

geologic repository site, or wishing to participate in a license application review for a potential geologic repository (other than a potential geologic repository site at Yucca Mountain, Nevada, currently under investigation by the U.S. Department of Energy, which is now regulated under 10 CFR Part 63).

5. *The number of annual respondents:* 1; however, none are expected in the next three years.

6. *The number of hours needed annually to complete the requirement or request:* 121 hours; however, none are expected in the next three years.

7. *Abstract:* Part 60 requires States and Indian Tribes to submit certain information to the NRC if they request consultation with the NRC staff concerning the review of a potential repository site, or wish to participate in a license application review for a potential repository (other than the Yucca Mountain, Nevada site proposed by the U.S. Department of Energy). Representatives of States or Indian Tribes must submit a statement of their authority to act in such a representative capacity. The information submitted by the States and Indian Tribes is used by the Director of the Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards as a basis for decisions about the commitment of NRC staff resources to the consultation and participation efforts. As provided in § 60.1, the regulations in 10 CFR Part 60 no longer apply to the licensing of a geologic repository at Yucca Mountain. All of the information collection requirements pertaining to Yucca Mountain were included in 10 CFR Part 63, and were approved by the Office of Management and Budget under control number 3150-0199 (§ 63.8). The Yucca Mountain site is regulated under 10 CFR Part 63 (66 FR 55792, November 2, 2001).

Submit, by April 21, 2003, comments that address the following questions:

1. Is the proposed collection of information necessary for the NRC to properly perform its functions? Does the information have practical utility?
2. Is the burden estimate accurate?
3. Is there a way to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected?
4. How can the burden of the information collection be minimized, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology?

A copy of the draft supporting statement may be viewed free of charge at the NRC Public Document Room located at One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, MD. OMB clearance requests are available at the

NRC worldwide Web site <http://www.nrc.gov/public-involve/doc-comment/omb/index.html>. The document will be available on the NRC home page site for 60 days after the signature date of this notice.

Comments and questions about the information collection requirements may be directed to the NRC Clearance Officer, Brenda Jo. Shelton, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, T-6 E 6, Washington, DC 20555-0001, by telephone at (301) 415-7233, or by Internet electronic mail at [INFOCOLLECTS@NRC.GOV](mailto:INFOCOLLECTS@NRC.GOV).

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 12th day of February, 2003.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Brenda Jo. Shelton,**

*NRC Clearance Officer, Office of the Chief Information Officer.*

[FR Doc. 03-3935 Filed 2-18-03; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7590-01-P**

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-263]

### **Nuclear Management Company, LLC; Monticello Nuclear Generating Plant; Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact**

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is considering issuance of an exemption from Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR) Part 50, Section 50.60, "Acceptance criteria for fracture prevention measures for light-water nuclear power reactors for normal operation," and 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix G, "Fracture Toughness Requirements," for Facility Operating License No. DPR-22, issued to the Nuclear Management Company, LLC (the licensee), for operation of the Monticello Nuclear Generating Plant, located in Wright County, Minnesota. 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 exempt the licensee from the requirements of 10 CFR Part 50, Section 50.60(a) and Appendix G, which would allow the use of American Society of Mechanical Engineers *Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code* (ASME Code) Code Case N-640 as the basis for revised reactor vessel pressure and temperature (P/T) limit curves in the Monticello Technical Specifications (TSs).

The regulation at 10 CFR Part 50, Section 50.60(a), requires, in part, that except where an exemption is granted by the Commission, all light-water nuclear power reactors must meet the fracture toughness requirements for the reactor coolant pressure boundary set forth in Appendices G and H to 10 CFR Part 50. Appendix G to 10 CFR Part 50 requires that P/T limits be established for reactor pressure vessels (RPVs) during normal operating and hydrostatic or leak-rate testing conditions. Specifically, 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix G, states, "The appropriate requirements on both the pressure-temperature limits and the minimum permissible temperature must be met for all conditions." Appendix G of 10 CFR Part 50 specifies that the requirements for these limits are the ASME Code, Section XI, Appendix G, limits.

ASME Code Case N-640 permits the use of alternate reference fracture toughness (*i.e.*, use of "K<sub>IC</sub> fracture toughness curve" instead of "K<sub>IA</sub> fracture toughness curve," where K<sub>IC</sub> and K<sub>IA</sub> are "Reference Stress Intensity Factors," as defined in ASME Code, Section XI, Appendices A and G, respectively) for reactor vessel materials in determining the P/T limits. Since the K<sub>IC</sub> fracture toughness curve shown in ASME Code, Section XI, Appendix A, Figure A-2200-1, provides greater allowable fracture toughness than the corresponding K<sub>IA</sub> fracture toughness curve of ASME Code, Section XI, Appendix G, Figure G-2210-1, using ASME Code Case N-640 to establish the P/T limits would be less conservative than the methodology currently endorsed by 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix G. Therefore, an exemption to apply ASME Code Case N-640 is required.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application dated April 22, 2002, as supplemented by letter dated September 16, 2002.

#### *The Need for the Proposed Action*

The proposed exemption is needed to allow the licensee to implement ASME Code Case N-640 in order to revise the method used to determine the P/T limits because continued use of the present curves unnecessarily restricts the P/T operating window. Since the P/T operating window is defined by the P/T operating and test limit curves developed in accordance with the ASME Code, Section XI, Appendix G, procedure, continued operation of Monticello with these P/T curves without the relief provided by ASME Code Case N-640 would unnecessarily require the RPV to maintain a temperature exceeding 212 °F in a limited operating window during the

pressure test. Consequently, steam vapor hazards would continue to be one of the safety concerns for personnel conducting inspections in primary containment. Implementation of the proposed P/T curves, as allowed by ASME Code Case N-640, would not significantly reduce the margin of safety and would eliminate steam vapor hazards by allowing inspections in primary containment to be conducted at a lower coolant temperature.

#### *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 NRC 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 Monticello.

#### *Agencies and Persons Consulted*

On February 11, 2003, the staff consulted with the Minnesota State official, Nancy Campbell of the Department of Commerce, 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 application dated April 22, 2002, as supplemented by letter dated September 16, 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](mailto:pdr@nrc.gov).

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 12th day of February 2003.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

#### **L. Raghavan,**

*Chief, Section 1, Project Directorate III,  
Division of Licensing Project Management,  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 03-3936 Filed 2-18-03; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7590-01-P**

## **SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION**

[Release No. 34-47354; File No. SR-NASD-2002-180]

### **Self-Regulatory Organizations; Order Approving Proposed Rule Change by the National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc. Regarding the Prohibition Against Guarantees and Sharing in Customer Accounts**

February 12, 2003.

On December 18, 2002, the National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc. ("NASD") filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission ("SEC" or "Commission") a proposed rule change to amend NASD Rule 2330(e) to clarify that members and their associated persons are prohibited from

guaranteeing any customer against loss in connection with any securities transaction or in any securities account of the customer. Additionally, the proposal would require that associated persons obtain written authorization from their employing member firm and the customer before sharing in a customer's account under Rule 2330(f). The proposal would delete the requirement that members and associated persons obtain the written authorization of the member carrying the account before sharing in a customer's account from Rule 2330(f). Notice of the proposed rule change was published for comment in the **Federal Register** on January 6, 2003.<sup>1</sup> The Commission received no comments regarding the proposal.

The Commission finds that the proposed rule change is consistent with the Act and the rules and regulations thereunder applicable to a national securities association.<sup>2</sup> The Commission finds that the proposal is consistent with the requirements of section 15A(b)(6) of the Act,<sup>3</sup> which requires, among other things, that the rules of a registered national securities association be designed to prevent fraudulent and manipulative acts and practices, to promote just and equitable principles of trade, and, in general, to protect investors and the public interest. Specifically, the Commission believes that the proposal should facilitate compliance with Rule 2330(e) by clarifying that members and their associated persons are prohibited from making guarantees to any customer, not just those whose accounts are carried by the member or those for whom a member is effecting a securities transaction. The proposal should also strengthen the regulatory protections provided in Rule 2330(f) by requiring members and their associated persons to obtain the prior written authorization of the customer before sharing in any customer account. Finally, the Commission believes that requiring associated persons who wish to share in a customer account to obtain authorization from their employer is a more effective way to detect and deter misconduct than requiring such authorization from the member carrying the account.

*It is therefore ordered*, pursuant to section 19(b)(2) of the Act,<sup>4</sup> that the

<sup>1</sup> See Securities Exchange Act Release No. 47103 (December 30, 2002), 68 FR 595.

<sup>2</sup> In approving the proposal, the Commission has considered the rule's impact on efficiency, competition, and capital formation. 15 U.S.C. 78c(f).

<sup>3</sup> 15 U.S.C. 78o(b)(6).

<sup>4</sup> 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(2).