

June 9, 2009, as supplemented by letter dated July 31, 2009.

The Need for the Proposed Action

The proposed action is needed to provide the licensee with additional time to perform the required upgrades to the FNP security system due to resource and logistical impacts of the spring 2010 Unit 2 and fall 2010 Unit 1 refueling outages and other factors.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The NRC has completed its environmental assessment of the proposed exemption. The staff has concluded that the proposed action to extend the implementation deadline would not significantly affect plant safety and would not have a significant adverse effect on the probability of an accident occurring. The proposed action would not result in an increased radiological hazard beyond those previously analyzed. There will be no change to radioactive effluents that effect radiation exposures to plant workers and members of the public. The proposed action does not involve a change to plant buildings or land areas on the FNP site. Therefore, no changes or different types of radiological impacts are expected as a result of the proposed exemption.

The proposed action does not result in changes to land use or water use, or result in changes to the quality or quantity of non-radiological effluents. No changes to the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System permit are needed. No effects on the aquatic or terrestrial habitat in the vicinity of the plant, or to threatened, endangered, or protected species under the Endangered Species Act, or impacts to essential fish habitat covered by the Magnuson-Stevens Act are expected. There are no impacts to the air or ambient air quality. There are no impacts to historical and cultural resources. There would be no impact to socioeconomic resources. Therefore, no changes to or different types of non-radiological environmental impacts are expected as a result of the proposed exemption. Accordingly, the NRC concludes that there are no significant environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

With its request to extend the implementation deadline, the licensee has proposed compensatory measures to be taken in lieu of full compliance with the new requirements specified in 10 CFR part 73. The licensee currently maintains a security system acceptable to the NRC and the proposed compensatory measures will continue to provide acceptable physical protection

of the FNP in lieu of the new requirements in 10 CFR part 73. Therefore, the extension of the implementation date of the new requirements of 10 CFR part 73 to December 15, 2010, would not have any significant environmental impacts.

The NRC staff's safety evaluation will be provided in the exemption that will be issued as part of the letter to the licensee approving the exemption to the regulation.

Environmental Impacts of the Alternatives to the Proposed Action

As an alternative to the proposed actions, the NRC staff considered denial of the proposed actions (*i.e.*, the "no-action" alternative). Denial of the exemption request would result in no change in current environmental impacts. The environmental impacts of the proposed exemption and technical specification change and the "no action" alternative are similar.

Alternative Use of Resources

The action does not involve the use of any different resources than those considered in the Final Environmental Statement for the FNP, as supplemented through the "Generic Environmental Impact Statement for License Renewal of Nuclear Plants: Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2—Final Report (NUREG—1437, Supplement 18)."

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on August 13, 2009, the NRC staff consulted with the Alabama State official, Mr. Kirk Whatley of the Alabama Department of Public Health, 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 letters dated June 9 and July 31, 2009. The June 9, 2009, letter and certain parts of the July 31, 2009, submittal contain proprietary and safeguards information and, accordingly, are not available to the public. Other parts of these documents may be examined, and/or copied for a fee, at the NRC's Public Document Room (PDR), located at One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville,

Maryland 20852. Publicly available records will be accessible electronically from the Agencywide Document 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 20th day of August 2009.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Robert E. Martin,

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

[FR Doc. E9-20586 Filed 8-25-09; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards (ACRS) Meeting of the Materials, Metallurgy, and Reactor Fuels Subcommittee; Notice of Meeting

The ACRS Subcommittee on the Materials, Metallurgy and Reactor Fuels will hold a meeting on September 23, 2009, 11555 Rockville Pike, Commissioner's Conference Room O1F16, One White Flint North, Rockville, Maryland.

The entire meeting will be open to public attendance. The agenda for the subject meeting shall be as follows:

Wednesday, September 23, 2009—8:30 a.m.–5 p.m.

The Subcommittee will discuss the "three-dimensional" finite element analysis of the Oyster Creek drywell shell. The Subcommittee will hear presentations by and hold discussions with representatives of the NRC staff and other interested persons regarding this matter. The Subcommittee will gather information, analyze relevant issues and facts, and formulate proposed positions and actions, as appropriate, for deliberation by the full Committee.

Members of the public desiring to provide oral statements and/or written comments should notify the Designated Federal Official, Peter Wen, telephone: 301-415-2832, e-mail:

Peter.Wen@nrc.gov, five days prior to the meeting, if possible, so that appropriate arrangements can be made. Thirty-five hard copies of each presentation or handout should be

provided to the Designated Federal Official 30 minutes before the meeting. In addition, one electronic copy of each presentation should be e-mailed to the Designated Federal Official 1 day before meeting. If an electronic copy cannot be provided within this timeframe, presenters should provide the Designated Federal Official with a CD containing each presentation at least 30 minutes before the meeting. Electronic recordings will be permitted. Detailed procedures for the conduct of and participation in ACRS meetings were published in the **Federal Register** on October 6, 2008 (73 FR 58268–58269).

Further information regarding this meeting can be obtained by contacting the Designated Federal Official between 7:30 a.m. and 5:15 p.m. (ET). Persons planning to attend this meeting are urged to contact the above named individual at least two working days prior to the meeting to be advised of any potential changes to the agenda.

Dated: August 19, 2009.

Antonio F. Dias,

Chief, Reactor Safety Branch B, Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards.

[FR Doc. E9–20588 Filed 8–25–09; 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 Investor Education and Advocacy, Washington, DC 20549–0213.

Extension: Rule 17f–6, SEC File No. 270–392, OMB Control No. 3235–0447.

Notice is hereby given that, pursuant to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501–3520), the Securities and Exchange Commission (the “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 17f–6 (17 CFR 270.17f-6) under the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a) permits registered investment companies (“funds”) to maintain assets (*i.e.*, margin) with futures commission merchants (“FCMs”) in connection with commodity transactions effected on

both domestic and foreign exchanges.¹ Prior to the rule’s adoption, funds generally were required to maintain these assets in special accounts with a custodian bank.

The rule requires a written contract that contains certain provisions designed to ensure important safeguards and other benefits relating to the custody of fund assets by FCMs. To protect fund assets, the contract must require that FCMs comply with the segregation or secured amount requirements of the Commodity Exchange Act (“CEA”) and the rules under that statute. The contract also must contain a requirement that FCMs obtain an acknowledgment from any clearing organization that the fund’s assets are held on behalf of the FCM’s customers according to CEA provisions. Finally, FCMs are required to furnish to the Commission or its staff on request information concerning the fund’s assets in order to facilitate Commission inspections.

The Commission estimates that approximately 2270 funds effect commodities transactions and could deposit margin with FCMs under Rule 17f-6 in connection with those transactions. Commission staff estimates that each fund uses and deposits margin with two different FCMs in connection with its commodity transactions.²

The Commission estimates that each of the 2270 funds spends an average of 1 hour annually complying with the contract requirements of the rule (*i.e.*, executing contracts that contain the requisite provisions with additional FCMs), for a total of 2270 annual burden hours. The estimate does not include the time required by an FCM to comply with the rule’s contract requirements because, to the extent that complying with the contract provisions could be considered “collections of information,” the burden hours for compliance are already included in other PRA submissions or are *de minimis*.³ The

¹ Custody of Investment Company Assets With Futures Commission Merchants and Commodity Clearing Organizations, Investment Company Act Release No. 22389 (Dec. 11, 1996) [61 FR 66207 (Dec. 17, 1996)].

² This estimate is based on information conversations with representatives of the fund industry.

³ The rule requires a contract with the FCM to contain three provisions. Two of the provisions require the FCM to comply with existing requirements under the CEA and rules adopted under that Act. Thus, to the extent these provisions could be considered collections of information, the hours required for compliance would be included in the collection of information burden hours submitted by the Commodity Futures Trading Commission for its rules. The third contract provision requires that the FCM produce records or other information requested by the Commission or

estimate of average burden hours is made solely for the purposes of the Paperwork Reduction Act, and is not derived from a comprehensive or even a representative survey or study of the costs of Commission rules and forms.

Compliance with the collection of information requirements of the rule is necessary to obtain the benefit of relying on the rule. If an FCM furnishes records pertaining to a fund’s assets at the request of the Commission or its staff, the records will be kept confidential to the extent permitted by relevant statutory or regulatory provisions. The rule does not require these records be retained for any specific period of time. 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 collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Commission, including whether the information has practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the Commission’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 after this publication.

Please direct your written comments to Charles Boucher, Director/CIO, Securities and Exchange Commission, C/O Shirley Martinson, 6432 General Green Way, Alexandria, VA 22312; or send an e-mail to: PRA_Mailbox@sec.gov.

Dated: August 19, 2009.

Florence E. Harmon,

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. E9–20527 Filed 8–25–09; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8010–01–P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

Upon written request, copies available from: U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission, Office of Investor

its staff. Commission staff has requested this type of information from an FCM so infrequently in the past that the annual burden hours are *de minimis*.