

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.
Farouk Eltawila,
 Director, Division of Risk Assessment and
 Special Projects, Office of Nuclear Regulatory
 Research.

**Agenda—Public Meeting on NUREG–
 1842 “Evaluation of Human Reliability
 Analysis Methods Against Good
 Practices, Draft Report for Comment,”**

May 23, 2006.

U.S. NRC Headquarters, 11555
 Rockville Pike, Rockville, MD 20852,
 Room Commission Briefing Room

PRELIMINARY AGENDA

Morning	Topic
8:30–9	Introduction/Overview.
9–10:30	Evaluation of Methods. —Approach and Summary of results. —Brief discussion of each method.
10:30–10:45	Break.
10:45–12	Evaluation of Methods (Continued). —Comparison of methods against some key char- acteristics. —Implications—What methods should be used when? Lunch. Discussion on method evaluation (continued). Questions and Answers (as needed).

[FR Doc. E6–5736 Filed 4–17–06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

**OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT
 CORPORATION**

**April 27, 2006 Board of Directors
 Meeting**

Time and Date: Thursday, April 27,
 2006, 10 a.m. (Open Portion); 10:15 a.m.
 (Closed Portion).

Place: Offices of the Corporation,
 Twelfth Floor Board Room, 1100 New
 York Avenue, NW., Washington, DC.

Status: Meeting Open to the Public
 from 10 a.m. to 10:15 a.m. Closed
 portion will commence at 10:15 a.m.
 (approx.).

Matters to be Considered:

1. President's Report.
2. Confirmation of Vice President.
3. Confirmation of Vice President.
4. Approval of January 19, 2006
Minutes (Open Portion).

Further Matters to be Considered:
 (Closed to the Public 10:15 a.m.).

1. Finance Project—Eastern Europe
and NIS Countries.
2. Finance Project—Global.

3. Finance Project—Global.
4. Finance Project—Caribbean
Community and Common Market/
Dominican Republic.
5. Finance Project—Central America,
Panama, Colombia, and Mexico.
6. Finance Project—Africa.
7. Finance Project—Southern Africa.
8. Approval of January 19, 2006
Minutes (Closed Portion).
6. Pending Major Projects.
7. Reports.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Information on the meeting may be
 obtained from Connie M. Downs at (202)
 336–8438.

Dated: January 6, 2006.

Connie M. Downs,

*Corporate Secretary, Overseas Private
 Investment Corporation.*

[FR Doc. 06–3740 Filed 4–14–06; 12:40 pm]

BILLING CODE 3210–01–M

POSTAL RATE COMMISSION

[Docket No. C2004–3; Order No. 1460]

Order and Notice of Proceeding

AGENCY: Postal Rate Commission.

ACTION: Order denying motion to
 dismiss and notice of proceeding.

SUMMARY: This document announces the
 Commission's decision to institute a
 formal proceeding to consider issues
 raised in a complaint concerning
 stamped stationery. Conducting this
 proceeding will allow the Commission
 to determine whether the complaint
 raises any genuine issues of material
 fact and to make related determinations.

DATES: 1. Deadline for filing issue
 statements and notices of intervention:
 April 27, 2006. 2. Deadline for filing
 replies to issue statements: May 4, 2006.

ADDRESSES: File all documents referred
 to in this order electronically via the
 Commission's Filing Online system at
<http://www.prc.gov>.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:
 Stephen L. Sharfman, 202–789–6820.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The
 Commission has before it a complaint
 filed by Douglas F. Carlson (Carlson or
 Complainant) concerning stamped
 stationery¹ and a motion to dismiss the
 complaint filed by the Postal Service.²
 The central issue presented by these
 pleadings is whether stamped stationery
 is a postal or philatelic product. If the

former, it is subject to the Commission's
 jurisdiction; if the latter, it is not.

The Postal Service's motion to
 dismiss is denied. This should not,
 however, be read as a finding on the
 merits on the jurisdictional question
 presented. The pleadings raise mixed
 questions of fact and law. Based solely
 on the pleadings, the Commission is
 disinclined to determine whether or not
 genuine issues of material fact remain in
 dispute. Accordingly, by this order the
 Commission hereby notices the
 proceeding and, as discussed below,
 provides interested persons an
 opportunity to address whether or not
 genuine issues of material fact remain to
 be presented in this case. Following
 submission of responsive pleadings, the
 Commission will determine whether to
 proceed with or without hearing. If no
 genuine material issue of fact is
 presented, the Commission will
 establish a briefing schedule affording
 participants an opportunity to address
 the principal legal issue whether or not
 stamped stationery is a postal service.

I. Background

The Complaint. In his Complaint,
 filed pursuant to 39 U.S.C. 3662,
 Carlson contends that stamped
 stationery is a postal service subject to
 the Commission's jurisdiction. The
 specific stationery in question consists
 of sheets of 6.25" x 14.31" paper
 imprinted with "The Art of Disney:
 Friendship" postage stamps or indicia.
 Each pre-stamped sheet has room for a
 message and address; the sheet is
 designed to be folded, sealed, and
 mailed.³

While Carlson makes several claims,
 the gravamen of his complaint is that
 stamped stationery is a postal service
 within the meaning of 39 U.S.C. 3621,
 3622, and 3623. *Id.* at 2, para. 10. In
 support, he compares stamped
 stationery to stamped envelopes and
 stamped cards, both of which are postal
 services. *Id.* at 3, paras. 14–15. He
 observes that section 960 of the
 Domestic Mail Classification Schedule
 (DMCS) is entitled "Stamped Paper"
 and that it includes stamped envelopes
 and stamped cards. *Ibid.* paras. 16–17.
 He contends that stamped stationery is
 a form of stamped paper within the
 meaning of section 960 of the DMCS.
Ibid. para. 21. In addition, Carlson notes
 that the Postal Service describes

¹ Douglas F. Carlson Complaint on Stamped
 Stationery, June 24, 2004 (Complaint).

² Motion of the United States Postal Service to
 Dismiss Complaint, January 18, 2006 (Motion to
 Dismiss).

³ At the time the Complaint was filed, the
 stamped stationery sold in pads of 12 for \$14.95,
 while the face value of the postage was \$4.44.
 Complaint at 2, para. 8.

stamped stationery in terms of its value as a means for sending correspondence.⁴

Pursuant to section 3662, Carlson requests that the Commission issue a recommended decision establishing fee and classification schedules for stamped stationery. Alternatively, he requests that, pursuant to section 3623(b), the Commission submit, on its own initiative, a recommended decision establishing a new classification for stamped stationery. *Id.* at 6.

Informal procedures. Upon its review of the Complaint, the Commission elected to employ informal procedures in an effort to facilitate settlement.⁵ To that end, the director of the Office of the Consumer Advocate (OCA) was appointed settlement coordinator to facilitate efforts to resolve the Complaint informally.⁶ OCA was charged with reporting on the status of negotiations. Pending the outcome of the negotiations, the due date for the Postal Service's answer to the Complaint was postponed. In its second report, OCA informed the Commission that settlement could not be achieved.⁷ Subsequently, the Postal Service submitted its answer to the Complaint, contending, among other things, that "[t]he stationery at issue is a philatelic item and mailing product which has much more in common with similar items over which the Commission does not assert jurisdiction than with the utilitarian stamped envelope product which is currently in the DMCS."⁸

⁴ *Id.* at 2, paras. 11–13. Complainant's remaining claims are derivatives of his principal claim that stamped stationery is a postal service. For example, he asserts that stamped stationery constitutes a change in the mail classification schedule and that the Postal Service is required to request a recommended decision from the Commission, pursuant to sections 3622 and 3623 of the Act, before either establishing a new classification for, or selling, stamped stationery. *Id.* at 4, paras. 22–24. This claim is true if stamped stationery is found to be a postal product. The claim is premised on the belief that stamped stationery is postal and thus does not go to the nature of the product (or service) itself. Accordingly, the Commission finds it unnecessary to address this claim in detail at this stage of the proceeding. Carlson's other derivative claims are that the rate or fee for stamped stationery is inconsistent with the Act and unduly discriminates against stamp collectors. *Id.* at 4–5, paras. 30–35. These claims, too, are premised on the assumption that stamped stationery is a postal product and, likewise, need not be addressed for purposes of this order. This is not to suggest, however, that claims do not raise factual or legal issues that may need to be addressed if the Commission concludes that stamped stationery is jurisdictional.

⁵ PRC Order No. 1412, July 8, 2004, at 2.

⁶ Notice Designating Settlement Coordinator, July 8, 2004.

⁷ Office of the Consumer Advocate Second Report on the Status of Negotiations for Informal Resolution of Complaint, August 12, 2004.

⁸ Answer of United States Postal Service, August 31, 2004, at 8 (Answer).

The Postal Service's Motion to Dismiss. Pursuant to Order No. 1449, the Postal Service recently filed a motion to dismiss the Complaint.⁹ At the outset, the Postal Service asserts that the sale of "Disney stationery" falls within its statutory authority to provide philatelic services.¹⁰ In support, it points to the Commission's decision in Docket No. R76–1 generally disclaiming jurisdiction over philatelic products. *Id.* at 1. Second, it argues that "Disney stationery is intended to be a philatelic item,"¹¹ distinguishable by its design and artwork from "utilitarian" stamped envelopes and cards which, it contends, have little inherent artistic or philatelic value.¹² Third, the Postal Service postulates that philatelic choices may be diminished if the Commission were to assert jurisdiction over Disney stationery, suggesting even the possibility that "no such future issuances might be able to occur." *Id.* at 4–5. Alternatively, it notes that it could "avoid the process" by selling unstamped stationery with a packet of stamps included. *Id.* at 5.

Lastly, the Postal Service infers comparability between stamped stationery and packaging supplies. The Postal Service disputes that its encouragement of buyers to use stamped stationery to write letters has any jurisdictional consequences. It observes that the Postal Service also sells packaging supplies, "presumably for the purpose of encouraging and making it easier for customers to send packages." *Ibid.* It concludes by noting that the Commission does not exercise jurisdiction over such supplies.

Carlson's opposition. Carlson opposes the Postal Service's motion to dismiss.¹³ Citing the Commission's recently adopted definition of the term postal

⁹ Motion to Dismiss, *supra*, January 18, 2006. See PRC Order No. 1449, Docket No. RM2004–1, January 4, 2006, at 30, n.88.

¹⁰ *Id.* at 1. The Postal Service characterizes the Complaint as requesting the Commission to "assert jurisdiction over *The Art of Disney: Friendship* stamped stationery." *Ibid.* To that end, the Postal Service uses the phrase "Disney stationery," apparently reading the Complaint as limited to that issuance rather than to the issue of stamped stationery generally. The Commission does not read the Complaint so narrowly. To be sure, "Disney stationery" precipitated the Complaint. Carlson's arguments, however, concern stamped stationery generally, not that Disney stationery alone is a postal service. The relief requested, that the Commission recommend stamped stationery as a new classification, confirms this reading of the Complaint.

¹¹ *Ibid.*

¹² *Id.* at 2–3. In passing, the Postal Service argues that the caption to DMCS section 960, "Stamped Paper" has no substantive meaning beyond stamped envelopes and cards. *Id.* at 2.

¹³ Douglas F. Carlson Answer in Opposition to the Postal Service Motion to Dismiss Complaint, January 24, 2006 (Carlson Opposition).

service, Carlson argues that stamped stationery is a postal service because it "is incidental to the receipt, transmission, and delivery by the Postal Service of correspondence, including letters."¹⁴ In support of this contention, Carlson advances several arguments. First, he argues that the stamped stationery is specifically designed for mailing, including identifiable space for the mailing address and for a written message, and that, to facilitate mailing, it can be folded and sealed.¹⁵

Second, Carlson contends that if stamped cards and stamped envelopes are postal services then stamped stationery must be as well. He discusses Postal Service witness Needham's testimony, sponsoring proposed fee increases in Docket No. R97–1, which detailed the benefits and value of stamped cards and stamped envelopes that facilitate the mailing of correspondence and letters. He contends that stamped stationery provides the same service incidental to the receipt, transmission, or delivery of correspondence as do these two acknowledged postal products. *Id.* at 5–6.

Third, Carlson also distinguishes between products with pre-affixed postage, such as stamped stationery and stamped cards, and those, such as packaging supplies, plain envelopes, and post cards, without it. He argues that the pre-affixed postage is significant because it entitles the purchaser to mailing services, which are not available to purchasers of unstamped envelopes, cards, or packaging supplies. *Id.* at 7–8.

The balance of Carlson's Opposition responds to arguments that are largely peripheral to the central legal issue of whether stamped stationery is a postal service. These include, for example, the philatelic value associated with any postage item, including all postal stationery (*id.* at 10), and that for ratemaking purposes, the philatelic and

¹⁴ *Id.* at 4. As historical background, Carlson provides a brief discussion of the use and development of stamped and unstamped letter sheets. He contends that what the Postal Service now calls stamped stationery is known generically as letter sheets. Distinguishing between stamped and unstamped letter sheets, he indicates that stamped letter sheets were not used by the Post Office Department until 1861. Further, he states that the Disney stamped stationery was the first domestic stamped letter sheets issued in more than a century. He argues that stamped letter sheets (stamped stationery) are, along with stamped envelopes and stamped cards, forms of postal stationery. *Id.* at 2–4.

¹⁵ *Id.* at 4. Carlson points to the Postal Service's own advertising, which trumpets the benefits of correspondence using stamped stationery, as corroboration that stamped stationery is a postal service. *Id.* at 4–5.

design value of stamped stationery are irrelevant. *Id.* at 11–12.

II. Proceedings

Based on a review of the pleadings, the Commission concludes that the facts, as alleged in the pleadings, do not warrant a summary dismissal of the Complaint. In light of this finding, and given the failure of informal procedures to resolve the Complaint, the Commission finds it appropriate, under rule 86 of the Rules of Practice, to conduct a formal proceeding pursuant to section 3624 of the Act in this docket. In noticing the proceeding pursuant to rule 17, the Commission has made no determination of whether or not to hold hearings in this docket. That determination will be made after submission of the statements discussed below.

Section 3662 provides that, in response to a complaint, the Commission may in its discretion hold a hearing. Generally, hearings are held only if genuine issues of material fact are presented. In this proceeding, the Commission is disinclined to rule on that issue based solely on the pleadings. Consequently, each participant shall be given an opportunity to address the question of whether or not genuine issues of material fact are presented in this case. Each participant addressing this issue should identify with specificity each issue of material fact, if any, it believes is presented along with the reason(s) it believes that issue is material. Such statements are due no later than April 27, 2006. Replies to such statements may be filed no later than May 4, 2006.

Intervention. Any interested person may file a notice of intervention, consistent with the Commission's Rules of Practice, as a full or limited participant. See 39 CFR 3001.20 and 39 CFR 3001.20a. The notice of intervention shall be filed using the Internet (Filing Online) at the Commission's Web site (www.prc.gov), unless a waiver is obtained for hardcopy filing. See 39 CFR 3001.9(a) and 39 CFR 3001.10(a). Notices of intervention are due no later than April 27, 2006.

Representation of the general public. Having noticed the proceeding, the Commission finds it appropriate that the interests of the general public be represented in this proceeding and thus the Commission designates Shelley S. Dreifuss, director of the Commission's Office of the Consumer Advocate, to represent those interests. Pursuant to this designation, Ms. Dreifuss will direct the activities of Commission personnel assigned to assist her and, upon request, will supply their names for the record.

Neither Ms. Dreifuss nor any of the assigned personnel will participate in or provide advice on any Commission decision in this proceeding.

Ordering Paragraphs

It is ordered:

1. Statements of genuine issues of material fact as discussed in the body of this order are due no later than April 27, 2006. Replies may be filed on or before May 4, 2006.

2. The deadline for filing notices of intervention is April 27, 2006.

3. Shelley S. Dreifuss, director of the Commission's Office of the Consumer Advocate, is designated to represent the interests of the general public.

4. The Secretary shall arrange for publication of this notice and order in the **Federal Register**.

Dated: April 13, 2006.

Steven W. Williams,
Secretary.

[FR Doc. E6-5774 Filed 4-17-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7710-FW-P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. IC-27287; 812-13068]

Special Value Opportunities Fund, LLC, et al.; Notice of Application

April 11, 2006.

AGENCY: Securities and Exchange Commission ("Commission").

ACTION: Notice of application for an order under rule 17d-1 under the Investment Company Act of 1940 ("Act") to permit certain joint transactions.

APPLICANTS: Special Value Opportunities Fund, LLC ("SVOF"); Special Value Expansion Fund, LLC ("SVEF"); Tennenbaum Capital Partners, LLC ("TCP"), on behalf of itself and its successors; Babson Capital Management LLC ("Babson"), on behalf of itself and its successors; Special Value Bond Fund II, LLC ("SVBF II"); Special Value Absolute Return Fund, LLC ("SVARF"); Tennenbaum Multi-Strategy Master Fund ("MSMF"); Tennenbaum Multi-Strategy Fund I LLC ("MSFI"); and Tennenbaum Multi-Strategy Fund (Offshore) ("MSFO").¹

SUMMARY OF APPLICATION: Applicants request an order to permit certain

registered investment companies to coinvest with certain affiliated entities.²

FILING DATES: The application was filed on February 19, 2004, and amended on April 10, 2006.

HEARING OR NOTIFICATION OF HEARING: An order granting the application will be issued unless the Commission orders a hearing. Interested persons may request a hearing by writing to the Commission's Secretary and serving applicants with a copy of the request, personally or by mail. Hearing requests should be received by the Commission by 5:30 p.m. on May 8, 2006, and should be accompanied by proof of service on applicants, in the form of an affidavit or, for lawyers, a certificate of service. Hearing requests should state the nature of the writer's interest, the reason for the request, and the issues contested. Persons who wish to be notified of a hearing may request notification by writing to the Commission's Secretary.

ADDRESSES: Secretary, Commission, 100 F Street, NE., Washington, DC 20549. Applicants: c/o Tennenbaum Capital Partners, LLC, 2951 28th Street, Suite 1000, Santa Monica, CA 90405.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Courtney S. Thornton, Senior Counsel, at (202) 551-6812, or Nadya B. Roytblat, Assistant Director, at (202) 942-6821 (Division of Investment Management, Office of Investment Company Regulation).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The following is a summary of the application. The complete application may be obtained for a fee at the SEC's Public Reference Branch, 100 F Street, NE., Washington, DC 20549-0102 (tel. 202-551-5850).

Applicants' Representations

1. TCP, a limited liability company organized under the laws of Delaware, is an investment adviser registered under the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 ("Advisers Act"). Babson, an indirect, wholly owned subsidiary of Massachusetts Mutual Life Insurance Company ("MassMutual Life"), is registered as an investment adviser under the Advisers Act.

2. SVOF, a Delaware limited liability company, is registered under the Act as a nondiversified closed-end management investment company. SVOF has \$1.422 billion in total available capital ("Total Available

¹The term "successor," as applied to TCP and Babson, means an entity that results from a reorganization into another jurisdiction or a change in the type of business organization.

²All existing entities that currently intend to rely on the requested order have been named as applicants. Any other existing or future entity that subsequently relies on the order will comply with the terms and conditions of the application.