

If you are requesting or aggregating comments from other persons for submission to the NRC, then you should inform those persons not to include identifying or contact information that they do not want to be publicly disclosed in their comment submissions. Your request should state that the NRC does not routinely edit comment submissions to remove such information before making the comment submissions available to the public or entering the comment submissions into ADAMS.

II. Further Information

The NRC seeks public comment on the proposed new section of SRP 13.7.2. This section has been developed to assist NRC staff with the review of applications for certain construction permits, early site permits, licenses, license amendments, and combined licenses and to inform new reactor applicants and other affected entities of proposed SRP guidance regarding an acceptable method by which to evaluate a proposed FFD program for compliance with Part 26 of Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR).

Following NRC staff evaluation of public comments, the NRC intends to finalize SRP 13.7.2, Revision 0 in ADAMS and post on the NRC's public Web site within the link for NUREG-0800. The SRP is guidance for the NRC staff. The SRP is not a substitute for the NRC regulations, and compliance with the SRP is not required.

III. Backfitting and Issue Finality

Issuance of this draft SRP, if finalized, would not constitute backfitting as defined in 10 CFR 50.109 (the Backfit Rule) or otherwise be inconsistent with the issue finality provisions in 10 CFR Part 52. The NRC's position is based upon the following considerations.

1. *The draft SRP positions, if finalized, would not constitute backfitting, inasmuch as the SRP is internal guidance to NRC staff.*

The SRP provides internal guidance to the NRC staff on how to review an application for NRC regulatory approval in the form of licensing. Changes in internal staff guidance are not matters for which either nuclear power plant applicants or licensees are protected under either the Backfit Rule or the issue finality provisions of 10 CFR Part 52.

2. *The NRC staff has no intention to impose the SRP positions on existing licensees either now or in the future.*

The NRC staff does not intend to impose or apply the positions described in the draft SRP to existing licenses and regulatory approvals. Hence, the

issuance of a final SRP—even if considered guidance within the purview of the issue finality provisions in 10 CFR Part 52—would not need to be evaluated as if it were a backfit or as being inconsistent with issue finality provisions. If, in the future, the NRC staff seeks to impose a position in the SRP on holders of already issued licenses in a manner that does not provide issue finality as described in the applicable issue finality provision, then the staff must make the showing as set forth in the Backfit Rule or address the criteria for avoiding issue finality as described in the applicable issue finality provision.

3. *Backfitting and issue finality do not—with limited exceptions not applicable here—protect current or future applicants.*

Applicants and potential applicants are not, with certain exceptions, protected by either the Backfit Rule or any issue finality provisions under 10 CFR Part 52. Neither the Backfit Rule nor the issue finality provisions under 10 CFR Part 52—with certain exclusions—were intended to apply to every NRC action that substantially changes the expectations of current and future applicants. The exceptions to the general principle are applicable whenever an applicant references a 10 CFR Part 52 license (e.g., an early site permit) and/or NRC regulatory approval (e.g., a design certification rule) with specified issue finality provisions. The NRC staff does not, at this time, intend to impose the positions represented in the draft SRP in a manner that is inconsistent with any issue finality provisions. If, in the future, the staff seeks to impose a position in the draft SRP in a manner that does not provide issue finality as described in the applicable issue finality provision, then the staff must address the criteria for avoiding issue finality as described in the applicable issue finality provision.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 22nd day of April 2014.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Joseph Colaccino,
Chief, Policy Branch, Division of Advanced Reactors and Rulemaking, Office of New Reactors.

[FR Doc. 2014-10217 Filed 5-2-14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Proposed Collection; Comment Request

Upon Written Request, Copies Available

From: U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission, Office of Investor Education and Advocacy, Washington, DC 20549-0213.

Extension:

Rule 15g-2, SEC File No. 270-381, OMB Control No. 3235-0434.

Notice is hereby given that pursuant to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*) (“PRA”), the Securities and Exchange Commission (“Commission”) is soliciting comments on the collection of information provided for in Rule 15g-2 (17 CFR 240.15g-2) under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78a *et seq.*) (“Exchange Act”). The Commission plans to submit this existing collection of information to the Office of Management and Budget (“OMB”) for extension and approval.

Rule 15g-2 (The “Penny Stock Disclosure Rule”) requires broker-dealers to provide their customers with a risk disclosure document, as set forth in Schedule 15G, prior to their first non-exempt transaction in a “penny stock.” As amended, the rule requires broker-dealers to obtain written acknowledgement from the customer that he or she has received the required risk disclosure document. The amended rule also requires broker-dealers to maintain a copy of the customer's written acknowledgement for at least three years following the date on which the risk disclosure document was provided to the customer, the first two years in an accessible place. Rule 15g-2 also requires a broker-dealer, upon request of a customer, to furnish the customer with a copy of certain information set forth on the Commission's Web site.

The risk disclosure documents are for the benefit of the customers, to assure that they are aware of the risks of trading in “penny stocks” before they enter into a transaction. The risk disclosure documents are maintained by the broker-dealers and may be reviewed during the course of an examination by the Commission.

There are approximately 221 broker-dealers that could potentially be subject to current Rule 15g-2. The Commission estimates that approximately 5% of registered broker-dealers are engaged in penny stock transactions, and thereby subject to the Rule (5% × approximately 4,410 registered broker-dealers = 221 broker-dealers). The Commission

estimates that each one of these firms processes an average of three new customers for penny stocks per week. Thus, each respondent processes approximately 156 penny stock disclosure documents per year. If communications in tangible form alone are used to satisfy the requirements of Rule 15g-2, then the copying and mailing of the penny stock disclosure document takes no more than two minutes. Thus, the total associated burden is approximately 2 minutes per response, or an aggregate total of 312 minutes per respondent. Since there are 221 respondents, the current annual burden is 68,952 minutes (312 minutes per each of the 221 respondents) or 1,150 hours for this third party disclosure burden. In addition, broker-dealers incur a recordkeeping burden of approximately two minutes per response when filing the completed penny stock disclosure documents as required pursuant to the Rule 15(g)(2)(c), which requires a broker-dealer to preserve a copy of the written acknowledgement pursuant to Rule 17a-4(b) of the Exchange Act. Since there are approximately 156 responses for each respondent, the respondents incur an aggregate recordkeeping burden of 68,952 minutes (221 respondents \times 156 responses for each \times 2 minutes per response) or 1,150 hours, under Rule 15g-2. Accordingly, the current aggregate annual hour burden associated with Rule 15g-2 (assuming that all respondents provide tangible copies of the required documents) is approximately 2,300 hours (1,150 third party disclosure hours + 1,150 recordkeeping hours).

The burden hours associated with Rule 15g-2 may be slightly reduced when the penny stock disclosure document required under the rule is provided through electronic means such as email from the broker-dealer (e.g., the broker-dealer respondent may take only one minute, instead of the two minutes estimated above, to provide the penny stock disclosure document by email to its customer). In this regard, if each of the customer respondents estimated above communicates with his or her broker-dealer electronically, the total ongoing respondent burden is approximately 1 minute per response, or an aggregate total of 156 minutes (156 customers \times 1 minutes per respondent). Assuming 221 respondents, the annual third party disclosure burden, if electronic communications were used by all customers, is 34,476 minutes (156 minutes per each of the 221 respondents) or 575 hours. If all respondents were to use electronic

means, the recordkeeping burden would be 68,952 minutes or 1,150 hours (the same as above). Thus, if all broker-dealer respondents obtain and send the documents required under the rules electronically, the aggregate annual hour burden associated with Rule 15g-2 is 1,725 (575 hours + 1,150 hours).

In addition, if the penny stock customer requests a paper copy of the information on the Commission's Web site regarding microcap securities, including penny stocks, from his or her broker-dealer, the printing and mailing of the document containing this information takes no more than two minutes per customer. Because many investors have access to the Commission's Web site via computers located in their homes, or in easily accessible public places such as libraries, then, at most, a quarter of customers who are required to receive the Rule 15g-2 disclosure document request that their broker-dealer provide them with the additional microcap and penny stock information posted on the Commission's Web site. Thus, each broker-dealer respondent processes approximately 39 requests for paper copies of this information per year or an aggregate total of 78 minutes per respondent (2 minutes per customer \times 39 requests per respondent). Since there are 221 respondents, the estimated annual burden is 17,238 minutes (78 minutes per each of the 221 respondents) or 288 hours. This is a third party disclosure type of burden.

We have no way of knowing how many broker-dealers and customers will choose to communicate electronically. Assuming that 50 percent of respondents continue to provide documents and obtain signatures in tangible form and 50 percent choose to communicate electronically to satisfy the requirements of Rule 15g-2, the total aggregate burden hours would be 2,301 ((aggregate burden hours for sending disclosure documents and obtaining signed customer acknowledgements in tangible form \times 0.50 of the respondents = 1,150 hours) + (aggregate burden hours for electronically signed and transmitted documents \times 0.50 of the respondents = 863 hours) + (288 burden hours for those customers making requests for a copy of the information on the Commission's Web site)).

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 will have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the collection of information; (c) ways to enhance the

quality, utility, and clarity of the information 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 writing within 60 days of this publication.

An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information under the PRA unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number.

Please direct your written comments to: Thomas Bayer, Director/Chief Information Officer, Securities and Exchange Commission, c/o Remi Pavlik-Simon, 100 F Street NE., Washington, DC 20549, or send an email to: PRA_Mailbox@sec.gov.

Dated: April 29, 2014.

Kevin M. O'Neill,

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2014-10142 Filed 5-2-14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8011-01-P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Sunshine Act Meeting

Notice is hereby given, pursuant to the provisions of the Government in the Sunshine Act, Public Law 94-409, that the Securities and Exchange Commission will hold a Closed Meeting on Thursday, May 8, 2014 at 2:00 p.m.

Commissioners, Counsel to the Commissioners, the Secretary to the Commission, and recording secretaries will attend the Closed Meeting. Certain staff members who have an interest in the matters also may be present.

The General Counsel of the Commission, or her designee, has certified that, in her opinion, one or more of the exemptions set forth in 5 U.S.C. 552b(c)(3), (5), (7), 9(B) and (10) and 17 CFR 200.402(a)(3), (5), (7), 9(ii) and (10), permit consideration of the scheduled matter at the Closed Meeting.

Commissioner Aguilar, as duty officer, voted to consider the items listed for the Closed Meeting in closed session.

The subject matter of the Closed Meeting will be:

- Institution and settlement of injunctive actions;
- institution and settlement of administrative proceedings;
- consideration of amicus participation;
- adjudicatory matters; and
- other matters relating to enforcement proceedings.