

Infrastructure upgrades, such as construction waste transfer pipelines, electric utility line realignment, and addition of access roads, would also be required. Any MOX fuel made at the proposed MOX facility would be transported to mission reactors, where it would be irradiated.

NRC published a Notice of Intent to prepare an EIS for the proposed MOX facility, and to conduct a scoping process, in the **Federal Register** on March 7, 2001 [66 FR 13794]. NRC staff subsequently held scoping meetings, and issued a Scoping Summary Report in August 2001. In early 2002, DOE announced its decision to alter its planned approach for surplus weapons plutonium disposition [67 FR 19432], causing the NRC to delay its issuance of the DEIS for the proposed MOX facility. On August 22, 2002, the NRC announced three mid-September public meetings to discuss changes in DCS' Environmental Report that resulted from changes in DOE's plans [67 FR 54501]. The meetings were held on September 17 in Savannah, Georgia, September 18 in Augusta, Georgia, and September 19 in Charlotte, North Carolina.

The DEIS describes the proposed action, and alternatives to the proposed action, including the no-action alternative. The DEIS' discussion of the no-action alternative evaluates the environmental impacts of the continued storage of surplus plutonium in various DOE locations nationwide, in the event NRC decides not to approve the proposed MOX facility. Alternatives considered but not analyzed in detail include alternate locations for the proposed MOX facility in the F-Area, alternative technology and design options, immobilization of surplus plutonium instead of producing MOX fuel, deliberately making off-specification MOX fuel, and the Parallel Project, the latter of which involves irradiating the MOX fuel in Candian CANDU reactors. Additionally, the DEIS compares the impacts of using HEPA filters to the impacts of using sand filters for removal of particulate air emissions.

The DEIS assesses the impacts of the proposed action and its alternatives for the issues of human health, air quality, hydrology, waste management, geology, noise, ecology, land use, cultural and paleontological resources, infrastructure, socioeconomics, accident impacts, decommissioning and environmental justice. Additionally, the DEIS analyzes and compares the costs and benefits of the proposed action.

Based on the evaluation in the DEIS, the NRC's preliminary recommendation is that the proposed action be approved,

with implementation of proposed mitigation measures which would eliminate or substantially lessen any potential adverse environmental impacts.

This DEIS is a preliminary analysis of the environmental impacts of the proposed action. The NRC will review the public's comments, conduct any necessary analyses, and make appropriate revisions in developing the Final EIS for the proposed MOX facility.

Participation in the public comment process for the DEIS does not entitle participants to become parties to the ongoing NRC adjudicatory proceeding pertaining to the construction of the proposed MOX facility. Participation in adjudicatory proceedings is governed by the 10 CFR part 2 hearing procedures.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 20th day of February 2003.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Lawrence E. Kokajko,**

*Acting Chief, Environmental and Performance Assessment Branch, Division of Waste Management, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.*

[FR Doc. 03-4753 Filed 2-27-03; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7590-01-P**

---

## SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

### Request For Public Comment

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

#### Extension:

Rule 15c2-1, SEC File No. 270-418, OMB Control No. 3235-0485.

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") is soliciting comments on the collection of information summarized below. The Commission plans to submit this existing collection of information to the Office of Management and Budget for extension and approval.

Rule 15c2-1 prohibits the commingling under the same lien of securities of margin customers (a) with other customers without their written consent and (b) with the broker or dealer. The rule also prohibits the rehypothecation of customers' margin securities for a sum in excess of the customer's aggregate indebtedness. See Securities Exchange Act Release No. 2690 (November 15, 1940); Securities Exchange Act Release No. 9428 (December 29, 1971). Pursuant to Rule

15c2-1, respondents must collect information necessary to prevent the rehypothecation of customer account in contravention of the rule, issue and retain copies of notices of hypothecation of customer accounts in accordance with the rule, and collect written consents from customers in accordance with the rule. The information is necessary to ensure compliance with the rule, and to advise customers of the rule's protections.

There are approximately 177 respondents per year (*i.e.*, broker-dealers that carry or clear customer accounts that also have bank loans) that require an aggregate total of 3,983 hours to comply with the rule. Each of these approximately 177 registered broker-dealers makes an estimated 45 annual responses, for an aggregate total of 7,965 responses per year. Each response takes approximately 0.5 hours to complete. Thus, the total compliance burden per year is 3,983 burden hours.

Written comments are invited on: (a) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the collection of information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology. Consideration will be given to comments and suggestions submitted in writing within 60 days of this publication.

Direct your written comments to Kenneth A. Fogash, Acting Associate Executive Director/CIO, Office of Information Technology, Securities and Exchange Commission, 450 5th Street, NW., Washington, DC 20549.

Dated: February 21, 2003.

**Margaret H. McFarland,**

*Deputy Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 03-4695 Filed 2-27-03; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 8010-01-P**

---

## SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

### Sunshine Act Meeting

Notice is hereby given, pursuant to the provisions of the Government in the Sunshine Act, Pub. L. 94-409, that the Securities and Exchange Commission will hold the following meetings during the week of March 3, 2003:

Closed Meetings will be held on Wednesday, March 5, 2003 at 10 a.m., and on Thursday, March 6, 2003 at 10 a.m.

Commissioner Campos, as duty officer, determined that no earlier notice thereof was possible.

Commissioners, Counsel to the Commissioners, the Secretary to the Commission, and recording secretaries will attend the Closed Meetings. Certain staff members who have an interest in the matters may also be present.

The General Counsel of the Commission, or his designee, has certified that, in his opinion, one or more of the exemptions set forth in 5 U.S.C. 552b(c)(3), (5), (7), (9)(B) and (10) and 17 CFR 200.402(a)(3), (5), (7), (9)(ii) and (10), permit consideration of the scheduled matters at the Closed Meetings.

The subject matter of the Closed Meeting scheduled for Wednesday, March 5, 2003 will be:

Formal orders of investigation;

Institution and settlement of administrative proceedings of an enforcement nature;

Institution and settlement of injunctive actions;

Adjudicatory matter; and

Amicus consideration.

The subject matter of the Closed Meeting scheduled for Thursday, March 6, 2003 will be:

Institution and settlement of administrative proceedings of an enforcement nature;

Institution and settlement of injunctive actions; and

Adjudicatory matter.

At times, changes in Commission priorities require alterations in the scheduling of meeting items. For further information and to ascertain what, if any, matters have been added, deleted, or postponed, please contact:

The Office of the Secretary at (202) 942-7070.

Dated: February 26, 2003.

**Jonathan G. Katz,**

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 03-4950 Filed 2-26-03; 3:58 pm]

**BILLING CODE 8010-01-M**

## SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34-47392; File No. SR-NASD-2003-19]

### Self-Regulatory Organizations; Notice of Filing and Immediate Effectiveness of Proposed Rule Change by the National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc. Relating to an Amendment to NASD Interpretive Material 2260 ("IM-2260")

February 21, 2003.

Pursuant to section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 ("Act"),<sup>1</sup> and rule 19b-4<sup>2</sup> thereunder, notice is hereby given that on February 13, 2003, the National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc. ("NASD") filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission ("Commission") the proposed rule change as described in items I, II, and III below, which items have been prepared by NASD. 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

NASD proposes to amend NASD Interpretive Material 2260 ("IM-2260") relating to their approved rates of reimbursement for expenses incurred in forwarding proxy material, annual reports, information statements, and other material.

Below is the text of the proposed rule change. Proposed new language is italicized; proposed deleted language is [bracketed].

\* \* \* \* \*

#### IM-2260. [Suggested] *Approved Rates of Reimbursement*

(a) The [Board of Governors has determined that the] following [suggested] *approved* rates of reimbursement for expenses incurred in forwarding proxy material, annual reports, information statements and other material [are to be used as a guide by members:] *shall be considered reasonable rates of reimbursement. In addition to the charges specified in this schedule, members also are entitled to receive reimbursement for: (1) actual postage costs (including return postage at the lowest available rate); (2) the actual cost of envelopes (provided they are not furnished by the issuer, the trustee, or a person soliciting proxies); and (3) any actual communication expenses (excluding overhead) incurred*

*in receiving voting returns either telephonically or electronically.*

(1) Charges for Initial Proxy and/or Annual Report Mailings

(A) [60] 40 cents for each set of proxy material, *i.e.*, proxy statement, form of proxy and annual report when mailed as a unit, *unless an opposition proxy statement has been furnished to securities holders,*<sup>3</sup> [plus postage.] with a minimum of \$5.00 for all sets mailed;

(B) [20] 15 cents for each copy, plus postage, for annual reports, which are mailed separately from the proxy material pursuant to the instruction of the person soliciting proxies *with a minimum of \$3.00 for all sets mailed;*[.]

(C) \$1.00 for each set of proxy material, *i.e.*, proxy statement, form of proxy and annual report when mailed as a unit, for a meeting for which an *opposition proxy statement has been furnished to security holders, with a minimum of \$5.00 for all sets mailed;*

(D) NASD has approved, as fair and reasonable, the following supplemental proxy fees for intermediaries that coordinate multiple nominees: \$20.00 per nominee plus (i) 10 cents for each set of proxy material, with respect to issuers whose shares are held in fewer than 200,000 nominee accounts, or (ii) 5 cents for each set of proxy material, with respect to issuers whose shares are held in at least 200,000 nominee accounts.

(2) Charges for Proxy Follow-Up Mailings

[(A)] 40 cents for each set of follow-up material, plus postage[, when the follow-up material is mailed to all beneficial owners;.]

[(B)] 60 cents for each set of follow-up material, plus postage, when the follow-up material is mailed only to beneficial owners who have not responded to the initial mailing.]

[(3) Surcharge for Proxy Solicitation

Eighteen and one-half cents for each set of proxy material, *i.e.*, proxy statement, form of proxy and annual report when mailed as a unit, for the period from April 1, 1986 to March 31, 1987 as a surcharge in addition to the appropriate charges specified herein.]

<sup>3</sup> NASD represents that there was an error in the proposed rule language in its original 19b-4 filing. The phrase "unless an opposition proxy statement is furnished to security holders," should have been underlined to indicate proposed new rule language. Telephone conversation between Shirley H. Weiss, Associate General Counsel, NASD, and Sapna C. Patel, Attorney, Division of Market Regulation, Commission, on February 21, 2003.

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

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