

applications, fees and other materials submitted to the Office. Persons who believe that they have been adversely affected by the disruption of postal services should comply with the provisions of 37 CFR 201.8.

When the disruption of postal services has ended, the Register shall publish a determination to that effect.

In the meantime, persons desiring to ensure prompt receipt of materials by the Copyright Office are encouraged to use alternative means such as delivery by private carriers or personal delivery rather than the United States Postal Service.

Dated: December 3, 2001.

**Marybeth Peters,**

*Register of Copyrights.*

[FR Doc. 01-30290 Filed 12-4-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 1410-30-P

## MEDICARE PAYMENT ADVISORY COMMISSION

### Commission Meeting

**AGENCY:** Medicare Payment Advisory Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice of meeting.

**SUMMARY:** The Commission will hold its next public meeting on Thursday, December 13, 2001, and Friday, December 14, 2001, at the Ronald Reagan Building, International Trade Center, 1300 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC. The meeting is tentatively scheduled to begin at 10 a.m. on December 13, and at 9 a.m. on December 14.

Topics for discussion include: Quality improvement for health plans and providers; pass-through payments under the prospective payment system for hospital outpatient department services; Medicare+Choice; measuring changes in input prices in traditional Medicare; adjusting local differences in resident training costs; paying for services in traditional Medicare; and assessing payment adequacy and updating Medicare payments.

Agendas will be mailed on December 4, 2001. The final agenda will be available on the Commission's web site ([www.MedPAC.gov](http://www.MedPAC.gov))

**ADDRESSES:** MedPAC's address is: 1730 K Street, NW., Suite 800, Washington, DC 20006. The telephone number is (202) 653-7220.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**  
Diane Ellison, Office Manager, (202) 653-7220.

**Murray N. Ross,**

*Executive Director.*

[FR Doc. 01-30040 Filed 12-4-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6820-BW-M

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-331]

### Nuclear Management Company, LLC; Correction

The November 14, 2001 (66 FR 57115), **Federal Register** contained a "Notice of Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating License." On page 57116, the date of September 24, 2001, should have been included in the list of supplemental letters to the application dated November 16, 2000.

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

**Brenda L. Mozafari,**

*Project Manager, Section 1, Project Directorate III-1, Division of Licensing Project Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 01-30111 Filed 12-4-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50-348 and 50-364]

### Southern Nuclear Operating Company, Inc., et al.; Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2; Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is considering issuance of amendments to Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-2 and NPF-8, issued to Southern Nuclear Operating Company Inc., et al. (the licensee), for operation of the Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2, located in Houston County, Alabama.

#### Environmental Assessment

##### Identification of Proposed Action

The proposed action would amend the Facility Operating Licenses (FOLs) for Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2, and to delete license conditions that have been completed or are otherwise no longer in effect. These activities have now been completed and the license conditions are either obsolete or are no longer needed.

The proposed action is in response to the licensee's application dated December 8, 2000.

#### The Need for the Proposed Action

When the FOLs, NPF-2 and NPF-8, were issued to the licensee, the NRC staff deemed certain issues essential to safety and/or essential to meeting certain regulatory interests. These issues were imposed as license conditions in the FOLs, with deadlines for their implementation. Since the units were licensed to operate in the late 1970s and early 1980s, most of these license conditions have been fulfilled. For the license conditions that have been fulfilled, the licensee proposed to have them deleted from the FOLs.

The licensee also proposed to make changes to correct administrative errors such as words inadvertently omitted, documents erroneously cited, etc.

The proposed amendments involve administrative changes to the FOLs only. No actual plant equipment, regulatory requirements, operating practices, or analyses are affected by these proposed amendments.

#### Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The NRC has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that there is no significant environmental impact if the amendments are granted. No changes will be made to the design and licensing bases, and applicable procedures at the two units at the Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2, will remain the same. Other than the administrative changes, no other changes will be made to the FOLs, including the Technical Specifications.

The changes will not 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 the allowable individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that 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 Commission concludes that there are no significant

nonradiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

#### *Environmental Impacts of the Alternatives to the Proposed Action*

Since the Commission has concluded there is no measurable environmental impact associated with the proposed action, any alternatives with equal or greater environmental impact need not be evaluated. As an alternative to the proposed action, the staff considered denial of the proposed action. 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 related to the McGuire Nuclear Station.

#### *Agencies and Persons Contacted*

In accordance with its stated policy, on January 10, 2001, the staff consulted with the Alabama State official, Kirk Whitley of the Office of Radiation Control, Alabama Department of Public Health, regarding the environmental impact of the proposed amendments. The State official had no comments.

#### **Finding of No Significant Impact**

Based upon the foregoing environmental assessment, the Commission concludes that the proposed amendments will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment. Accordingly, the Commission has determined not to prepare an environmental impact statement for the proposed amendments.

For further details with respect to the proposed action, see the licensee's letter dated December 8, 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 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 email to [pdr@nrc.gov](mailto:pdr@nrc.gov).

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

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Frank Rinaldi,**

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

[FR Doc. 01-30110 Filed 12-4-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

## **SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION**

**[Release No. 34-45115; File No. SR-CHX-2001-17]**

### **Self-Regulatory Organizations; Notice of Filing of Proposed Rule Change by The Chicago Stock Exchange, Incorporated, Relating to Eligibility of Limit Orders for Trade Through Protection**

November 28, 2001.

Pursuant to section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 ("the Act"),<sup>1</sup> and Rule 19b-4 thereunder,<sup>2</sup> notice is hereby given that on August 6, 2001, the Chicago Stock Exchange, Incorporated ("CHX" or "Exchange") filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission ("Commission" or "SEC") the proposed rule change as described in Items I, II and III below, which Items have been prepared by the self-regulatory organization. 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 proposes to amend CHX Article XX, Rule 37(b)(6), which governs execution of limit orders in the specialist's book in the event of a trade through in the primary market. The proposed rule change would require that a limit order be resident in the specialist's book for a time period of 0-15 seconds (as designated by the specialist) before it would be eligible for limit order protection. The text of the proposed rule change is available from the Office of the Secretary, the CHX 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 Exchange included statements concerning the purpose of and basis for

the proposed rule change and discussed any comments it received regarding the proposed rule change. The text of these statements may be examined at the places specified in Item IV below. The Exchange 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 proposes to amend Article XX, Rule 37(b)(6) of its rules, which governs execution of limit orders in the specialist's book in the event of a trade through in the primary market. The proposed rule change would require that a limit order be resident in the specialist's book for a time period of 0-15 seconds (as designated by the specialist) before it would be eligible for limit order protection.

Under current CHX rules, limit orders resting in a specialists's book are afforded trade through protection, which requires execution of the limit orders in the event of a price penetration in the primary market. The limit orders are entitled to price protection in their entirety regardless of their size. The Exchange represents that, at present, an order sender is able to take advantage of the time latency between a primary market execution and the reporting of the execution to the tape to gain these liquidity guarantees. The Exchange believes that an order sender will do so by placing a large limit order in a CHX specialist's book between the time of the primary market execution and the tape print. The limit order will typically be priced at a penny or two superior to the primary market trade price. According to the Exchange, the print of the inferior priced primary market trade will cause an automatic execution of the limit order in its entirety on the CHX at the limit price, thus giving the order sender inexpensive access to large amounts of liquidity.

In the example above, the Exchange explains that the limit order would not be due an execution because it was not "resting" on the specialist's book at the time the trade through occurred in the primary market. Rather, it was resting at the time the trade through execution was reported to the tape. The Exchange believes that this practice exploits a limitation in the trade reporting system that equates "trade time" with "report time." The Exchange believes that this practice has grown more prevalent with

<sup>1</sup> 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1).

<sup>2</sup> 17 CFR 240.19b-4.