at reactor core power levels not in excess of 2775 megawatts thermal in accordance with the provisions of the FNP, Unit 2, renewed license and its technical specifications.

The FNP units are Westinghouse pressurized-water nuclear reactors located in Houston County, Alabama, on the west bank of the Chattahoochee River.

The application for the renewed licenses complied with the standards and requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), and the Commission's regulations. As required by the Act and the Commission's regulations in 10 CFR Chapter I, the Commission has made appropriate findings, which are set forth in each license. Prior public notice of the proposed issuance of these renewed licenses and of an opportunity for a hearing regarding the proposed issuance of these renewed licenses was published in the **Federal Register** on November 5, 2003 (68 FR 62640).

For further details with respect to this action, see (1) SNC's license renewal application for FNP, Units 1 and 2, dated September 12, 2003; (2) the Commission's safety evaluation report dated May 2005 (NUREG-1825); (3) the licensee's updated final safety analysis report; and (4) the Commission's final environmental impact statement dated March 2005 (NUREG-1437, Supplement 18). These documents are available at the NRC's Public Document Room, One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, first floor, Rockville, Maryland 20852, and can be viewed from the NRC Public Electronic Reading Room at http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/ adams.html.

Copies of Renewed Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-2 and NPF-8 may be obtained by writing to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, Attention: Director, Division of Regulatory Improvement Programs. Copies of the safety evaluation report (NUREG-1825) and the final environmental impact statement (NUREG-1437, Supplement 18) may be purchased from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161-0002 (http://www.ntis.gov), 1-800-553-6847, or the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, P.O. Box 371954, Pittsburgh, PA 15250-7954 (http://www.access.gpo.gov/su\_docs/ index.html), (202) 512-1800. All orders should clearly identify the NRC publication number and the requestor's Government Printing Office deposit account number or VISA or MasterCard number and expiration date.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 12th day of May 2005.

For The Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

#### Pao-Tsin Kuo,

Program Director, License Renewal and Environmental Impacts Program, Division of Regulatory Improvement Programs, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. E5–2556 Filed 5–19–05; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

## SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

### Reinstatement; Comment Request

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

["Tell Us How We're Doing!", SEC File No. 270–406, OMB Control No. 3235–0463]

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 previously-approved questionnaire to the Office of Management and Budget for approval.

The Commission currently sends the questionnaire to persons who have used the services of the Commission's Office of Investor Education and Assistance. The questionnaire consists mainly of eight (8) questions concerning the quality of services provided by OIEA. Most of the questions can be answered by checking a box on the questionnaire.

The Commission needs the information to evaluate the quality of services provided by OIEA. Supervisory personnel of OIEA use the information collected in assessing staff performance and for determining what improvements or changes should be made in OIEA operations for services provided to investors.

The respondents to the questionnaire are those investors who request assistance or information from OIEA.

The total reporting burden of the questionnaire in 2004 was approximately 5 hours and 45 minutes. This was calculated by multiplying the total number of investors who responded to the questionnaire times how long it is estimated to take to complete the questionnaire (23 respondents  $\times$  15 minutes = 5 hours and 45 minutes).

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 R. Corey Booth, Chief Information Officer, Office of Information Technology, Securities and Exchange Commission, 450 5th Street, NW., Washington, DC 20549.

Dated: May 11, 2005.

### Margaret H. McFarland,

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 05–10172 Filed 5–19–05; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 8010–01–P

# SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

#### **Sunshine Act Meetings**

Notice is hereby given, pursuant to the provisions of the Government in the Sunshine Act, Pub. L. 94–409, that the Securities and Exchange Commission will hold the following meetings during the week of May 23, 2005:

An open meeting will be held on Monday, May 23, 2005, at 10 a.m., in Room 1C30, the William O. Douglas Meeting Room, and a closed meeting will be held on Wednesday, May 25, 2005 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. 552b(c)(3), (5), (7), (9)(B), and (10) and 17 CFR 200.402(a)(3), (5), (7), 9(ii) and (10), permit consideration of the scheduled matters at the closed meeting.

Commissioner Goldschmid, as duty officer, voted to consider the items listed for the closed meeting in closed session, and that no earlier notice thereof was possible.

The subject matter of the open meeting scheduled for Monday, May 23, 2005, will be:

The Commission will hear oral argument on an appeal by Rita J. McConville from the decision of an administrative law judge. The administrative law judge found that McConville, formerly the chief financial officer of Akorn, Inc. ("Akorn"), had significant responsibility for the financial statements in the Form 10-K for the year ended December 31, 2000 (the "2000 Form 10-K") filed by Akorn, which materially inflated Akorn's accounts receivable, net sales, and assets; caused Akorn to maintain inaccurate books and records; and falsely assured Akorn's auditors that the financial statements in the 2000 Form 10-K complied with Generally Accepted Accounting Principles and that she did not know of any events that would materially impact those financial statements. In so doing, the law judge found, McConville violated Sections 10(b) and 13(b)(5) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and Rules 10b-5, 13b2-1 and 13b2-2 thereunder, and caused Akorn to violate Sections 13(a) and 13(b)(2) of the Exchange Act and Rules 12b-20 and 13a-1 thereunder. The law judge ordered McConville to cease and desist from violating and causing violations of these provisions, and to pay disgorgement in the amount of \$115,858, plus prejudgment interest.

Among the issues likely to be argued are:

- 1. Whether McConville's involvement in the preparation and filing of the 2000 Form 10–K was sufficient to provide a basis for liability;
- 2. Whether McConville knew that Akorn did not have a system of internal accounting controls for its accounts receivable necessary for the preparation of accurate financial statements and knowingly failed to implement such a system;
- 3. Whether the Order Instituting Proceedings gave McConville adequate notice of the claims lodged against her and the grounds on which those claims allegedly rested;
- 4. Whether a cease-and-desist order against McConville is in the public interest: and
- 5. Whether disgorgement should be ordered, and if so, in what amount.

The subject matter of the closed meeting scheduled for Wednesday, May 25, 2005, 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) 942–7070.

Dated: May 17, 2005.

Jonathan G. Katz,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 05–10173 Filed 5–17–05; 4:20 pm]

BILLING CODE 8010-01-P

# SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34-51696; File No. SR-PCX-2005-50]

Self-Regulatory Organizations; Pacific Exchange, Inc.; Notice of Filing and Order Granting Accelerated Approval of Proposed Rule Change Relating to a Pilot Rule Extension of a Waiver of California Arbitrator Disclosure Standards

May 13, 2005.

Pursuant to Section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 ("Act"),¹ and Rule 19b–4 thereunder,² notice is hereby given that on April 12, 2005 and on May 13, 2005 (Amendment No. 1), the Pacific Exchange, Inc. ("PCX" or "Exchange") filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission ("Commission") the proposed rule change as described in Items I and II below, which Items have been prepared by the Exchange. The Commission is publishing this notice to solicit comments on the proposed rule change from interested persons and is approving the proposal on an accelerated basis.

### I. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Terms of Substance of the Proposed Rule Change

The Exchange and its wholly owned subsidiary PCX Equities, Inc. ("PCXE") are proposing to extend the pilot rule in PCX Rule 12.1(i) and PCXE Rule 12.2(h), which requires industry parties in arbitration to waive application of contested California arbitrator disclosure standards, upon the request of customers (and, in industry cases, upon the request of associated persons with claims of statutory employment discrimination), for an additional sixmonth pilot period, until November 26, 2005.

### 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 Exchange included statements concerning the purpose of and basis for the proposed rule change and discussed any comments it received on the proposed rule change. The text of these statements may be examined at the places specified in Item III 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

### 1. Purpose

On November 21, 2002, the Commission approved, for a six-month pilot period, the Exchange's proposal to amend PCX and PCXE arbitration rules to require industry parties in arbitration to waive application of contested California arbitrator disclosure standards, upon the request of customers or, in employment discrimination cases, upon the request of associated persons.<sup>3</sup> The Commission approved an extension of the pilot period on May 15, 2003,4 November 19, 2003,5 May 24, 2004,6 and November 23, 2004.7 The pilot period is currently set to expire on May 25, 2005.

On July 1, 2002, the Judicial Council of the State of California adopted new rules that mandated extensive disclosure requirements for arbitrators in California (the "California Standards"). The California Standards are intended to address perceived conflicts of interest in certain commercial arbitration proceedings. As a result of the imposition of the California Standards on arbitrations conducted under the auspices of selfregulatory organizations ("SROs"), the National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc. ("NASD") and the New York Stock Exchange ("NYSE") suspended the appointment of arbitrators for cases pending in California, and filed a joint complaint in federal court for declaratory relief in which they contend that the California Standards cannot lawfully be applied to NASD and NYSE because the California Standards are preempted by federal law and are inapplicable to SROs under

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> 17 CFR 240.19b–4.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> See Exchange Act Release No. 46881 (November 21, 2002), 67 FR 71224 (November 29, 2002) (Order approving SR–PCX–2002–71).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> See Exchange Act Release No. 47872 (May 15, 2003), 68 FR 28869 (May 27, 2003) (Order approving SR–PCX–2003–22).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> See Exchange Act Release No. 48806 (November 19, 2003), 68 FR 66521 (November 26, 2003) (Order approving SR–PCX–2003–61).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> See Exchange Act Release No. 49758 (May 24, 2004), 69 FR 30734 (May 28, 2004) (Order approving SR–PCX–2004–25).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> See Exchange Act Release No. 50731 (November 23, 2004), 69 FR 69660 (November 30, 2004) (Order approving SR–PCX–2004–104).