

storage of classified information, and serves to comply with E.O. 12958, as amended.

Dated: July 27, 2004.

**L. Reynolds Cahoon,**

*Assistant Archivist for Human Resources and Information Services.*

[FR Doc. 04-17485 Filed 7-30-04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7515-01-P

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

### Agency Information Collection Activities: Submission for the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Review; Comment Request

**AGENCY:** Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC).

**ACTION:** Notice of the OMB review of information collection and solicitation of public comment.

**SUMMARY:** The NRC has recently submitted to OMB for review the following proposal for the collection of information under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. chapter 35). The NRC hereby informs potential respondents that an agency may not conduct or sponsor, and that a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a current valid OMB control number.

1. *Type of submission, new, revision, or extension:* Revision.
2. *The title of the information collection:* 10 CFR part 35, Medical Use of Byproduct Material.
3. *The form number if applicable:* Not applicable.
4. *How often the collection is required:* Reports of medical events, doses to an embryo/fetus or nursing child, or leaking sources are reportable on occurrence. A certifying entity desiring to be recognized by the NRC must submit a one-time request for recognition.

5. *Who will be required or asked to report:* Physicians and medical institutions holding an NRC license authorizing the administration of byproduct material or radiation therefrom to humans for medical use.

6. *An estimate of the number of responses:* The estimated number of annual responses: 242,030 (51,309 responses from NRC licensees + 1,759 recordkeepers and 184,686 responses from Agreement State licensees + 6,332 recordkeepers). Also 23 specialty certification boards are expected to request recognition under the proposed revision of part 35 (amendment of 10 CFR part 35, "Medical Use of Byproduct

Material—Recognition of Specialty Boards").

7. *The estimated number of annual respondents:* 8,091 (1,759 NRC licensees and 6,332 Agreement State licensees).

8. *An estimate of the total number of hours needed annually to complete the requirement or request:* 1,113,217 hours (242,030 hours for NRC licensees and 871,059 hours for Agreement State licensees [an average of 138 hours per licensee] and an additional one-time burden of 128 hours for certifying boards).

9. *An indication of whether section 3507(d), Pub. L. 104-13 applies:* Not applicable.

10. *Abstract:* 10 CFR part 35, "Medical Use of Byproduct Material," contains NRC's requirements and provisions for the medical use of byproduct material and for issuance of specific licenses authorizing the medical use of this material. These requirements and provisions provide for the radiation safety of workers, the general public, patients, and human research subjects. 10 CFR part 35 contains mandatory requirements that apply to NRC licensees authorized to administer byproduct material or radiation therefrom to humans for medical use.

The information in the required reports and records is used by the NRC to ensure that public health and safety is protected, and that the possession and use of byproduct material is in compliance with the license and regulatory requirements.

A copy of the final supporting statement may be viewed free of charge at the NRC Public Document Room, One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Room O-1 F21, Rockville, MD 20852. OMB clearance requests are available at the NRC worldwide Web site: <http://www.nrc.gov/public-involve/doc-comment/omb/index.html>. The document will be available on the NRC home page site for 60 days after the signature date of this notice.

Comments and questions should be directed to the OMB reviewer listed below by September 1, 2004. Comments received after this date will be considered if it is practical to do so, but assurance of consideration cannot be given to comments received after this date.

OMB Desk Officer,  
Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs (3150-0010),  
NEOB-10202,  
Office of Management and Budget,  
Washington, DC 20503.

Comments can also be submitted by telephone at (202) 395-3087.

The NRC Clearance Officer is Brenda Jo. Shelton, (301) 415-7233.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 26th day of July 2004.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Brenda Jo. Shelton,**

*NRC Clearance Officer, Office of the Chief Information Officer.*

[FR Doc. 04-17478 Filed 7-30-04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-263]

### Nuclear Management Company, LLC; Monticello Nuclear Generating Plant; Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is considering issuance of an exemption from title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations (10 CFR), part 50, appendix R, section III.G.2.b. for Facility Operating License No. DPR-22, issued to Nuclear Management Company, LLC (NMC), for operation of the Monticello Nuclear Generating Plant (Monticello), located in Wright County, Minnesota. Therefore, as required by 10 CFR 51.21, the NRC is issuing this environmental assessment and finding of no significant impact.

#### Environmental Assessment

##### Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed action would authorize an exemption from the automatic fire suppression system requirements of 10 CFR part 50, appendix R, section III.G.2.b. as it applies to Fire Area IV/Fire Zone 1F. Fire Area IV/Fire Zone 1F corresponds to the Monticello torus compartment, located at elevation 896 feet, 3 inches of the reactor building. The proposed action is in accordance with NMC's exemption request of September 15, 2003, as supplemented February 24, 2004.

##### The Need for the Proposed Action

NMC requested this exemption as a result of internal assessments of the Monticello's Fire Protection Program. NMC determined that the existing exemption from 10 CFR part 50 appendix R, section III.G.2.b (granted in 1983) for the torus compartment did not bound the existing plant configuration and the current Monticello Appendix R safe shutdown analysis. Accordingly, the NMC resubmitted its request for a permanent exemption for this area.

### *Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action*

The NRC staff reviewed NMC's exemption request and will issue a safety evaluation documenting its review. The review found that the Division 1 and Division 2 components of the core spray, residual heat removal (RHR) cooling, suppression pool level transmitter, and suppression pool temperature monitoring systems (SPOTMOS) are separated in Fire Area IV/Fire Zone 1F by at least 75 feet. The NRC staff concluded that the area wide automatic fire suppression is not necessary to achieve the underlying purpose of appendix R, section III.G.2.b, for the suppression pool torus area at Monticello considering the following:

- The minimal amount of fixed and transient combustibles present;
- The separation between redundant trains of core spray valves, RHR cooling valves, and suppression pool level transmitters;
- Smoke and temperature detector provisions;
- The ability of SPOTMOS to continue to operate with at least one RTD on one train in the operable-but-degraded mode for any fire in fire zone 1F that involved both conduit trains.

The details of the NRC staff's safety evaluation will be provided as part of the letter to NMC transmitting the NRC staff's decision on the exemption request.

The proposed action will not significantly increase the probability or consequences of accidents, no changes are being made in the types of effluents that may be released off site, and there is no significant increase in occupational or public radiation exposure. Therefore, there are no significant radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

With regard to potential non-radiological impacts, the proposed action does not have a potential to affect any historic sites. It does not affect non-radiological plant effluents and has no other environmental impact. Therefore, there are no significant non-radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

Accordingly, the NRC concludes that there are no significant environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

### *Environmental Impacts of the Alternatives to the Proposed Action*

As an alternative to the proposed action, the staff considered denial of the proposed action (*i.e.*, the "no-action" alternative). Denial of the application

would result in no change in current environmental impacts. The environmental impacts of the proposed action and the alternative action are similar.

### *Alternative Use of Resources*

The action does not involve the use of any different resource than those previously considered in the Final Environmental Statement for Monticello dated November 1972.

### *Agencies and Persons Consulted*

On July 22, 2004, the NRC staff consulted with the Minnesota State official, Nancy Campbell of the Department of Commerce, regarding the environmental impact of the proposed action. The State official had no comments.

### **Finding of No Significant Impact**

On the basis of the environmental assessment, the NRC concludes that the proposed action will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment. Accordingly, the NRC has determined not to prepare an environmental impact statement for the proposed action.

For further details with respect to the proposed action, see NMC's exemption request of September 15, 2003, as supplemented February 24, 2004. Documents may be examined, and/or copied for a fee, at the NRC's Public Document Room (PDR), located at One White Flint North, Public File Area O1 F21, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland. Publicly available records will be accessible electronically from the Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS) Public Electronic Reading Room on the Internet at the NRC Web site, <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html>. Persons who do not have access to ADAMS or who encounter problems in accessing the documents located in ADAMS should contact the NRC PDR Reference staff by telephone at 1-800-397-4209 or (301) 415-4737, or by e-mail to [pdr@nrc.gov](mailto:pdr@nrc.gov).

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 22nd day of July 2004.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**L. Raghavan,**

*Chief, Section 1, Project Directorate III,  
Division of Licensing Project Management,  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 04-17476 Filed 7-30-04; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7590-01-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 11Ac1-4; SEC File No.  
270-405; OMB Control No. 3235-  
0462.

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 extension and approval.

Rule 11Ac1-4 [17 CFR 240.11Ac1-4] under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 requires specialists and market makers to publicly display a customer limit order when that limit order is priced superior to the quote that is currently being displayed by the specialist or market maker. Customer limit orders that match the bid or offer being displayed by the specialist or market maker must also be displayed if the limit order price matches the national best bid or offer. It is estimated that approximately 585 broker and dealer respondents incur an aggregate burden of 228,735 hours per year to comply with this rule.

Rule 11Ac1-4 does not contain record retention requirements. Compliance with the rule is mandatory. Responses are not confidential. An agency may not conduct or sponsor and a person is not required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid control number.

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