

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.  
**Gary S. Janosko,**  
*Chief Fuel Cycle Facilities Branch, Division of Fuel Cycle Safety and Safeguards, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.*  
 [FR Doc. E6-13110 Filed 8-9-06; 8:45 am]  
 BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

### Correction to Biweekly Notice Applications and Amendments to Operating Licenses Involving No Significant Hazards Consideration

On August 1, 2006 (71 FR 43539), the **Federal Register** published the "Biweekly Notice of Applications and Amendments to Operating Licenses Involving No Significant Hazards Considerations." On Page 43539, Column 1, the very last line in the column, Amendment Nos. should read "294 and 277".

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 3rd day of August 2006.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
**David H. Jaffe,**  
*Senior Project Manager, Plant Licensing Branch III-1, Division of Operating Reactor Licensing, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*  
 [FR Doc. E6-13111 Filed 8-9-06; 8:45 am]  
 BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

### Regulatory Guide and Associated Standard Review Plan; Issuance, Availability

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) has issued for public comment a revision of a regulatory guide (and its associated Standard Review Plan). Regulatory Guides are developed to describe and make available to the public such information as methods acceptable to the NRC staff for implementing specific parts of the NRC's regulations, techniques used by the staff in its review of applications for permits and licenses, and data needed by NRC staff in its review of applications for permits and licenses.

Regulatory Guide 1.200, Revision 1, "An approach for Determining the Technical Adequacy of Probabilistic Risk Assessment Results for Risk-Informed Activities," provides guidance to licensees in determining the technical adequacy of a probabilistic risk analysis used in a risk-informed, integrated decision-making process, and to endorse standards and industry guidance. Guidance is provided in four areas:

(1) A minimal set of functional requirements of a technically acceptable PRA.

(2) NRC position on consensus PRA standards and industry PRA program documents.

(3) Demonstration that the PRA (*in toto* or specific parts) used in regulatory applications is of sufficient technical adequacy.

(4) Documentation that the PRA (*in toto* or specific parts) used in regulatory applications is of sufficient technical adequacy.

RG 1.200, Revision 1, proposes to endorse, with certain clarifications and substitutions, ASME Standard, "Standard for Probabilistic Risk Assessment for Nuclear Power Plant Applications" (RA-S-2002, RA-Sa-2003 and RA-Sb-2005, dated April 5, 2002, December 5, 2003, and December 30, 2005, respectively), Revision A3 of NEI-00-02, "Probabilistic Risk (PRA) Peer Review Process Guidance," with its August 16, 2002 and May 19, 2006 supplemental guidance on industry self-assessment, and NEI-05-04, "Process for Performing Follow-on PRA Peer Reviews Using the ASME PRA Standard," January 2005.

Standard Review Plan Chapter 19.1, Revision 1, "Determining the Technical Adequacy of Probabilistic Risk and Assessment Results for Risk-Informed Activities," has been developed for the NRC staff to use in conjunction with Regulatory Guide 1.200, Revision 1.

It is the NRC's intent to update this RG when a new or revised PRA standard or industry program is published. If a new standard or program is published, an additional appendix will be added to set forth the staff position. If a revision of a current standard or program would impact the staff position, the appropriate appendix would be revised.

The NRC staff is soliciting comments on these proposed documents. Comments may be accompanied by relevant information or supporting data. Written comments may be submitted to the Rules and Directives Branch, Office of Administration, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555. Copies of comments received may be examined at the NRC Public Document Room, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, MD. Comments will be most helpful if received by September 15, 2006.

Comments received after this date will be considered if it is practical to do so, but the NRC is able to ensure consideration only for comments received on or before this date.

You may also provide comments via the NRC's interactive rulemaking Web site through the NRC home page (<http://www.nrc.gov>).

This site provides the ability to upload comments as files (any format) if your web browser supports that function. For information about the interactive rulemaking Web site, contact Ms. Carol Gallagher, (301) 415-5905; e-mail [CAG@NRC.GOV](mailto:CAG@NRC.GOV). For information about the draft guide and the related standard review plan chapter, contact Ms. M.T. Drouin at (301)415-6675; e-mail [MXD@NRC.GOV](mailto:MXD@NRC.GOV).

Although a time limit is given for comments on this draft guide, comments and suggestions in connection with items for inclusion in guides currently being developed or improvements in all published guides are encouraged at any time.

Electronic copies of this draft RG are available on the NRC's Web site <http://www.nrc.gov> in the Reference Library under Regulatory Guides. Electronic copies are also available in NRC's Public Electronic Reading Room at the same Web site; DG-1122 is under ADAMS Accession Number ML062150231. Regulatory guides are available for inspection at the NRC's Public Document Room, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, MD; the PDR's mailing address is USNRC PDR, Washington, DC 20555; telephone (301) 415-4737 or (800) 397-4205; fax (301) 415-3548; e-mail [PDR@NRC.GOV](mailto:PDR@NRC.GOV). Requests for single copies of draft or final guides (which may be reproduced) or for placement on an automatic distribution list for single copies of future draft guides in specific divisions should be made in writing to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, Attention: Reproduction and Distribution Services Section; or by e-mail to [DISTRIBUTION@NRC.GOV](mailto:DISTRIBUTION@NRC.GOV); or by fax to (301) 415-2289. Telephone requests cannot be accommodated. Regulatory guides are not copyrighted, and Commission approval is not required to reproduce them. (5 U.S.C. 552(a)).

Dated at Rockville, MD this 3rd day of August 2006.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Farouk Eltawila,**

*Director, Division of Risk Assessment and Special Projects, Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research.*

[FR Doc. E6-13115 Filed 8-9-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

## SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

### Proposed Collection; Comment Request

*Upon written request, copies available from: Securities and Exchange*

Commission, Office of Filings and Information Services, Washington, DC 20549.

*Extension:* Regulation SHO; SEC File No. 270-534; OMB Control No. 3235-0589.

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 existing collection of information to the Office of Management and Budget for extension and approval.

### Regulation SHO

Proposed Regulation SHO, Rule 201 (17 CFR 242.200 through 242.203) requires each broker-dealer that effects a sell order in any equity security to mark the order "long," "short," or "short exempt." Proposed Regulation SHO, Rule 201 causes a collection of information because the rule's requirement that each order ticket be marked either "long," "short," or "short exempt" is a disclosure to third parties and the public imposed on ten or more persons.

The information required by the rule is necessary for the execution of the Commission's mandate under the Exchange Act to prevent fraudulent, manipulative, and deceptive acts and practices by broker-dealers. The purpose of the information collected is to enable regulators to monitor whether a person effecting a short sale is acting in accordance with proposed Regulation SHO. Without the requirement that each order or an equity security be marked either "long," "short," or "short exempt," there would be no means to police compliance with Regulation SHO.

We assume that all of the approximately 6,752 registered broker-dealers effect sell orders in securities covered by proposed Regulation SHO. For purposes of the Paperwork Reduction Act, the Commission staff has estimated that a total of 1,164,755,007 trades are executed annually.

This is an average of approximately 172,505 annual responses by each respondent. Each response of marking orders "long," "short" or "short exempt" takes approximately .000139 hours (.5 seconds) to complete. Thus, the total approximate estimated annual hour burden per year is 161,900 burden hours (1,164,755,007 responses @ 0.000139 hours/response). A reasonable estimate for the paperwork compliance for the proposed rules for each broker-dealer is approximately 24 burden hours

(172,505 responses @ .000139 hours/response) or (161,900 burden hours/6,752 respondents).

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, Director/CIO, Office of Information Technology, Securities and Exchange Commission, c/o Shirley Martinson, 6432 General Green Way, Alexandria, VA 22312 or send an E-mail to: [PRA\\_Mailbox@sec.gov](mailto:PRA_Mailbox@sec.gov). Comments must be submitted to OMB within 60 days of this notice.

Dated: July 31, 2006.

**Nancy M. Morris,**  
*Secretary.*

[FR Doc. E6-13027 Filed 8-9-06; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 8010-01-P**

### SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34-54272; File No. SR-CBOE-2006-59]

#### Self-Regulatory Organizations; Chicago Board Options Exchange, Incorporated; Order Granting Accelerated Approval of Proposed Rule Change and Amendment No. 1 Thereto Relating to Extension of the Options Intermarket Linkage Fees Pilot Program

August 3, 2006.

On June 15, 2006, 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")<sup>1</sup> and Rule 19b-4 thereunder,<sup>2</sup> a proposed rule change to amend its Fees Schedule to extend until July 31, 2007 the Options Intermarket Linkage ("Linkage") fee pilot program ("Pilot Program"). The proposed rule

change was published for comment in the **Federal Register** on July 6, 2006.<sup>3</sup> The Commission received no comments on the proposal. On August 3, 2006, the Exchange filed Amendment No. 1 to the proposed rule change.<sup>4</sup> This order approves the proposed rule change, as amended, on an accelerated basis.

The Exchange's fees for Principal and Principal Acting as Agent orders are operating under the Pilot Program. These Linkage-related fees expired on July 31, 2006.<sup>5</sup> The Exchange proposes to retroactively extend from August 1, 2006 through July 31, 2007 the Pilot Program.<sup>6</sup>

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 applicable thereunder to a national securities exchange.<sup>7</sup> More specifically, the Commission finds that the proposal is consistent with Section 6(b) of the Act<sup>8</sup> in general, and furthers the objectives of Section 6(b)(4) of the Act<sup>9</sup> in particular, in that it is designed to provide for the equitable allocation of reasonable dues, fees, and other charges among CBOE members and other persons using its facilities. The Commission believes that: (i) The prospective extension of the Pilot Program will give the Exchange and the Commission further opportunity to evaluate whether the fees are appropriate; and (ii) the retroactive extension of the Pilot Program will permit the pilot to continue on an uninterrupted basis for the two days between the expiration of the pilot on July 31, 2006 and the date of this approval order.

The Commission finds good cause, pursuant to Section 19(b)(2) of the Act,<sup>10</sup> for approving the proposed rule change prior to the 30th day after the date of publication of notice thereof in the **Federal Register**. Specifically, the Commission notes that accelerated approval of the proposal will allow the Pilot Program to continue without

<sup>3</sup> Securities Exchange Act Release No. 54064 (June 29, 2006), 71 FR 38438.

<sup>4</sup> See *infra*, at note 6.

<sup>5</sup> See Securities Exchange Act Release No. 52073 (July 20, 2005), 70 FR 43474 (July 27, 2005) (SR-CBOE-2005-54).

<sup>6</sup> In Amendment No. 1, in light of the expiration of the Pilot Program, the Exchange modified its proposal to request that the Pilot Program be extended retroactively. Amendment No. 1 is a technical amendment and is not subject to notice and comment.

<sup>7</sup> In approving the proposed rule change, as amended, the Commission has considered the proposed rule's impact on efficiency, competition, and capital formation. See 15 U.S.C. 78c(f).

<sup>8</sup> 15 U.S.C. 78f(b).

<sup>9</sup> 15 U.S.C. 78f(b)(4).

<sup>10</sup> 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(2).

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

<sup>2</sup> 17 CFR 240.19b-4.