Environment and Natural Resources, 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. 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 Electronic Reading Room).

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 29th day of January 2001.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Donnie J. Ashley,

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

[FR Doc. 01–2830 Filed 2–1–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–U

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Financial Assistance (Grants) To Support Agreement States in Closing Sites Formerly Licensed by the NRC

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is announcing the availability of financial assistance to support Agreement States in closing outstanding sites formerly licensed by the NRC. The assistance is being made available through a grant program. Eligible Agreement States that desire funding assistance should submit a written grant proposal to NRC for review and approval.

Agreement State grant proposals for file reviews and/or for conduct of initial site surveys should be submitted within 60–90 days of the publication of this announcement. Proposals for site characterization, if needed, should be submitted as soon as possible after completion of file reviews and/or initial surveys. Similarly, proposals for site remediation, if needed, should be submitted as soon as possible after completion of site characterization. Proposals that are not submitted in time for consideration under FY 2001 funds will be considered for FY 2002 funding.

ADDRESSES: Nuclear Regulatory Commission, ATTN: Grants Officer, Division of Contracts and Property Management, Office of Administration, Mail Stop T–7–I–2, Washington, DC 20555.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Yvette Brown, 301–415–6507.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The NRC has been reviewing files for previously terminated licenses to determine whether there was appropriate documentation in the files that the sites were decommissioned prior to termination of the license and release of the site. A number of files have been identified for which there is insufficient documentation about site decommissioning or sealed source disposition.

Radioactive material remaining at a site located within an Agreement State, including material originally licensed by the NRC or its predecessor, is the regulatory responsibility of the Agreement State under its agreement with NRC. Therefore, an Agreement State has regulatory jurisdiction for conducting license file reviews and initial site surveys of formerly NRC licensed sites, including sites with insufficient documentation to account for sealed sources. An Agreement State also has regulatory jurisdiction for remediation of any sites identified as being contaminated.

Under section 274.i of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the NRC is supporting Agreement States through providing funds for the purpose of reviewing files, conducting surveys, characterizing, and remediating sites formerly licensed by the NRC.

On May 24, 1999 (64 FR 28014), the NRC published a notice in the **Federal Register** (FR) that requested stakeholders' comment on the proposed grant program for Agreement States for formerly NRC licensed sites. The basis for the FY 2001–2002 cost estimates for formerly NRC licensed sites is set out in a Commission Paper-SECY–99–193, entitled ''Cost Estimates for Completion of Formerly Terminated NRC Licensed Sites Program.'' In that paper, a total of 11 Agreement States were identified that could need funding assistance to close out formerly NRC licensed sites in their States. (SECY–99–193 is available on the NRC homepage at http://www.nrc.gov/NRC/COMMISSION/SECYS/secy1999–193/1999–193scy.html.)

During the past year, the NRC staff determined that three of the 11 Agreement States, identified in SECY–99–193, have taken action to close out the formerly NRC licensed sites in their States after file review/investigation. The following eight Agreement States with remaining formerly NRC licensed sites are eligible to submit grant proposals for funding assistance: Arizona, California, Colorado, Massachusetts, New Mexico, North Dakota, New York and Texas.

On October 2, 2000, during the annual Organization of Agreement State Meeting, the NRC staff presented information on the grant program to provide Agreement State staff an opportunity to discuss the process and procedure that will be used to administer the program. Copies of the draft grant proposal for file review and/or initial survey, and the draft procedure were distributed at that meeting.

The grant program will be administered to ensure a proper, fair, and equitable use of available funds to assist Agreement States with remaining formerly NRC licensed sites to complete necessary file reviews and surveys; site characterization; and remediation, if necessary. The program will include a risk-ranking of the sites to ensure that funds are available for the ''high-risk'' sites in the event that the appropriated funds are less than requested or prove to be insufficient to fully remediate remaining identified sites. The FY 2001 funding appropriation is $1,650,000.00. The FY 2002 proposed ceiling is $1,650,000.00 pending availability of the funds.

The grant program is organized into four different kinds of proposals for funding assistance:

(1) Proposal for file review and/or initial survey;

(2) Proposal for regulatory oversight for site characterization and/or remediation;

(3) Proposal for site characterization; and

(4) Proposal for site remediation.

Each State that desires funding assistance should submit a written grant proposal to the Attention of: Grants Officer, Division of Contracts and Property Management, Office of Administration, Mail Stop T–7–I–2, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555.

An STP procedure (SA–1000), entitled ''Implementation of the Grant Program for Funding Assistance for

Formerly Licensed Sites in Agreement States'', with a sample proposal for file review and/or initial survey is available on the NRC homepage at http://www.hsrd.ornl.gov/nrc/procedures/sa1000.pdf.

Each proposal should contain basic information including project goals and objectives, project management, period of the project, project total cost, and anticipated results. In addition, the proposal should include the following information depending on the type of proposal being submitted:

(1) Proposal for File Review and/or Initial Survey (A sample proposal can be found in the STP Procedure SA–1000).

a. A brief description of each file to be reviewed;

b. The number of loose material and/or sealed source files to be reviewed;

c. Estimated work hours by major activity for each file (including review of records and documents, travel, interviews, survey and sampling, etc.);

d. Estimated hourly rate of the person(s) conducting the reviews and/or initial surveys;

e. Estimated cost for file review and/or initial survey (using data from items c and d);

f. Estimated worker benefit cost;

g. Estimated travel and Per Diem cost;

h. Estimated supplies and service cost;

i. Estimated total direct cost (using data from items e to h);

j. Estimated total indirect cost;

k. Estimated total cost (items i plus j);

l. Estimated laboratory analysis and service costs, if any;

m. Estimated grand total cost (items k plus l); and

n. Any supporting information that will strengthen the proposal.

(2) Proposal for Regulatory Oversight for Site Characterization and/or Remediation.

a. A brief description of each site that needs regulatory oversight for site characterization and/or remediation;

b. The number of sites that need regulatory oversight for site characterization and/or remediation;

c. Estimated work hours by major activity for each site (including review of records and documents, travel, administration record keeping and correspondence, etc.);

d. Estimated hourly rate of the person(s) conducting the oversight;

e. Estimated cost for sites that need regulatory oversight (using data from items c and d);

f. Estimated worker benefit cost;

g. Estimated travel and Per Diem cost;

h. Estimated supplies and service cost;

i. Estimated total direct cost (using data from items e to h);

j. Estimated total indirect cost;

k. Estimated total cost (items i plus j);

l. Estimated laboratory analysis and service costs, if any;

m. Estimated grand total cost (items k plus l); and

n. Any supporting information that will strengthen the proposal.

(3) Proposal for Site Characterization.

Note that Agreement States should complete all file reviews and/or initial surveys before submitting their site characterization proposal to NRC, and each proposal should deal with only one specific site.

a. A brief description of the site characterization plan;

b. Estimated work hours by major activity for the site including regulatory oversight and actual site characterization work;

c. Estimated hourly rate of the person(s) conducting the activity including regulatory oversight and actual site characterization work;

d. Estimated cost (using data from items b and c);

e. Estimated worker benefit cost;

f. Estimated travel and Per Diem cost;

g. Estimated supplies and service cost;

h. Estimated total direct cost (using data from d to g);

i. Estimated total indirect cost;

j. Estimated total cost (items h plus i);

k. Estimated laboratory analysis and service costs, if any;

l. Estimated grand total cost (items j plus k);

m. Documentation that none of the following three conditions exist:

(1) the current site owner is financially capable for site characterization;

(2) the original licensee is still in existence and financially capable; or

(3) the site qualifies for the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) funding assistance; and

n. Any supporting information that will strengthen the proposal.

(4) Proposal for Site Remediation.

Note that each proposal deals with only one specific site.

a. A brief description of site cleanup plan;

b. Estimated work hours by major activity for the site including regulatory oversight and actual site remediation work;

c. Estimated hourly rate of the person(s) conducting the activity including regulatory oversight and actual site remediation work;

d. Estimated cost (using data from items b and c);

e. Estimated worker benefit cost;

f. Estimated travel and Per Diem cost;

g. Estimated supplies and service cost;

h. Estimated total direct cost (using data from items d to g);

i. Estimated total indirect cost;

j. Estimated total cost (items h plus i);

k. Estimated laboratory analysis and service costs, if any;

l. Estimated grand total cost (items j plus k) including regulatory oversight and actual remediation work;

m. An estimate of the residence or worker population, if any, within the contaminated area(s);

o. Accessibility of the contaminated site to the public;

p. Average gamma surface dose rate of the contaminated areas;

q. An estimate of the contaminated areas;

r. An estimate of the total volume of waste;

s. An estimate of the percentage of contaminated area where the level of removable contamination exceeds permissible regulatory limits;

t. Any economic impact of not cleaning up the site immediately;

u. The funding needed for each year and the amount of time needed to complete site cleanup activities;

v. Plans for disposal of waste and availability of the waste disposal site;

w. A statement or conclusion (and supporting basis) that the contaminated site could result in doses that exceed the 25 millirem/year public dose limit;

x. Documentation that none of the following three conditions exist:

(1) The current site owner is financially capable of conducting the site remediation;

(2) The original licensee is still in existence and financially capable; or

(3) The site qualifies for CERCLA funding assistance;

y. Any considerations that would warrant that this site needs to be remediated in a short period of time; and

z. Any supporting information that will strengthen the proposal.

Evaluation Process

All proposals received as a result of this announcement will be evaluated by NRC staff.

Evaluation Criteria

The common evaluation criteria for each proposal are as follows:

1. Clarity of statement of project objectives, management and anticipated results;

2. The completeness of the cost estimate;

3. The level of supporting detail presented; and

4. The reasonableness of the cost estimate (i.e., the accuracy and

magnitude of estimated costs) in relation to the work to be performed and anticipated results.

Additional evaluation criteria for site characterization proposal:

The funding will not be granted to a site if any of the following conditions exist:

a. The current site owner is financially capable for site characterization.

b. The original licensee is still in existence and financially capable.

c. The site qualifies for CERCLA funding assistance.

Additional evaluation criteria for site remediation proposal:

a. The funding will not be granted to a site if any of the following conditions exist:

i. The current site owner is financially capable for site remediation.

ii. The original licensee is still in existence and financially capable.

iii. The site qualifies for CERCLA funding assistance.

iv. Site remediation is proposed for compliance with a more conservative criterion than 25 millirem/year.

b. If necessary, the NRC staff will evaluate and approve the grants based on a risk-ranking for each site. Information on the approach for risk ranking contaminated formerly NRC licensed sites will be provided at a later date, if necessary.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland this 26th day of January, 2001.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Paul H. Lohaus,

Director, Office of State and Tribal Programs.

[FR Doc. 01–2832 Filed 2–1–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

Upon Written Request, Copies Available From: Securities and Exchange Commission, Office of Filings and Information Services, Washington, DC 20549.

Extension:

Rule 29; SEC File No. 270–169; OMB Control No. 3235–0149

Rule 83; SEC File No. 270–82; OMB Control No. 3235–0181

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'') has submitted to the Office of Management and Budget requests for extension of the previously approved collections of information discussed below.

Rules 29, Filing of Reports to State Commissions, concerns reports to state commissions by registered holding companies and their subsidiaries. The rule requires that a copy of each annual report submitted by any registered holding company or any of its subsidiaries to a state commission covering operations not reported to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission be filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission no later than ten days after such submission.

The information collected under Rule 29 permits the Commission to remain current on developments that are reported to state commissions, but that might not be reported to the Commission otherwise. This information is beneficial to the liaison the Commission maintains with state governments and also is useful in the preparation of annual reports to the U.S. Congress under Section 23 of the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935.

The title of Rule 83 is Exemption In the Case of Transactions with Foreign Associates. It authorizes exemption from the at cost standard of section 13(b) of the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935 for services provided to associated foreign utility companies.

Rule 83 requires a registered holding company system that wishes to avail itself of this exemption from Section 13(b) to submit an application, in the form of a declaration, to the Commission. The Commission will grant the application if, by reason of the lack of any major interest of holders of securities offered in the United States in servicing arrangements affecting such serviced subsidiaries, such an application for exemption is necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors.

Rules 29 and 83 do not create a recordkeeping or retention burden on respondents. These rules do, however, contain reporting and filing requirements. Rule 29 imposes a reporting burden of about .25 hours for each of sixty-two respondents, each of which makes one submission annually. The total annual burden is fifteen and one-half hours. Rule 29 imposes no cost burdens.

The filing requirement of Rule 29 is mandatory. Responses will not be kept confidential. The filing requirement of Rule 83 is necessary to obtain a benefit. Responses will not be kept confidential.

Since the Commission has received no applications under Rule 83 recently, it is estimated the burden of Rule 83 as zero.

These estimates of average burden hours are made solely for the purposes of the Paperwork Reduction Act and are not derived from a comprehensive or even a representative survey or study of the costs of SEC rules and forms.

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.

General comments regarding the above information should be directed to the following persons: (i) Desk Officer for the Securities and Exchange Commission, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, New Executive Office Building, Washington, DC 20503; and (ii) Michael E. Bartell, Associate Executive Director, Office of Information Technology, Securities and Exchange Commission, 450 Fifth Street, N.W., Washington, DC 25049. Comments must be submitted to OMB within 30 days of this notice.

Dated: January 8, 2001.

Margaret H. McFarland,

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 01–2811 Filed 2–1–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8010–01–M

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 35–27340]

Filings Under the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935, as Amended (''Act'')

January 26, 2001.

Notice is hereby given that the following filing(s) has/have been made with the Commission pursuant to provisions of the Act and rules promulgated under the Act. All interested persons are referred to the application(s) and/or declaration(s) for complete statements of the proposed transaction(s) summarized below. The application(s) and/or declaration(s) and any amendment(s) is/are available for public inspection through the Commission's Branch of Public Reference.

Interested persons wishing to comment or request a hearing on the application(s) and/or declaration(s) should submit their views in writing by February 20, 2001, to the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, Washington, DC 20549–0609, and serve a copy on the relevant applicant(s) and/or declarant(s) at the address(es) specified below. Proof of service (by affidavit or, in the case of an attorney at law, by certificate) should be filed with the request. Any request for hearing should identify specifically the issues of