

Current ROP 1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

Questions related to the efficacy of the overall Reactor Oversight Process (ROP) (As appropriate, please provide specific examples and suggestions for improvement.)

(9) Are the ROP oversight activities predictable (i.e., controlled by the process) and reasonably objective (i.e., based on supported facts, rather than relying on subjective judgement)?

Initial ROP Implementation 1 2 3 4 5

 Current ROP

Comments:

(10) Is the ROP risk-informed, in that the NRC's actions are graduated on the basis of increased significance?

Initial ROP Implementation 1 2 3 4 5

 Current ROP

Comments:

(11) Is the ROP understandable and are the processes, procedures and products clear and written in plain English?

Initial ROP Implementation 1 2 3 4 5

 Current ROP

Comments:

(12) Does the ROP provide adequate regulatory assurance when combined with other NRC regulatory processes that plants are being operated and maintained safely?

Initial ROP Implementation 1 2 3 4 5

 Current ROP

Comments:

(13) Does the ROP improve the efficiency, effectiveness, and realism of the regulatory process?

Initial ROP Implementation 1 2 3 4 5

 Current ROP

Comments:

(14) Does the ROP ensure openness in the regulatory process?

Initial ROP Implementation 1 2 3 4 5

 Current ROP

Comments:

(15) Has the public been afforded adequate opportunity to participate in the ROP and to provide inputs and comments?

Initial ROP Implementation 1 2 3 4 5

 Current ROP

Comments:

(16) Has the NRC been responsive to public inputs and comments on the ROP?

Initial ROP Implementation 1 2 3 4 5

 Current ROP

Comments:

(17) Has the NRC implemented the ROP as defined by program documents?

Initial ROP Implementation 1 2 3 4 5

 Current ROP

Comments:

(18) Does the ROP reduce unnecessary regulatory burden on licensees?

Initial ROP Implementation 1 2 3 4 5

 Current ROP

Comments:

(19) Does the ROP minimize unintended consequences?

Initial ROP Implementation 1 2 3 4 5

 Current ROP

Comments:

(20) Please provide any additional information or comments related to the Reactor Oversight Process.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 25th day of October 2004.

For the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission .

Stuart A. Richards,

Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, Division of Inspection Program Management, Inspection Program Branch.

[FR Doc. 04-24304 Filed 10-29-04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

Comment Request for Review of a Revised Information Collection: OPM Online Form 1417

AGENCY: Office of Personnel Management.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104-13, May 22, 1995), this notice announces that the Office of Personnel Management intends to submit to the Office of Management and Budget a request for clearance of a revised information collection. Online OPM Form 1417, Combined Federal Campaign Results Form, is used to collect information from the 320 local CFC's around the country to verify campaign results. Revisions to the form clarify OPM's request for budgeted campaign costs and provide the ability to create a printer friendly copy of the report.

We estimate 320 Online OPM Forms 1417 are completed annually. Each form

takes approximately 20 minutes to complete. The annual estimated burden is 107 hours.

Comments are particularly invited on: Whether this information is necessary for the proper performance of functions of the Office of Personnel Management, and whether it will have practical utility; whether our estimate of the public burden of this collection of information is accurate, and based on valid assumptions and methodology; and ways in which we can minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, through the appropriate use of technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

For copies of this proposal, contact Mary Beth Smith-Toomey on (202) 606-8358, Fax (202) 418-3251 or E-mail to mbtoomey@opm.gov. Please be sure to include a mailing address with your request.

DATES: Comments on this proposal should be received within 60 calendar days from the date of this publication.

ADDRESSES: Send or deliver comments to—Curtis Rumbaugh, CFC Operations Manager, Office of CFC Operations, U.S. Office of Personnel Management, 1900 E Street, NW., Room 5450, Washington, DC 20415.

Office of Personnel Management.

Kay Coles James,

Director.

[FR Doc. 04-24337 Filed 10-29-04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6325-46-U

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Investment Company Act Release No. 26643; 812-12953]

PacifiCare of Arizona, Inc., et al.; Notice of Application and Commission Statement

October 25, 2004.

AGENCY: Securities and Exchange Commission ("Commission").

ACTION: (1) Notice of application for an order under sections 3(b)(2) and 45(a) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (the "Act") and (2) a Commission statement that the Commission is considering clarifying the primary business test under sections 3(b)(1) and (2) of the Act with respect to health maintenance organizations and similar entities that provide managed health care services (collectively, "HMOs").

APPLICANTS: PacifiCare of Arizona, Inc., PacifiCare of California, PacifiCare of Colorado, Inc., PacifiCare of Nevada,