for a hearing will not be entertained absent a determination by the Commission, the presiding officer, or the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board that the petition and/or request should be granted based upon a balancing of the factors specified in 10 CFR 2.714(a)(1)(i)–(v) and 2.714(d).

If a request for a hearing is received, the Commission's staff may issue the amendment after it completes its technical review and prior to the completion of any required hearing if it publishes a further notice for public comment of its proposed finding of no significant hazards consideration in accordance with 10 CFR 50.91 and 10 CFR 50.92.

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendment dated April 5, 2001, which is available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room (PDR), located at One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland, and accessible electronically through the Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS) Public Electronic Reading Room link at the NRC Web site (http://www.nrc.gov). If there are problems accessing the document located in ADAMS, contact the PDR Reference staff at 1–800–397–4209, 301–415–4737, or send an email to pdr@nrc.gov.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 11th day of May 2001.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

David H. Jaffe,

Senior Project Manager, Section 1, Project Directorate IV & Decommissioning Division of Licensing Project Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 01–13398 Filed 5–25–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 30–595]

South Carolina Electric & Gas; V.C. Summer Nuclear Station, Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is considering issuance of an exemption from 10 CFR 55.59 for Facility Operating License No. NPF–12, issued to South Carolina Electric & Gas Company (SCE&G, the licensee), for operation of the V.C. Summer Nuclear Station, located in Jenkinsville, South Carolina.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed action would allow the licensed operator requalification examinations for the V.C. Summer Nuclear Station to be rescheduled. The requested exemption would extend the completion date for the examinations from May 31, 2001, to August 31, 2001.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application for exemption dated January 12, 2001.

The Need for the Proposed Action

The proposed action would extend the current V.C. Summer Nuclear Station requalification program from May 31, 2001, to August 31, 2001. On October 13, 2000, during routine shutdown inspections, SCE&G discovered a leak in a weld in the reactor coolant system. Activities to determine the root cause and extent of condition and to repair the leak extended through the end of February 2001, months beyond the original scheduled plant restart. To provide the necessary level of licensed operator support to ensure safety throughout the extended plant outage, SCE&G postponed the training and other requalification program activities originally planned during that time.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The NRC has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes, as set forth below, that there are no environmental impacts associated with the extension of the operator requalification examinations from May 31, 2001, to August 31, 2001. The proposed action will not significantly increase the probability or consequences of accidents, no changes are being made in the types or amounts of any 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 involve 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.

Alternatives to the Proposed Action

As an alternative to the proposed action, the 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

This action does not involve the use of any resources not previously considered in the Final Environmental Statement for the V.C. Summer Nuclear Station.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on May 18, 2001, the staff consulted with the South Carolina State official, Henry Porter of the Division of Waste Management, 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 letter dated January 12, 2001. Documents may be examined, and/or copied for a fee, at the NRC's Public Document Room, located at One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland. Publicly available records will be accessible electronically from the ADAMS Public Library component on the NRC Web site, *http:www.nrc.gov* (the Public Electronic Reading Room).

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 22nd day of May 2001.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Karen R. Cotton,

Project Manager, Section 1, Project Directorate II, Division of Licensing Project Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 01–13399 Filed 5–25–01; 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 Filings and Information Services, Washington, DC 20549.

Extension: Rule 15a–4; SEC File No. 270–7; OMB Control No. 3235–0010.

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 15a–4 under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (the ''Exchange Act'') permits a natural person member of a securities exchange who terminates his or her association with a registered broker-dealer to continue to transact business on the exchange while the Commission reviews his or her application for registration as a broker-dealer if the exchange files a statement indicating that there does not appear to be any ground for disapproving the application. The total annual burden imposed by Rule 15a–4 is approximately 106 hours, based on approximately 25 responses (25 Respondents × 1 Response/Respondent), each requiring approximately 4.23 hours to complete. The total annual cost burden is $5,875, based on approximately 25 responses, each costing approximately $235 to complete.

The Commission uses the information disclosed by applicants in Form BD: (1) to determine whether the applicant meets the standards for registration set forth in the provisions of the Exchange Act; (2) to develop a central information resource where members of the public may obtain relevant, up-to-date information about broker-dealers, municipal securities dealers and government securities broker-dealers, and where the Commission, other regulators and SROs may obtain information for investigatory purposes in connection with securities litigation; and (3) to develop statistical information about broker-dealers, municipal securities dealers and government securities broker-dealers. Without the information disclosed in Form BD, the Commission could not effectively implement policy objectives of the Exchange Act with respect to its investor protection function.

The statement submitted by the exchange assures the Commission that the applicant, in the opinion of the exchange, is qualified to transact business on the exchange during the time that the applications are reviewed.

Written comments are invited on: (a) whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility and clarity of the information to be 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.

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

Dated: May 18, 2001.

Margaret H. McFarland,

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 01–13385 Filed 5–25–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8010–01–M

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34–44327; File No. SR–ISE–2001–04]

Self-Regulatory Organizations; Notice of Filing of Proposed Rule Change by the International Securities Exchange LLC Relating to Its Disciplinary Procedures

May 18, 2001.

Pursuant to section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (''Act''),[1] and Rule 19b–4 thereunder,[2] notice is hereby given that on February 6, 2001, the International Securities Exchange LLC (the ''Exchange'' or the ''ISE'') filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission (''Commission'') the proposed rule change, as described in Items I, II, and III below, which Items have been prepared by the ISE. The Commission is publishing this notice to solicit comments on the proposed rule change from interested persons.

I. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Terms of Substance of the Proposed Rule Change

The Exchange is proposing various changes to its disciplinary rules and procedures. A complete copy of the text of the proposed rule change is available at the Office of the Secretary, the ISE and the Commission.

II. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Purpose of, and Statutory Basis for, the Proposed Rule Change

In its filing with the Commission, the ISE included statements concerning the purpose of and basis for the proposed rule change and discussed any comments it received on the proposed rule change. The text of these statements may be examined at the places specified in Item IV below. The ISE has prepared summaries, set forth in Sections A, B, and C below, of the most significant aspects of such statements.

A. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Purpose of, and Statutory Basis for, the Proposed Rule Change

1. Purpose

The Exchange has entered into a regulatory services agreement with NASD Regulation (''NASDR'') pursuant to which, among other things, NASDR provides services related to conducting regulatory investigations and disciplinary actions. The ISE is proposing to make changes to its disciplinary rules and procedures to reflect and facilitate this ''hybrid'' regulatory system. In particular, the Exchange seeks to conform its disciplinary rules and procedures to those of NASDR where appropriate. In addition, the Exchange has carefully reviewed the disciplinary rules currently in place at the other self-regulatory organizations (''SROs'') and seeks to incorporate rules and standards found in the rule of the other SROs in a manner tailored to fit the needs of the Exchange, while assuring a disciplinary process that is fair to the Exchange's members as required by the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended (''Exchange Act''). The specific changes are discussed below.

The Exchange proposes to include in separate Rules the provisions currently contained in Rule 1601 that (1) require members and persons associated with Members to provide information upon the request of the Exchange, and (2) specify the Exchange's authority and obligation to investigate possible violations within the disciplinary jurisdiction of the Exchange. These provisions will be contained in Rules 1601 and 1602, respectively. While Rule 1615 already provides the Exchange authority to contract with another SRO to perform some or all of the Exchange's

[1] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1).

[2] 17 CFR 240.19b–4.