

[FR Doc. 03-11091 Filed 5-5-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8010-01-P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[File No. 500-1]

Aqua Vie Beverage Corporation; Order of Suspension of Trading

May 2, 2003.

It appears to the Securities and Exchange Commission that there is a lack of current and accurate information concerning the securities of Aqua Vie Beverage Corporation ("Aqua Vie"), trading under the stock symbol AQVB. Questions have been raised regarding the accuracy and completeness of information about Aqua Vie in fax broadcasts and on the Internet investors concerning, among other things, Aqua Vie's revenue projections and transactions in the common stock of Aqua Vie by certain individuals or entities providing services to Aqua Vie.

The Commission is of the opinion that the public interest and the protection of investors require a suspension of trading in the securities of the above listed company.

Therefore, it is ordered, pursuant to section 12(k) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, that trading in the above listed company is suspended for the period from 9:30 a.m. EDT, May 2, 2003 through 11:59 p.m. EDT, on May 15, 2003.

By the Commission.

Margaret H. McFarland,

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 03-11310 Filed 5-2-03; 1:50 pm]

BILLING CODE 8010-01-P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34-47761; File No. SR-CBOE-2003-11]

Self-Regulatory Organizations; Order Approving Proposed Rule Change by the Chicago Board Options Exchange, Incorporated Relating to a One-Year Pilot for Options Intermarket Linkage Fees

April 29, 2003.

On March 12, 2003, the Chicago Board Options Exchange, Incorporated ("CBOE" 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 amend its fee structure to clarify which fees apply to trades pertaining to the options intermarket linkage ("Linkage") and to specify that such fees are for a one-year pilot.

The Commission published the proposal rule change for comment in the **Federal Register** on March 25, 2003.³ The Commission received no comments on the proposal. This order approves the proposal rule change.

Four CBOE fees would potentially apply to Linkage trades other than satisfaction orders: a transaction fee (\$.19 per contract for equity options and QQQ options, \$.30 per contract for OEF options with a premium greater than or equal to \$1.00, and \$.15 per contract for OEF options with a premium less than \$1.00); a \$.05 per contract trade match fee; a \$.30 per contract RAES fee if the order is executed in whole or in part on RAES; and a \$.04 per contract floor brokerage fee if any portion of the order is manually handled. Each of these Linkage-related fees would be implemented as a one-year pilot, expiring on January 31, 2004.

The Commission finds that the proposed rule change is consistent with the requirements of the Act and the rules and regulations thereunder applicable to a national securities exchange⁴ and, in particular, the requirements of section 6 of the Act.⁵ The Commission finds that the proposed rule change is consistent with section 6(b)(4) of the Act,⁶ which requires that the rules of an exchange provide equitable allocation of reasonable dues, fees and other charges among its members and other persons using its facilities. The Commission believes the one-year pilot will give the Exchange and the Commission the opportunity to evaluate whether these fees are appropriate.

It is therefore ordered, pursuant to section 19(b)(2) of the Act,⁷ that the proposed rule change is approved on a pilot basis until January 31, 2004.

² 17 CFR 240.19b-4.

³ See Securities Exchange Act Release No. 47515 (March 17, 2003), 68 FR 14445.

⁴ 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).

⁵ 15 U.S.C. 78f.

⁶ 15 U.S.C. 78f(b)(4).

⁷ 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(2).

For the Commission, by the Division of Market Regulation, pursuant to delegated authority.⁸

Margaret H. McFarland,

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 03-11092 Filed 5-5-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8010-01-P

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Charter Renewal

Renewal of Advisory Committees: We publish this notice following the provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92-463) to renew Small Business Administration (SBA) discretionary Advisory Committees. The General Services Administration's Committee Management Secretariat has determined that renewal is in the public interest.

1. *National Advisory Council:* The Council will provide advice, ideas and opinions on SBA programs and small business issues. The Council's scope of activities includes reviewing SBA programs and informing SBA of current small business issues. Its members provide an essential connection between SBA, SBA program participants, and the small business community nationwide.

2. *District Advisory Councils:* The District Advisory Councils provide advice and recommendations to the SBA regarding the effectiveness of and need for SBA programs, particularly within the local districts. Official designations include:

1. Alabama District Advisory Council (formerly Birmingham District Advisory Council).

2. Buffalo District Advisory Council.

3. Columbus District Advisory Council.

4. Connecticut District Advisory Council (formerly Hartford District Advisory Council).

5. Georgia District Advisory Council (formerly Atlanta District Advisory Council).

6. Hawaii District Advisory Council (formerly Honolulu District Advisory Council).

7. Houston District Advisory Council.

8. Indiana District Advisory Council (formerly Indianapolis District Advisory Council).

9. Louisiana District Advisory Council (formerly New Orleans District Advisory Council).

10. Maine District Advisory Council (formerly Augusta District Advisory Council).

⁸ 17 CFR 200.30-3(a)(12).

¹ 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1).

11. Minnesota District Advisory Council (formerly Minneapolis District Advisory Council).

12. Montana District Advisory Council (formerly Helena District Advisory Council).

13. North Florida District Advisory Council.

14. Oregon District Advisory Council (formerly Portland District Advisory Council).

15. Pittsburgh District Advisory Council.

16. Rhode Island District Advisory Council (formerly Providence District Advisory Council).

17. Richmond District Advisory Council.

18. Santa Ana District Advisory Council.

19. Utah District Advisory Council (formerly Salt Lake City District Advisory Council).

20. Vermont District Advisory Council (formerly Montpelier District Advisory Council).

21. Washington, DC District Advisory Council.

22. West Virginia District Advisory Council (formerly Clarksburg District Advisory Council).

23. Wisconsin District Advisory Council (formerly Madison District Advisory Council).

Contact for Information: For additional information, contact Candace H. Stoltz, Director Advisory Councils, 409 Third Street, SW., Washington, DC 20416; telephone (202) 619-0379.

Candace H. Stoltz,

Director Advisory Councils.

[FR Doc. 03-11180 Filed 5-5-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8025-01-P

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

[Declaration of Disaster #3482]

State of Kentucky (Amendment #2)

In accordance with a notice received from the Department of Homeland Security—Federal Emergency Management Agency, effective April 4, 2003 and received in this office on April 29, 2003, the above numbered declaration is hereby amended to include Fleming County in the State of Kentucky as a disaster area due to damages caused by severe winter ice and snow storms, heavy rain, flooding, tornadoes, and mud and rock slides occurring on February 15 through February 26, 2003.

All other counties contiguous to the above named primary county have been previously declared.

All other information remains the same, *i.e.*, the deadline for filing

applications for physical damage is May 13, 2003, and for economic injury the deadline is December 15, 2003.

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Program Nos. 59002 and 59008).

Dated: April 29, 2003.

Herbert L. Mitchell,

Associate Administrator for Disaster Assistance.

[FR Doc. 03-11102 Filed 5-5-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8025-01-P

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Addition of Electric Generation Baseload Capacity in Franklin County, TN

AGENCY: Tennessee Valley Authority.

ACTION: Issuance of Record of Decision.

SUMMARY: This notice is provided in accordance with the Council on Environmental Quality's regulations (40 CFR parts 1500 to 1508) and TVA's procedures implementing the National Environmental Policy Act. TVA has decided to adopt the No Action alternative identified in its *Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Addition of Electric Generation Baseload Capacity in Franklin County, Tennessee.*

The Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) was made available to the public in August 2001. A Notice of Availability (NOA) of the FEIS was published by the Environmental Protection Agency in the **Federal Register** on August 31, 2001. The U. S. Air Force is a cooperating agency in the development of the EIS. In the FEIS, TVA identified the construction of a natural gas-fired combined cycle power plant with a nominal output of 510 Megawatts (MW) for intermediate/baseload capacity at a site on the Arnold Air Force Base (AAFB) in Franklin County, Tennessee to be operational as early as June 2003 as the preferred alternative, contingent upon Air Force approvals. However, because projections for near-term baseload power demand changed to indicate that ample power from other generation sources within the TVA service area should be available to meet TVA's near-term power needs at competitive prices, TVA concluded in March 2002 that the most prudent course of action was to not proceed with the project.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Bruce L. Yeager, Senior Specialist, National Environmental Policy Act, Environmental Policy and Planning, Tennessee Valley Authority, 400 West Summit Hill Drive, mail stop WT 8C,

Knoxville, Tennessee 37902-1499; telephone (865) 632-8051 or e-mail blyeaeger@tva.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

In December 1995, TVA completed and published *Energy Vision 2020—Integrated Resource Plan/Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement*. Energy Vision 2020 projected demands for electricity in the TVA power service area through 2020 and evaluated and recommended ways of meeting the projected increases. *Energy Vision 2020* evaluated an array of power supply technologies, both supply-side and demand-side. A portfolio of options drawn from several effective strategies was chosen as TVA's preferred alternative. This preferred alternative included the following portfolio components:

- Supply-side alternatives, including combined cycle plants, purchasing and exercising call alternatives, purchasing power from independent power producers, developing renewable energy resources, improving the existing hydroelectric generating system, and converting Bellefonte Nuclear Plant to an alternative fuel source, such as natural gas or gasified coal;
- Customer service alternatives, including demand-side management and beneficial electrification;
- Environmental control alternatives to reduce pollutant emissions including switching to cleaner fuels; and
- Resource management alternatives to reduce risks, including increased use of natural gas to meet future environmental regulations.

TVA projections in its annual report to the Southeastern Electric Reliability Council (SERC) indicate continued growth of baseload energy need at a rate of approximately 2% per year from 2001 through 2009 (equivalent to the medium growth projection of TVA's *Energy Vision 2020*). Recent experience indicated that the demand for baseload generation had been slightly greater than projections. When the FEIS was completed in August 2001, it appeared that without TVA-owned and operated new capacity, none of the other programs or portfolio components identified above, either individually or collectively, would be adequate to meet TVA's power generation need. Events in the interim period altered this perception.

Tiering from the *Energy Vision 2020* EIS, the FEIS for *Addition of Electric Generation Baseload Capacity in Franklin County, Tennessee* presented a site-specific analysis of the impacts