

and thus to ensure the reliability of, the OCNCS reactor vessel internal components.

Based on the above, the staff has concluded that suspension of the Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station operating license due to embrittlement and cracking of the reactor vessel internal components is not warranted. As stated previously, continued monitoring of reactor vessel internals as required by the ASME Code and the licensee's inservice inspection program will provide assurance that degradation of components will be detected and appropriate action will be taken.

*B. Petitioners request that the NRC suspend the OCNCS operating license until the Licensee provides an analysis regarding the synergistic effects of through-wall cracking of multiple safety-class components.* The majority of reactor internals are fabricated from high-toughness materials such as stainless steel and were designed with significant margins on allowable stresses. As such, cracking must be severe to adversely impact plant safety. It is unlikely that licensee inspections would not find such severe degradation. In fact, identification and sizing of the cracks in the H4 location on the OCNCS core shroud are good examples of the effectiveness of the inspections. In addition, NRC staff evaluation of the results from internals inspections performed to date at OCNCS resulted in the conclusion that ASME Code safety margins have been maintained.

The Licensee has not provided an analysis to NRC that addresses the synergistic effects of cracking in multiple safety-class components. The NRC staff does not consider the lack of such an analysis to be a safety concern because of the inspection requirements that pertain to reactor internals and the results of inspections performed to date. See Section III.A, *supra*.

Continued monitoring of reactor vessel internals as required by the ASME Code and the licensee's inservice inspection program will provide information about the structural integrity of reactor vessel internals in the long term. The NRC has asked the BWR Vessel Internals Project (BWRVIP), an industry group, to develop an assessment to address cracking in BWR reactor vessel internals. A report from the BWRVIP is expected on the long term effects of reactor vessel internals cracking in late 1995. In addition, the NRC has undertaken a longer term evaluation of the effects of cracking in multiple reactor vessel internal components that will be approached with appropriate treatment of the key variables (safety function, material

susceptibility, loading, environment, etc.).

Based on the above, the staff has concluded that suspension of the Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station license, due to the lack of an analysis of the synergistic effects of through-wall cracking of safety-class reactor internal components, is not warranted.

#### IV. Conclusion

The Petitioners requested that the NRC suspend the operating license of Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station until: (1) the Licensee inspects, repairs, or replaces, all safety-class reactor internal components subject to embrittlement and cracking, and (2) the Licensee provides an analysis regarding the synergistic effects of through-wall cracking of multiple safety-class components. For the reasons discussed above, I conclude that the issues raised by the Petitioners are being adequately addressed and that there is no basis for suspending the OCNCS operating license or taking the other requested action. Accordingly, the Petitioners' above-referenced requests are denied.

A copy of this Partial Director's Decision will be filed with the Secretary of the Commission for review as stated in 10 CFR 2.206(c). This Decision will become the final action of the Commission 25 days after issuance unless the Commission, on its own motion, institutes review of the Decision within that time.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 4th day of August 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.  
**William T. Russell,**  
*Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*  
[FR Doc. 95-19766 Filed 8-9-95; 8:45 am]  
BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

[Docket Nos. 50-280 and 50-281]

#### Virginia Electric and Power Co.; Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating License

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (Commission) has issued Amendment Nos. 203 and 203 to Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-32 and DPR-37 issued to Virginia Electric and Power Company, which revised the License and the Technical Specifications for operation of the Surry Power Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2 located in Surry County, Virginia. The amendments are effective as of the date of issuance.

The amendments modified the Licenses and the Technical Specifications to increase the authorized

core power level for Surry, Units 1 and 2, from 2441 MWt to 2546 MWt.

The application for the amendments complies with the standards and requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), and the Commission's rules and regulations. The Commission has made appropriate findings as required by the Act and the Commission's rules and regulations in 10 CFR Chapter I, which are set forth in the license amendment.

Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment and Opportunity for Hearing in connection with this action was published in the **Federal Register** on December 16, 1994 (59 FR 65085). No request for a hearing or petition for leave to intervene was filed following this notice.

The Commission has prepared an Environmental Assessment related to the action and has determined not to prepare an environmental impact statement.

Based upon the environmental assessment, the Commission has concluded that the issuance of the amendment will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment (60 FR 32356).

For further details with respect to the action see (1) the application for amendment dated August 30, 1994, and supplemented February 6, February 13, February 27, March 23, March 28, April 13, April 20, April 28, May 5, and June 8, 1995, (2) Amendment Nos. 203 and 203 to License Nos. DPR-32 and DPR-37, (3) the Commission's related Safety Evaluation, and (4) the Commission's Environmental Assessment. All of these items 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 Swen Library, College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia 23185.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 3rd day of August 1995.

For The Nuclear Regulatory Commission.  
**Bart C. Buckley,**  
*Senior Project Manager, Project Directorate II-1, Division of Reactor Projects, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*  
[FR Doc. 95-19767 Filed 8-9-95; 8:45 am]  
BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

#### SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

#### Requests Under Review by Office of Management and Budget

Agency Clearance Officer: Michael E.  
Bartell (202) 942-8800

Upon written request copy available from: Securities and Exchange Commission, Office of Filings and Information Services, Washington, D.C. 20549

**Extensions:**

Form 144, File No. 270-112  
Regulations S, File No. 270-315

Notice is hereby given pursuant to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980 (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*), that the Securities and Exchange Commission ("Commission") has submitted for OMB approval extension of the following currently approved form and regulation:

Form 144 provides notice of a proposed sale of securities pursuant to Rule 144 under the Securities Act of 1933. It is estimated that 31,136 respondents would incur 62,672 burden hours annually to comply with Form 144.

Regulation S contains rules governing the offer and sale of securities made outside of the United States without registration under the Securities Act of 1933. Regulation S does not directly impose burden hours on filers (the burden hours are reflected in submissions for forms that refer to the disclosure requirements in Regulation S) and therefore is assigned one burden hour for administrative convenience.

General comments regarding the estimated burden hours should be directed to the OMB Clearance Officer at the address below. Any comments concerning the accuracy of the estimated average burden hours for compliance with Commission rules and forms should be directed to Michael E. Bartell, Securities and Exchange Commission, 450 Fifth Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20549 and Clearance Officer, Project Numbers 3235-0101 (Form 144) and 3235-0357 (Regulation S), Office of Management and Budget, Room 3208, New Executive Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20503.

Dated: July 31, 1995.

**Jonathan G. Katz,**

*Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 95-19718 Filed 8-9-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8010-01-M

[Release No. 34-36060; File No. SR-NYSE-95-27]

**Self-Regulatory Organizations; Notice of Filing and Immediate Effectiveness of Proposed Rule Change by the New York Stock Exchange, Inc., Relating to Initial Listing Fees**

August 4, 1995.

Pursuant to Section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934

("Act"),<sup>1</sup> notice is hereby given that on August 3, 1995 the New York Stock Exchange, Inc. ("NYSE" or "Exchange") filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission ("Commission") the proposed rule change as described in Items I, and II 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 proposed rule change will amend the Exchange's fee schedule for listed companies by (i) limiting the initial listing fee component of the Original Listing Fee for common shares to the first 125 million common shares issued and (ii) establishing a flat \$5,300 "technical fee" for reserve stock splits.<sup>2</sup>

**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 Exchange routinely reviews its pricing relative to listed and prospective listed companies. This proposal is intended to address certain anomalies within the Exchange's current pricing relating specifically to very large capitalization companies. The proposed rule change would limit the Initial Fee component of the Original Listing Fee for common shares to the first 125 million common shares issued. In addition, the initial fee for additional shares subsequently listed will be based on the fee bracket appropriate to the new shares being listed, in relation to the company's total number of shares issued.

The proposal also amends the Exchange's listing fees with respect to

reverse stock splits. The Exchange currently charges an initial fee on all shares issued in connection with a reverse stock split. A listed company effecting a reverse stock split, however, has already paid an initial fee on all its outstanding shares, and the reverse split will result in there being fewer shares outstanding. Thus, the Exchange is proposing to charge only \$5,300 for reverse stock splits, the "technical fee" that it currently charges for a reincorporation or a change in corporate structure, such as the formation of a holding company.

**2. Statutory Basis**

The proposed rule change is consistent with Section 6(b) of the Act<sup>3</sup> in general and furthers the objectives of Section 6(b)(4)<sup>4</sup> in particular in that it provides for the equitable allocation of reasonable dues, fees and other charges among the Exchange's members and other persons using its facilities.

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

The proposed rule change does not impose 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**

The Exchange has neither solicited nor received written comments on the proposed rule change.

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

Because the foregoing proposed rule change: (1) Does not significantly affect the protection of investors or the public interest; (2) does not impose any significant burden on competition; and (3) the Exchange provided the Commission with notice of its intent to file the proposed rule change at least five days prior to the filing date, the proposed rule change has become effective pursuant to Section 19(b)(3)(A) of the Act<sup>5</sup> and Rule 19b-4(e)(6)<sup>6</sup> thereunder.

A proposed rule change filed under Rule 19b-4(e)<sup>7</sup> does not become operative prior to thirty days after the date of filing or such shorter time as the Commission may designate if such action is consistent with the protection of investors and the public interest. The

<sup>3</sup> 15 U.S.C. 78f(b).

<sup>4</sup> 15 U.S.C. 78f(b)(4).

<sup>5</sup> 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(3)(A).

<sup>6</sup> 17 CFR 240.19b-4(e)(6).

<sup>7</sup> 17 CFR 240.19b-4(e).

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

<sup>2</sup> NYSE Listed Company Manual ¶ 902.02.