

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, the NRC staff consulted with the New York State official 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 March 9, 1995, 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 Reference and Documents Department, Penfield Library, State University of New York, Oswego, New York 13126.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 29th day of March 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Ledyard B. Marsh,

Director, Project Directorate I-1, Division of Reactor Projects—I/II, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 95-8312 Filed 4-4-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

[Docket No. 50-245]

Northeast Nuclear Energy Company; Notice of Withdrawal of Application for Amendment to Facility Operating License

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has granted the request of Northeast Nuclear Energy Company (the licensee) to withdraw its June 23, 1994, application for proposed amendment to Facility Operating License No. DPR-21 for Millstone Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1, located in New London County, Connecticut.

The proposed amendment would have reworded Technical Specification 3.7, "Containment Systems," to permit operation with one of the two circuits of the reactor building ventilation logic temporarily inoperable. In addition, Section 3.7.C.1.b would have been reworded to prohibit movement of irradiated fuel, or movement of any loads over irradiated fuel, without secondary containment integrity.

The Commission had previously issued a Notice of Consideration of

Issuance of Amendment published in the **Federal Register** on August 31, 1994 (59 FR 45029). However, by letter dated March 15, 1995, the licensee withdrew the proposed change.

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendment dated June 23, 1994, and the licensee's letter dated March 15, 1995, which withdrew the application for license amendment. The above documents 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 Learning Resource Center, Three Rivers Community-Technical College, Thames Valley Campus, 574 New London Turnpike, Norwich, CT 06360.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 27th day of March 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

James W. Andersen,

Project Manager, Project Directorate I-4 Division of Reactor Projects—I/II Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 95-8309 Filed 4-4-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34-35547; File No. SR-CHX-95-08]

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

March 29, 1995.

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 2, 1995, the Chicago Stock Exchange, Incorporated ("CHX" or "Exchange") filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission ("Commission") the proposed rule change 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 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 Exchange proposes to amend Article XX, Rule 37 to add a new subsection (d) thereunder. The text of

the proposed rule change is as follows [new text is italicized]:

Article XX

Rule 37(d) *Notwithstanding anything herein to the contrary, a specialist may voluntarily provide order execution guarantees more favorable than those required pursuant to this Rule 37 (i.e., greater size, better price, limitations on partial executions, etc.). At the request of a specialist, the Exchange may provide for automatic execution of orders in accordance with such guarantees upon such terms and conditions as the Exchange shall determine. In either event, failure of a specialist to honor a promised guarantee shall be deemed a violation of Exchange rules.*

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 self-regulatory organization 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 self-regulatory organization 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, the Proposed Rule Change

1. Purpose

The purpose of the proposed rule change is to give specialists on the Exchange the ability to provide order execution guarantees that are more favorable than those required under the BEST Rule¹ through the Exchange's automated execution system ("MAX").²

¹ See *Chicago Stock Exchange Guide*, Article XX, Rule 37(a). (CCH) ¶ 1714.

² The Exchange has indicated to the Commission that this proposed rule change will have the effect of an "enabling rule" whereby specialists may provide better guarantees than currently is required under the Rules through the Exchange's Midwest Automated Execution System ("MAX"). The Exchange expects modifications to the parameters of the automated execution system to be on a per stock basis and the specific execution programs that are necessary to implement these guarantees will be filed in the future under Section 19(b)(3)(A). Telephone conversation with Craig Long and David Rusoff, Foley & Lardner, and Julio Mojica, Susan Lee, and Jennifer Choi, SEC, on March 10, 1995. The Exchange has indicated that the number of parameters for the automated executions will be limited. The Exchange anticipates that the options would include: a system allowing thirty-second order exposure, the automated execution system within MAX in which a Specialist may voluntarily choose to participate on a stock by stock basis ("SuperMAX"), and the enhanced version of SuperMAX ("Enhanced SuperMAX"), which is

Continued