regulations, and (3) the issuance of the amendments will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination

Description of Amendment Request: The proposed amendment revises TS [5.5.7, "Reactor Coolant Pump Flywheel Inspection Program,"] to extend the allowable inspection interval to 20 years.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), an analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration is presented below:

Criterion 1—The Proposed Change Does Not Involve a Significant Increase in the Probability or Consequences of an Accident Previously Evaluated

The proposed change to the RCP flywheel examination frequency does not change the response of the plant to any accidents. The RCP will remain highly reliable and the proposed change will not result in a significant increase in the risk of plant operation. Given the extremely low failure probabilities for the RCP motor flywheel during normal and accident conditions, the extremely low probability of a loss-of-coolant accident (LOCA) with loss of offsite power (LOOP), and assuming a conditional core damage probability (CCDP) of 1.0 (complete failure of safety systems), the core damage frequency (CDF) and change in risk would still not exceed the NRC's acceptance guidelines contined in RG 1.174 (<1.0E-6 per year). Moreover, considering the uncertainties involved in this evaluation, the risk associated with the postulated failure of an RCP motor flywheel is significantly low. Even if all four RCP motor flywheels are considered in the bounding plant configuration case, the risk is still acceptably low.

The proposed change does not adversely affect accident initiators or precursors, nor alter the design assumptions, conditions, or configuration of the facility, or the manner in which the plant is operated and maintained; alter or prevent the ability of structures, systems, components (SSCs) from performing their intended function to mitigate the consequences of an initiating event within the assumed acceptance limits; or affect the source term, containment isolation, or radiological release assumptions used in evaluating the radiological consequences of an accident previously evaluated. Further, the proposed change does not increase

the type or amount of radioactive effluent that may be released offsite, nor significantly increase individual or cumulative occupational/public radiation exposure. The proposed change is consistent with the safety analysis assumptions and resultant consequences. Therefore, the proposed change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

Criterion 2—The Proposed Change Does Not Create the Possibility of a New or Different Kind of Accident From Any Accident Previously Evaluated

The proposed change in flywheel inspection frequency does not involve any change in the design or operation of the RCP. Nor does the change to examination frequency affect any existing accident scenarios, or create any new or different accident scenarios. Further, the change does not involve a physical alteration of the plant (i.e., no new or different type of equipment will be installed) or alter the methods governing normal plant operation. In addition, the change does not impose any new or different requirements or eliminate any existing requirements, and does not alter any assumptions made in the safety analysis. The proposed change is consistent with the safety analysis assumptions and current plant operating practice. Therefore, the proposed change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

Criterion 3—The Proposed Change Does Not Involve a Significant Reduction in a Margin of Safety

The proposed change does not alter the manner in which safety limits, limiting safety system settings, or limiting conditions for operation are determined. The safety analysis acceptance criteria are not impacted by this change. The proposed change will not result in plant operation in a configuration outside of the design basis. The calculated impact on risk is insignificant and meets the acceptance criteria contained in RG 1.174. There are no significant mechanisms for inservice degradation of the RCP flywheel. Therefore, the proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

Based upon the reasoning presented above and the previous discussion of the amendment request, the requested change does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

Dated in Rockville, Maryland, this 13th day of June, 2003.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. **Robert A. Gramm**,

Acting Director, Project Directorate IV, Division of Licensing Project Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation. [FR Doc. 03–15860 Filed 6–23–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION

July 10, 2003, Public Hearing

Time and Date: 2 p.m., Thursday, July 10, 2003.

Place: Offices of the Corporation, Twelfth Floor Board Room, 1100 New York Avenue, NW., Washington, DC.

Status: Hearing open to the public at 2 p.m.

Purpose: Hearing in conjunction with each meeting of OPIC's Board of Directors, to afford an opportunity for any person to present views regarding the activities of the Corporation.

Procedures: Individuals wishing to address the hearing orally must provide advance notice to OPIC's Corporate Secretary no later than 5 p.m., Monday, July 7, 2003. The notice must include the individual name, organization, address, and telephone number, and a concise summary of the subject matter to be presented.

Oral presentations may not exceed ten (10) minutes. The time for individual presentations may be reduced proportionately, if necessary, to afford all participants who have submitted a timely request to participate an opportunity to be heard.

Participants wishing to submit a written statement for the record must submit a copy of such statement to OPIC's Corporate Secretary no later than 5 p.m., Monday, July 7, 2003. Such statements must be typwewritten, double-spaced, and may not exceed twenty-five (25) pages.

Upon receipt of the required notice, OPIC will prepare an agenda for the hearing identifying speakers, setting forth the subject on which each participant will speak, and the time allotted for each presentation. The agenda will be available at the hearing.

A written summary of the hearing will be compiled, and such summary will be made available, upon written request to OPIC's Corporate Secretary, at the cost of reproduction.

Contact Person for Information: Information on the hearing may be obtained from Connie M. Downs at (202) 336–8438, via facsimile at (202) 218–0136, or via email at cdown@opic.gov. Dated: June 20, 2003.

Connie M. Downs,

OPIC Corporate Secretary.

[FR Doc. 03–15982 Filed 6–20–03; 9:49 am]

BILLING CODE 3210-01-M

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Issuer Delisting; Notice of Application To Withdraw From Listing and Registration on the American Stock Exchange LLC (Azco Mining Inc., Common Stock, \$.002 Par Value) File No. 1–12974

June 18, 2003.

Azco Mining Inc., 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, \$.002 par value ("Security"), from listing and registration on the American Stock Exchange LLC ("Amex" or "Exchange").

The Issuer stated in its application that it has met the requirements of Amex Rule 18 by complying with all applicable laws 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 states that it is taking such action because the Issuer has been notified that it is not in compliance with the Amex's listing standards. In addition, the Issuer believes that its needs would be better served by listing its Security on the OTC Bulletin Board ("OTCBB").

The Issuer's application relates solely to the withdrawal of the Securities from listing on the Amex and from registration under section 12(b) of the Act ³ shall not affect its obligation to be registered under section 12(g) of the Act.⁴

Any interested person may, on or before July 9, 2003, 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. 5

Jonathan G. Katz,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 03–15883 Filed 6–23–03; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 8010–01–P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34–48045; File No. SR–PCX– 2003–28]

Self-Regulatory Organizations; Notice of Filing and Order Granting Accelerated Approval of a Proposed Rule Change and Amendments No. 1 and 2 by the Pacific Exchange, Inc. To Initiate a Pilot Program That Allows the Listing of Strike Prices at One-Point Intervals for Certain Stocks Trading Under \$20

June 17, 2003.

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 June 13, 2003, the Pacific Exchange, Inc. ("PCX" or "Exchange") filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission ("SEC" or "Commission") the proposed rule change as described in Items I and II below, which Items have been prepared by the Exchange. The PCX filed Amendments No. 1 and 2 to the proposal on June 16, 2003.3 The Commission is publishing this notice to solicit comments on the proposed rule change, as amended, from interested persons and to grant accelerated

approval to the proposed rule change, as amended, through June 5, 2004.

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

The Exchange proposes to initiate a pilot program ("Pilot Program") that will allow the Exchange to list options on selected stocks trading below \$20 at one-point intervals. The text of the proposed rule change appears below. Additions are in *italics*; deletions are in brackets.

4745 Series of Options Open for Trading

Rule 6.4(a)–(e)—No change. Commentary .01–.03—No change.

.04 The Exchange may select a limited number of its listed options on individual stocks for which the interval of strike prices will be \$1.00 ("\$1 strike prices") provided the strike price is \$20.00 or less, but not less than \$3. The listing of \$1 strike prices will be limited to options issues overlying no more than five (5) individual stocks (the "\$1 Strike Pilot Program'') as specifically designated by the Exchange. The Exchange may list \$1 strike prices on any other option issues if those issues are specifically designated by other securities exchanges that employ a \$1 Strike Pilot Program under their respective rules. To be eligible for inclusion into the \$1 Strike Pilot Program, an underlying stock must close below \$20 in its primary market on the previous trading day. After a stock is added to the \$1 Strike Pilot Program, the Exchange may list \$1 strike prices from \$3 to \$20 that are no more than \$5 from the closing price of the underlying on the preceding day. For example, if the underlying stock closes at \$13, the Exchange may list strike prices from \$8 to \$18. The Exchange may not list series with \$1.00 intervals within \$0.50 of an existing \$2.50 strike price (e.g., \$12.50, \$17.50) in the same series, and may not list \$2.50 intervals (e.g. \$12.50, \$17.50) below \$20 under Commentary .03 of this Rule for any issue included within the \$1 Strike Pilot Program if the addition of \$2.50 intervals would cause the issue to have strike price intervals that are \$.50 apart. Additionally, the Exchange may not list long-term option series ("LEAPS") at \$1 strike price intervals for any option class selected for the \$1 Strike Pilot Program. A stock shall remain in the \$1 Strike Pilot Program until otherwise designated by the Exchange. The \$1 Strike Pilot Program shall expire on June 5, 2004.

[.04] .05—No change.

¹ 15 U.S.C. 78l(d).

² 17 CFR 240.12d2-2(d).

^{3 15} U.S.C. 78*l*(b).

^{4 15} U.S.C. 78 l(g).

⁵ 17 CFR 200.30–3(a)(1).

¹ 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1).

² 17 CFR 240.19b-4.

³ See letter from Mai Shiver, Senior Attorney, Regulatory Policy, PCX, to Nancy J. Sanow, Assistant Director, Division of Market Regulation ("Division"), Commission, dated June 13, 2003 'Amendment No. 1"). Amendment No. 1 revises the text of the proposed rule to state that the pilot program will expire on June 5, 2004. In addition, Amendment No. 1 revises the proposal's description of the Exchange's current strike price intervals for equity options. See also letter from Mai Shiver, Senior Attorney, Regulatory Policy, PCX, to Nancy J. Sanow, Assistant Director, Division, Commission, dated June 16, 2003 ("Amendment No. 2"). Amendment No. 2 corrects a typographical error in the text of the proposed rule by replacing a reference to the interval of "stock" prices in the first sentence of proposed PCX Rule 6.4, Commentary .04 with a reference to the interval of "strike" prices.