requestor seeks to have litigated at the proceeding. Each contention must consist of a specific statement of the issue of law or fact to be raised or controverted. In addition, the petitioner/requestor shall provide a brief explanation of the bases for the contention and a concise statement of the alleged facts or expert opinion which support the contention and on which the petitioner intends to rely in proving the contention at the hearing. The petitioner must also provide references to those specific sources and documents of which the petitioner is aware and on which the petitioner intends to rely to establish those facts or expert opinion. The petition must include sufficient information to show that a genuine dispute exists with the applicant on a material issue of law or fact. Contents shall be limited to matters within the scope of the amendment under consideration. The contention must be one which, if proven, would entitle the petitioner to relief. A petitioner/requestor who fails to satisfy these requirements with respect to at least one contention will not be permitted to participate as a party. Each contention shall be given a separate numeric or alpha designation within one of the following groups:

1. Technical—primarily concerns/ issues relating to technical and/or health and safety matters discussed or referenced in the applications.
2. Environmental—primarily concerns/issues relating to matters discussed or referenced in the environmental analysis for the applications.
3. Miscellaneous—does not fall into one of the categories outlined above.

As specified in 10 CFR 2.309, if two or more petitioners/requestors seek to co-sponsor a contention, the petitioners/requestors shall jointly designate a representative who shall have the authority to act for the petitioners/requestors with respect to that contention. Those permitted to intervene become parties to the proceeding, subject to any limitations in the order granting leave to intervene, and have the opportunity to participate fully in the conduct of the hearing. Since the Commission has made a final determination that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration, if a hearing is requested, it will not stay the effectiveness of the amendment. Any hearing held would take place while the amendment is in effect.

A request for a hearing or a petition for leave to intervene must be filed by:

1. First class mail addressed to the Office of the Secretary of the Commission, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001, Attention: Rulemaking and Adjudications Staff;
2. courier, express mail, and expedited delivery services: Office of the Secretary, Sixteenth Floor, One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland, 20852, Attention: Rulemaking and Adjudications Staff;
3. E-mail addressed to the Office of the Secretary, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, HearingDocket@nrc.gov; or
4. facsimile transmission addressed to the Office of the Secretary, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC, Attention: Rulemakings and Adjudications Staff.

A copy of the request for hearing and petition for leave to intervene shall also be sent to the Office of the General Counsel, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001, and it is requested that copies be transmitted either by means of facsimile transmission to (301) 415–3725 or by e-mail to OGCMailCenter@nrc.gov. A copy of the request for hearing and petition for leave to intervene should also be sent to the attorney for the licensees.

Nontimely requests and/or petitions and contentions will not be entertained absent a determination by the Commission or the presiding officer or the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board that the petition, request and/or the contentions should be granted based on a balancing of the factors specified in 10 CFR 2.309(a)(1)(i)–(viii).

**Detroit Edison Company, Docket No. 50–341, Fermi 2, Monroe County, Michigan**

**Date of amendment request:** February 5, 2006, as supplemented February 5, 2006.

**Description of amendment request:** The amendment revised Technical Specifications 3.8.1. “AC Sources—Operating,” to extend the allowed outage time for Emergency Diesel Generator 12 from seven days to 14 days for one specific incident.

**Date of issuance:** February 6, 2006.

**Effective date:** As of the date of issuance and shall be implemented immediately.

**Amendment No.:** 171.

**Facility Operating License No.:** 50–341: Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Public comments requested as to proposed no significant hazards consideration (NSHC): No. The Commission’s related evaluation of the amendment, finding of emergency circumstances, state consultation, and final NSHC determination are contained in a safety evaluation dated February 6, 2006.

**Attorney for licensee:** David G. Pettinari, Legal Department, 688 WCB, Detroit Edison Company, 2000 2nd Avenue, Detroit, Michigan 48226–1279.

**NRC Branch Chief:** Timothy J. Kobetz, Acting.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 16th day of February, 2006.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Catherine Haney, Acting.

**Director, Division of Operating Reactor Licensing, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.**

**[FR Doc. 06–1737 Filed 2–27–06; 8:45 am]**

**BILLING CODE 7590–01–P**
countries do not seem to have much effect in developing countries. This briefing will begin at 10 a.m. in the Commission’s hearing room.

The second briefing will be presented by Postal Service Headquarters personnel. It will explain the impact of extensive changes in the design of the Service’s In-Office Cost System data collection effort on the most recent (fiscal year 2005) Cost and Revenue Analysis. This briefing will begin at 2 p.m. in the Commission’s hearing room.

DATES: March 1, 2006.


Steven W. Williams, Secretary. [FR Doc. 06–1857 Filed 2–27–06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7710–01–M

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Notice of Meeting; Sunshine Act

Notice is hereby given, pursuant to the provisions of the Government in the Sunshine Act, Pub. L. 94–665, that the Securities and Exchange Commission will hold the following meeting during the week of February 27, 2006:

A closed meeting will be held on Thursday, March 2, 2006 at 2 p.m.

Commissioners, Counsel to the Commissioners, the Secretary to the Commission, and recording secretaries will attend the closed meeting. 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. 552(b)(3), (5), (6), (7), (9)(B), and (10) and 17 CFR 200.402(a)(3), (5), (6), (7), (9)(ii) and (10) permit consideration of the scheduled matters at the closed meeting.

Commissioner Atkins, as duty officer, voted to consider the items listed for the closed meeting in closed session.

The subject matter of the closed meeting scheduled for Thursday, March 2, 2006 will be:

Formal orders of investigations; Institution and settlement of injunctive actions; and

Institution and settlement of administrative proceedings of an enforcement nature.

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) 551–5400.


Nancy M. Morris, Secretary. [FR Doc. 06–1906 Filed 2–24–06; 11:12 am]

BILLING CODE 8010–01–P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION


Self-Regulatory Organizations; American Stock Exchange LLC; Notice of Filing and Immediate Effectiveness of Proposed Rule Change to Increase the Options Marketing Fee Applicable to Certain Types of Equity Options

February 21, 2006.

Pursuant to Section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (“Act”), and Rule 19b–4 thereunder, notice is hereby given that on February 15, 2006, the American Stock Exchange LLC (“Amex” or “Exchange”) 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 the Amex. The Amex has designated this proposal as one establishing or changing a due, fee, or other charge imposed by a self-regulatory organization pursuant to Section 19(b)(3)(A)(ii) of the Act and Rule 19–4(f)(2) thereunder, which renders the proposal effective upon filing with the Commission. 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

The Exchange proposes to increase the options marketing fee applicable to certain equity options. The text of the proposed rule change is available on the Amex’s Web site at http://www.amex.com, at the principal office of the Exchange, and at the Commission’s Public Reference Room.

II. Self-Regulatory Organization’s Statement of the Purpose of, and Statutory Basis for, the Proposed Rule Change

In its filing with the Commission, the Amex included statements concerning the purpose of, and basis for, the proposed rule change and discussed any comments it received on the proposal. The text of these statements may be examined at the places specified in Item IV below. The Exchange has prepared summaries, set forth in Sections A, B, and C below, of the most significant aspects of such statements.

A. Self-Regulatory Organization’s Statement of the Purpose of, and Statutory Basis for, the Proposed Rule Change

In June 2003, the Exchange re-instated its options marketing fee of $0.40 per contract on the transactions of specialists and registered options traders (“ROTs”) in equity options. Currently, the options marketing fee is eligible to be assessed on all equity options transactions (including options on exchange-traded funds and trust issued receipts). The Exchange now proposes to amend the equity options marketing fee to increase the fee from the current level of $0.40 to $0.75 per contract (except for SPDR options, which will continue to remain subject to the current fee level of $1.00 per contract). The Exchange also proposes to revise the equity options marketing fee by limiting its assessment to customer orders that are from payment accepting firms with whom a specialist has negotiated a payment for order flow arrangement and that are executed electronically (i.e., through the Exchange’s ANTE system). The current equity options marketing fee is assessed on all executed customer orders (whether electronically or manually executed) of payment accepting firms. This revision further limits the assessment of the marketing fee to electronic executions. The Exchange represents that it has no role with respect to the negotiations between specialists and payment accepting firms. The Exchange states that it collects and administers the payment of the fee collected on those transactions for which the specialist has


7 Telephone conversation between Caroline McCaffery, Assistant General Counsel, Amex, and Hong Anh Tran, Special Counsel, Division of Market Regulation, on February 17, 2006.


