comments or suggestions on the environmental issues or the proposed scope of the supplement to the GEIS. Additionally, the NRC staff will host informal discussions one hour prior to the start of each session at the same location. No formal comments on the proposed scope of the supplement to the GEIS will be accepted during the informal discussions. To be considered, comments must be provided either at the transcribed public meetings or in writing, as discussed below. For more information about the proposed action, the scoping process, and the environmental impact statement, please contact the NRC Environmental Project Manager, Mr. Samuel Hernandez, at Mail Stop O–11F1, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, by telephone at 1–800–368–5642, extension 4049, or by e-mail at *shq@nrc.gov.* Persons may register to attend or present oral comments at the meetings on the scope of the NEPA review by contacting Mr. Hernandez. Members of the public may also register to speak at the meeting within 15 minutes of the start of each meeting. Individual oral comments may be limited by the time available, depending on the number of persons who register. Members of the public who have not registered may also have an opportunity to speak, if time permits. Public comments will be considered in the scoping process for the supplement to the GEIS. Mr. Hernandez will need to be contacted no later than September 29, 2006, if special equipment or accommodations are needed to attend or present information at the public meeting, so that the NRC staff can determine whether the request can be accommodated.

Members of the public may send written comments on the environmental scope of the JAFNPP license renewal review to: Chief, Rules and Directives Branch, Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration, Mail Stop T–6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC, 20555–0001, and should cite the publication date and page number of this **Federal Register** notice. Comments may also be delivered to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Mail Stop T–6D59, Two White Flint North, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland, 20852, from 7:30 a.m. to 4:15 p.m. during Federal workdays. To be considered in the scoping process, written comments should be postmarked by November 14, 2006. Electronic comments may be sent by e-mail to the NRC at *FitzPatrickEIS@nrc.gov,* and should be sent no later than November 14, 2006, to be considered in the scoping process. Comments will be available electronically and accessible through ADAMS.

Participation in the scoping process for the supplement to the GEIS does not entitle participants to become parties to the proceeding to which the supplement to the GEIS relates. Matters related to participation in any hearing are outside the scope of matters to be discussed at this public meeting.

At the conclusion of the scoping process, the NRC will prepare a concise summary of the determination and conclusions reached, including the significant issues identified, and will send a copy of the summary to each participant in the scoping process. The summary will also be available for viewing in ADAMS. The staff will then prepare and issue for comment the draft supplement to the GEIS, which will be the subject of separate notices and separate public meetings. Copies will be available for public viewing at the above-mentioned addresses, and one copy per request will be provided free of charge, to the extent of supply. After receipt and consideration of the comments, the NRC will prepare a final supplement to the GEIS, which will also be available for public viewing.

Information about the proposed action, the supplement to the GEIS, and the scoping process may be obtained from Mr. Hernandez at the aforementioned telephone number or e-mail address.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 14th day of September 2006.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Eric J. Benner,

Acting Director, Division of License Renewal, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 06–7974 Filed 9–19–06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50–275 And 50–323]

Pacific Gas and Electric Company; Diablo Canyon Power Plant, Unit Nos. 1 and 2 Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is considering issuance of an amendment to Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR), Section 50.90 for Facility Operating Licenses, Nos. DPR–80 and DPR–82, issued to Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E, the licensee) for operation of the Diablo Canyon Power Plant, Unit Nos. 1 and 2 (DCPP or facility), located in San Luis Obispo County, California. 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 delete the antitrust license conditions from the licenses.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application dated January 19, 2006, as supplemented by letter dated June 20, 2006.

The Need for the Proposed Action

Circumstances have changed significantly from those that existed when the antitrust license conditions were first imposed 28 years ago. In particular, there have been recent developments in the law at both the Federal and State levels to ensure competition in the industry in California and elsewhere. Moreover, agreements binding PG&E related to the Stanislaus Commitments will continue to be in effect whether or not the antitrust conditions actually remain a part of the DCPP licenses, and competitors have voiced no opposition to the removal of the conditions. Finally, under the limited statutory authority granted to the NRC under Section 105 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, it appears that the NRC lacks the authority now to continue to impose the antitrust conditions against PG&E through the DCPP licenses. Accordingly, in consideration of all of the foregoing, the licensee has requested to remove the antitrust conditions from the licenses as the conditions are no longer necessary to serve the original intended purpose.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The NRC has completed its safety evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that the proposed license amendment involves administrative actions which have no effect on plant equipment or operation.

The details of the staff's safety evaluation will be provided in the license amendment that will be issued as part of the letter to the licensee approving the license amendment.

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. There is no significant increase in the amount of any effluent released off site. 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 resources than those previously considered in the Final Environmental Statement for DCPP, dated May 1973, and Addendum to Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for DCPP dated May 1976.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on July 27, 2006, the staff consulted with the California State official, Steve Hsu of the Radiologic Health Branch, Department of Health Services, 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 the licensee's letter dated January 19, 2006, as supplemented by letter dated June 20, 2006. 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 send an e-mail to *pdr@nrc.gov*.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 14th day of September 2006.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Alan Wang,

Project Manager, Plant Licensing Branch IV, Division of Operating Reactor Licensing, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. E6–15589 Filed 9–19–06; 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 11Ac1–1; SEC File No. 270–404; OMB Control No. 3235–0461.

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'') intends to submit to the Office of Management and Budget (''OMB'') a request for extension of the previously approved collection of information discussed below.

Rule 11Ac1–1 (17 CFR 240.11Ac1–1), Dissemination of Quotations, contains two related collections of information necessary to disseminate market makers' published quotations to buy and sell securities to the public. The first collection of information is found in Rule 11Ac1–1(c) (17 CFR 240.11Ac1–1(c)). This reporting requirement obligates each ''responsible broker or dealer,'' as defined under the rule, to communicate to its exchange or association its best bids, best offers, and quotation sizes for any subject security, as defined under the rule. The second collection of information is found in Rule 11Ac1–1(b), (17 CFR 240.11Ac1–1(b)). This reporting requirement obligates each exchange and association to make available to quotation vendors for dissemination to the public the best bid, best offer, and aggregate quotation size for each subject security.[1] Brokers, dealers, other market participants, and members of the public rely on published quotation information to determine the best price and market for execution of customer orders.

It is anticipated that 721 respondents, consisting of 180 exchange specialists and 541 OTC market makers, will make 246,788,000 total annual responses pursuant to Rule 11Ac1–1, resulting in an annual aggregate burden of approximately 205,486 hours.

Written comments are invited on: (a) Whether the proposed collections of information are necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collections 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 collections of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology. Consideration will be given to comments and suggestions submitted in writing within 60 days of this publication.

Please direct your written comments to R. Corey Booth, Director/Chief Information Officer, Securities and Exchange Commission, C/O Shirley Martinson, 6432 General Green Way, Alexandria, Virginia 22312 or send an e-mail to: *PRA_Mailbox@sec.gov*. Comments must be submitted within 60 days of this notice.

Dated: September 7, 2006.

Nancy M. Morris,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. E6–15585 Filed 9–19–06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8010–01–P

[1] A third requirement under the Rule 11Ac1–1, as amended at 17 CFR 11Ac1–1(c)(5), gives electronic communications networks (''ECNs'') the option of reporting to an exchange or association for public dissemination, on behalf of their OTC market maker or exchange specialist customers, the best priced orders and the full size for such orders entered by market makers, to satisfy such market makers' reporting obligation under Rule 11Ac1–1(c). Because this reporting requirement is an alternative method of meeting the market makers' reporting obligation, and because it is directed to nine or fewer persons (ECNs), this collection of information is not subject to OMB review under the Paperwork Reduction Act.