NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Advisory Committee on the Medical Uses of Isotopes: Meeting Notice

AGENCY: U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Notice of meeting.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) will convene a teleconference meeting on July 17, 2003, between members of NRC staff and the Advisory Committee on the Medical Uses of Isotopes (ACMUI). This meeting will be held to discuss and develop the ACMUI's recommendations regarding NRC staff's proposed language to amend the training and experience requirements for authorized users, authorized medical physicists, authorized nuclear pharmacists, and radiation safety officers, as these requirements are currently outlined in the revised 10 CFR part 35. During this meeting, NRC staff and ACMUI will engage in detailed discussions pertaining to NRC staff's recommendations contained in a draft document that staff will later finalize and forward to the Commission for a vote. The draft document contains predecisional information not appropriate for public release. Therefore, the NRC staff has determined that this meeting must be closed to the public, so that the confidential nature of the document and the associated discussion is protected.

DATES AND TIME: July 17, 2003.

ADDRESSES: U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Two White Flint North Building, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, MD 20852–2738.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Angela R. Williamson, telephone (301) 415–5030; e-mail *arw@nrc.gov* of the Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001.

Conduct of the Meeting

Leon S. Malmud, M.D., designated Vice Chair, will conduct the meeting. Dr. Malmud will conduct the meeting in a manner that will facilitate the orderly conduct of business.

This meeting will be held in accordance with the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (primarily section 161a); the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App); and the Commission's regulations in Title 10, *U.S. Code of Federal Regulations,* part 7.

Dated: July 7, 2003.

Annette Vietti-Cook,

Secretary of the Commission.

[FR Doc. 03–17703 Filed 7–11–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

Agency Forms Submitted for OMB Review

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35), the Railroad Retirement Board (RRB) has submitted the following proposal(s) for the collection of information to the Office of Management and Budget for review and approval.

Summary of Proposal(s)

(1) *Collection title:* Repayment of Debt.

(2) *Form(s) submitted:* G–421f.

(3) *OMB Number:* 3220–0169.

(4) *Expiration date of current OMB clearance:* September 30, 2003.

(5) *Type of request:* Extension of a currently approved collection.

(6) *Respondents:* Individuals or households.

(7) *Estimated annual number of respondents:* 300.

(8) *Total annual responses:* 300.

(9) *Total annual reporting hours:* 25.

(10) *Collection description:* Section 2 of the Railroad Retirement Act provides for payment of annuities to retired or disabled railroad employees, their spouses, and eligible survivors. When the RRB determines that an overpayment of RRA benefits has occurred, it initiates prompt action to notify the claimant of the overpayment and to recover the amount owed. The collection obtains information needed to allow for repayment by the claimant by credit card, in addition to the customary form of payment by check or money order.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Copies of the forms and supporting documents can be obtained from Chuck Mierzwa, the agency clearance officer (312–751–3363).

Comments regarding the information collection should be addressed to Ronald J. Hodapp, Railroad Retirement Board, 844 North Rush Street, Chicago, Illinois, 60611–2092 and to the OMB Desk Officer for the RRB, at the Office of Management and Budget, Room 10230, New Executive Office Building, Washington, DC 20503.

Chuck Mierzwa,

Clearance Officer.

[FR Doc. 03–17666 Filed 7–11–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7905–01–M

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34–48132; File No. SR–AMEX–2002–112]

Self-Regulatory Organizations; Order Approving Proposed Rule Change and Amendment No. 1 Thereto by the American Stock Exchange LLC Relating to Its Performance Evaluation and Allocations Procedures

July 7, 2003.

On December 19, 2002, the American Stock Exchange LLC (''Amex'' or ''Exchange''), filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission (''Commission''), pursuant to section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (''Act'') [1] and Rule 19b–4 thereunder,[2] a proposed rule change to revise its performance evaluation and allocations procedures. On May 1, 2003 the Amex amended the proposed rule change.[3] Specifically, Amex proposes to modify Amex Rule 26 to reduce the size of the Performance Committee and related subcommittees, while also modifying the committee pool balance where specialist relations with listed companies or Exchange Traded Funds (''ETF'') sponsors are in issue. The proposed rule change also modifies Amex Rules 26(e) and 29(d) to establish deadlines for submission of materials to Amex staff to accommodate transmission of materials in connection with specialist minimum performance standard meetings.[4] Finally, the proposed rule change eliminates the Notice of Marketing Interest (''NOMI'') process in Amex Rule 27 that previously

[1] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1).

[2] 17 CFR 240.19b–4.

[3] *See* Letter from William Floyd Jones, Associate General Counsel, Amex, to Nancy Sanow, Assistant Director, Division of Market Regulation (''Division''), Commission, dated April 30, 2003 (''Amendment No. 1''). In Amendment No. 1 the Exchange submitted a new Form 19b–4 which replaced the original filing in its entirety.

[4] Persons that are the subject of performance reviews have a reasonable amount of time between delivery of the written notice and the Committee's meeting to prepare their presentation to the Committee. A mutually convenient date for the performance review is selected by the person being reviewed and the Committee. Telephone discussions between William Floyd-Jones, Assistant General Counsel, Amex, Christopher B. Stone, Special Counsel, and Mia C. Zur, Attorney, Division, Commission (January 30 and 31, 2003).

required equity specialists to obtain written approval prior to contacting an unlisted company.

The proposed rule change, as amended, was published for comment in the **Federal Register** on June 2, 2003.[5] The Commission received no comments on the proposal.

After careful review, the Commission finds that the proposed rule change, as amended, is consistent with the requirements of the Act and the rules and regulations thereunder applicable to a national securities exchange.[6] Specifically, the Commission finds that the proposed rule change promotes the objectives of section 6(b)(5) of the Act,[7] which requires among other things, that the rules of the Exchange be designed to prevent fraudulent and manipulative acts and practices, to promote just and equitable principles of trade, to foster cooperation and coordination with persons engaged in regulating, clearing, settling, processing information with respect to, and facilitating transactions in securities, to remove impediments to and perfect the mechanism of a free and open market and national market system, and in general, to protect investors and the public interest.

The Commission believes that the proposed rule change is a reasonable modification of the Exchange's performance evaluation and allocations procedures as it is intended to enable the Performance Committee to operate more flexibly and responsively, as well as to more accurately reflect the views of issuers and ETF sponsors in certain situations. Additionally, the timely disclosure of information and materials to the Performance Committee and the Market Quality Committee will ensure adequate time for review and distribution to participants. Finally, the elimination of the now outdated NOMI process will better serve to facilitate the Exchange's listing efforts by removing a process that caused the unintended result of specialist firms requesting NOMIs to contact an unlisted company without then undertaking substantial contact with them.

It is therefore ordered, pursuant to section 19(b)(2) of the Act,[8] that the amended proposed rule change (SR–AMEX–2002–112) be, and hereby is, approved.

For the Commission, by the Division of Market Regulation, pursuant to delegated authority.[9]

Margaret H. McFarland,

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 03–17668 Filed 7–11–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8010–01–P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34–48130; File No. SR–DTC–2003–08]

Self-Regulatory Organizations; The Depository Trust Company; Order Granting Approval of a Proposed Rule Change Relating to Rule 4(A), Pledge of Property to the Corporation and Its Lenders

July 3, 2003.

I. Introduction

On May 6, 2003, The Depository Trust Company (''DTC'') filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission (''Commission'') proposed rule change SR–DTC–2003–08 pursuant to section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (''Act'') [1]. Notice of the proposal was published in the **Federal Register** on May 21, 2003.[2] No comment letters were received. For the reasons discussed below, the Commission is granting approval of the proposed rule change.

II. Description

Each DTC participant pays or receives the net debit or net credit balance in its DTC money settlement account at the end of each day. DTC's principal risk is the possible failure of one or more participants to settle their net debit obligations. To assure that it is able to complete its settlement obligations each day, DTC maintains liquidity resources, including a committed line of credit (maximum amount of $1.75 billion) with a consortium of banks. This committed line of credit is part of a combined syndicated facility with National Securities Clearing Corporation (''NSCC'').

The line of credit matures annually. As part of the negotiations to extend the facility for the year beginning May 27, 2003, the lenders requested that Section 1 of DTC's Rule 4(A), ''Pledge of Property to the Corporation and its Lenders,'' be clarified.[3] That section currently provides that for the purpose of securing loans to DTC, DTC may pledge and repledge and grant its lenders a security interest in (i) cash deposits in the participants fund and all securities, repurchase agreements, or deposits in which such cash is invested, (ii) net additions, including any security entitlements of participants in net additions, and (iii) preferred stock. That section also provides that any such loan to DTC may be on such terms as DTC, in its discretion, may deem necessary or advisable and may be in amounts greater and extend for time periods longer than the obligations of any participant in DTC. It further provides that no lender shall be obligated to return any pledged collateral prior to the full repayment of any loan secured thereby.

DTC is adding language to Section 1 of Rule 4(A) to make clear what is implicit in the current rule that while there remain any outstanding obligations under any such loan, no participant may assert a claim against the lender for the return of any collateral pledged by DTC as security therefore.[4] Subject to the foregoing and the terms of any such loan, the obligation of DTC to return any items of pledged collateral to its participants or to permit substitutions and withdrawals thereof remains unaffected.

In addition, the rule change makes a technical correction to the definition of the term ''pledge'' in Rule 1 necessitated by the recent revisions to Article 9 of the New York Uniform Commercial Code (''NYUCC''). Currently, the definition of ''pledge'' refers to Section 9–115 of the NYUCC. The references to that specific section are deleted so DTC's definition refers to the NYUCC in general.

III. Discussion

Section 17A(b)(3)(F) of the Act requires, among other things, that the rules of a clearing agency be designed to assure the safeguarding of securities and funds which are in its custody or control or for which it is responsible.[5] By adding language, as requested by its lenders, to its rules to make clear the rights of DTC, lenders, and participants with respect to pledged deposits, the

---

[5] *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 47914 (May 23, 2003), 68 FR 32782 (June 2, 2003).

[6] In approving this proposed rule change, the Commission notes that it has considered the proposed rule's impact on efficiency, competition, and capital formation. 15 U.S.C. 78c(f).

[7] 15 U.S.C. 78f(b)(5).

[8] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(2).

[9] 17 CFR 200.30–3(a)(12).

[1] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1).

[2] Securities Exchange Act Release No. 47875 (May 15, 2003), 68 FR 27877.

[3] The lenders made a similar request of NSCC which also resulted in the filing of a proposed rule change by NSCC. Securities Exchange Act Release No. 47874 (May 15, 2003), 68 FR 27881 (May 21, 2003) [File No. NSCC–2003–08].

[4] The new language states, ''No Participant shall have any right, claim or action against any secured Lender (or any collateral agent of such secured Lender) for the return, or otherwise in respect, of any such collateral Pledged by the Corporation to such secured Lender (or its collateral agent), so long as any loans made by such Lender to the Corporation or other obligations, secured by such collateral, are unpaid and outstanding.''

[5] 15 U.S.C. 78q–1(b)(3)(F).