steam flow velocities and moisture conditions.

The staff finds that the commenter's statement is correct in that the draft EA did not address flow-accelerated corrosion (FAC). However, that is because FAC is a safety issue which the staff addresses in its safety evaluations. FAC has been reviewed by the staff for the CPS EPU. Based on its review, the staff concludes that the licensee has adequately demonstrated that the changes in FAC caused by the EPU will be accounted for by the licensee making modifications to its FAC program. A summary of the staff's review will be contained in the CPS EPU safety evaluation. Additionally, the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards commented that the licensee's program for monitoring FAC should be rigorously conducted. Also, this issue will be followed by the staff as part of its oversight of plants that receive power uprate approvals. In conclusion, while FAC is a consideration for the CPS EPU, this comment is not within the scope of the EA and no change to the EA was necessary as a result of this comment.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on January 28, 2002, prior to issuance of this environmental assessment, the staff consulted with the Illinois State official, Frank Nizidlek, of the Illinois Department of Nuclear Safety, 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 this action, see the application for amendment dated June 18, 2001, as supplemented by letters dated September 7 and 28, October 17, 23, 26, and 31, November 8 (2 letters), 20, 21, 29, and 30, and December 5, 6, 7, 13 (2 letters), 20, 21, and 26, 2001, January 8, 15, 16, and 24, and March 15, 22, and 29, 2002, which are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, 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 Systems (ADAMS) Public Electronic Reading Room on the Internet at the NRC Web site, *http://www.nrc.gov/NRC/ADAMS/index.html*. Persons who do not have access to ADAMS or who encounter problems in accessing the documents located in ADAMS, should contact the NRC Public Document Room Reference staff by telephone at 1–800–397–4209, 301–415–4737 or by e-mail to *pdr@nrc.gov*.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 29th day of March, 2002.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Jon B. Hopkins,

Senior Project Manager, Section 2, Project Directorate III, Division of Licensing Project Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 02–8240 Filed 4–2–02; 2:02 pm]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Issuance, Availability of Draft NUREG; Announcements of Public Workshops

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Issuance of draft NUREG for comment and announcements of public workshops.

SUMMARY: The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is re-issuing for comment a draft of NUREG–1556, Volume 9, ''Consolidated Guidance About Materials Licenses; Program-Specific Guidance About Medical Use Licenses.'' This licensing guide is a companion to the recently published revision to 10 CFR part 35, ''Medical Use of Byproduct Material.'' The NRC is also developing additional guidance for medical use licensees and will be holding public workshops to obtain stakeholder input on content of this guidance. The NRC is especially interested in stakeholder comments that will improve the guidance to make it useful to applicants for medical use licenses, including licensees in Agreement States. The NRC is focusing on making the guidance more risk-informed and performance-based.

DATES: Commenters should submit comments on Draft NUREG–1556, Volume 9 by June 4, 2002. Comments received after this date will be considered if it is practical to do so, but the Commission is able to assure consideration only for comments received on or before this date. A 1-day public workshop will be held on Thursday, April 25, 2002, from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. at NRC's headquarters; the workshop will be preceded by an open house from 8 a.m. to 9 a.m. The emphasis in this workshop will be on guidance related to therapeutic applications of byproduct materials. To ensure that adequate copies of handouts are available, persons planning to attend the workshop should contact the person designated below by April 18, 2002. A second 1-day public workshop will be held at the same location on April 30, 2002, from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m.; the workshop will be preceded by an open house from 8 a.m. to 9 a.m. The emphasis of this workshop will be on guidance related to diagnostic applications of byproduct material. To ensure that adequate copies of handouts are available, persons planning to attend the workshop should contact the person designated below by April 23, 2002. The intent of the open houses is to present the opportunity for informal interactions between attendees, both NRC staff and members of the public. A third workshop, relating to guidance for inspection of entities licensed under 10 CFR part 35, is planned for late May and will be announced in the **Federal Register** as well as on the NRC's web site (see **ADDRESSES**, below). It is also planned to post draft inspection guidance on the NRC's web site for comment.

ADDRESSES: Written comments on NUREG–1556, Volume 9 may be submitted to the Chief, Rules and Directives Branch, Division of Administrative Services, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555. You may also provide comments through the NRC's rulemaking forum / web site at *http://ruleforum.llnl.gov/cgi-bin/rulemake?source=MU—PRULE*. The NRC also plans to post draft inspection guidance at this web site for public viewing prior to the public meeting on inspection guidance planned for late May. Provisions are available at this site to upload comments as files (any format) if your web browser supports that function. For information about the web site, contact Carol Gallagher via E-mail at *CAG@nrc.gov*.

The public workshops will be held at the NRC Auditorium, Two White Flint North, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland. Information about the workshops will also be posted at NRC's web site at *http://www.nrc.gov*; click on ''Public Meeting Schedule.''

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Roger W. Broseus, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, Office of Industrial and Medical Nuclear Safety, Rulemaking and Guidance Branch, Mail Stop T9–C24, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001; telephone: (301) 415–7608; E-mail: *RWB@nrc.gov*. Questions

about the public meeting process should be directed to Francis Cameron; Office of the General Counsel, USNRC, Washington DC 20555–000; E-mail: *FXC@nrc.gov*; telephone: (301) 415–1642.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Draft NUREG–1556, Consolidated Guidance About Materials Licenses—Volume 9, Program—Specific Guidance About Medical Use Licenses

The NRC is issuing a draft of NUREG–1556, Volume 9, for public comment for a 60-day period. In addition to obtaining written comments, the staff will be conducting a public workshop on April 25, 2002, to obtain stakeholder comments on this Volume, with emphasis on therapeutic applications of byproduct materials. A second public workshop will be held on April 30, 2002, to receive stakeholder input on guidance, with emphasis on diagnostic applications of byproduct materials. Both workshops will be held in the Auditorium at NRC Headquarters in Rockville, MD.

The NRC staff is seeking input on the guidance contained in the draft NUREG, previously published for public comment in August 1998, in order to make the guidance as useful as possible to those who may seek NRC licensure under 10 CFR part 35, ''Medical Use of Byproduct Material.'' Comments received since publication of the 1998 draft have been considered by staff; these comments and NRC's responses appear in Appendix Z of the current draft. Comments about any of the guidance in Volume 9 are welcome; staff is especially interested in receiving comments on the following questions:

1. Level of Detail and Format: Is the format and level of detail in the guidance appropriate for first-time applicants? Should the guidance be more general in describing acceptable methods of meeting 10 CFR part 35 requirements? If so, please provide suggestions for revisions. Discussion about the pros and cons of providing extensive detail about safety and other procedures would be especially helpful.

2. Model Procedures: Are the model procedures helpful as written? Should they be retained or rewritten? If so, please provide suggestions for revisions.

3. Licensing Guidance Specific to Diagnostic Nuclear Medicine: The staff is considering development of a summary of the licensing requirements for diagnostic medical use of byproduct materials? Is such a document desirable? What should be provided in the guidance? How long should it be?

4. Other Guidance: Are there additional voluntary industry consensus standards or other publically available documents that should be considered for reference in NUREG–1556, Volume 9?

To facilitate the NRC's handling of comments, we request that commenters relate their comments to specific sections and/or appendices in the NUREG. This will help place the comments in context and aid in understanding how they relate to the guidance.

The NRC is placing added emphasis on conducting its regulatory activities in a risk-informed and performance-based manner. This approach is intended to be less prescriptive and allow for the implementation of programs by licensees that may be specific to their needs while meeting the regulatory requirements. In the past, applicants have requested guidance from the NRC staff on what procedures are acceptable, with the expectation that licensing process delays would thereby be avoided. Others have expressed the view that the provision of specific guidance results in the perception that the only way to receive a license is to adhere to the guidance. The NRC staff seeks to meet the needs of applicants for licensure, while not suggesting that details in the guidance are prescriptive. Comments on Volume 9 will help NRC staff to provide guidance that is helpful while not providing too much detail.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 28th day of March, 2002.

For The Nuclear Regulatory Commission

Patricia K. Holahan,

Chief, Rulemaking and Guidance Branch, Division of Industrial and Medical Nuclear Safety, Office of Nuclear Materials Safety and Safeguards.

[FR Doc. 02–8243 Filed 4–4–02; 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 17f–2(e), SEC File No. 270–37; OMB Control No. 3235–0031

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'') 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–2(e) requires members of national securities exchanges, brokers, dealers, registered transfer agents, and registered clearing agencies claiming exemption from the fingerprinting requirements of Rule 17f–2 to prepare and maintain a statement supporting their claim for exemption. Approximately 75 respondents incur an annual total burden of 37.5 hours complying with the requirements of Rule 17f–2(e).

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 estimates 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.

Please direct your written comments to Michael E. Bartell, Associate Executive Director, Office of Information Technology, Securities and Exchange Commission, 450 5th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20549.

Dated: March 29, 2002.

Margaret H. McFarland,

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 02–8205 Filed 4–4–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8010–01–P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. IC—25502]

Notice of Applications for Deregistration Under Section 8(f) of the Investment Company Act of 1940

March 29, 2002.

The following is a notice of applications for deregistration under section 8(f) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 for the month of March, 2002. A copy of each application may be obtained for a fee at the SEC's Public Reference Branch, 450 Fifth St., NW, Washington, DC 20549–0102 (tel. 202–942–8090). An order granting each