

integrity. The individual providing the signature should know that he/she is signing the document, and the signature process should be concise enough to assure that the individual initiating the process is the same person concluding the process. Systems that produce electronic records should have provisions that inform individuals electronically signing the document that they are entering their signatures. This process should be separate from the act of opening the document because most records required by NRC are produced by other individuals and may be produced and revised over an unspecified time.

The signature process should be such that it is uniquely tied to the individual whose signature is required and the period that the signature process is open should be short enough to assure that the individual starting the process is the individual completing the process. If the signature is required to demonstrate review of specific information, then completion of the electronic signature should also block alteration of that information. Subsequent changes to the information should require a new electronic signature and not overwrite previous versions of the signed document. If the document must be dated and signed to meet the regulations, the electronic signature process should also affix the date and time to each electronic signature.

Because these electronic records are kept at the facility and not sent to the NRC they have to be electronically inspected at the facility. Printing an electronic record with an electronic signature would not constitute a complete and accurate record because critical electronic information associated with the electronic record would not be available for inspection.

#### B. Issues for Discussion

The following is a listing of issues regarding the use of electronic signatures on documents related to the medical use of byproduct material. Each issue is followed by one or more questions about existing practices related to standards, authentication, non-repudiation, data integrity, records inspection, and improvements to software. The questions listed below are not meant to be a complete or final list of issues to be considered but are provided to initiate comments. Stakeholders are requested to comment on and recommend additions, deletions, or modifications to the issues listed below; and propose considerations for implementation of electronic signatures regarding each issue, as appropriate. These issues, and other relevant and

substantial issues identified by commenters, will serve as the basis of discussion at the public meetings, if these meetings are scheduled in the future. Public feedback will also be used in developing options for implementation.

#### *Issue No. 1—Standards*

Q1.1 What standards for electronic signatures in medical records are in use or under development?

Q1.2 How do these standards address the principles of authentication, non-repudiation, data integrity, and access for inspection, as described in Issues No. 2 through 5, below?

Q1.3 Do these standards consider any additional key principles?

#### *Issue No. 2—Authentication*

Q2.1 For software applications currently in use, how does the licensee assure that the signature process is uniquely tied to the individual whose signature is required?

#### *Issue No. 3—Non-Repudiation*

Q3.1 For software applications currently in use, what provisions does the licensee use to inform persons electronically signing documents that they are entering their signature?

#### *Issue No. 4—Data Integrity*

Q4.1 For software applications currently in use, how does the licensee assure that the document being electronically signed cannot be changed after it is signed?

Q4.2 For software applications currently in use, how does the licensee assure that subsequent changes to the electronically signed document require a new electronic signature and cannot overwrite previous versions of the signed document?

Q4.3 For software applications currently in use, how does the licensee assure that the electronic signature process affixes the date and time to each electronic signature?

#### *Issue No. 5—Records Inspection*

Q5.1 For software applications currently in use, how does the licensee assure that electronically signed documents and all revisions to the electronically signed documents are accessible for inspection?

Q5.2 For software applications currently in use, how does the licensee assure that electronically signed documents and all revisions to the electronically signed documents are retained for 3 years?

#### *Issue No. 6—Need for Improvements to Current Commercially-Available Software Applications*

Q6.1 Are any improvements needed for current commercially-available software applications to adequately meet existing standards and principles?

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 14th day of Oct. 2010.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Christian Einberg,**

*Acting Deputy Director, Licensing and Inspection Support Directorate, Division of Materials Safety and State Agreements, Office of Federal and State Materials, and Environmental Management Programs.*

[FR Doc. 2010–26391 Filed 10–19–10; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7590–01–P**

## **NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

**[Docket Nos. STN 50–456, STN 50–457, STN 50–454, and STN 50–455; NRC–2010–0329]**

### **Braidwood Station, Units 1 and 2 and Byron Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2; Notice of Withdrawal of Application for Amendment to Facility Operating License**

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has granted the request of Exelon Generation Company, LLC (the licensee) to withdraw its March 26, 2009, application for proposed amendments to Facility Operating License Nos. NPF–72 and NPF–77 for Braidwood Station, Units 1 and 2, respectively, located in Will County, Illinois, and to Facility Operating License Nos. NPF–37 and NPF–66 for Byron Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, respectively, located in Ogle County, Illinois.

The proposed amendment would have revised the fire protection program to eliminate the requirement for the backup manual carbon dioxide fire suppression system in the upper cable spreading rooms.

The Commission had previously issued a Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment published in the **Federal Register** on May 19, 2009 (74 FR 23445). However, by letter dated September 20, 2010, the licensee withdrew the proposed change.

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendment dated March 26, 2009, as supplemented by letters dated September 10, 2009, March 15, and May 27, 2010, and the licensee's letter dated September 20, 2010, which withdrew the application for license amendment. Documents may be examined, and/or copied for a fee, at the NRC's Public

Document Room (PDR), located at One White Flint North, Public File Area O1 F21, 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.resource@nrc.gov](mailto:pdr.resource@nrc.gov).

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 13th day of October 2010.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Marshall J. David,**

*Senior Project Manager, Plant Licensing Branch III-2, Division of Operating Reactor Licensing, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 2010-26394 Filed 10-19-10; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7590-01-P**

## **PACIFIC NORTHWEST ELECTRIC POWER AND CONSERVATION PLANNING COUNCIL**

### **Amended Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife Program**

**AGENCY:** Pacific Northwest Electric Power and Conservation Planning Council (Northwest Power and Conservation Council), an interstate compact agency organized under the authority of the Pacific Northwest Electric Power Planning and Conservation Act of 1980, 16 U.S.C. 839 *et seq.* (Northwest Power Act).

**ACTION:** Notice of final action adopting the management plan elements of the Bitterroot River Subbasin Plan into the Council's *Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife Program*.

**SUMMARY:** Pursuant to Section 4(h) of the Northwest Power Act, the Council has amended its *Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife Program* to add the Bitterroot River Subbasin Plan. The program as amended may be found on the Council's Web site at <http://www.nwcouncil.org/fw/program> and then, for the subbasin plan elements and relevant decision documents in particular, at <http://www.nwcouncil.org/fw/subbasinplanning/Default.htm>. Further information and an explanation of this amendment process may be found in the documents on that page or by contacting the Northwest Power and

Conservation Council at (503) 222-5161 or toll free (800) 452-5161.

**Stephen L. Crow,**  
*Executive Director.*

[FR Doc. 2010-26372 Filed 10-19-10; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE P**

## **SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION**

### **Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request**

*Upon Written Request, Copies Available*

From: Securities and Exchange Commission, Office of Investor Education and Advocacy, Washington, DC 20549-0213.

*Extension:*

Form N-CSR, SEC File No. 270-512, OMB Control No. 3235-0570.

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 (the "Commission") has submitted to the Office of Management and Budget ("OMB") a request for extension of the previously approved collection of information discussed below.

Form N-CSR (17 CFR 249.331 and 274.128) is a combined reporting form used by management investment companies to file certified shareholder reports under the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a-1 *et seq.*) ("Investment Company Act") and under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78a *et seq.*) ("Exchange Act"). Form N-CSR is to be used for reports under Section 30(b)(2) of the Investment Company Act and Section 13(a) or 15(d) of the Exchange Act, filed pursuant to rule 30b2-1(a) under the Investment Company Act (17 CFR 270.30b2-1(a)). Reports on Form N-CSR are to be filed with the Commission not later than 10 days after the transmission to stockholders of any report that is required to be transmitted to stockholders under rule 30e-1 under the Investment Company Act (17 CFR 270.30e-1).

The Commission estimates that there are 6,640 reports filed on Form N-CSR annually and that the average number of portfolios referenced in each filing is 3.75. The Commission further estimates that the hour burden for preparing and filing a report on Form N-CSR is 7.62 hours per portfolio. Given that filings on Form N-CSR are filed semi-annually, filings on Form N-CSR require 15.24 hours per portfolio each year. The total annual hour burden for Form N-CSR, therefore, is estimated to be 154,686 hours.

The current total annual cost burden to respondents for outside professionals associated with the collection of data relating to Form N-CSR is currently \$1,119,001 and the new total annual cost burden to respondents is estimated to be \$1,556,401, representing an increase of \$437,400.

The information collection requirements imposed by Form N-CSR are mandatory. Responses to the collection of information will not be kept confidential. An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid control number.

Please direct general comments regarding the above information to the following persons: (i) Desk Officer for the Securities and Exchange Commission, Office of Management and Budget, Room 10102, New Executive Office Building, Washington, DC 20503 or send an e-mail to: [Shagufta.Ahmed@omb.eop.gov](mailto:Shagufta.Ahmed@omb.eop.gov); and (ii) Jeffrey Heslop, Acting Director/CIO, Securities and Exchange Commission, C/O Remi Pavlik-Simon, 6432 General Green Way, Alexandria, VA 22312, or send an e-mail to: [PRA\\_Mailbox@sec.gov](mailto:PRA_Mailbox@sec.gov). Comments must be submitted to OMB within 30 days of this notice.

Dated: October 13, 2010.

**Florence E. Harmon,**  
*Deputy Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 2010-26343 Filed 10-19-10; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 8011-01-P**

## **SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION**

### **Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request**

*Upon Written Request, Copies Available*

From: Securities and Exchange Commission, Office of Investor Education and Advocacy, Washington, DC 20549-0213.

*Extension:*

Form 5 OMB Control No. 3235-0362 SEC File No. 270-323.

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") has submitted to the Office of Management and Budget this request for extension of the previously approved collection of information discussed below.

Under Section 16(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 ("Exchange Act") (15 U.S.C. 78a *et seq.*) every person who is directly or indirectly the beneficial