

presentation giving the view of state and local governments potentially affected by transportation to the repository. The meeting will conclude with DOE presentations of its plans for designing and operating the surface facilities and the underground emplacement areas of a Yucca Mountain repository.

At the conclusion of each meeting, a public comment period has been scheduled. Those wanting to speak during the public comment periods are encouraged to sign the "Public Comment Register" at the check-in table. A time limit may have to be set on individual remarks, but written comments of any length may be submitted for the record.

A detailed agenda will be available approximately one week before each meeting. Copies of the agendas can be requested by telephone or obtained from the Board's Web site at www.nwtrb.gov. Beginning about March 31, 2003, transcripts of the meetings will be available on the Board's Web site, via e-mail, on computer disk, and on a library-loan basis in paper format from Davonya Barnes of the Board staff.

A block of rooms has been reserved at the Best Western Tuscany Hotel. Reservations must be made by February 3, 2003, to obtain the meeting rate. When making a reservation, please state that you are attending the Nuclear Waste Technical Review meeting. For more information, contact the NWTRB; Karyn Severson, External Affairs; 2300 Clarendon Boulevard, Suite 1300; Arlington, VA 22201-3367; telephone 703-235-4473; fax 703-235-4495; or by "contact form" at <http://www.nwtrb.gov>.

The Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board was created by Congress in the Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 1987. The Board's purpose is to evaluate the technical and scientific validity of activities undertaken by the Secretary of Energy related to disposal of the nation's spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste. In the same legislation, Congress directed the DOE to characterize a site at Yucca Mountain, Nevada, to determine its suitability as the location of a potential repository for permanently disposing of spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste.

Dated: January 15, 2003.

William D. Barnard,

Executive Director, Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board.

[FR Doc. 03-1258 Filed 1-21-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6820-AM-M

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Proposed Collection; Comment Request

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

Extension:

Rule 9b-1, SEC File No. 270-429, OMB Control No. 3235-0480;

Rule 15c2-7, SEC File No. 270-420, OMB Control No. 3235-0479.

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 9b-1 Options Disclosure Document

Rule 9b-1 (17 CFR 240.9b-1) sets forth the categories of information required to be disclosed in an options disclosure document ("ODD") and requires the options markets to file an ODD with the Commission 60 days prior to the date it is distributed to investors. In addition, Rule 9b-1 provides that the ODD must be amended if the information in the document becomes materially inaccurate or incomplete and that amendments must be filed with the Commission 30 days prior to the distribution to customers. Finally, Rule 9b-1 requires a broker-dealer to furnish to each customer an ODD and any amendments, prior to accepting an order to purchase or sell an option on behalf of that customer.

There are 5 options markets that must comply with Rule 9b-1. These 5 respondents work together to prepare a single ODD covering options traded on each market, as well as amendments to the ODD. These respondents file no more than one amendment per year, which requires approximately 8 hours per year for each respondent. Thus, the total compliance burden for options markets per year is 40 hours. The approximate cost per hour is \$100, resulting in a total cost of compliance for these respondents of \$4,000 per year (40 hours @ \$100).

In addition, approximately 2,000 broker-dealers must comply with Rule 9b-1. Each of these respondents will process an average of three new customers for options each week and,

therefore, will have to furnish approximately 156 ODDs per year. The postal mailing or electronic delivery of the ODD takes respondents no more than 30 seconds to complete for an annual compliance burden for each of these respondents of 78 minutes, or 1.3 hours. Thus, the total compliance burden per year is 2,600 hours (2,000 broker-dealers X 1.3 hours). The approximate cost per hour to these respondents is \$10 per hour, resulting in a total cost of compliance for these respondents of \$26,000 per year (2,600 hours @ \$10).

The total compliance burden for all respondents under this rule (both options markets and broker-dealers) is 2640 hours per year (40 + 2,600), and total compliance costs of \$30,000 (\$4,000 + \$26,000).

Rule 15c2-7 Identification of Quotations

Rule 15c2-7 (17 CFR 240.15c2-7) enumerates the requirements with which all brokers and dealers must comply when submitting a quotation for a security (other than a municipal security) to an inter-dealer quotation system.

It is estimated that there are 8,500 brokers and dealers. Industry personnel estimate that approximately 900 notices are filed pursuant to Rule 15c2-7 annually. Based on industry estimates that respondents complying with Rule 15c2-7 spend 30 seconds to add notice of an arrangement and 1 minute to delete notice of an arrangement, the staff estimates that, on an annual basis, respondents spend a total of 11.25 hours to comply with Rule 15c2-7, based upon past submissions. The average cost per hour is approximately \$35. Therefore, the total cost of compliance for brokers and dealers is approximately \$393.75.

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 will 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 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.

Please direct your written comments to Kenneth A. Fogash, Acting Associate