and enter the environment by evaporation from the tower to the air and by blowdown to the sanitary sewer. About 105 gallons (400 liters) of the two biocides, 700 gallons (2,650 liters) of corrosion inhibitor, and 4,000 gallons (15,150 liters) of sulfuric acid are used annually. The use of these chemicals is approved by EPA. These chemicals are stored in a manner that will contain the chemicals in the event of material storage container failure. The use and disposal of these chemicals will not have a significant impact on the environment. The proposed action will not result in significant increases in the use of these chemicals.

The facility uses approximately 38 million gallons of water annually. The water is supplied by university owned and maintained deep wells which provide water to the campus. Most of the water (28 million gallons) is used in the cooling tower with the majority of the water lost to the atmosphere as water vapor. Wastewater from the facility discharges to the City of Columbia sewer system and is treated at the Columbia Regional Wastewater Treatment Plant.

The Missouri Department of Conservation has determined that no Federal or State listed plants or animals are known to occur on the MURR site, but did identify two species in the vicinity of the project site. One species, the Topeka Shiner, is listed as endangered. MURR withdraws a minimal amount of groundwater for reactor operation, has no major refurbishment or construction activities planned, and will have no significant change in the types or amounts of effluents leaving the facility as a result of construction permit recapture. Therefore, the proposed action is not expected to affect aquatic and terrestrial biota. The staff concludes 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

As an alternative to the proposed action, the staff considered denial of the proposed action (i.e., the ''no-action'' alternative). Denial of the proposed action would result in expiration of the current license in November 2001, and the commencement of decommissioning if an application for license renewal is not made. If the application is denied, it is expected that the licensee would apply for renewal of the license. With operation under the proposed action or with a renewed license approved by the Commission, the environmental impacts of the proposed action and the alternative are similar. If the Commission denied the application for license renewal, facility operations would end and decommissioning would be required with a likely small impact on the environment. In addition, the benefits of education and research conducted by the facility would be lost. The environmental impacts of the proposed action and this alternative action are similar.

Alternative Use of Resources

This action does not involve the use of any resources not previously considered in the Hazards Analysis Report prepared for initial licensing of the facility and the power upgrade to 10 MW(t).

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on [insert date] the staff consulted with the Missouri State official, Mr. Ron Kucera, Director of Intergovernmental Cooperation and Special Projects of the Missouri Department of Natural Resources, regarding the environmental impact of the proposed action. The State official _____. In addition, the NRC elected to provide the Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact to the public for a 30-day comment period in response to a request from the State of Missouri Department of Natural Resources. Comments received related to this Environmental Assessment were _____.

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 27, 2000, as supplemented by letter dated April 12 and June 6, 2001, which are available for public inspection, and can be copied for a fee, at the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Public Document Room (PDR), located at One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland. The NRC maintains an Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS), which provides text and image files of NRC's public documents. These documents may be accessed through the NRC's Public Electronic Reading Room on the internet at *http://www.nrc.gov/NRC/ADAMS/index.html.* Persons who do not have access to ADAMS or who have problems in accessing the documents located in ADAMS may contact the PDR reference staff at 1–800–397–4209, 301–415–4737 or by email at pdr@nrc.gov.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Ledyard B. Marsh,
Chief, Operational Experience and Non-Power Reactors Branch, Division of Regulatory Improvement Programs, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 01–19177 Filed 7–31–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P]

OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION

Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

AGENCY: Overseas Private Investment Corporation (OPIC).

ACTION: Request for comments.

SUMMARY: Under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. chapter 35), Agencies are required to publish a Notice in the **Federal Register** notifying the public that the Agency has prepared an information collection request for OMB review and approval and has requested public review and comment on the submission. OPIC published its first Federal Register Notice on this information collection request on April 25, 2001, in 66 FR 20841, at which time a 60-calendar day comment period was announced. This comment period ended June 25, 2001. No comments were received in response to this Notice.

This information collection submission has now been submitted to OMB for review. Comments are again being solicited on the need for the information, its practical utility, the accuracy of the Agency's burden estimate, and on ways to minimize the reporting burden, including automated collection techniques and uses of other forms of technology. The proposed form under review is summarized below.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before August 31, 2001.

ADDRESSES: Copies of the subject form and the request for review submitted to OMB may be obtained from the Agency

Submitting Officer. Comments on the form should be submitted to the OMB Reviewer.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

OPIC AGENCY SUBMITTING OFFICER: Carol Brock, Records Manager, Overseas Private Investment Corporation, 1100 New York Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20527; 202/336–8563.

OMB Reviewer

David Rostker, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, New Executive Office Building, Docket Library, Room 10102, 725 17th Street, NW., Washington, DC 20503, 202/395–3897.

Summary of Form Under Review

Type of Request: Form Renewal.

Title: Project Information Report.

Form Number: OPIC 71.

Frequency of Use: No more than once per contract.

Type of Respondents: Business or other institutions (except farms).

Standard Industrial Classification Codes: All.

Description of Affected Public: U.S. companies investing overseas.

Reporting Hours: 7 hours per project.

Number of Responses: 25 per year.

Federal Cost: $1,600.00.

Authority for Information Collection: Title 22 U.S.C. 2191(k)(2) and 2199(h) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended.

Abstract (Needs and Uses): The project information report is necessary to elicit and record the information on the developmental, environmental, and U.S. economic effects of OPIC-assisted projects. The information will be used by OPIC's staff and management solely as a basis for monitoring these projects, and reporting the results in aggregate form, as required by Congress.

Dated: July 26, 2001.

Rumu Sarkar,

Assistant General Counsel, Administrative Affairs, Department of Legal Affairs.

[FR Doc. 01–19202 Filed 7–31–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3210–01–M

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34–44589; File No. SR–Amex–2001–36]

Self-Regulatory Organizations; Notice of Filing of Proposed Rule Change by the American Stock Exchange LLC Relating to Hearing Fees for Issuer Requests for Review of Initial Listing and Delisting Decisions

July 26, 2001.

Pursuant to section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (''Act''),[1] and Rule 19b–4 [2] thereunder, notice is hereby given that on June 1, 2001, the American Stock Exchange LLC (''Amex'' or ''Exchange'') filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission (''SEC'' or ''Commission'') the proposed rule change as described in Items I, II, and III below, which Items have been prepared by the Exchange. 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 Amex proposes to amend sections 1010(c), 1203(a), and 1204(c) of the Amex Company Guide to impose hearing fees on issuers in connection with issuer requests for review of Exchange initial listing or delisting decisions.

Below is the text of the proposed rule change. Proposed new language is *italicized.*

* * * * *

Amex Company Guide

Section 1010. Delisting Procedures

(a) No change

(b) No change

(c) If, within five days after receiving such written notice, the company informs the Exchange in writing that it wishes to appeal the decision of the Exchange and requests an opportunity for a hearing, the Exchange will give the company at least ten days' prior written notice of the time and place at which a hearing shall be held. *A company requesting an opportunity for a hearing must submit a hearing fee of $2,500 to the American Stock Exchange LLC in the form and manner prescribed by the Exchange to cover the cost of the hearing. A company will be deemed to have waived the opportunity for a hearing, and a hearing will not be scheduled, if the hearing fee has not been submitted to the Exchange within five days after the company receives the written notice referred to in section 1010(b) above.*

(d) through (h) No change.

Section 1203. Request for Hearing

(a) An applicant may, within seven calendar days of the date of the Staff Determination, request either a written or oral hearing to review the staff Determination. Requests for hearings should be filed with the Nasdaq–Amex Office of Listing Qualifications Hearings (the ''Hearings Department''). *An applicant must submit a hearing fee to the American Stock Exchange LLC, to cover the cost of holding the hearing, as follows: (1) where consideration is on the basis of a written submission from the issuer, $1,500, or (2) where consideration is on the basis of an oral hearing, whether in person or by telephone, $2,500. The applicant will be deemed to have waived the opportunity to request a hearing, and a hearing will not be scheduled, unless the applicant has submitted such hearing fee, in the form and manner prescribed by the Exchange, no later than seven calendar days of the date of the Staff Determination.*

All hearings will be held before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Securities as described in section 1204. All hearings will be scheduled, to the extent practicable, within 45 days of the date that the request for hearing is filed, at a location determined by the Hearings Department. The Hearings Department will make an acknowledgement of the applicant's hearing request stating the date, time, and location of the hearing, and the deadline for written submissions to the Committee on Securities. The applicant will be provided at least 10 calendar days notice of the hearing unless the applicant waives such notice.

(b) No change

Section 1204. The Committee on Securities

(a) No change

(b) No change

(c) After the Hearing, the Subcommittee will issue a written decision (the ''Subcommittee Decision'') describing the specific grounds for the determination and identifying the quantitative guideline or qualitative consideration set forth in Part 1 that the applicant has failed to satisfy. The Subcommittee Decisions will be promptly provided to the applicant and is effective immediately unless it specifies to the contrary. The Subcommittee Decision will provide notice that the applicant may request review of the Subcommittee Decision by the Adjudicatory Council within 15 calendar days of the date of the Subcommittee Decision and that the Subcommittee Decision may be called for review by the Adjudicatory Council within 45 calendar days from the date of the Subcommittee Decision pursuant to Section 1205. *If the applicant requests review of the Subcommittee Decision, the applicant must submit a fee of $2,500 to the American Stock Exchange LLC to cover the cost of the review by the Adjudicatory Council. The applicant will be deemed to have waived the opportunity for review, and a review will not be commenced, unless the applicant has submitted the fee, in the form and manner prescribed by the Exchange, within 15 calendar days of the date of the Subcommittee Decision.*

* * * * *

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

[2] 17 CFR 240.19b–4.