ADAMS accession number for each document referenced in this document (if that document is available in ADAMS) is provided the first time that a document is referenced. The PSDAR, dated June 2013, was placed in ADAMS with Accession No. ML13190A366.

• NRC's PDR: You may examine and purchase copies of public documents at the NRC's PDR, Room O1–F21, One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland 20852.

B. Submitting Comments

Please include Docket ID NRC–2013–0183 in the subject line of your comment submission, in order to ensure that the NRC is able to make your comment submission available to the public in this docket.

The NRC cautions you not to include identifying or contact information that you do not want to be publicly disclosed in you comment submission. The NRC will post all comment submissions at *http://www.regulations.gov* as well as enter the comment submissions into ADAMS. The NRC does not routinely edit comment submissions to remove identifying or contact information.

If you are requesting or aggregating comments from other persons for submission to the NRC, then you should inform those persons not to include identifying or contact information that they do not want to be publicly disclosed in their comment submission. Your request should state that the NRC does not routinely edit comment submissions to remove such information before making the comment submissions available to the public or entering the comment submissions into ADAMS.

II. Discussion

The NRC issued GPUN operating license DPR–73 for TMI–2 on February 8, 1978. Commercial operation of TMI–2 began on December 30, 1978. On March 28, 1979, TMI–2 experienced an accident which resulted in severe damage to the reactor core and has been in a non-operating status since the accident. The GPUN defueled the reactor vessel and decontaminated the facility to the extent that the plant is in a safe, inherently stable condition known as post-defueling monitored storage (PDMS). Approximately 99 percent of the fuel was removed from TMI–2 and shipped to Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory under the responsibility of the U.S. Department of Energy.

The accident made the shutdown of TMI–2 unique from all other reactors in that GPUN did not follow the standard process for cessation of operations provided in § 50.82 of Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations (10 CFR), ''Termination of license.'' The formal transition of TMI–2 from post-accident cleanup to PDMS required NRC approval. The GPUN obtained NRC approval to maintain TMI–2 in the PDMS state until decommissioning with the issuance of License Amendment No. 45 dated September 14, 1993 (ADAMS Accession No. 9405190046). License Amendment No. 45 also converted GPUN's operating license to the current possession-only license. As a result, the NRC considers GPUN to have submitted a certification of permanent cessation of operations and a certification of permanent fuel removal as of September 14, 1993. In accordance with § 50.82 in effect at that time, GPUN should have submitted a decommissioning plan by September 1995. In 1996, the NRC amended its regulations in 10 CFR 50.82 to require, among other things, that power reactor licensees submit a PSDAR instead of a decommissioning plan. On June 28, 2013, the GPUN submitted its PSDAR to establish compliance with § 50.82(a)(4). The GPUN stated that its PSDAR will maintain TMI–2 in the PDMS state up to an additional 20 years to coincide with the end of the TMI, Unit 1 (TMI–1) Operating License to synchronize decommissioning of TMI–1 and TMI–2.

III. Request for Public Comments

The NRC is requesting public comments on the PSDAR.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 6th day of August 2013.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Bruce Watson,

Chief, Decommissioning and Uranium Licensing Directorate, Division of Waste Management and Environmental Protection, Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs.

[FR Doc. 2013–19710 Filed 8–13–13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Proposed Collection; Comment Request

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

Extension:
Rule 12h–1(f);
OMB Control No. 3235–0632, SEC File No. 270–570.

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 12h–1(f) [17 CFR 240.12h–1(f)] provides an exemption from the registration requirements of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 for compensatory employee stock options of issuers that are not required to file periodic reports under the Exchange Act and that have 500 or more option holders and more than $10 million in assets at its most recently ended fiscal year. The information required under Rule 12h–1(f) is not filed with the Commission. Rule 12h–1(f) permits issuers to provide the required information (other than the issuer's books and records) to the option holders and holders of share received on exercise of compensatory employee stock options either by: (i) physical or electronic delivery of the information; and (ii) notice to the option holders and holders of shares received on exercise of compensatory employee stock options of the availability of the information on a password-protected Internet site. We estimate that it takes approximately 2 burden hours per response to provide the information required under Rule 12h–1(f) and that the information is filed by approximately 40 respondents. We estimate that 25% of the 2 hours per response (0.5 hours) is prepared by the company for a total annual reporting burden of 20 hours (0.5 hours per response × 40 responses).

Written comments are invited on: (a) Whether this proposed collection of information is necessary for the performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden imposed by the collection of information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection 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.

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 your written comment to Thomas Bayer, Director/Chief Information Officer, Securities and Exchange Commission, c/o Remi Pavlik-Simon, 100 F Street, NE., Washington, DC 20549 or send an email to: *PRA_Mailbox@sec.gov.*

Dated: August 8, 2013.

Kevin M. O'Neill,

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2013–19670 Filed 8–13–13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8011–01–P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Investment Company Act Release No. 30647; File No. 811–07528]

Special Opportunities Fund, Inc.; Notice of Application

August 8, 2013.

AGENCY: Securities and Exchange Commission (''Commission'').

ACTION: Notice of an application for a declaratory order under Section 554(e) of the Administrative Procedure Act of 1946 (''APA'') concerning a proxy voting procedure under Section 12(d)(1)(F) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (''Act'').

SUMMARY OF APPLICATION: Applicant requests an order declaring that its proxy voting procedure does not cause the applicant to be in violation of Section 12(d)(1) of the Act.

APPLICANT: Special Opportunities Fund, Inc. (''SPE'' or ''Fund'').

FILING DATES: The application was filed on December 13, 2011 and amended on November 5, 2012.

HEARING OR NOTIFICATION OF HEARING: Interested persons may request a hearing by writing to the Commission's Secretary and serving applicant with a copy of the request, personally or by mail. Hearing requests should be received by the Commission by 5:30 p.m. on September 3, 2013, and should be accompanied by proof of service on applicants, in the form of an affidavit or, for lawyers, a certificate of service. Hearing requests should state the nature of the writer's interest, the reason for the request, and the issues contested. Persons who wish to be notified of a hearing may request notification by writing to the Commission's Secretary. Absent a request for a hearing that is granted by the Commission, the Commission intends to issue an order under Section 554(e) of the APA declaring that applicant's proxy voting procedure does not satisfy Section 12(d)(1)(F) of the Act.

ADDRESSES: Elizabeth M. Murphy, Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, 100 F Street NE., Washington, DC 20549–1090; Applicant, 615 East Michigan Street, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Adam Glazer, Senior Counsel, at (202) 551–6825, Division of Investment Management, Office of Chief Counsel.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The following is a summary of the application. The complete application may be obtained via the Commission's Web site at *http://www.sec.gov/rules/ic/2012/special-opportunities-fund-application.pdf* or by calling (202) 551–8090.

Applicant's Representations

1. SPE is organized as a Maryland corporation and is registered under the Act as a closed-end management investment company. Brooklyn Capital Management, LLC (''Adviser''), a Delaware limited liability company, is an investment adviser registered under the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 and currently serves as investment adviser to SPE. SPE seeks to rely on Section 12(d)(1)(F) of the Act to invest its assets in securities of other investment companies registered under the Act (''underlying funds'') that are closed-end investment companies, in excess of the limits in Section 12(d)(1)(A) of the Act.

2. On December 7, 2011, SPE's shareholders approved a proposal to ''instruct the Adviser to vote proxies received by the Fund from any [underlying fund] on any proposal (including the election of directors) in a manner which the Adviser reasonably determines is likely to favorably impact the discount of such [underlying fund's] market price as compared to its net asset value'' (''Voting Procedure''). SPE requests a declaratory order pursuant to Section 554(e) of the APA stating that the Voting Procedure ''does not cause it to be in violation of Section 12(d)(1) of the Act.''

Applicant's Legal Analysis

1. Section 12(d)(1)(A) of the Act provides, in relevant part, that it shall be unlawful for any registered investment company (''acquiring fund'') to purchase or otherwise acquire any security issued by an underlying fund if immediately after such purchase or acquisition: (i) the acquiring company owns more than 3% of the underlying fund's total outstanding voting stock; (ii) securities issued by the underlying fund have an aggregate value in excess of 5% of the value of the acquiring fund's total assets (''5% limit''); or if such securities, together with the securities of other investment companies, have an aggregate value in excess of 10% of the value of the acquiring fund's total assets (''10% limit'').

2. Section 12(d)(1)(F) of the Act provides a conditional exemption from the 5% and 10% limits in Section 12(d)(1)(A). Section 12(d)(1)(F) permits an acquiring fund to purchase or otherwise acquire shares of an underlying fund if, immediately after the purchase or acquisition, the acquiring fund and all of its affiliated persons would not own more than 3% of the underlying fund's total outstanding stock, and if certain sales load restrictions are met. Section 12(d)(1)(F) further provides that the underlying fund is not obligated to redeem, during any period of less than 30 days, securities held by the acquiring fund in an amount exceeding 1% of the underlying fund's outstanding securities. Finally, Section 12(d)(1)(F) provides that the acquiring fund ''shall exercise voting rights by proxy or otherwise with respect to any security purchased or acquired pursuant to [Section 12(d)(1)(F)] in the manner prescribed by [Section 12(d)(1)(E)].'' Section 12(d)(1)(E)(iii), in turn, provides, in relevant part, that ''the purchase or acquisition is made pursuant to an arrangement with the issuer of, or principal underwriter for, the issuer of the security whereby [the acquiring fund] is obligated either to seek instructions from its security holders with regard to the voting of all proxies with respect to such security and to vote such proxies only in accordance with such instructions, or to vote the shares held by it in the same proportion as the vote of all other holders of such security.'' The first alternative is referred to as ''Pass-Through Voting Condition.'' The second alternative is referred to as ''Mirror Voting.''

3. SPE asserts that its Voting Procedure satisfies the Pass-Through Voting Condition. SPE states that it has been ''unable to find anything in the legislative history of Section 12(d)(1) that provides any clue as to the reason for the [Pass-Through Voting Condition].'' SPE further asserts that ''there are good reasons for interpreting the [Pass-Through Voting Condition] to allow an acquiring fund to seek standing instructions to vote on proposals regarding acquired funds.'' In this regard, SPE asserts that it is not cost effective for an acquiring fund to obtain voting instructions for a particular