f)(1) of ERISA prohibit the payment by a mass-withdrawal-terminated plan of lump sums greater than \$1,750 or of nonvested plan benefits unless authorized by the PBGC.

The regulation requires the plan sponsor of a terminated plan to submit a notice of termination to the PBGC. It also requires the plan sponsor of a mass-withdrawal-terminated plan that is closing out to give notices to participants regarding the election of alternative forms of benefit distribution and to obtain PBGC approval to pay lump sums greater than \$1,750 or to pay nonvested plan benefits.

The PBGC uses the information in a notice of termination to assess the likelihood that PBGC financial assistance will be needed. Plan participants and beneficiaries use the information on alternative forms of benefit to make personal financial decisions. The PBGC uses the information in an application for approval to pay lump sums greater than \$1,750 or to pay nonvested plan benefits to determine whether such payments should be permitted.

This collection of information is being revised to include certain items that were previously covered under OMB control number 1212-0032 (because they were in a different part of the PBGC's regulations) but that were moved into Part 4041A when the PBGC reorganized its regulations in 1996. As revised, control number 1212-0020 will cover all collection of information requirements in Part 4041A.

The PBGC estimates that plan sponsors each year (1) submit notices of termination for 20 plans, (2) distribute election notices to participants in 15 of those plans, and (3) submit requests to pay benefits or benefit forms not otherwise permitted for 1 of those plans. The estimated annual burden of the collection of information is 48 hours and \$13,481.

**2. Extension of Special Withdrawal Liability Rules (29 CFR Part 4203) (OMB Control Number 1212-0023)**

Sections 4203(f) and 4208(e)(3) of ERISA allow the PBGC to permit a multiemployer plan to adopt special rules for determining whether a withdrawal from the plan has occurred, subject to PBGC approval.

The regulation specifies the information that a plan that adopts special rules must submit to the PBGC about the rules, the plan, and the industry in which the plan operates. The PBGC uses the information to determine whether the rules are appropriate for the industry in which the plan functions and do not pose a significant risk to the insurance system.

The PBGC estimates that at most 1 plan sponsor submits a request each year under this regulation. The estimated annual burden of the collection of information is 1 hour and \$2,400.

**3. Variances for Sale of Assets (29 CFR Part 4204) (OMB Control Number 1212-0021)**

If an employer's covered operations or contribution obligation under a plan ceases, the employer must generally pay withdrawal liability to the plan. Section 4204 of ERISA provides an exception, under certain conditions, where the cessation results from a sale of assets. Among other things, the buyer must furnish a bond or escrow, and the sale contract must provide for secondary liability of the seller.

The regulation establishes general variances (rules for avoiding the bond/escrow and sale-contract requirements) and authorizes plans to determine whether the variances apply in particular cases. It also allows buyers and sellers to request individual variances from the PBGC. Plans and the PBGC use the information to determine whether employers qualify for variances.

The PBGC estimates that 11 employers submit variance requests to plans, and 2 employers submit variance requests to the PBGC, each year. The estimated annual burden of the collection of information is 1 hour and \$2,663.

**4. Reduction or Waiver of Complete Withdrawal Liability (29 CFR Part 4207) (OMB Control Number 1212-0044)**

Section 4207 of ERISA allows the PBGC to provide for abatement of an employer's complete withdrawal liability, and for plan adoption of alternative abatement rules, where appropriate.

Under the regulation, an employer applies to a plan for an abatement determination, providing information the plan needs to determine whether withdrawal liability should be abated, and the plan notifies the employer of its determination. The employer may, pending plan action, furnish a bond or escrow instead of making withdrawal liability payments, and must notify the plan if it does so. When the plan then makes its determination, it must so notify the bonding or escrow agent.

The regulation also permits plans to adopt their own abatement rules and request PBGC approval. The PBGC uses the information in such a request to determine whether the amendment should be approved.

The PBGC estimates that 100 employers apply to plans for abatement of complete withdrawal liability each year and that 1 plan sponsor requests approval of plan abatement rules each year from the PBGC. The estimated annual burden of the collection of information is 25.5 hours and \$15,000.

**5. Reduction or Waiver of Partial Withdrawal Liability (29 CFR Part 4208) (OMB Control Number 1212-0039)**

Section 4208 of ERISA provides for abatement, in certain circumstances, of an employer's partial withdrawal liability and authorizes the PBGC to issue additional partial withdrawal liability abatement rules.

Under the regulation, an employer applies to a plan for an abatement determination, providing information the plan needs to determine whether withdrawal liability should be abated, and the plan notifies the employer of its determination. The employer may, pending plan action, furnish a bond or escrow instead of making withdrawal liability payments, and must notify the plan if it does so. When the plan then makes its determination, it must so notify the bonding or escrow agent.

The regulation also permits plans to adopt their own abatement rules and request PBGC approval. The PBGC uses the information in such a request to determine whether the amendment should be approved.

The PBGC estimates that 1,000 employers apply to plans for abatement of partial withdrawal liability each year and that 1 plan sponsor requests approval of plan abatement rules each year from the PBGC. The estimated annual burden of the collection of information is 250.5 hours and \$150,000.

**6. Allocating Unfunded Vested Benefits to Withdrawing Employers (29 CFR Part 4211) (OMB Control Number 1212-0035)**

Section 4211(c)(5)(A) of ERISA requires the PBGC to prescribe how plans can, with PBGC approval, change the way they allocate unfunded vested benefits to withdrawing employers for purposes of calculating withdrawal liability.

The regulation prescribes the information that must be submitted to the PBGC by a plan seeking such approval. The PBGC uses the information to determine how the amendment changes the way the plan allocates unfunded vested benefits and how it will affect the risk of loss to plan participants and the PBGC.

The PBGC estimates that 5 plan sponsors submit approval requests each year under this regulation. The estimated annual burden of the collection of information is 10 hours.

**7. Notice, Collection, and Redetermination of Withdrawal Liability (29 CFR Part 4219) (OMB Control Number 1212-0034)**

Section 4219(c)(1)(D) of ERISA requires that the PBGC prescribe regulations for the allocation of a plan's total unfunded vested benefits in the event of a "mass withdrawal." ERISA section 4209(c) deals with an employer's liability for *de minimis* amounts if the employer withdraws in a "substantial withdrawal."

The reporting requirements in the regulation give employers notice of a mass withdrawal or substantial withdrawal and advise them of their rights and liabilities. They also provide notice to the PBGC so that it can monitor the plan, and they help the PBGC assess the possible impact of a withdrawal event on participants and the multiemployer plan insurance program.

The PBGC estimates that there is at most 1 mass withdrawal and 1 substantial withdrawal per year. The plan sponsor of a plan subject to a withdrawal covered by the regulation provides notices of the withdrawal to the PBGC and to employers covered by the plan, liability assessments to the employers, and a certification to the PBGC that assessments have been made. (For a mass withdrawal, there are 2 assessments and 2 certifications that deal with 2 different types of liability. For a substantial withdrawal, there is 1 assessment and 1 certification (combined with the withdrawal notice to the PBGC).) The estimated annual burden of the collection of information is 4 hours and \$3,939.

**8. Procedures for PBGC Approval of Plan Amendments (29 CFR Part 4220) (OMB Control Number 1212-0031)**

Under section 4220 of ERISA, a plan may within certain limits adopt special plan rules regarding when a withdrawal from the plan occurs and how the withdrawing employer's withdrawal liability is determined. Any such special rule is effective only if, within 90 days after receiving notice and a copy of the rule, the PBGC either approves or fails to disapprove the rule.

The regulation provides rules for requesting the PBGC's approval of an amendment. The PBGC needs the required information to identify the plan, evaluate the risk of loss, if any, posed by the plan amendment, and determine whether to approve or disapprove the amendment.

The PBGC estimates that 3 plan sponsors submit approval requests per year under this regulation. The estimated annual burden of the collection of information is 1.5 hours.

**9. Mergers and Transfers Between Multiemployer Plans (29 CFR Part 4231) (OMB Control Number 1212-0022)**

Section 4231(a) and (b) of ERISA requires plans that are involved in a merger or transfer to give the PBGC 120 days' notice of the transaction and provides that if the PBGC determines that specified requirements are satisfied, the transaction will be deemed not to be in violation of ERISA section 406(a) or (b)(2) (dealing with prohibited transactions).

This regulation sets forth the procedures for giving notice of a merger or transfer under section 4231 and for requesting a determination that a transaction complies with section 4231.

The PBGC uses information submitted by plan sponsors under the regulation to determine whether mergers and transfers conform to the requirements of ERISA section 4231 and the regulation.

The PBGC estimates that there are 20 transactions each year for which plan sponsors submit notices and approval requests under this regulation. The estimated annual burden of the collection of information is 5 hours and \$2,500.

**10. Notice of Insolvency (29 CFR Part 4245) (OMB Control Number 1212-0033)**

If the plan sponsor of a plan in reorganization under ERISA section 4241 determines that the plan may become insolvent, ERISA section 4245(e) requires the plan sponsor to give a "notice of insolvency" to the PBGC,

contributing employers, and plan participants and their unions in accordance with PBGC rules.

For each insolvency year under ERISA section 4245(b)(4), ERISA section 4245(e) also requires the plan sponsor to give a "notice of insolvency benefit level" to the same parties.

This regulation establishes the procedure for giving these notices. The PBGC uses the information submitted to estimate cash needs for financial assistance to troubled plans. Employers and unions use the information to decide whether additional plan contributions will be made to avoid the insolvency and consequent benefit suspensions. Plan participants and beneficiaries use the information in personal financial decisions.

The PBGC estimates that 9 plan sponsors give notices each year under this regulation. The estimated annual burden of the collection of information is 1 hour and \$7,633.

**11. Duties of Plan Sponsor Following Mass Withdrawal (29 CFR Part 4281) (OMB Control Number 1212-0032)**

Section 4281 of ERISA provides rules for plans that have terminated by mass withdrawal. Under section 4281, if nonforfeitable benefits exceed plan assets, the plan sponsor must amend the plan to reduce benefits. If the plan nevertheless becomes insolvent, the plan sponsor must suspend certain benefits that cannot be paid. If available resources are inadequate to pay guaranteed benefits, the plan sponsor must request financial assistance from the PBGC.

The regulation requires a plan sponsor to give notices of benefit reduction, notices of insolvency and annual updates, and notices of insolvency benefit level to the PBGC and to participants and beneficiaries and, if necessary, to apply to the PBGC for financial assistance.

The PBGC uses the information it receives to make determinations required by ERISA, to identify and estimate the cash needed for financial assistance to terminated plans, and to verify the appropriateness of financial assistance payments. Plan participants and beneficiaries use the information to make personal financial decisions.

This collection of information is being revised to exclude certain items that were previously covered under OMB control number 1212-0032 but that were moved into Part 4041A when the PBGC reorganized its regulations in 1996. As revised, control number 1212-0032 will cover only collection of information requirements in Part 4281.

The PBGC estimates that plan sponsors each year (1) give benefit reduction notices for 1 plan, (2) give notices of insolvency for 2 plans, (3) give notices of insolvency benefit level and annual updates for 23 plans, and (4) submit requests for financial assistance for 18 plans. The estimated annual burden of the collection of information is 1 hour and \$66,900.

Issued in Washington, DC, this 18th day of June 1998.

**Stuart A. Sirkin,**

*Director, Corporate Policy and Research  
Department, Pension Benefit Guaranty  
Corporation.*

[FR Doc. 98-16679 Filed 6-22-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7708-01-P

## POSTAL RATE COMMISSION

### Facility Visit

**AGENCY:** Postal Rate Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice of visit.

**SUMMARY:** Arrangements have been made for members of the Commission and certain advisory staff members to visit the World Headquarters and Technology Center of Pitney Bowes in Stamford, Connecticut. The purpose is to gain a better understanding of new and evolving technologies and their potential impact on the nature of the mailstream and postal operations. Information obtained during the visit will assist Commissioners and staff in the execution of their duties.

**DATES:** The tour is scheduled for Monday, July 20, 1998.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Steven L. Sharfman, General Counsel, (202) 789-6820.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** A report of the visit will be filed in the Commission's Docket Room.

(Authority: 39 U.S.C. 404(b), 3603, 3622-3624, 3661, 3662)

Dated: June 17, 1998.

**Margaret P. Crenshaw,**

*Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 98-16611 Filed 6-22-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7710-FW-M

## UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE BOARD OF GOVERNORS

### Sunshine Act Meeting

**TIMES AND DATES:** 1:00 p.m., Monday, June 29, 1998; 8:30 a.m., Tuesday, June 30, 1998.

**PLACE:** Washington, D.C., at U.S. Postal Service Headquarters, 475 L'Enfant

Plaza, S.W., in the Benjamin Franklin Room.

**STATUS:** June 29 (Closed); June 30 (Open).

### MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED:

Monday, June 29—1:00 p.m. (Closed)

1. Postal Rate Commission Opinion and Recommended Decision in Docket No. R97-1.
2. Post Office Online.
3. Compensation Issues.

Tuesday, June 30—8:30 a.m. (Open)

1. Minutes of the Previous Meeting, June 1-2, 1998.
2. Remarks of the Postmaster General/Chief Executive Officer.
3. Consideration of Board Resolution on Audit Committee Charter.
4. Capital Investments.
  - a. Delivery Operations Information System (DOIS)—R&D.
  - b. 546 Delivery Bar Code Sorter (DBCS) Output Subsystem Kits.
5. Tentative Agenda for the August 3-4, 1998, meeting in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

**CONTACT PERSON FOR MORE INFORMATION:** Thomas J. Koerber, Secretary of the Board, U.S. Postal Service, 475 L'Enfant Plaza, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20260-1000. Telephone (202) 268-4800.

**Thomas J. Koerber,**

*Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 98-16722 Filed 6-18-98; 4:19 pm]

BILLING CODE 7710-12-M

## SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34-40096; File No. SR-CBOE-98-13]

### Self-Regulatory Organizations; Order Granting Accelerated Approval of Proposed Rule Change By the Chicago Board Options Exchange, Inc. Relating to the Automatic Execution of Small Retail Orders in Equity Options

June 16, 1998.

#### I. Introduction

On April 6, 1998, the Chicago Board Options Exchange, Inc. ("CBOE" or "Exchange") submitted to the Securities and Exchange Commission ("SEC" or "Commission"), pursuant to Section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 ("Act")<sup>1</sup> and Rule 19b-4 thereunder,<sup>2</sup> a proposed rule change to amend Interpretation and Policy .02 under CBOE Rule 6.8 governing the operations of the Exchange's Retail

Automatic Execution System ("RAES"). On May 13, 1998, the CBOE filed with the Commission Amendment No. 1 to the proposed rule change.<sup>3</sup> The proposed rule change, as amended, was published for comment in the **Federal Register** on May 21, 1998.<sup>4</sup> The Commission received no comments regarding the proposal. This order approves the proposal, as amended, on an accelerated basis.

#### II. Description of the Proposal

Presently, under CBOE Rule 6.8(a)(ii), the execution price automatically attached to an equity option order executed in RAES is the prevailing market quote on the CBOE at the time the order is entered into the system. If at that same time another market is displaying a better quote for the option, under CBOE Rules the order is not automatically executed, but instead, pursuant to Interpretation and Policy .02 under CBOE Rule 6.8, is rerouted for non-automated handling. In most cases, especially where the market away from the CBOE is better by only one "tick" (i.e., by one minimum quote interval), the order is usually manually executed on the CBOE at the better price.

The CBOE now proposes to amend Interpretation and Policy .02 to automate the process of filling equity option orders through RAES at any better price being quoted in another market, so long as the price is better by no more than one tick ("RAES Auto-Step-Up"). If the market away from the CBOE is better than the CBOE's quoted market by more than one tick, the existing procedure will continue to apply whereby the order is rerouted out of RAES to the Designated Primary Market Maker or Order Book Official for non-automated handling.

While the Exchange expects that eventually the Floor Procedure Committees will determine to apply the RAES Auto-Step-Up to all or nearly all option classes traded on the floor, the proposed rule change would permit the program to be initiated on a class by class or trading station by trading station basis.<sup>5</sup> To provide for the orderly introduction of this change to the Exchange's RAES procedures and to measure its effect before expanding it to equity options floor-wide, the Exchange intends to introduce the changed RAES procedure to selected classes of equity

<sup>3</sup> See Letter from Timothy Thompson, Director, Regulatory Affairs, Legal Department, CBOE, to Ken Rosen, Attorney, Division of Market Regulation, Commission, dated May 11, 1998 ("Amendment No. 1").

<sup>4</sup> Securities Exchange Act Release No. 39992 (May 14, 1998), 63 FR 28019.

<sup>5</sup> See Amendment No. 1.

<sup>1</sup> 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1).

<sup>2</sup> 17 CFR 240.19b-4.