reading-rm/adams.html. The documents are also available at *http://www.nrc.gov/reactors/new-licensing/esp.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, 301–415–4737, or by e-mail to *pdr@nrc.gov*.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland this 30th day of October 2008.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Michael R. Johnson,

Director, Office of New Reactors.

[FR Doc. E8–26368 Filed 11–4–08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 030–04781]

Notice of Availability of Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact for License Amendment to Byproduct Materials; License No. 21–00182–03, for Unrestricted Release of the Pharmacia & Upjohn Company LLC; Facility in Kalamazoo, MI

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Issuance of Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact for License Amendment.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: William Snell, Senior Health Physicist, Decommissioning Branch, Division of Nuclear Materials Safety, Region III, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, 2443 Warrenville Road, Lisle, Illinois 60532; *telephone:* (630) 829–9871; *fax number:* (630) 515–1259; or by e-mail at *william.snell@nrc.gov*.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Introduction

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is proposing to amend Byproduct Materials License No. 21–00182–03. This license is held by Pharmacia & Upjohn Company LLC (the Licensee), and authorizes the use of byproduct materials within Building 267 (the Facility), located at 333 Portage Street, Kalamazoo, Michigan. Amendment of the license would authorize release of the Facility for unrestricted use. The Licensee requested this action in a letter dated July 9, 2008 (ADAMS Accession No. ML081920702). The NRC has prepared an Environmental Assessment (EA) in support of this proposed action in accordance with the requirements of Title 10 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), Part 51 (10 CFR Part 51). Based on the EA, the NRC has concluded that a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) is appropriate with respect to the proposed action. The license will be amended following the publication of this FONSI and EA in the **Federal Register**.

II. Environmental Assessment

Identification of Proposed Action

The proposed action would approve the Licensee's July 9, 2008, license amendment request, resulting in release of the Facility for unrestricted use. License No. 21–00182–03 was issued on April 24, 1958, pursuant to 10 CFR Part 30, and has been amended periodically since that time. The license authorizes the use of byproduct materials for conducting research and development.

The Facility is a six-story steel frame building on a 39-acre pharmaceutical research and development campus comprised of offices and laboratories located in a primarily commercial area. The Licensee ceased using licensed materials in the Facility in April 2008, and has conducted final status surveys of the Facility. The results of these surveys along with other supporting information were provided to the NRC to demonstrate that the criteria in Subpart E of 10 CFR Part 20 for unrestricted release have been met.

Need for the Proposed Action

The licensee has ceased conducting licensed activities at the Facility, and seeks the unrestricted use of its Facility.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The historical review of licensed activities conducted at the Facility shows that such activities involved use of the following radionuclides with half-lives greater than 120 days: Hydrogen-3 and carbon-14. Prior to performing the final status survey, the Licensee conducted decontamination activities, as necessary, in the areas of the Facility affected by these radionuclides.

The Licensee conducted onsite final status surveys on the Facility during April, May and June 2008. The final status survey report was attached to the Licensee's amendment request dated July 9, 2008. The Licensee elected to demonstrate compliance with the radiological criteria for unrestricted release as specified in 10 CFR 20.1402 by using the screening approach described in NUREG–1757, ''Consolidated Decommissioning Guidance,'' Volume 2. The Licensee used the radionuclide-specific derived concentration guideline levels (DCGLs), developed there by the NRC, which comply with the dose criterion in 10 CFR 20.1402. These DCGLs define the maximum amount of residual radioactivity on building surfaces, equipment, and materials, and in soils, that will satisfy the NRC requirements in Subpart E of 10 CFR Part 20 for unrestricted release. The Licensee's final status survey results were below these DCGLs and are in compliance with the As Low As Reasonably Achievable (ALARA) requirement of 10 CFR 20.1402. The NRC thus finds that the Licensee's final status survey results are acceptable.

Based on its review, the staff determined that the affected environment and any environmental impacts associated with the proposed action are bounded by the impacts evaluated by the ''Generic Environmental Impact Statement in Support of Rulemaking on Radiological Criteria for License Termination of NRC-Licensed Nuclear Facility'' (NUREG–1496) Volumes 1–3 (ML042310492, ML042320379, and ML042330385). The staff finds there were no significant environmental impacts from the use of radioactive material at the Facility. The NRC staff reviewed the docket file records and the final status survey report to identify any non-radiological hazards that may have impacted the environment surrounding the Facility. No such hazards or impacts to the environment were identified. The NRC has identified no other radiological or non-radiological activities in the area that could result in cumulative environmental impacts.

The NRC staff finds that the proposed amendment of the license and release of the Facility for unrestricted use is in compliance with 10 CFR Part 20. Based on its review, the staff considered the impact of the residual radioactivity at the Facility and concluded that the proposed action will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment.

Environmental Impacts of the Alternatives to the Proposed Action

Due to the largely administrative nature of the proposed action, its environmental impacts are small. Therefore, the only alternative the staff considered is the no-action alternative, under which the staff would leave things as they are by simply denying the amendment request. This no-action alternative is not feasible because it conflicts with 10 CFR 30.36(d) requiring that decommissioning of byproduct material Facility be completed and

approved by the NRC after licensed activities cease. The NRC's analysis of the Licensee's final status survey data confirmed that the Facility meets the requirements of 10 CFR 20.1402 for unrestricted release. Additionally, denying the amendment request would result in no change in current environmental impacts. The environmental impacts of the proposed action and the no-action alternative are therefore similar, and the no-action alternative is accordingly not further considered.

Conclusion

The NRC staff has concluded that the proposed action is consistent with the NRC's unrestricted release criteria specified in 10 CFR 20.1402. Because the proposed action will not significantly impact the quality of the human environment, the NRC staff concludes that the proposed action is the preferred alternative.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

NRC provided a draft of this Environmental Assessment to the Michigan Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) for review on October 1, 2008. By response dated October 9, 2008, the State agreed with the conclusions of the EA, and otherwise provided no comments.

The NRC staff has determined that the proposed action is of a procedural nature, and will not affect listed species or critical habitat. Therefore, no further consultation is required under section 7 of the Endangered Species Act. The NRC staff has also determined that the proposed action is not the type of activity that has the potential to cause effects on historic properties. Therefore, no further consultation is required under section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

III. Finding of No Significant Impact

The NRC staff has prepared this EA in support of the proposed action. On the basis of this EA, the NRC finds that there are no significant environmental impacts from the proposed action, and that preparation of an environmental impact statement is not warranted. Accordingly, the NRC has determined that a Finding of No Significant Impact is appropriate.

IV. Further Information

Documents related to this action, including the application for license amendment and supporting documentation, are available electronically at the NRC's Electronic Reading Room at *http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html*. From this site, you can access the NRC's Agencywide Document Access and Management System (ADAMS), which provides text and image files of NRC's public documents. The documents related to this action are listed below, along with their ADAMS accession numbers.

1. Dee L. Clement, Pfizer, Inc., letter to William Snell, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, July 9, 2008 (ADAMS Accession No. ML081920702);

2. Dee L. Clement, Pfizer, Inc., letter to William Snell, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, April 8, 2008 (ADAMS Accession No. ML081010514);

3. Dee L. Clement, Pfizer, Inc., letter to William Snell, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, March 25, 2008 (ADAMS Accession No. ML080930101);

4. Title 10 Code of Federal Regulations, Part 20, Subpart E, ''Radiological Criteria for License Termination'';

5. Title 10 Code of Federal Regulations, Part 51, ''Environmental Protection Regulations for Domestic Licensing and Related Regulatory Functions'';

6. NUREG–1496, ''Generic Environmental Impact Statement in Support of Rulemaking on Radiological Criteria for License Termination of NRC-Licensed Nuclear Facility'';

7. NUREG–1757, ''Consolidated Decommissioning Guidance.''

8. By response dated October 9, 2008, the State had no comments.

If you do not have access to ADAMS, or if there are problems in accessing the documents located in ADAMS, contact the NRC Public Document Room (PDR) Reference staff at 1–800–397–4209, 301–415–4737, or by e-mail to *pdr.resource@nrc.gov*. These documents may also be viewed electronically on the public computers located at the NRC's PDR, O 1 F21, One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, MD 20852. The PDR reproduction contractor will copy documents for a fee.

Dated at Lisle, Illinois, this 22nd day of October 2008.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Christine Lipa,

Chief, Materials Control, ISFSI, and Decommissioning Branch, Division of Nuclear Materials Safety, Region III.

[FR Doc. E8–26361 Filed 11–4–08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Proposed Collection; Comment Request

Upon Written Request, Copies Available From: U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission, Office of Investor Education and Advocacy, Washington, DC 20549–0213.

Extension:

Rule 15c2–7; OMB Control No. 3235–0479; SEC File No. 270–420.

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 15c2–7 (17 CFR 240.15c2–7) places disclosure requirements on broker-dealers who have correspondent relationships, or agreements identified in the rule, with other broker-dealers. Whenever any such broker-dealer enters a quotation for a security through an inter-dealer quotation system, Rule 15c2–7 requires the broker-dealer to disclose these relationships and agreements in the manner required by the rule. The inter-dealer quotation system must also be able to make these disclosures public in association with the quotation the broker-dealer is making.

When rule 15c2–7 was adopted in 1964, the information it requires was necessary for execution of the Commission's mandate under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to prevent fraudulent, manipulative and deceptive acts by broker-dealers. In the absence of the information collection required under Rule 15c2–7, investors and broker-dealers would have been unable to accurately determine the market depth of, and demand for, securities in an inter-dealer quotation system.

There are approximately 5,808 broker-dealers registered with the Commission. Any of these broker-dealers could be potential respondents for Rule 15c2–7, so the Commission is using that figure to represent the number of respondents. Rule 15c2–7 applies only to quotations entered into an inter-dealer quotation system, such as the OTC Bulletin Board (''OTCBB''), or Pink Sheets, operated by Pink OTC Markets, Inc. According to representatives of both Pink Sheets and the OTCBB, neither entity has recently received, or anticipates receiving any