consultation is required under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act. Likewise, NRC determined that the proposed action is not the type of activity that has the potential to cause previously unconsidered effects on historic properties, as consultation for site decommissioning has been conducted previously. There are no additional impacts to historic properties associated with the disposal method and location for demolition debris. Therefore, no consultation is required under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. The NRC provided a draft of its EA to the following individuals:

- Mr. Dave Howland, Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection, Western Regional Office, 436 Dwight Street, Springfield, MA 01103.
- Mr. Michael Whalen, Radiation Control Program, Massachusetts Department of Public Health, 90 Washington Street, Dorchester, MA 02121.
- Ms. Carla A. White, Vermont Department of Health, 108 Cherry St., P.O. Box 70 Burlington, VT 05402.

The owner of the property where the blocks are currently located. Name and address withheld from public disclosure.

Both the MADEP and the MA
Department of Public Health noted that
the BUD previously issued by the
MADEP is not appropriate for the
removal, transport, or disposal of lowlevel radioactive waste. Therefore, based
on the subsequently identified
radioactive materials in the concrete
blocks, the MADEP does not consider
the BUD as providing adequate legal
authority for the removal of the shield
blocks from the site. Otherwise neither
the MADEP or MADPH had any issue
with the proposed NRC action.

Neither the Vermont Department of Health or the property owner had any comments on the proposed NRC action.

III. 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.

Sources Used

- —US NRC Power Reactor License: Yankee Atomic Electric Company Docket Number 050–00029, License Number DPR–03.
- —Yankee Atomic Electric Company, June 6, 2005, Request for Approval of

- Proposed Procedures in Accordance with 10 CFR part 20.2002, (ML051650291) as supplemented on October 31, 2005. (ML053120275)
- —NRC 10 CFR 20.2002, "Method of Obtaining Approval of Proposed Disposal Procedures."
- —NUREG–1640, "Radiological Assessment for Clearance of Materials from Nuclear Facilities."
- —NUREG-1748, "Environmental Review Guidance for Licensing Actions Associated with NMSS Programs."
- —NUREG-0586, Supplement 1, Generic Environmental Impact Statement of Decommissioning of Nuclear Facilities, November 2002.

IV. Further Information

For further details with respect to the proposed action, see the licensee's letter dated June 6, 2005, (ADAMS Accession No. ML051650291) as supplemented on October 31, 2005. (ADAMS Accession No. ML053120275) The NRC Public Documents Room is located at NRC Headquarters in Rockville, MD, and can be contacted at (800) 397-4209. 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 (first floor), Rockville, Maryland. Publicly available records will be accessible electronically from the Agencywide Documents Access and Management System's (ADAMS) Public Library component on the NRC Web site, http://www.nrc.gov (the Public Electronic Reading Room). 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 at pdr@nrc.gov.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 1st day of March, 2006.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission Andrew Persinko,

Acting Deputy Director, Decommissioning Directorate, Division of Waste Management and Environmental Protection, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards. [FR Doc. E6–3338 Filed 3–8–06; 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 6e-2; SEC File No. 270-177; OMB Control No. 3235-0177.

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 (the "Commission") is soliciting comments on the collections of information summarized below. The Commission plans to submit these existing collections of information to the Office of Management and Budget ("OMB") for extension and approval.

Rule 6e–2 (17 ČFR 270.6e–2) under the Investment Company Act of 1940 ("Act") is an exemptive rule that permits separate accounts, formed by life insurance companies, to fund certain variable life insurance products. The rule exempts such separate accounts from the registration requirements under the Act, among others, on condition that they comply with all but certain designated provisions of the Act and meet the other requirements of the rule. The rule sets forth several information collection requirements.

Rule 6e–2 provides a separate account with an exemption from the registration provisions of section 8(a) of the Act if the account files with the Commission Form N–6EI–1, a notification of claim of exemption.

The rule also exempts a separate account from a number of other sections of the Act, provided that the separate account makes certain disclosure in its registration statements, reports to contractholders, proxy solicitations, and submissions to state regulatory authorities, as prescribed by the rule.

Paragraph (b)(9) of rule 6e–2 provides an exemption from the requirements of section 17(f) of the Act and imposes a reporting burden and certain other conditions. Section 17(f) requires that every registered management company meet various custody requirements for its securities and similar investments. Paragraph (b)(9) applies only to management accounts that offer life insurance contracts subject to rule 6e–2.

Since 2003, there have been no filings under paragraph (b)(9) of rule 6e–2 by management accounts. Therefore, since 2003, there has been no cost or burden to the industry regarding the information collection requirements of paragraph (b)(9) of rule 6e–2. In addition, there have been no filings of Form N–6EI–1 by separate accounts since 2003. Therefore, there has been no cost or burden to the industry since that time.

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 writing within 60 days of this publication. The Commission request authorization to maintain an inventory of one burden hour for administrative purposes.

Please direct your written comments to R. Corey Booth, Director/Chief Information Officer, Office of Information Technology, Securities and Exchange Commission, 100 F Street, NE Washington, DC 20549.

Dated: March 2, 2006.

Jill M. Peterson,

Assistant Secretary.

[FR Doc. E6-3328 Filed 3-8-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8010-01-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 17f–1; File No. 270–236; OMB Control No. 3235–0222. Form N–17f–1; File No. 270–316; OMB Control No. 3235–0359.

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 (the "Commission") is soliciting comments on the collection of information summarized below. The Commission plans to submit these existing collections of information to the Office of Management and Budget ("OMB") for extension and approval.

Rule 17f–1 under the Investment Company Act of 1940 (the "Act") [17 CFR 270.17f–1] is entitled: "Custody of Securities with Members of National Securities Exchanges." Rule 17f–1 provides that any registered

management investment company ("fund") that wishes to place its assets in the custody of a national securities exchange member may do so only under a written contract that must be ratified initially and approved annually by a majority of the fund's board of directors. The written contract also must contain certain specified provisions. In addition, the rule requires an independent public accountant to examine the fund's assets in the custody of the exchange member at least three times during the fund's fiscal year. The rule requires the written contract and the certificate of each examination to be transmitted to the Commission. The purpose of the rule is to ensure the safekeeping of fund assets.

Commission staff estimates that each fund makes 1 response and spends an average of 3.5 hours annually in complying with the rule's requirements.¹ Commission staff estimates that on an annual basis it takes: (i) 0.5 hours for the board of directors at a total cost of approximately \$1000 to review and ratify the custodial contracts; 2 and (ii) 3 hours for the fund's controller at a total cost of approximately \$445 to assist the fund's independent public auditors in verifying the fund's assets.3 Approximately 60 funds rely on the rule annually.4 Thus, the total annual burden for rule 17f-1 is estimated to be approximately 210 hours. Based on the total costs per fund listed above, the total cost of the rule 17f-1's collection

of information requirements is estimated to be \$86,700.6

Form N-17f-1 is entitled: "Certificate of Accounting of Securities and Similar Investments of a Management Investment Company in the Custody of Members of National Securities Exchanges." Form N-17f-1 (17 CFR 274.219) is the cover sheet for accountant examination certificates filed under rule 17f-1 of the Act. Rule 17f-1 requires the accountant's certificate of each examination be attached to Form N-17f-1 and transmitted to the Commission promptly after each examination. The form facilitates the filing of the accountant's certificate, and increases the accessibility of the certificate to both Commission's staff and interested investors.

Commission staff estimates that on an annual basis it takes: (i) On average 1 hour of clerical time at a total cost of \$28 to prepare and file the Form N-17f-1; and (ii) 1 hour for the fund's chief compliance officer at a total cost of \$137 to review the Form N-17f-1 prior to filing with the Commission. As noted above, approximately 60 funds currently file Form N-17f-1 with the Commission, and each fund is required to make three filings annually for a total annual burden per fund of approximately 6 hours. The total annual hour burden for Form N-17f-1 is therefore estimated to be approximately 360 hours. Based on the total costs per fund listed above, the total cost of Form N-17f-1's collection of information requirements is estimated to be approximately \$59,400.7

The 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. Compliance with the collections of information required by rule 17f-1 and Form N-17f-1 is mandatory for funds that place their assets in the custody of a national securities exchange member. Responses will not be kept 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.

The Commission requests written comments on: (a) Whether the collections of information are necessary for the proper performance of the

 $^{^{\}rm 1}{\rm The~1}$ response is the board's approval of the custodial contract.

² Estimates of the number of hours are based on conversations with individuals in the mutual fund industry. In preparing this submission, Commission staff randomly selected 9 funds from the pool of Form N–17f–1 filers. The actual number of hours may vary significantly depending on individual fund assets. The hour burden for rule 17f–1 does not include preparing the custody contract because that would be part of customary and usual business practice.

³This estimate is based on the following calculation: $3 \times \$148.38$ (fund controller hourly rate) = \$445. This estimate is based on the following calculation: $3 \times \$148.38$ (fund controller hourly rate) = \$445. The estimated costs for all fund professional and support staff time are based on the average annual salaries reported for employees in New York City in Securities Industry Association, Management and Professional Earnings in the Securities Industry (2003) and Securities Industry Association, Office Salaries in the Securities Industry (2003), which are adjusted to reflect additional overhead costs and employee benefits.

⁴ Based on a review of Form N–17f–1 filings in 2004, the Commission staff estimates that 60 funds relied on rule 17f–1 in 2005.

 $^{^5}$ This estimate is based on the following calculation: 60 (respondents) \times 3.5 (total annual hourly burden per respondent) = 210 hours. The annual burden for rule 17f–1 does not include time spent preparing Form N–17f–1. The burden for Form N–17f–1 is included in a separate collection of information.

⁶ This estimate is based on the following calculation: 60 hours × \$1445 (total annual cost per fund) = \$86.700.

⁷This estimate is based on the following calculation: 360 hours × \$165 (total annual cost per fund) = \$59.400.