

potential corrective measures described in RG 1.154 indicates that they are either impractical or that they have already been implemented because of changes to standard industry practices since the issuance of the RG in 1987. RG 1.154 lists five general classes of potential corrective actions. The current assessment suggests that few of the corrective actions listed in RG 1.154 would effectively mitigate PTS risk relative to the baseline risk established by the technical basis documents that support the alternative rule 10 CFR 50.61a. Licensees have a choice to apply more conservative screening criteria in 10 CFR 50.61 or more permissive and risk-informed criteria in the alternative rule 10 CFR 50.61a. If a licensee chooses to apply the screening criteria in 10 CFR 50.61 to their plant, and the plant is projected to reach the screening limits in 10 CFR 50.61, the licensee can either choose to follow procedures prescribed in 10 CFR 50.61 (b)(3) on implementing flux reduction measures or 10 CFR 50.61 (b)(4) on performing plant-specific safety analysis. However, if a licensee chooses to follow 10 CFR 50.61 (b)(4) on performing safety analysis, Regulatory Guide 1.154 cannot be used, as it is hereby being withdrawn.

II. Further Information

The withdrawal of RG 1.154 does not alter any prior or existing licensing commitments based on its use. Regulatory guides may be withdrawn when their guidance no longer provides useful information, or is superseded by technological, congressional action, or other events.

Guides are revised for a variety of reasons, and the withdrawal of a regulatory guide should be thought of as the final revision of the guide. Although a regulatory guide is withdrawn, current licensees may continue to use it, and withdrawal does not affect any existing licenses or agreements. Withdrawal means that the guide should not be used for future NRC licensing activities. Changes to existing licenses would be accomplished using other regulatory products.

Regulatory guides and publicly available NRC documents are available electronically through the Electronic Reading Room on the NRC's public Web site at: <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/doc-collections/>. The documents can also be viewed online or printed for a fee in the NRC's Public Document Room (PDR) at 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland; the mailing address is USNRC PDR, Washington, DC 20555; telephone: 301-415-4737 or 800-397-4209; fax: 301-415-3548; and e-mail: pdr.resource@nrc.gov.

Regulatory guides are not copyrighted, and NRC approval is not required to reproduce them.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 6th day of January 2011.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Harriet Karagiannis,

Acting Chief, Regulatory Guide Development Branch, Division of Engineering, Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research.

[FR Doc. 2011-723 Filed 1-13-11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

PEACE CORPS

Proposed Collection of Information

ACTION: Submission for Office of Management and Budget (OMB) review; comment request.

SUMMARY: The Peace Corps has submitted a proposed collection of information to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and clearance under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995. This notice invites the public to comment on the proposed collection of information by the Peace Corps' Office of Communications. The Peace Corps invites comments on whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for proper performance of the functions of the Peace Corps, including whether the information will have practical use; the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the information to be collected; and ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who respond, including through the use of automated collection techniques, when appropriate, and other forms of information technology.

DATES: Comments regarding this collection must be received on or before February 14, 2011.

ADDRESSES: Interested persons are invited to submit comments regarding this proposal. Comments should refer to the proposal by name/or OMB approval number and should be sent via e-mail to: oira_submission@omb.eop.gov or fax to: 202-395-3086. *Attention:* Desk Officer for Peace Corps.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Denora Miller, FOIA Officer, Peace Corps, 1111 20th Street, NW., Washington, DC 20526, (202) 692-1236, or e-mail at pcf@peacecorps.gov. Copies of available documents submitted to OMB may be obtained from Denora Miller.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The purpose of this survey is to collect feedback from Peace Corps applicants and Returned Volunteers to help understand which factors are driving recruitment attrition, as well as what information or education needs would increase the conversion ratio. An online survey will be conducted among 1,200 Peace Corps applicants and Returned Peace Corps Volunteers including 300 from each of the following segments: Inquire—complete an initial inquiry but do not begin or submit an application; Begin application—but either do not submit it or move forward; Submit complete application—but then elect not to proceed by stopping communication or actively withdrawing during the review process; Returned Peace Corps Volunteers—who recently closed Peace Corps service in the past two years. Including Returned Peace Corps Volunteers in the study will provide information to understand what is working in the application process and will help guide the strategies for correcting the conversion loss. There is no statutory or regulatory requirement for this information.

Method: The information will be collected through an online survey.

Title: Peace Corps Conversion Loss Survey.

OMB Control Number: [To be assigned.]

Type of Review: New.

Affected Public: Former applicants to the Peace Corps and Returned Peace Corps Volunteers Respondents' obligation to reply: Voluntary.

Estimate of the total number of respondents: 1,200.

Estimated time to complete survey: 20 minutes.

Estimate of the total public burden (in hours): 400 hours.

Frequency of Response: 1 time.

Estimated number of respondents: 1,200.

General description of collection: To understand which factors are driving recruitment attrition, as well as what information or education needs would increase the conversion ratio.

Dated: January 10, 2011.

Earl W. Yates,

Associate Director for Management.

[FR Doc. 2011-766 Filed 1-13-11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6051-01-P

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

Sunshine Act; Notice of Public Meeting

Notice is hereby given that the Railroad Retirement Board will hold a

meeting on January 19, 2011, 10 a.m. at the Board's meeting room on the 8th floor of its headquarters building, 844 North Rush Street, Chicago, Illinois, 60611. The agenda for this meeting follows:

(1) Executive Committee Reports

The entire meeting will be open to the public. The person to contact for more information is Beatrice Ezerski, Secretary to the Board, Phone No. 312-751-4920.

Dated: January 10, 2011.

Beatrice Ezerski,

Secretary to the Board.

[FR Doc. 2011-864 Filed 1-12-11; 11:15 am]

BILLING CODE 7905-01-P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. SIPA-170; File No. SIPC-2010-01]

Securities Investor Protection Corporation; Order Approving a Proposed Bylaw Change Relating to SIPC Fund Assessments on SIPC Members

January 10, 2011.

On October 8, 2010, the Securities Investor Protection Corporation ("SIPC") filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission ("Commission") a proposed bylaw change pursuant to Section 3(e)(1) of the Securities Investor Protection Act of 1970 ("SIPA"), 15 U.S.C. 78ccc(e)(1). Notice of the proposed bylaw change was published in the **Federal Register** on December 6, 2010.¹ The Commission received no comment letters on the proposed bylaw change. This order approves the proposed bylaw change.

I. Description of Proposed Bylaw Change

Section 4(c)(2) of SIPA requires SIPC to impose assessments upon its member broker-dealers deemed necessary and appropriate to establish and maintain a broker-dealer liquidation fund administered by SIPC (the "SIPC Fund") and to repay any borrowings by SIPC used to liquidate a broker-dealer. Pursuant to this authority, SIPC collects an annual assessment from its members. The amount of the annual assessment is prescribed by SIPA and the SIPC bylaws. When the SIPC Fund is at its targeted level, SIPC collects a minimum assessment as provided in SIPA. The current target level for the SIPC Fund is \$2.5 billion.

The Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act of 2010 ("Dodd-Frank Act") amended SIPA to change the minimum assessment from an amount not to exceed \$150 to an amount not to exceed 0.02 percent of the gross revenues from the securities business of the SIPC member.² Under Article 6 of the SIPC bylaws, SIPC must assess its members a minimum amount (\$150) unless certain conditions apply. Because in some cases an assessment of \$150 would exceed 0.02 percent of a member's gross revenues, the SIPC Assessments bylaw must be amended to be consistent with the Dodd-Frank Act. First, SIPC has proposed to amend Article 6, Section 1(a)(1)(B) of the SIPC bylaws by replacing "\$150" with the term "0.02 percent of the net operating revenues from the securities business." This amendment clarifies that the minimum assessment for members, once the SIPC Fund reaches its target, is 0.02 percent of a member's net operating revenues, rather than \$150. Second, SIPC has proposed deleting Section 1(a)(3) of Article 6, which states that \$150 was the minimum assessment a SIPC member would be required to pay in any calendar year. These amendments were approved by SIPC's Board of Directors on September 16, 2010.

As indicated above, SIPC's bylaw changes refer to "net operating revenues" instead of "gross revenues." Since 1991, when assessing on a percentage basis (*i.e.*, not a flat \$150 minimum assessment), SIPC has based the assessment amount on a percentage of net operating revenues, not gross revenues, from the securities business. In 1991, a SIPC Task Force study found that securities firms no longer structured their business on a gross revenue basis but instead used a net operating revenue basis, which excludes interest expense and dividend expense in accounting for revenue. SIPC bases its assessment on the net revenues associated with that business, which it believes is consistent with SIPA. Basing the assessment on net operating revenues as opposed to gross revenues will decrease the amount of the assessment in most situations. However, under SIPA, SIPC may adjust the basis for collecting assessments and the amount of assessments as long as the assessments are within the parameters prescribed in SIPA.³ Using a minimum assessment of 0.02 percent of net operating revenues would not cause the amount of the assessment to exceed the maximum amount permitted for the

minimum assessment under Section 4(d)(1)(C) of SIPA, as amended by the Dodd-Frank Act.

II. Commission Findings

Section 3(e)(1) of SIPA provides that SIPC must file with the Commission a copy of proposed bylaw changes. That section further provides that bylaw changes shall take effect 30 days after filing, unless the Commission either: (i) Disapproves the change as contrary to the public interest or the purposes of SIPA, or (ii) finds that the change involves a matter of such significant public interest that public comment should be obtained. Once the Commission finds that the proposed bylaw change involves a matter of such significant public interest that public comment should be obtained, the Commission may, after notifying SIPC in writing of such finding, require that the proposed bylaw change be considered by the same procedures as a proposed rule change including, among other things, publication in the **Federal Register** and opportunity for public comment. Prior to approving a proposed bylaw change that has been noticed for public comment the Commission must make a finding that the change is in the public interest and is consistent with the purposes of SIPA.⁴

The Commission finds, pursuant to Section 3(e)(2)(D) of SIPA, that the proposed bylaw change is in the public interest and consistent with SIPA. First, the proposed bylaw change is a necessary consequence of Dodd-Frank. Second, utilizing net operating revenues instead of gross revenues is consistent with industry practice, SIPA, and the SIPC bylaws.

III. Conclusion

It is therefore ordered, pursuant to Section 3(e)(2)(B) of SIPA, that the proposed bylaw changes (File No. SIPC-2010-01) are approved.

By the Commission.

Elizabeth M. Murphy,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2011-711 Filed 1-13-11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8011-01-P

¹ See Release No. SIPA-169 (November 30, 2010), 75 FR 75711 (December 6, 2010).

² The Dodd-Frank Act, Section 929V.

³ 15 U.S.C. 78ddd(c)(2) and 78lll(9).

⁴ 15 U.S.C. 78ccc(e)(2)(D).