explanation of the bases of each contention and a concise statement of the alleged facts or expert opinion that support the contention and on which the petitioner intends to rely in proving the contention at the hearing. The petitioner must also provide references to those specific sources and documents of which the petitioner is aware and on which the petitioner intends to rely to establish those facts or expert opinion. The petitioner must provide sufficient information to show that a genuine dispute exists with the applicant on a material issue of law or fact. Contentions shall be limited to matters within the scope of the amendment under consideration. The contention must be one that, if proven, would entitle the petitioner to relief. A petitioner who fails to file such a supplement that satisfies these requirements with respect to at least one contention will not be permitted to participate as a party.

Those permitted to intervene become parties to the proceeding, subject to any limitations in the order granting leave to intervene, and have the opportunity to participate fully in the conduct of the hearing, including the opportunity to present evidence and cross-examine witnesses.

A request for a hearing and petition for leave to intervene must be filed with the Secretary of the Commission, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001, Attention: Rulemakings and Adjudications Staff, or may be delivered to the Commission's Public Document Room, located at One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland, by the above date. A copy of the request for a hearing and the petition should also be sent to the Office of the General Counsel, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001, and to John H. O'Neill, Jr., Shaw, Pittman, Potts, and Trowbridge, 2300 N Street, NW, Washington, DC 20037, attorney for the licensee.

Nontimely filings of petitions for leave to intervene, amended petitions, supplemental petitions and/or requests 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 50.92.

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendment dated November 15, 1999, as supplemented by letters dated March 15, June 15, June 19, July 28, August 17, September 14, October 19, and December 21, 2000, February 6, February 23, March 19, May 11, and June 13, 2001, which is available for public inspection at the Commission'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 Agencywide Documents Access and Management Systems (ADAMS) Public Electronic Reading Room on the Internet at the NRC Web site, *http://www.nrc.gov/NRC/ADAMS/index.html*. 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 Reference staff at 1–800–397–4209, 301–415–4737 or by e-mail to pdr@nrc.gov.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 15th day of June 2001.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Beth A. Wetzel,

Senior Project Manager, Section I, Project Directorate III, Division of Licensing Project Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 01–15710 Filed 6–21–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50–354]

PSEG Nuclear Limited Liability Company; Hope Creek Generating Station; Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is considering issuance of an amendment to Facility Operating License (FOL) No. NPF–57, issued to PSEG Nuclear LLC, (the licensee), for operation of the Hope Creek Generating Station (HCGS) located in Lower Alloways Creek Township, Salem County, New Jersey.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed

The proposed license amendment would revise the FOL and Technical Specifications (TSs) for the HCGS, to allow the licensee to increase the licensed core power level from 3,293 megawatts thermal (MWt) to 3,339 MWt, which represents a 1.4-percent increase in the allowable thermal power. The NRC authorized HCGS for full power production at 3,293 MWt with issuance of the FOL on July 25, 1986. In addition to the power uprate, the proposed license amendment would allow the licensee to make editorial changes to the TS Bases and Index sections.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application for license amendment dated December 1, 2000, as supplemented by letters dated February 12, May 7, and May 14, 2001.

The Need for the Proposed Action

The proposed action would allow an increase in power generation at HCGS to provide additional electrical power for distribution to the grid. In certain circumstances, power uprate has been recognized as a safe and cost-effective method to increase generating capacity. The proposed action would also allow editorial changes to the TS Bases and Index sections to provide corrections to references and typographical errors.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The NRC has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that implementation of the proposed amendment would not have a significant impact on the environment.

With regard to potential radiological impacts, the licensee has evaluated the proposed 1.4-percent power uprate with respect to its effect on the consequences of postulated design-basis accidents and on normal releases of liquid and gaseous effluents. For postulated design-basis accidents, the effects of the proposed power uprate are bounded by current licensing basis dose analyses. No increase in the probability of these accidents is expected to occur. For liquid and gaseous effluents, the offsite doses resulting from normal releases are not impacted by the proposed power uprate because the uprated power is less than the core power level that was used for the source term development in the existing analyses. The release volumes from the liquid and solid waste processing systems are not expected to change as a result of the proposed power level change. The proposed editorial changes to the TSs are administrative in nature and would have no radiological impact. The proposed action will not significantly increase the probability or consequences of accidents, no changes are being made in the types of any effluents that may be released offsite, and there is no significant increase in occupational or public radiation exposure. Based on the

above, the staff concludes that there are no significant radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

With regard to potential non-radiological impacts, the proposed action does not involve any historic sites. With regard to other non-radiological impacts, the licensee performed an environmental evaluation, as documented in the submittal dated May 14, 2001, that considered thermal effects, consumptive uses, and particulate emissions. This evaluation was performed assuming a 1.5-percent uprated power value, thus bounding the proposed 1.4-percent power uprate. The evaluation was performed as required by the Environmental Protection Plan (EPP) for HCGS (Appendix B to FOL No. NPF–57). The EPP states that ''[e]nvironmental concerns identified in the FES–OL [Final Environmental Statement—Operating Licensing Stage (NUREG–1074, dated December 1984)] which relate to water quality matters are regulated by way of the licensee's NPDES [New Jersey Pollution Discharge Elimination System] permit.'' The NJDES permit imposes limits on plant effluents that are discharged to the Delaware River estuary. The licensee's environmental evaluation concluded that there are no significant non-radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed power uprate and that the current NJDES permit limits would not require any changes. The proposed editorial changes to the TSs are administrative in nature and would have no non-radiological impact. Based on the above, the staff concludes that there are no significant non-radiological 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 HCGS.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on June 7, 2001, the staff consulted with the New Jersey State official, Mr. Dennis Zannoni, of the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection, 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 December 1, 2000, as supplemented by letter dated February 12, May 7, and May 14, 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 Agencywide Documents Access and Management Systems (ADAMS) Public Electronic Reading Room on the Internet at the NRC web site, *http://www.nrc.gov/NRC/ADAMS/index.html.* 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@nrc.gov.*

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 18th day of June 2001.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Richard B. Ennis,

Project Manager, Section 2, Project Directorate I, Division of Licensing Project Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 01–15707 Filed 6–21–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Issuer Delisting; Notice of Application to Withdraw From Listing and Registration; (Stillwater Mining, Common Stock, $.01 Par Value) File No. 1–13053

June 15, 2001.

Stillwater Mining Company, a Delaware corporation (''Issuer''), has filed an application with the Securities and Exchange Commission (''Commission''), pursuant to Section 12(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (''Act'') [1] and Rule 12d2–2(d) thereunder,[2] to withdraw its Common Stock, $.01 par value (''Security''), from listing and registration on the American Stock Exchange LLC (''Amex'').

The Board of Directors (''Board'') of the Issuer approved a resolution on January 9, 2001 to withdraw the Security from listing on the Exchange and to list the Security on the New York Stock Exchange (''NYSE''). The Issuer represents that on June 26, 2001 the Security will begin trading on the NYSE. The Issuer stated that the Board took such action in order to avoid the direct and indirect costs and the division of the market resulting from dual listing on the Amex and NYSE.

The Issuer stated in its application that is has met the requirements of Amex Rule 18 by complying with all applicable laws in effect in the State of Delaware, in which it is incorporated, and with the Amex's rules governing an issuer's voluntary withdrawal of a security from listing and registration. The Issuer's application relates solely to the withdrawal of the Security from listing on the Amex and shall have no affect upon its listing on the NYSE or its registration under Section 12(b) of the Act.[3]

Any interested person may, on or before July 9, 2001 submit by letter to the Secretary of the Securities and Exchange Commission, 450 Fifth Street, NW, Washington, DC 20549–0609, facts bearing upon whether the application has been made in accordance with the rules of the Amex and what terms, if any, should be imposed by the Commission for the protection of investors. The Commission, based on the information submitted to it, will issue an order granting the application after the date mentioned above, unless the Commission determines to order a hearing on the matter.

For the Commission, by the Division of Market Regulation, pursuant to delegated authority.[4]

Margaret H. McFarland,

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 01–15681 Filed 6–21–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8010–01–M

[1] 15 U.S.C. 78*l*(d).

[2] 17 CFR 240.12d2–2(d).

[3] 15 U.S.C. 78*l*(b).

[4] 17 CFR 200.30–3(a)(1).