

contamination and a more comprehensive dose impact analysis would be required. The table is intended for use as screening criteria to facilitate license termination for many simple routine decommissioning cases that do not require a site-specific dose assessment. For facilities with contamination levels above those in Table 3, additional site-specific dose assessments may be necessary, and licensees should refer to DG-4006 regarding acceptable methods for conducting the appropriate dose assessment.

NRC staff has also prepared "Preliminary Guidelines for Evaluating Dose Assessments in Support of Decommissioning." The purpose of these guidelines is to provide a consistent approach for NRC staff to evaluate dose assessments conducted to demonstrate compliance with the LTR. This interim guidance was developed by NRC staff for reviewing dose assessments and may be useful to licensees preparing dose assessment during both screening and site-specific analyses. A copy of the guidance is available on the web site "http://techconf.llnl.gov/."

During our analysis of the basis for selecting the default parameter set for the DandD code, we discovered a transcription error in the soil-to-plant transfer factor for S-35. This error substantially overestimates the allowable DCGL for this radionuclide. The soil-to-plant transfer factor has been revised in DandD version 1 and posted on the above referenced web site. In addition, a "patch" to correct this problem for users that already have the code installed is also available from this web site.

The staff intends to consider placing Tables 1 and 3, revised as necessary, to reflect improvement in the DandD code in the Standard Review Plan for decommissioning, and/or in the next revision of the Regulatory Guide DG-4006. Comments on these Tables may be submitted within 30 days from the date of this notice to the Rules and Directives Branch, Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001.

For Further Information Contact: For more information, contact Dr. Boby Abu-Eid, High-Level Waste 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) 415-5811; fax: (301) 415-5398; or email: bae@nrc.gov.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 29th day of November 1999.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Larry W. Camper,**  
Chief, Decommissioning Branch Division of Waste Management, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.

TABLE 3.1—INTERIM SCREENING VALUES<sup>2</sup> (PCI/G) OF COMMON RADIONUCLIDES FOR SOIL SURFACE CONTAMINATION LEVELS

Radionuclide	Surface soil screening values <sup>3</sup>
H-3	1.1 E+02
C-14	1.2 E+01
Na-22	4.3 E+00
S-35	2.7 E+02
Cl-36	3.6 E-01
Ca-45	5.7 E+01
Sc-46	1.5 E+01
Mn-54	1.5 E+01
Fe-55	1.0 E+04
Co-57	1.5 E+02
Co-60	3.8 E+00
Ni-59	5.5 E+03
Ni-63	2.1 E+03
Sr-90	1.7 E+00
Nb-94	5.8 E+00
Tc-99	1.9 E+01
I-129	5.0 E-01
Cs-134	5.7 E+00
Cs-137	1.1 E+01
Eu-152	8.7 E+00
Eu-154	8.0 E+00
Ir-192	4.1 E+01
Pb-210	9.0 E-01
Ra-226	7.0 E-01
Ra-226+C <sup>4</sup>	6.0 E-01
Ac-227	5.0 E-01
Ac-227+C	5.0 E-01
Th-228	4.7 E+00
Th-228+C	4.7 E+00
Th-230	1.8 E+00
Th-230+C	6.0 E-01
Th-232	1.1 E+00
Th-232+C	1.1 E+00
Pa-231	3.0 E-01
Pa-231+C	3.0 E-01
U-234	1.3 E+01
U-235	8.0 E+00
U-235+C	2.9 E-01
U-238	1.4 E+01
U-238+C	5.0 E-01
Pu-238	2.5 E+00
Pu-239	2.3 E+00
Pu-241	7.2 E+01
Am-241	2.1 E+00
Cm-242	1.6 E+02
Cm-243	3.2 E+00

<sup>1</sup> Tables 1 and 2 were published in the Federal Register on November 18, 1998, (63 FR 64132)

<sup>2</sup> These values represent superficial surface soil concentrations of individual radionuclides that would be deemed in compliance with the 25 mrem/y (0.25 mSv) unrestricted release dose limit in 10 CFR 20.1402. For radionuclides in a mixture, the "sum of fractions" rule applies; see Part 20, Appendix B, Note 4. Refer to NRC Draft Guidance DG-4006 for further information on application of the values in this table.

<sup>3</sup> Screening values (pCi/g) equivalent to 25 mrem/y derived using DandD screening methodology (SNL Letter Report for NRC Project JCN W6227, January 30, 1998). These values were derived based on selection of the 90th Percentile of the output dose distribution for each specific radionuclide (or radionuclide with the specific decay chain). Behavioral parameters are set at the mean of the distribution of the assumed critical group. The Metabolic parameters are set at Standard Man or at the mean of the distribution for an average man.

<sup>4</sup> "+C" indicates a value for a radionuclide with its decay progeny present in equilibrium. The values are concentrations of the parent radionuclide, but account for contributions from the complete chain of progeny in equilibrium with the parent radionuclide.

[FR Doc. 99-31508 Filed 12-6-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

**RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD**

**Agency Forms Submitted for OMB Review**

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35), the Railroad Retirement Board (RRB) has submitted the following proposal(s) for the collection of information to the Office of Management and Budget for review and approval.

**SUMMARY OF PROPOSAL(S):**

- (1) *Collection title:* Application for Survivor Death Benefits.
- (2) *Form(s) submitted:* AA-21, G-273a, AA-11a, G-131, and AA-21cert.
- (3) *OMB Number:* 3220-0031.
- (4) *Expiration date of current OMB clearance:* 2/28/2000.
- (5) *Type of request:* Revision of a currently approved collection.
- (6) *Respondents:* Individuals or Households, Business or other for-profit.
- (7) *Estimated annual number of respondents:* 20,600.
- (8) *Total annual responses:* 20,600.
- (9) *Total annual reporting hours:* 5,150.
- (10) *Collection description:* The collection obtains the information needed to pay death benefits and annuities due but unpaid at death under the Railroad Retirement Act. Benefits are paid to designated beneficiaries or to survivors in a priority designated by law.

**ADDITIONAL INFORMATION OR COMMENTS:**

Copies of the forms and supporting documents can be obtained from Chuck Mierzwa, the agency clearance officer (312-751-3363). Comments regarding the information collection should be addressed to Ronald J. Hodapp, Railroad Retirement Board, 844 North Rush Street, Chicago, Illinois 60611-2092 and the OMB reviewer, Lori Schack (202-395-7316), Office of Management and

Budget, Room 10230, New Executive Office Building, Washington, DC 20503.

**Chuck Mierzwa,**

*Clearance Officer.*

[FR Doc. 99-31627 Filed 12-6-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7905-01-M

## SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

### Existing Collection; Comment Request

Upon written request, copies available from: Securities and Exchange Commission, Office of Filings and Information Services, 450 5th Street, NW., Washington, DC 20549.

Extension: Rule 18f-3; SEC File No. 270-385; OMB Control No. 3235-0441

Notice is hereby given that, pursuant to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501-3520), the Securities and Exchange Commission (the "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 ("OMB") for extension and approval.

Section 18(f)(1)<sup>1</sup> of the Investment Company Act of 1940<sup>2</sup> (the "Investment Company Act") prohibits registered open-end management investment companies ("funds") from issuing any senior security. Rule 18f-3 under the Act<sup>3</sup> exempts from section 18(f)(1) a fund that issues multiple classes of shares representing interests in the same portfolio of securities (a "multiple class fund") if the fund satisfies the conditions of the rule. In general, each class must differ in its arrangement for shareholder services or distribution or both, and must pay the related expenses of the different arrangement.

The rule includes one requirement for the collection of information. A multiple class fund must prepare and fund directors must approve a written plan setting forth the separate arrangement and expense allocation of each class, and any related conversion features or exchange privileges ("rule 18f-3 plan").<sup>4</sup> Approval of the plan must occur before the fund issues any shares of multiple classes, and whenever the fund materially amends the plan. In approving the plan, the fund board, including a majority of the independent directors, must determine

that the plan is in the best interests of each class and the fund as a whole.

The requirement that the fund prepare and directors approve a written rule 18f-3 plan is intended to ensure that the fund compiles information relevant to the fairness of the separate arrangement and expense allocation for each class, and that directors review and approve the information. Without a blueprint that highlights material differences among classes, directors might not perceive potential conflicts of interests when they determine whether the plan is in the best interests of each class and the fund. In addition, the plan may be useful to Commission staff in reviewing the fund's compliance with the rule.

There are approximately 550 multiple class funds.<sup>5</sup> Based on a review of typical rule 18f-3 plans, the Commission's staff estimates that the 550 funds together make an average of 275 responses each year to prepare and approve a written rule 18f-3 plan, requiring approximately 5.5 hours per response, and a total of 1512.5 burden hours per year in the aggregate.<sup>6</sup> The estimated annual burden of 1512.5 hours represents an increase of 912.5 hours over the prior estimate of 600 hours. The increase in burden hours is attributable to more accurate estimates of the burden hours that reflect additional time spent by professionals and time spent by directors. The estimated number of multiple class funds has decreased, however, from 600 to 550.

The estimate of average burden hours is made solely for the purposes of the Paperwork Reduction Act. The estimate is not derived from a comprehensive or even a representative survey or study of the costs of Commission rules. Complying with this collection of information requirement is necessary to obtain the benefit of relying on rule 18f-3. Responses 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.

Written comments are invited on: (a) whether the collections of information are necessary for the proper

<sup>5</sup> This estimate is based on data from Form N-SAR, the semi-annual report that funds file with the Commission.

<sup>6</sup> The estimate reflects the assumption that each multiple class fund prepares and approves a rule 18f-3 plan every two years when issuing a new class or amending a plan (or that 275 of all 550 funds prepare and approve a plan each year). The estimate assumes that the time required to prepare a plan is 3 hours per plan (or 825 hours for 275 funds annually), and the time required to approve a plan is an additional 2.5 hours per plan (or 687.5 hours for 275 funds annually.)

performance of the functions of the Commission, including whether the information has practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the Commission's estimate of the burdens of the collections of information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burdens of the collections of information on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology. Consideration will be given to comments and suggestions submitted in writing within 60 days of this publication.

Please direct your written comments to Michael E. Bartell, Associate Executive Director, Office of Information Technology, Securities and Exchange Commission, 450 5th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20549.

Dated: November 30, 1999.

**Jonathan G. Katz,**  
*Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 99-31638 Filed 12-6-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8010-01-M

## SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Investment Company Act Release No. 24181; 812-11534]

### Salomon Brothers Asset Management Inc., et al.; Notice of Application

December 1, 1999.

**AGENCY:** Securities and Exchange Commission ("Commission").

**ACTION:** Notice of an application under sections 6(c) and 17(b) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (the "Act") for an exemption from section 17(a) of the Act, and under section 17(d) of the Act and rule 17d-1 under the Act to permit certain joint transactions.

**APPLICANTS:** Salomon Brothers Assets Management Inc. ("SBAM"), Salomon Brothers High Income Fund II Inc. ("Fund"), Citicorp, and Citicorp North America, Inc. ("CNAI").

**SUMMARY OF APPLICATION:** Applicants request an order to permit the Fund and any other registered closed-end management investment company for which SBAM or any entity controlling, controlled by, or under common control with SBAM serves as investment adviser (collectively with the Fund, the "Funds") to enter into secured loan transactions with a facility administered by CNAI.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> All registered investment companies that currently intend to rely on the requested order are named as an applicant. Any Fund that relies on the

Continued

<sup>1</sup> 15 U.S.C. 80a-18(f)(1).

<sup>2</sup> 15 U.S.C. 80a.

<sup>3</sup> 17 CFR 270.18f-3.

<sup>4</sup> Rule 18f-3(d).