

Company, LLC (the licensee), for operation of the Quad Cities Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1, located in Rock Island County, Illinois. 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 grant a schedular extension for Quad Cities Nuclear Power Station (Quad Cities), Unit 1, from implementation of inservice examinations of the reactor pressure vessel (RPV) nozzle-to-vessel welds and nozzle inside radius sections, per American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME) Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code (Code), Section XI, Table IWB-2500, Examination Category B-D, Item Nos. B3.90 and B3.100, by the end of the current 120-month inspection interval, as required by 10 CFR 50.55a, "Codes and standards," paragraph (g)(4)(ii). The current interval ends on February 17, 2003 for Quad Cities Unit 1. This schedular exemption requests an extension for the performance of the third interval inspections until the completion of the Unit 1 refueling outage in January 2005.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application dated July 10, 2002.

The Need for the Proposed Action

The proposed action is needed to prevent unnecessary radiation worker exposure. Quad Cities Unit 1 was not specifically designed or constructed to permit easy access to the RPV nozzle-to-vessel welds and nozzle inside radius sections for inservice inspection, from the inside or outside surface. The task to access a nozzle for inservice examination employs several work groups and a significant number of man-hours with the attendant large radiation exposure accumulation. The estimated radiation dose avoided by exempting the nine nozzles until the fourth inspection interval is a minimum of 60 man-rem.

The licensee wishes to extend the inspection schedule in order to reduce unnecessary radiation exposure. Such an extension requires an exemption because 10 CFR 50.55a(g)(4)(ii) requires inservice examinations of the RPV nozzle-to-vessel welds and nozzle inside radius sections, per the ASME Code, Section XI, Table IWB-2500, Examination Category B-D, Item Nos. B3.90 and B3.100, by the end of the current 120-month inspection interval.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The NRC has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that there are no significant adverse environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

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, and 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 nonradiological impacts, the proposed action does not have a potential to affect any historic sites. It does not affect nonradiological plant effluents and has no other environmental impact. Therefore, there are no significant nonradiological 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 resource than those previously considered in the Final Environmental Statement for the Quad Cities Nuclear Power Station, Units 1 and 2, dated September 1972.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

On July 25, 2002, the staff consulted with the Illinois State official, Mr. F. Niziolek of the 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 the proposed action, see the licensee's letter dated July 10, 2002. 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 (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 by e-mail to pdr@nrc.gov.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 27th day of August 2002.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Anthony J. Mendiola,

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

[FR Doc. 02-22598 Filed 9-4-02; 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 20a-1 SEC File No. 270-132 OMB Control No. 3235-0158.

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.

The title of the collection of information is "Rule 20a-1 under the Investment Company Act of 1940, Solicitation of Proxies, Consents and Authorizations." Rule 20a-1(a) requires that the solicitation of a proxy, consent or authorization with respect to a security issued by a registered fund be in compliance with Regulation 14A (17 CFR 240.14a-1 to 14a-104), Schedule 14A (17 CFR 240.14a-101), and all other rules and regulations adopted under section 14(a) of the Securities Exchange

Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78n(a)). Rule 20a-1(b) requires a fund's investment adviser, or a prospective adviser, to transmit to the person making a proxy solicitation the information necessary to enable that person to comply with the rules and regulations applicable to the solicitation.

Regulation 14A and Schedule 14A establish the disclosure requirements applicable to the solicitation of proxies, consents and authorizations. In particular, Item 22 of Schedule 14A contains extensive disclosure requirements for registered investment company proxy statements. Among other things, it requires the disclosure of information about fund fee or expense increases, the election of directors, the approval of an investment advisory contract and the approval of a distribution plan.

The Commission requires the dissemination of this information to assist investors in understanding their fund investments and the choices they may be asked to make regarding fund operations. The Commission does not use the information in proxies directly, but reviews proxy statement filings for compliance with applicable rules.

It is estimated that approximately 1,000 registered investment companies are required to file one proxy statement annually. The total annual reporting and recordkeeping burden of the collection of information is estimated to be approximately 106,200 hours (1,000 responses \times 106.2 hours per response).

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.

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: August 28, 2002.

Margaret H. McFarland,

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 02-22573 Filed 9-4-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8010-01-P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 46429; File No. SR-NASD-99-53]

Order With Respect to the Implementation of NASDAQ'S SuperMontage Facility

On January 19, 2001, the Commission conditionally approved a proposed rule change submitted by the National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc. (the "NASD"), on behalf of The Nasdaq Stock Market ("Nasdaq"), that would establish a new order display and collection facility for Nasdaq-listed securities ("SuperMontage").¹ To address the concerns expressed by several market participants that certain Commission rules would effectively make their participation in the SuperMontage mandatory,² the Commission conditioned its approval of the SuperMontage on the implementation of an alternative display facility ("ADF") by the NASD.

Specifically, the Commission conditioned its approval of the SuperMontage on the following, which must be implemented prior to or at the same time as the SuperMontage:

(1) That the NASD will offer a quote and trade reporting alternative that satisfies the Order Handling Rules, Regulation ATS, and other regulatory requirements for ATSs, ECNs, and market makers;

(2) That NASD quotes disseminated through the exclusive securities information processor ("SIP") for Nasdaq-listed securities will identify the

ATS, ECN, or market maker source of the quote;³ and

(3) That participation in SuperMontage will be entirely voluntary, because NASD quotes will be included in the Nasdaq quotation management system while Nasdaq is the exclusive SIP, but only for display purposes, and the NASD will provide access to its quotes on a market-neutral basis.⁴

On July 24, 2002, the Division of Market Regulation approved, pursuant to delegated authority, operation of the ADF as a pilot program for nine months.⁵ The ADF pilot program permits registered market makers and registered ECNs to display their best-priced quotes or customer limit orders in Nasdaq-listed securities through the NASD. ADF market participants are required to provide other ADF market participants with direct electronic access to their quote, and to provide all other members of the NASD or a national securities exchange with the option to obtain direct electronic access or indirect electronic access through private linkages. The ADF also serves as a trade reporting and trade comparison facility. The ADF will therefore allow market participants to satisfy their order display and execution access obligations under the Order Handling Rules and Regulation ATS. The NASD staff has indicated that several ECNs have expressed an interest in fulfilling their quote display obligations through the ADF and are in varying stages of adapting their systems to participate in the ADF.⁶

³ The Commission stated in the SuperMontage Approval Order that it would require Nasdaq and the exchanges trading Nasdaq securities on an unlisted trading privileges ("UTP") basis to renegotiate existing intermarket plans to provide for a new exclusive SIP or multiple non-exclusive SIPs for Nasdaq securities. The Commission further stated that if the revised plan provided for a new exclusive SIP, the operator of the new processor should not be a Plan participant except under certain conditions. SuperMontage Approval Order, 66 FR at 8052-55.

⁴ *Id.*, 66 FR at 8053-54.

⁵ Exchange Act Release No. 46249 (July 24, 2002), 67 FR 49822 (July 31, 2002). The NASD filed a proposal to establish an ADF on December 7, 2001. Exchange Act Release No. 45156 (December 14, 2001), 67 FR 388 (January 3, 2002). The NASD subsequently filed an amendment to the proposal on May 24, 2002, to respond to issues raised by commenters. Exchange Act Release No. 45991 (May 28, 2002), 67 FR 39476 (June 7, 2002).

⁶ Market Participants are not required to use either the ADF or SuperMontage to quote or report trades. For instance, beginning the week of August 5, 2002, the Cincinnati Stock Exchange has provided Island ECN ("Island") with the ability to represent orders in certain Nasdaq securities in the national best bid or offer. As a result, Island has indicated that it may choose not to represent customer limit orders in SuperMontage. See Notice to Island Subscribers dated August 5, 2002,

¹ Exchange Act Release No. 43863 (January 19, 2001), 66 FR 8020 (January 26, 2001) (File No. SR-NASD-99-53) (the "SuperMontage Approval Order").

² Rules 11Ac1-1(c)(5) and 11Ac1-4 under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (the "Exchange Act") permit a market maker or specialist to place a better-priced proprietary or customer limit order with an electronic communications network ("ECN") anonymously without updating its public quote to reflect the better-priced order, as long as the ECN displays the order in the public market through a self-regulatory organization ("SRO") and provides equivalent access to such order. 17 CFR 240.11Ac1-1(c) and 240.11Ac1-4 (the "Order Handling Rules"). Regulation ATS requires alternative trading systems ("ATSs"), including ECNs, that trade 5% or more of the average daily trading volume in an exchange or Nasdaq-listed security to display and provide execution access to their quotes through an SRO. 17 CFR 242.301(b).