

Contact Person: Dr. Bernard R. McDonald, Executive Officer for Mathematical Sciences Division, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, VA 22230. Telephone: (703) 306-1872.

Purpose of Meeting: To carry out Committee of Visitors (COV) review, including program evaluation, GPRA assessments, and access to privileged materials.

Agenda: To provide oversight review of the Mathematical Sciences Programs.

Reason for Closing: The meeting is closed to the public because the Committee is reviewing proposal 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.

Reason for Late Notice: Meeting Announcement was inadvertently misplaced.

Dated: January 16, 1998.

M. Rebecca Winkler,

Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 98-1564 Filed 1-22-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555-01-M

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Special Emphasis Panel in Mathematical Sciences; Notice of Meeting

In accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92-463, as amended), the National Science Foundation announces the following meeting.

Name: Special Emphasis Panel in Mathematical Sciences (1204).

Date and Time: February 12-14, 1998.

Place: Room 1020, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, VA 22230.

Type of Meeting: Closed.

Contact Person: John Strikwerda, Computational Mathematics Program, Program Officer, Room 1025, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, VA 22230. Telephone: (703) 306-1870.

Purpose of Meeting: To provide advice and recommendations concerning applications submitted to NSF for financial support.

Agenda: To review and evaluate proposals in the mathematics of fluids as part of the selection process for awards.

Reason for Closing: The proposals being reviewed include information of a proprietary or confidential nature, including technical information; financial data, such as salaries and personal information concerning individuals associated with the proposals. These matters are exempt under 5 U.S.C. 552b(c) (4) and (6) of the Government in the Sunshine Act.

Dated: January 16, 1998.

M. Rebecca Winkler,

Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 98-1570 Filed 1-22-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555-01-M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50-269, 50-270, and 50-287]

Oconee Nuclear Station, Units 1, 2, and 3; Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating License, Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity for a Hearing

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of amendments to Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-38, DPR-47, and DPR-55 issued to Duke Energy Corporation (the licensee) for operation of the Oconee Nuclear Station, Units 1, 2, and 3, located Oconee County, South Carolina.

The proposed amendments would revise Technical Specification (TS) Table 4.1-1 and Specification 4.5.2.1.2 to allow a one-time extension for specified Unit 2 refueling outage surveillances during operating cycle 16.

Before issuance of the proposed license amendments, the Commission will have made findings required by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act) and the Commission's regulations.

The Commission has made a proposed determination that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration. Under the Commission's regulations in 10 CFR 50.92, this means that operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendments would not (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; or (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

This proposed change has been evaluated against the standards in 10 CFR 50.92 and has been determined to involve no significant hazards, in that operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not:

1. Involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated?

No. A review of the previous two instrument channel tests and calibrations for

the instruments discussed in the amendment request concluded that no adverse affects should occur as a result of the one-time extension. The ICCM [Inadequate Core Cooling Monitor] should be available to perform its intended function during the requested extension period. Thus, the probability and consequences of an accident previously evaluated will not be significant[ly] increased.

In addition, a review of the previous ES channel 5 and 6 manual trip test and Reactor Building Cooling system test that are discussed in the amendment request concluded that no adverse affects should occur as a result of the one-time extension. ES channels 5 and 6 and the Reactor Building Cooling system should be available to perform their intended function during the requested extension period. Thus, the probability and consequences of an accident previously evaluated will not be significantly increased.

2. Create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from the accidents previously evaluated?

No. Since the one-time extension should not cause any adverse effects on the ICCM, ES channels 5 and 6, or Reactor Building Spray system, a new or different kind of accident from the accidents which were previously evaluated will not occur. The ICCM, ES channels 5 and 6, and Reactor Building Cooling system, should be available to perform their intended function during the requested extension period.

3. Involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety?

No. The margin of safety will not be significantly reduced by this amendment request because the ICCM, ES channels 5 and 6, and Reactor Building Cooling system, should be available to perform their intended function during the requested extension period. In addition, the review of the previous tests and calibrations which are discussed in the amendment request concluded that no adverse affects should occur as a result of the one-time extension.

Duke has concluded based on the above information that there are no significant hazards involved in this amendment request.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

The Commission is seeking public comments on this proposed determination. Any comments received within 30 days after the date of publication of this notice will be considered in making any final determination.

Normally, the Commission will not issue the amendment until the expiration of the 30-day notice period. However, should circumstances change during the notice period such that failure to act in a timely way would

result, for example, in derating or shutdown of the facility, the Commission may issue the license amendment before the expiration of the 30-day notice period, provided that its final determination is that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration. The final determination will consider all public and State comments received. Should the Commission take this action, it will publish in the **Federal Register** a notice of issuance and provide for opportunity for a hearing after issuance. The Commission expects that the need to take this action will occur very infrequently.

Written comments may be submitted by mail to the Chief, Rules and Directives Branch, Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, and should cite the publication date and page number of this **Federal Register** notice. Written comments may also be delivered to Room 6D22, Two White Flint North, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland, from 7:30 a.m. to 4:15 p.m. Federal workdays. Copies of written comments received may be examined at the NRC Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC.

The filing of requests for hearing and petitions for leave to intervene is discussed below.

By February 23, 1998, the licensee may file a request for a hearing with respect to issuance of the amendment to the subject facility operating license and any person whose interest may be affected by this proceeding and who wishes to participate as a party in the proceeding must file a written request for a hearing and a petition for leave to intervene. Requests for a hearing and a petition for leave to intervene shall be filed in accordance with the Commission's "Rules of Practice for Domestic Licensing Proceedings" in 10 CFR Part 2. Interested persons should consult a current copy of 10 CFR 2.714 which is available 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 Oconee County Library, 501 West South Broad Street, Walhalla, South Carolina. If a request for a hearing or petition for leave to intervene is filed by the above date, the Commission or an Atomic Safety and Licensing Board, designated by the Commission or by the Chairman of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, will rule on the request and/or petition; and the Secretary or the designated Atomic Safety and Licensing

Board will issue a notice of hearing or an appropriate order.

As required by 10 CFR 2.714, a petition for leave to intervene shall set forth with particularity the interest of the petitioner in the proceeding, and how that interest may be affected by the results of the proceeding. The petition should specifically explain the reasons why intervention should be permitted with particular reference to the following factors: (1) the nature of the petitioner's right under the Act to be made party to the proceeding; (2) the nature and extent of the petitioner's property, financial, or other interest in the proceeding; and (3) the possible effect of any order which may be entered in the proceeding on the petitioner's interest. The petition should also identify the specific aspect(s) of the subject matter of the proceeding as to which petitioner wishes to intervene. Any person who has filed a petition for leave to intervene or who has been admitted as a party may amend the petition without requesting leave of the Board up to 15 days prior to the first prehearing conference scheduled in the proceeding, but such an amended petition must satisfy the specificity requirements described above.

Not later than 15 days prior to the first prehearing conference scheduled in the proceeding, a petitioner shall file a supplement to the petition to intervene which must include a list of the contentions which are sought to be litigated in the matter. Each contention must consist of a specific statement of the issue of law or fact to be raised or controverted. In addition, the petitioner shall provide a brief explanation of the bases of the contention and a concise statement of the alleged facts or expert opinion which support the contention and on which the petitioner intends to rely in proving the contention at the hearing. The petitioner must also provide references to those specific sources and documents of which the petitioner is aware and on which the petitioner intends to rely to establish those facts or expert opinion. Petitioner must provide sufficient information to show that a genuine dispute exists with the applicant on a material issue of law or fact. Contentions shall be limited to matters within the scope of the amendment under consideration. The contention must be one which, if proven, would entitle the petitioner to relief. A petitioner who fails to file such a supplement which satisfies these requirements with respect to at least one contention will not be permitted to participate as a party.

Those permitted to intervene become parties to the proceeding, subject to any

limitations in the order granting leave to intervene, and have the opportunity to participate fully in the conduct of the hearing, including the opportunity to present evidence and cross-examine witnesses.

If a hearing is requested, the Commission will make a final determination on the issue of no significant hazards consideration. The final determination will serve to decide when the hearing is held.

If the final determination is that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration, the Commission may issue the amendment and make it immediately effective, notwithstanding the request for a hearing. Any hearing held would take place after issuance of the amendment.

If the final determination is that the amendment request involves a significant hazards consideration, any hearing held would take place before the issuance of any amendment.

A request for a hearing or a petition for leave to intervene must be filed with the Secretary of the Commission, 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. A copy of the petition should also be sent to the Office of the General Counsel, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, and to J. Michael McGarry, III, Winston and Strawn, 1200 17th Street, NW., Washington, DC 20036, attorney for the licensee.

Nontimely filings of petitions for leave to intervene, amended petitions, supplemental petitions and/or requests for hearing will not be entertained absent a determination by the Commission, the presiding officer or the presiding Atomic Safety and Licensing Board that the petition and/or request should be granted based upon a balancing of the factors specified in 10 CFR 2.714(a)(1)(i)-(v) and 2.714(d).

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendments dated January 15, 1998, which is 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 Oconee County Library, 501 West South Broad Street, Walhalla, South Carolina.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 20th day of January 1998.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

David E. LaBarge,

Senior Project Manager, Project Directorate II-2, Division of Reactor Projects—I/II, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 98-1752 Filed 1-22-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

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 meeting during the week of January 26, 1998.

A closed meeting will be held on Thursday, January 29, 1998, at 10:00 a.m.

Commissioners, Counsel to the Commissioners, the Secretary to the Commission, and recording secretaries will attend the closed meeting. Certain staff members who have an interest in the matters may also be present.

The General Counsel of the Commission, or his designee, has certified that, in his opinion, one or more of the exemptions set forth in 5 U.S.C. 552(b)(4), (8), (9)(A) and (10) and 17 CFR 200.402(a)(4), (8), (9)(i) and (10), permit consideration of the scheduled matters at the closed meeting.

Commissioner Johnson, as duty officer, voted to consider the items listed for the closed meeting in a closed session.

The subject matter of the closed meeting scheduled for Thursday, January 29, 1998, at 10:00 a.m., will be:

Institution and settlement of injunctive actions.

Institution and settlement of administrative proceedings of an enforcement nature.

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: January 21, 1998.

Jonathan G. Katz,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 98-1852 Filed 1-21-98; 3:40 pm]

BILLING CODE 8010-01-M

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34-39555; File No. SR-NASD-97-98]

Self-Regulatory Organizations; Notice of Filing and Immediate Effectiveness of Proposed Rule Change by the National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc. Relating to SelectNet Fees

January 15, 1998.

Pursuant to Section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 ("Act"),¹ notice is hereby given that on December 31, 1997, the National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc. ("NASD" or "Association") through its wholly owned subsidiary, the Nasdaq Stock Market, Inc. ("Nasdaq") 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 NASD. 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

Pursuant to Rule 19b-4 under the Act Nasdaq is herewith filing a proposed extension of the temporary 50% fee reduction currently charged under NASD Rule 7010(1) for the execution of a transaction in SelectNet.

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 NASD included statements concerning the purpose of and basis for the proposed rule change.

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

Nasdaq is proposing to extend the temporary 50% fee abatement currently charged under NASD Rule 7010(1) for the execution of a transaction in SelectNet. This proposed extension continues the current SelectNet fee reduction from \$2.50 per side to \$1.25 per side and is effective January 1, 1998, through March 31, 1998. The proposed extension constitutes only a temporary abatement in the fee Nasdaq collects and, if no further action is taken, SelectNet fees will revert to the \$2.50 per side level on April, 1998.

¹ 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1).

The reasons justifying a SelectNet fee reduction are contained in Nasdaq's original rule filing in October of 1997 seeking a 50% abatement for the period of October 1, 1997, through December 31, 1997.² SelectNet usage has continued to grow with more than 107,000 transactions in October of 1997 and over 79,000 transactions in November of 1997. Nasdaq believes that while the level of SelectNet activity supports a continuation of lower SelectNet fees, the volatility of current SelectNet usage levels militates in favor of the maintenance of the fee reduction on a temporary basis.

Nasdaq believes that the proposed extension of the fee reduction is consistent with Section 15A(b)(5) of the Act, which requires that the rules of the NASD provide for the equitable allocation of reasonable dues, fees and other charges among members and issuers and other persons using any facility or system which the NASD operates or controls.

B. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement on Burden on Competition

The NASD believes that the proposed rule change will not result in any burden on competition that is not necessary or appropriate in furtherance of the purposes of the Act.

C. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement on Comments on the Proposed Rule Change Received From Members, Participants, or Others

Comments were neither solicited nor received.

III. Date of Effectiveness of the Proposed Rule Change and Timing for Commission Action

This filing applies to the assessment of SelectNet fees to NASD members, and thus the proposed rule change is effective immediately upon filing pursuant to Section 19(b)(3)(A)(ii)³ of the Act and subparagraph (e)(2) of Rule 19b-4 under the Act⁴ because the proposal is establishing or changing a due, fee or other charge.

At any time within 60 days of the filing of the proposed rule change, the Commission may summarily abrogate such rule change if it appears to the Commission that such action is necessary or appropriate in the public interest, for the protection of investors, or otherwise in furtherance of the purposes of the Act.

² See Securities Exchange Act Release No. 39248 (October 16, 1997), 62 FR 55296 (October 23, 1997).

³ 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(3)(A)(ii).

⁴ 17 CFR 240.19b-4(e)(2).