

scenario to reflect the permanently shut down and defueled condition of the BRP facility.

The most recent NRC Systematic Assessment of Licensee Performance (SALP 13, Report No. 50-155/96001) for BRP, issued on December 6, 1996, for the period May 1, 1994, through November 25, 1995, indicated that the performance of the emergency preparedness program was good. NRC Inspection Report No. 50-155/95010 documented NRC staff inspection of the onsite portion of the August 1995 exercise and concluded that, overall, there was acceptable performance with no violations of NRC requirements identified. Additionally, NRC Inspection Report No. 50-155/97003, dated May 13, 1997, evaluated the onsite portions of the BRP emergency preparedness program and concluded that the overall effectiveness of emergency preparedness facilities, equipment, training, and organization was very good and that the licensee had conservatively implemented the emergency plan in declaring three separate Unusual Events in 1996. Therefore, there is reasonable assurance that onsite plans, facilities, and personnel are adequate and in place to respond to a radiological emergency at BRP.

In the permanently shut down and defueled condition, BRP is no longer susceptible to any of the operating type of reactor accidents and events, as described in Chapter 15 of the BRP Final Hazards Summary Report. Further, by letters dated February 27, 1995, and August 5, September 4 and 19, and November 12 and 20, 1997, the licensee provided credible analysis of accidents and events that could possibly occur during BRP decommissioning. These accidents and events included, in part, those described in NUREG-0586, "Final Generic Environmental Impact Statement on decommissioning nuclear facilities," and NUREG/CR-0672, "Technology, Safety, and Costs of Decommissioning Reference Boiling Water Reactor Power Station." Consumers also evaluated (1) a release of gap radioactive isotopes from all spent fuel, (2) gamma shine resulting from a complete draindown of the spent fuel pool, and (3) an airborne release of radioactive isotopes from primary system chemical decontamination. Further, Consumers stated that they will not perform any decommissioning activities that result in significant environmental impacts not previously reviewed (10 CFR 50.82(a)(6)(ii)). The licensee has also provided reasonable assurance that the environmental impacts associated with the

decommissioning of the BRP facility are bounded by appropriate previously issued environmental impact statements and that the above-mentioned accidents and events would not result in offsite doses exceeding EPA PAGs.

Based upon the aforementioned NRC and FEMA findings regarding onsite and offsite preparedness, respectively, the exemption will not present an undue risk to public health and safety. Additionally, the schedule for future exercises will not be affected by this exemption. The NRC staff is still reviewing licensee request for exemption from certain 10 CFR Part 50 requirements for emergency planning (Consumers' letter to the Commission dated September 19, 1997). Therefore, the licensee is still required to comply with all NRC rules and regulations and their current emergency plan, as approved or until revised by subsequent Commission action.

IV

The NRC staff has completed its review of the licensee's request for schedular exemption from the requirement to conduct an offsite emergency preparedness exercise in calendar year 1997 and FEMA's letter dated December 17, 1997, stating FEMA's determination that the offsite radiological emergency plans and preparedness of the State and local offsite emergency preparedness staffs are adequate and that there is reasonable assurance that protective measures can be implemented following a radiological emergency at the BRP facility. Based on this review, the NRC staff finds that the underlying purposes of the regulation will not be adversely affected by delaying the 1997 offsite emergency preparedness exercise for a period not to exceed 90 days commencing on January 1, 1998. Thus, an offsite exercise in calendar year 1997 is not necessary to achieve the underlying purpose of the rule and the requested exemption, as modified herein, will not adversely affect the overall state of emergency preparedness at the BRP site.

For these reasons, the Commission has determined that, pursuant to 10 CFR 50.12, a 90-day schedular exemption commencing on January 1, 1998, as discussed above, is authorized by law, will not present undue risk to public health and safety, and is consistent with the common defense and security. Further, special circumstances are present as set forth in 10 CFR 50.12(a)(2)(ii) and (v).

Pursuant to 10 CFR 51.32, the Commission has determined that granting this exemption will have no

significant impact on the environment (62 FR 67667).

This Exemption is effective upon issuance.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 30th day of December 1997.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Samuel J. Collins,

Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 98-193 Filed 1-5-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

The National Partnership Council; Meeting

Time and Date: 1:00 p.m., January 14, 1998.

Place: OPM Conference Center, Room 1350, Theodore Roosevelt Building, 1900 E Street, NW., Washington, DC 20415-0001. The conference center is located on the first floor.

Status: This meeting will be open to the public. Seating will be available on a first-come, first-served basis. Individuals with special access needs wishing to attend should contact OPM at the number shown below to obtain appropriate accommodations.

Matters To Be Considered: The National Partnership Council will complete its discussion of and adopt the 1997 Report to the President on the Progress of Labor-Management Partnerships. Professor Marick F. Masters of the Joseph M. Katz Graduate School of Business, University of Pittsburgh, and Professor Robert R. Albright of the U.S. Coast Guard Academy will present the findings of the Council's 1997 Federal Sector Labor Relations Climate Survey. The Council will be briefed on Reinvention Impact Centers (RICs), an initiative of the National Performance Review.

Contact Person for More Information:

Rose M. Gwin, Director, Center for Partnership and Labor-Management Relations, Office of Personnel Management, Theodore Roosevelt Building, 1900 E Street, NW., Room 7H28, Washington, DC 20415-0001, (202) 606-2930.

Supplementary Information: We invite interested persons and organizations to submit written comments. Mail or deliver your comments to Rose M. Gwin at the address shown above.

Office of Personnel Management.

Janice R. Lachance,

Director.

[FR Doc. 98-218 Filed 1-5-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6325-01-P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Proposed Collection; Comment Request

Upon Written Request, Copies Available From: Securities and Exchange Commission, Office of Filings and Information Services, Washington, DC 20549.

Extension:

Rule 206(3)-2

SEC File No. 270-216

OMB Control No. 3235-0243.

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") is publishing the following summary of collections for public comment.

Rule 206(3)-2 permits investment advisers to comply with section 206(3) of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 by obtaining a blanket consent from a client to enter into agency cross transactions, provided that certain disclosures are made to the client. The information requirements of the rule consist of the following: (1) Prior to obtaining the client's consent appropriate disclosure must be made to the client as to the practice of, and the conflicts of interest involved in, agency cross transactions; (2) at or before the completion of any such transaction the client must be furnished with a written confirmation containing specified information and offering to furnish upon request certain additional information; and (3) at least annually, the client must be furnished with a written statement or summary as to the total number of transactions during the period covered by the consent and the total amount of commissions received by the adviser or its affiliated broker-dealer attributable to such transactions.

The information required by rule 206(3)-2 is used by the Commission in connection with its investment adviser inspection program to ensure that advisers are in compliance with rule 206(3)-2. The information is also used by clients. Without the information collected under the rule, the Commission would be less efficient and effective in its inspection program and clients would not have information valuable for monitoring the adviser's handling of their accounts.

The Commission estimates that approximately 233 respondents utilize the rule annually, necessitating about 122 responses per respondent each year, for a total of 28,426 responses. Each response requires about .5 hours, for a total of 14,213 hours.

The estimated average burden hours are made solely for the purposes of the Paperwork Reduction Act and are not derived from a comprehensive or even representative survey or study of the cost of Commission rules and forms.

Written comments are invited on: (a) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology. Consideration will be given to comments and suggestions submitted in writing within 60 days of this publication.

Direct your written comments to Michael E. Bartell, Associate Executive Director, Office of Information Technology, Securities and Exchange Commission, 450 5th Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20549.

Dated: December 23, 1997.

Margaret H. McFarland,

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 98-160 Filed 1-5-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8010-01-M

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Proposed Collection; Comment Request

Upon Written Request, Copies Available From: Securities and Exchange Commission Office of Filings and Information Services Washington, DC 20549.

Rule 11Aa3-2

OMB Control No. 3235-new

SEC File No. 270-439

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") is soliciting comments on the collection of information summarized below. The Commission plans to submit this existing collection of information to the Office of Management and Budget for approval.

- Rule 11Aa3-2 Filing and Amendment of National Market System Plans

Rule 11Aa3-2 provides that self-regulatory organizations ("SROs") may, acting jointly, file a national market system plan or may propose an amendment to an effective national market system plan by submitting the text of the plan or amendment to the Secretary of the Commission, together with a statement of the purpose of such plan or amendment and, to the extent applicable, the documents and information required by Rule 11Aa3-2(b)(4) and (5). These record keeping requirements assist the Commission with monitoring SROs, national market system plans, and ensuring compliance with the rule.

There are nine SROs which are members of the Intermarket Trading System ("ITS"), the Consolidated Tape Association ("CTA"), the Consolidated Quote System ("CQS"), the Nasdaq Stock Market, Inc., ("Nasdaq"), or the Options Price Reporting Association ("OPRA"). Only ITS, CTA, CQS, Nasdaq, or OPRA submit filings pursuant to Rule 11Aa3-2 and only after an agreement is reached among member SROs. The staff estimates that there will be approximately six filings pursuant to Rule 11Aa3-2 each year. The staff also estimates that the average number of hours necessary for compliance with the Rule 11Aa3-2 is 33 annually. The total burden is approximately 200 hours annually, based upon past submissions. The average cost per hour is approximately \$50. Therefore, the total cost of compliance for SROs is \$10,000.

Written comments are invited on: (a) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimates of the burden of the proposed collection of information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology. Consideration will be given to comments and suggestions submitted in writing within 60 days of this publication.

Please direct your written comments to Michael E. Bartell, Associate Executive Director, Office of Information Technology, Securities and Exchange Commission, 450 5th Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20549.