information that may be in documents, folders, etc., in the meeting room. Electronic recordings will be permitted only during those portions of the meeting that are open to the public.

(e) A transcript is kept for certain open portions of the meeting and will be available in the NRC Public Document Room (PDR), One White Flint North, Room O-1F21, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, MD 20852-2738. ACRS meeting agenda, transcripts, and letter reports are available through the NRC Public Document Room at pdr@nrc.gov, by calling the PDR at 1-800-394-4209, or from the Publicly Available Records System (PARS) component of NRC's document system (ADAMS) which is accessible from the NRC Web site at http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/ adams.html or http://www.nrc.gov/ reading-rm/doc-collections/. A copy of the certified minutes of the meeting will be available at the same location up to three months following the meeting. Copies may be obtained upon payment of appropriate reproduction charges.

(f) Video teleconferencing service is available for observing open sessions of ACRS meetings. Those wishing to use this service for observing ACRS meetings should contact Mr. Theron Brown, ACRS Audio Visual Technician, (301-415-8066) between 7:30 a.m. and 3:45 p.m. eastern time at least 10 days before the meeting to ensure the availability of this service. Individuals or organizations requesting this service will be responsible for telephone line charges and for providing the equipment and facilities that they use to establish the video teleconferencing link. The availability of video teleconferencing services is not guaranteed.

#### **ACRS Subcommittee Meetings**

In accordance with the revised FACA, the agency is no longer required to apply the FACA requirements to meetings conducted by the Subcommittees of the NRC Advisory Committees, if the Subcommittee's recommendations would be independently reviewed by its parent Committee.

The ACRS, however, chose to conduct its Subcommittee meetings in accordance with the above procedures noted above for ACRS meetings, as appropriate, to facilitate public participation, and to provide a forum to stakeholders to express their views on regulatory matters being considered by the ACRS. When Subcommittee meetings are held at locations other than at NRC facilities, reproduction facilities may not be available at a reasonable cost. Accordingly, 25 additional copies

of the materials to be used during the meeting should be provided for distribution at such meetings.

## Special Provisions When Proprietary Sessions Are To Be Held

If it is necessary to hold closed sessions for the purpose of discussing matters involving proprietary information, persons with agreements permitting access to such information may attend those portions of the ACRS meetings where this material is being discussed upon confirmation that such agreements are effective and related to the material being discussed.

The DFO should be informed of such an agreement at least five working days prior to the meeting so that it can be confirmed, and a determination can be made regarding the applicability of the agreement to the material that will be discussed during the meeting. The minimum information provided should include information regarding the date of the agreement, the scope of material included in the agreement, the project or projects involved, and the names and titles of the persons signing the agreement. Additional information may be requested to identify the specific agreement involved. A copy of the executed agreement should be provided to the DFO prior to the beginning of the meeting for admittance to the closed session.

Dated: October 9, 2003.

## Andrew L. Bates,

Advisory Committee Management Officer. [FR Doc. 03–26136 Filed 10–15–03; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

# Regulatory Guide; Issuance, Availability

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) has issued a revision of a guide in its Regulatory Guide Series. This series has been developed to describe and make available to the public such information as methods acceptable to the NRC staff for implementing specific parts of the NRC's regulations, techniques used by the staff in its review of applications for permits and licenses, and data needed by the NRC staff in its review of applications for permits and licenses.

Revision 1 of Regulatory Guide 1.159, "Assuring the Availability of Funds for Decommissioning Nuclear Reactors," provides guidance to licensees and applicants of nuclear power, research, and test reactors concerning methods acceptable to the NRC staff for complying with requirements in the rules regarding the amount of funds for decommissioning. It also provides guidance on the content and form of the financial assurance mechanisms in those rule amendments.

Comments and suggestions in connection with items for inclusion in guides currently being developed or improvements in all published guides are encouraged at any time. Written comments may be submitted to the Rules and Directives Branch, Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington DC 20555. Questions on the content of this guide may be directed to Mr. B.J. Richter, (301) 415–1978; e-mail BJR@NRC.GOV.

Regulatory guides are available for inspection or downloading at the NRC's Web site at http://www.nrc.gov under Regulatory Guides and in NRC's **Electronic Reading Room (ADAMS** System) at the same site. Single copies of regulatory guides may be obtained free of charge by writing the Reproduction and Distribution Services Section, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, or by fax to (301) 415–2289, or by e-mail to DISTRIBUTION@NRC.GOV. Issued guides may also be purchased from the National Technical Information Service (NTIS) on a standing order basis. Details on this service may be obtained by writing NTIS at 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, VA 22161; telephone 1-800-553-6847; http:// www.ntis.gov/. Regulatory guides are not copyrighted, and Commission approval is not required to reproduce them. (5 U.S.C. 552(a))

Dated at Rockville, MD, this 2nd day of October, 2003.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

## Ashok C. Thadani,

Director, Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research.

[FR Doc. 03–26138 Filed 10–15–03; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 40-8989]

Issuance of Environmental
Assessment and Finding of No
Significant Impact for Exemption From
Certain NRC Licensing Requirements
for Special Nuclear Material for
Envirocare of Utah, Inc.

### **I Introduction**

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is considering issuance of an Order pursuant to Section 274f of the Atomic Energy Act that would modify an Order transmitted to Envirocare of Utah, Inc. (Envirocare). The original Order was published in the Federal Register on May 21, 1999 (64 FR 27826). The 1999 Order exempted Envirocare from certain NRC regulations and permitted Envirocare, under specified conditions, to possess waste containing special nuclear material (SNM), in greater quantities than specified in 10 CFR part 150, at Envirocare's low-level waste (LLW) disposal facility located in Clive, Utah, without obtaining an NRC license pursuant to 10 CFR part 70. At the request of Envirocare, the Order was subsequently modified on January 30, 2003, and published in the Federal Register on February 13, 2003 (68 FR

Envirocare is licensed by the State of Utah, an NRC Agreement State, under a 10 CFR part 61 equivalent license for the disposal of LLW. Envirocare is also licensed by Utah to dispose of mixed-radioactive and hazardous waste. In addition, Envirocare has an NRC license (SMC–1559) to dispose of waste containing 11(e)2 byproduct material.

In a letter dated July 8, 2003, Envirocare requested that the January 2003 Order be amended as discussed below. Staff's safety analysis for the revisions to the January 2003 Order is discussed in the companion Safety Evaluation Report (SER).

### II Environmental Assessment (EA)

Identification of Proposed Action

Envirocare proposes that NRC amend the January 2003 Order to: (1) Modify the table in Condition 1 to a criticality basis for uranium-233 and plutonium isotopes, and revise the concentration limits for uranium and plutonium to include limits for waste without magnesium oxide; (2) modify the units of the table from pCi of SNM per gram of waste material to gram of SNM per gram of waste material; and (3) revise the language of Condition 5 to be consistent with the revised units in the table.

Need for the Proposed Action

The table in Condition 1 of the January 2003 Order prescribes concentration limits that are based on Class A low-level radioactive waste limits rather than a criticality-based analysis. Envirocare would like to expand its capabilities to accept additional waste streams. In order to do so, the SNM concentration limits in the table in Condition 1 of the Order would need to be revised.

Alternatives to the Proposed Action

The NRC staff considered the proposed action and the no-action alternative. The no-action alternative would be not to revise the Order.

#### Affected Environment

NRC has prepared an environmental impact statement (EIS) (NUREG–1476), SERs, and EAs for its previous actions. The affected environment for the Envirocare site is described in detail in NUREG–1476.

Environmental Impacts of the Alternatives

No-Action Alternative: For the noaction alternative, the environmental impacts would be the same as evaluated in the Environmental Assessments to support the 1999 Order (64 FR 26463, May 14, 1999) and the January 2003 modification of the Order (68 FR 3281). The regulations regarding SNM possession in 10 CFR part 150 set mass limits whereby a licensee is exempted from the licensing requirements of 10 CFR part 70 and can be regulated by an Agreement State. The licensing requirements in 10 CFR part 70 apply to persons possessing greater than critical mass quantities (as defined in 10 CFR 150.11). The principle emphasis of 10 CFR part 70 is criticality safety and safeguarding SNM against diversion or sabotage. The NRC staff considers that criticality safety can be maintained by relying on concentration limits, under the specified conditions. These concentration limits are considered an alternative definition of quantities not sufficient to form a critical mass to the weight limits in 10 CFR 150.11; thereby, assuring the same level of protection. The 1999 and January 2003 EAs concluded that the Order would have no significant radiological or nonradiological environmental impacts.

Proposed Action: For the proposed action, the environmental impacts are not expected to be significant. Effluent releases and potential doses to the public are regulated by the State of Utah and are not anticipated to change as a result of this revision. In a 2001 EA for Waste Control Specialists, LLC (WCS) (66 FR 56358), the staff found that there would be no significant radiological or nonradiological impacts resulting from the proposed limits of uranium and plutonium, and the same limits are being applied to Envirocare in this revision of its Order. In addition, these revisions to the Order are not expected to significantly change environmental impacts from current operations at Envirocare. WCS does not use magnesium oxide in its processing;

therefore, in order to use the same limits for uranium and plutonium at its facility, Envirocare will not use magnesium oxide during treatment of the waste stream allowed by the revision. This will help ensure criticality safety during processing.

For Envirocare, the changes to the limits will allow the site to accept a new waste stream, which may increase the number of waste shipments to the site. The addition of a new waste stream would result in approximately 40 additional shipments per year to the site, which equates to less than one shipment per week. It is not expected that the small increase in shipments would have a significant environmental impact to the local area.

## Preferred Alternative

The staff has concluded that the proposed action is the preferred alternative. The radiological and nonradiological impacts are not expected to be significant.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

Officials from the State of Utah, Department of Environmental Quality, Division of Radiation Control were contacted about this EA for the proposed action and had no comments. Because the proposed action is not expected to have any impact on threatened or endangered species or historic resources, the Fish and Wildlife Service and the State of Utah Historic Preservation Officer were not contacted.

### III. Finding of No Significant Impact

The environmental impacts of the proposed action have been reviewed in accordance with the requirements set forth in 10 CFR part 51. Based upon the forgoing EA, the NRC finds that the preferred alternative of the proposed action will not significantly impact the quality of the human environment. Accordingly, the NRC has decided not to prepare an EIS for the proposed exemption.

## IV. Further Information

The request for modifying the Order is available for inspection at NRC's Public Electronic Reading Room at http://www.nrc.gov/NRC/ADAMS/index.html ML031950334. The September 23, 2003, Safety Evaluation Report is available at ML032680942. The EA for the January 2003 Order is available in the Federal Register at 68 FR 3281. The EA for the exemption for WCS is available in the Federal Register at 66 FR 56358. Documents may also be obtained from NRC's Public Document Room at U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Public Document Room,

Washington DC 20555. Any questions with respect to this action should be referred to Anna H. Bradford, Environmental and Performance Assessment Branch, Division of Waste Management, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington DC 20555–0001. Telephone: (301) 415–5228, Fax: (301) 415–5397.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 8th day of October, 2003.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

#### Lawrence E. Kokajko,

Chief, Environmental and Performance Assessment Branch, Division of Waste Management, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.

[FR Doc. 03–26137 Filed 10–15–03; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

## OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION

#### **Sunshine Act Meetings; Public Hearing**

October 14, 2003.

OPIC's Sunshine Act notice of its public hearing was published in the **Federal Register** (Volume 68, Number 193, page 57716) on October 6, 2003. No requests were received to provide testimony or submit written statements for the record; therefore, OPIC's public hearing in conjunction with OPIC's October 15, 2003 Board of Directors meeting scheduled for 11 AM on October 14, 2003 has been cancelled.

## FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Information on the hearing cancellation may be obtained from Connie M. Downs at (202) 336–8438, via facsimile at (202) 218–0136, or via email at *cdown@opic.gov*.

Dated: October 14, 2003.

#### Connie M. Downs,

OPIC Corporate Secretary.

[FR Doc. 03–26278 Filed 10–14–03; 11:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3210-01-M

## OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

Proposed Collection; Comment Request for Review of a Revised Information Collection: RI 30–1

AGENCY: Office of Personnel

Management. **ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104–13, May 22, 1995), this notice announces that the Office of Personnel

Management (OPM) intends to submit to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) a request for review of a revised information collection. RI 30–1, Request to Disability Annuitant for Information on Physical Condition and Employment, is used by persons who are not yet age 60 and who are receiving disability annuity and are subject to inquiry as to their medical condition as OPM deems reasonably necessary. RI 30–1 collects information as to whether the disabling condition has changed.

Approximately 8,000 RI 30–1 forms will be completed annually. We estimate it takes approximately 60 minutes to complete the form. The annual burden is 8,000 hours.

Comments are particularly invited on: whether this collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of functions of the Office of Personnel Management, and whether it will have practical utility; whether our estimate of the public burden of this collection is accurate, and based on valid assumptions and methodology; and ways in which we can minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, through use of the appropriate technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology. For copies of this proposal, contact Mary Beth Smith-Toomey on (202) 606-8358, fax (202) 418-3251 or E-mail to mbtoomey@opm.gov. Please include your mailing address with your request.

**DATES:** Comments on this proposal should be received on or before December 15, 2003.

ADDRESSES: Send or deliver comments to Ronald W. Melton, Chief, Operations Support Group, Center for Retirement and Insurance Services, U.S. Office of Personnel Management, 1900 E Street, NW., Room 3349A, Washington, DC 20415–3540.

For Information Regarding Administrative Coordination— Contact: Cyrus S. Benson, Team Leader, Publications Team, (202) 606–0623.

U.S. Office of Personnel Management.

### Kay Coles James,

Director.

[FR Doc. 03–26215 Filed 10–15–03; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6325–50–P

## SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

## Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

Upon Written Request, Copies Available From: Securities and Exchange Commission, Office of Filings and Information Services, 450 Fifth Street, NW., Washington, DC 20549.

Extension: Rule 17f–6 [17 CFR 270.17f–6]; SEC File No. 270–392; OMB Control No. 3235–0447.

Notice is hereby given that, under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501–3520), the Securities and Exchange Commission (the "Commission") has submitted to the Office of Management and Budget a request for extension of the previously approved collection of information discussed below.

Rule 17f–6 under the Investment Company Act of 1940 [17 CFR 270.17f–6] 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. Before the rule was adopted, funds generally were required to maintain such assets in special accounts with a custodian bank.¹

The rule requires a written contract that contains certain provisions to ensure important safeguards and other benefits relating to the custody of fund assets by FCMs. The requirement that FCMs comply with the segregation or secured amount requirements of the Commodity Exchange Act ("CEA") and the rules under that statute is designed to protect fund assets held by FCMs. The contract requirement that an FCM obtain an acknowledgment from an entity that clears fund transactions that the fund's assets are held on behalf of the FCM's customers according to CEA provisions seeks to accommodate the legitimate needs of the participants in the commodity settlement process, consistent with the protection of fund assets. 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 of funds.

The Commission estimates that approximately 2,154 funds effect commodities transactions and could

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> See 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)].