loaded into the CC1 reactor core during the upcoming refueling outage and will remain in the core for Cycles 13, 14, and 15.

#### The Need for the Proposed Action

The proposed temporary exemption from 10 CFR 50.44, 10 CFR 50.46, and Appendix K to 10 CFR Part 50 is needed because these regulations specifically refer to light-water reactors containing fuel consisting of uranium oxide pellets enclosed in zircaloy or ZIRLO tubes. A new zirconium-based alloy cladding has been developed, which is not the same chemical composition as zircaloy or ZIRLO, and the licensee wants to insert assemblies with the new cladding material into the CC1 reactor core and test them during power operation.

### Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

With regard to potential radiological impacts to the general public, the proposed temporary exemption involves features located entirely within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20. The lead fuel assemblies, with the zirconium-based alloy cladding, meet the same design basis as the Zircaloy-4 fuel which is currently in the CC1 reactor core. No safety limits will be changed or setpoints altered as a result of using the lead fuel assemblies. The Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (UFSAR) analysis are bounding for the lead fuel assemblies as well as the remainder of the core. The mechanical properties and behavior of the lead fuel assemblies during postulated loss-ofcoolant-accidents (LOCA) and non-LOCA transients and operational transients will be essentially the same. In addition, the four lead fuel assemblies represent a small portion of the total core and will be placed in nonlimiting core locations which experience no more than 0.95 of the core power density during operation. The small number of lead fuel assemblies, in conjunction with the similarity of the chemical and material characteristics with the existing fuel, ensures that hydrogen production will not be significantly different from previous assessments.

Therefore, the proposed temporary exemption, which would allow the operation of CC1 with four lead fuel assemblies in its reactor core, will not significantly affect the consequences of radiological accidents previously considered.

With regard to potential nonradiological impacts, the proposed action involves features located entirely within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20. It does not affect

nonradiological plant effluents and has no other environmental impact. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant nonradiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

#### Alternatives to the Proposed Action

Since the Commission has concluded there is no measurable 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 action, the NRC staff considered denial of the proposed action. Denial of the application would deny the licensee the operational flexibility to demonstrate any improved cladding material performance and would not reduce the environmental impacts.

#### Alternative Use of Resources

This action does not involve the use of any resources not previously considered in the Final Environmental Statement for CC1.

#### Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on October 24, 1995, the staff consulted with the Maryland State official, Mr. Richard McLean of the Department of Natural Resources, 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 July 13, 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 Calvert County Library, Prince Frederick, Maryland 20678.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 2nd day of November 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. 95–27773 Filed 11–8–95; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

#### RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

#### Proposed Data Collection Available for Public Comment and Recommendations

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with the requirement of Section 3506(c)(2)(A) of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 which provides opportunity for public comment on new or revised data collections, the Railroad Retirement Board will publish periodic summaries of proposed data collections.

Comments are invited on: (a) Whether the proposed information collection is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information has practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the RRB's estimate of the burden of the collection of the information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden related to the collection of information on respondents, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

Title and Purpose of Information Collection

# RUIA Claims Notification and Verification System

Section 5 (b) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, as amended by the Railroad Unemployment Insurance and Retirement Improvement Act of 1988 (P.L. 100–647), requires that "when a claim for benefits is filed with the Railroad Retirement Board (RRB), the RRB shall provide notice of such claim to the claimant's base year employer or employers and afford such employer or employers an opportunity to submit information relevant to the claim before making an initial determination on the claim." The purpose of the claims notification system is to provide to each unemployment and sickness claimant's base year employer or current employer, notice of each application and claim for benefits under the RUIA and to provide an opportunity for employers to convey information relevant to the proper adjudication of the claim. Railroad employers receive notice of applications and claims by one of two options. The first option, Form Letter ID-4K is a computer generated form letter notice of all unemployment applications, unemployment claims and sickness claims received from employees of a railroad company on a particular day. Form Letters ID-4K are mailed on a daily basis to officials designated by railroad employers. The second option is an Electronic Data Interchange (EDI)

version of the Form Letter ID-4K notice. EDI notices of applications are transmitted to participating railroads on a daily basis, generally on the same day that applications are received. Railroad

employers can respond to RRB notices of applications and claims manually by mailing a completed ID-4K back to the RRB or electronically via EDI. No

changes are being proposed to Form ID–4K or the electronic equivalent.

Estimate of Annual Respondent Burden

The estimated annual respondent burden is as follows:

RRB messages	Annual responses	Time (min)	Burden (hrs)
Unemployment Insurance Applications/Claims:			
ID-4K (EDI version)	133,700	**	201
ID-4K (manual)	57,300	2	1,910
Sickness Insurance Applications/Claims:	,		•
ID-4K (EDI version)	136,500	**	134
ID-4K (manual)	58,500	2	1,950
Total	386,000	2	4,195

<sup>\*\*</sup>The burden for the 8 participating employers who transmit EDI responses is calculated at 10 minutes each per day, 251 workdays a year or 335 total hours of burden. We estimate that 60 percent of the responses are related to unemployment transactions and 40 percent to sickness transactions.

#### ADDITIONAL INFORMATION OR COMMENTS:

To request more information or to obtain a copy of the information collection justification, forms, and/or supporting material, please call the RRB Clearance Officer at (312) 751–3363. Comments regarding the information collection should be addressed to Ronald J. Hodapp, Railroad Retirement Board, 844 N. Rush Street, Chicago, Illinois 60611–2092. Written comments should be received within 60 days of this notice.

Chuck Mierzwa, Clearance Officer.

[FR Doc. 95–27783 Filed 11–8–95; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 7905–01–M

## SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34–36455; File No. SR-CBOE-95–63]

Self-Regulatory Organizations; Notice of Filing of Proposed Rule Change by the Chicago Board Options Exchange, Inc. Relating to Adoption of Rule 9.24 and an Interpretation with Respect to Proposed Rule 9.24

November 3, 1995.

Pursuant to Section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 ("Act"),¹ and Rule 19b–4 thereunder,² notice is hereby given that on October 19, 1995, the Chicago Board Options Exchange, Inc. ("CBOE" 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 selfregulatory organiation. 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 CBOE proposes to adopt new Rule 9.24 and to add an Interpretation and Policy thereunder with respect to the meaning and administration of proposed Rule 9.24. The text of the proposed rule change is available at the Office of the Secretary, the Exchange, and the Commission.

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 CBOE 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 CBOE 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:

(i) Adopt Rule 9.24 requiring members and member organizations that engage in telephone solicitations to maintain a centralized list of persons who do not wish to receive telephone solicitations, and to refrain from making telephone solicitations to persons named on such list; and

(ii) Set forth Interpretation and Policy .01 concerning the meaning and administration of proposed Rule 9.24 with respect to compliance with Federal Communications Commission ("FCC") and Commission rules relating to telemarketing practices.<sup>3</sup>

In 1994, an industry Task Force, comprised of representatives from various industry regulatory and selfregulatory organizations, was formed to review broker-dealer telemarketing practices and compliance with the Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991 ("TCPA"), as well as with the FCC rules and regulations which implemented that law. The TCPA and FCC rules address telemarketing practices and the rights of telephone customers. One of the TCPA's requirements is that businesses, including broker-dealers, that make telephone solicitations to residential telephone subscribers institute written policies and have procedures in place for maintaining "do-not-call" lists. As recommended by the Task Force, proposed Rule 9.24 implements this requirement by obligating CBOE members to make and maintain a centralized list of persons who have informed the member that they do not wish to receive telephone solicitations.

The proposed Interpretation to Rule 9.24 reminds members and member organizations that they are subject to compliance with the requirements of the relevant rules of the FCC and the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1) (1988).

<sup>2 17</sup> CFR 240.19b-4 (1994).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup>The CBOE notes that it intends to include this Interpretation and Policy in a Circular that will be distrubted to members and member organizations.