

proceeding, but such an amended petition must satisfy the specificity requirements described above.

Not later than 15 days prior to the first prehearing conference scheduled in the proceeding, a petitioner shall file a supplement to the petition to intervene which must include a list of the contentions which are sought to be litigated in the matter. Each contention must consist of a specific statement of the issue of law or fact to be raised or controverted. In addition, the petitioner shall provide a brief explanation of the bases of 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. Petitioner must provide sufficient information to show that a genuine dispute exists with the applicant on a material issue of law or fact. Contentions 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 who fails to file such a supplement which satisfies these requirements with respect to at least one contention will not be permitted to participate as a party.

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, including the opportunity to present evidence and cross-examine witnesses. 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 with the Secretary of the Commission, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, Attention: Rulemakings and Adjudications Staff, or may be delivered to the Commission's PDR, located at One White Flint North, Public File Area 01F21, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland, by the above date. Because of the continuing disruptions in delivery of mail to United States Government offices, it is requested that petitions for leave to intervene and requests for hearing be transmitted to the Secretary

of the Commission either by means of facsimile transmission to 301-415-1101 or by e-mail to [hearingdocket@nrc.gov](mailto:hearingdocket@nrc.gov). A copy of the petition for leave to intervene and request for hearing should also be sent to the Office of the General Counsel, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, and because of continuing disruptions in delivery of mail to United States Government offices, 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](mailto: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 licensee.

Nontimely filings of petitions for leave to intervene, amended petitions, supplemental petitions and/or requests for a hearing will not be entertained absent a determination by the Commission, the presiding officer or the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board that the petition and/or request should be granted based upon a balancing of the factors specified in 10 CFR 2.714(a)(1)(i)-(v) and 2.714(d).

*Exelon Generation Company, LLC, Docket Nos. 50-254 and 50-265, Quad Cities Nuclear Power Station, Units 1 and 2, Rock Island County, Illinois*

*Date of application for amendments:* April 25, 2003.

*Brief description of amendments:* The amendments modify Technical Specification surveillance requirements to provide an alternative means of testing the Unit 2 main steam power operated relief valves, including those that provide the automatic depressurization system and low set relief functions.

*Date of issuance:* May 8, 2003.

*Effective date:* As of the date of issuance and shall be implemented within 60 days.

*Amendment Nos.:* 215/209.

*Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-29 and DPR-30:* The amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

*Public comments requested as to proposed no significant hazards consideration (NSHC):* Yes. Quad-City Times, dated May 5, 2003. The notice provided an opportunity to submit comments on the Commission's proposed NSHC determination. No comments have been received.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment, finding of exigent circumstances, state consultation, and final NSHC determination are contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 8, 2003.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 19th day of May 2003.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**William H. Ruland,**

*Acting Director, Division of Licensing Project Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 03-12973 Filed 5-23-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-U

## SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

### Issuer Delisting; Notice of Application To Withdraw From Listing and Registration on the American Stock Exchange LLC (Atlantic Premium Brands, Ltd., Common Stock, \$.01 par value) File No. 1-13747

May 19, 2003.

Atlantic Premium Brands, Ltd., a Delaware corporation ("Issuer"), has filed an application with the Securities and Exchange Commission ("Commission"), pursuant to section 12(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 ("Act")<sup>1</sup> and Rule 12d2-2(d) thereunder,<sup>2</sup> to withdraw its Common Stock, \$.01 par value ("Security"), from listing and registration on the American Stock Exchange LLC ("Amex" or "Exchange").

The Issuer stated in its application that it has met the requirements of Amex Rule 18 by complying with all applicable laws in the State of Delaware, in which it is incorporated, and with the Amex's rules governing an issuer's voluntary withdrawal of a security from listing and registration.

The Board of Directors ("Board") of the Issuer approved a resolution on May 14, 2003 to withdraw the Issuer's Security from listing on the Amex. The Board considered such action to be in the best interest of the Issuer and its stockholders. In addition, the Board states that it took into account alternatives explored by the Issuer, including, without limitation, that: (i) The significant costs associated with maintaining the Issuer's status as a reporting company are expected to increasingly reduce profitability; (ii) the limited volume of trading of the Issuer's Security has resulted in the shares not providing a practical source of capital or liquidity; and (iii) no analysts currently cover the Issuer and its Security. The Issuer states in its application that it is currently seeking to list its Security on the Pink Sheets.

The Issuer's application relates solely to the withdrawal of the Securities from listing on the Amex and from registration under section 12(b) of the

<sup>1</sup> 15 U.S.C. 78j(d).

<sup>2</sup> 17 CFR 240.12d2-2(d).

Act<sup>3</sup> shall not affect its obligation to be registered under section 12(g) of the Act.<sup>4</sup>

Any interested person may, on or before June 12, 2003, submit by letter to the Secretary of the Securities and Exchange Commission, 450 Fifth Street, NW., Washington, DC 20549-0609, facts bearing upon whether the application has been made in accordance with the rules of the Amex and what terms, if any, should be imposed by the Commission for the protection of investors. The Commission, based on the information submitted to it, will issue an order granting the application after the date mentioned above, unless the Commission determines to order a hearing on the matter.

For the Commission, by the Division of Market Regulation, pursuant to delegated authority.<sup>5</sup>

**Jonathan G. Katz,**  
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 03-13096 Filed 5-23-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8010-01-P

## SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

### Sunshine Act Meeting

*Federal Register Citation of Previous Announcement:* 68 FR 27114, May 19, 2003.

*Status:* Closed meetings.

*Place:* 450 Fifth Street, NW., Washington, DC.

*Date and Time of Previously Announced Meeting:* Wednesday, May 21, 2003.

*Change in the Meeting:* Additional item.

The following item has been added to the closed meeting of Wednesday, May 21, 2003: Litigation matter.

Commissioner Atkins, as duty officer, determined that Commission business required the above change and that no earlier notice thereof was possible.

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 20, 2003.

**Jill M. Peterson,**

Assistant Secretary.

[FR Doc. 03-13197 Filed 5-21-03; 4:25 pm]

BILLING CODE 8010-01-P

<sup>3</sup> 15 U.S.C. 781(b).

<sup>4</sup> 15 U.S.C. 781(g).

<sup>5</sup> 17 CFR 200.30-3(a)(1).

## SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34-47888; File No. SR-MSRB-2003-02]

### Self-Regulatory Organizations; Order Granting Approval of a Proposed Rule Change by the Municipal Securities Rulemaking Board Relating to Rule G-14, on Reports of Sales or Purchases

May 19, 2003.

On April 7, 2003, Municipal Securities Rulemaking Board ("MSRB") filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission ("Commission"), pursuant to section 19(b)(1) of the Securities and Exchange Act of 1934 (the "Exchange Act") and Rule 19b-4 thereunder,<sup>1</sup> a proposed rule change (File No. SR-MSRB-2003-02). The proposed rule change relates to Rule G-14, on reports of sales or purchases, to increase transparency in the municipal securities market. The proposed rule change does not change the wording of Rule G-14.

The proposed rule change was published for notice and comment in the *Federal Register* on April 15, 2003.<sup>2</sup> The Commission received two comment letters on the proposed rule change.<sup>3</sup> This order approves the proposed rule change.

### I. Description of the Proposed Rule Change

The MSRB's T+1 Daily Report and the Comprehensive Report are made available for market professionals seeking information on market price levels and trading activity for individual securities. In preparation for the move to real-time price transparency in mid-2004, the MSRB believes that the trading threshold in the T+1 Daily Reports should be eliminated to further increase the price transparency that is available on T+1. The current transaction threshold for the T+1 Daily Report is two or more trades per day. Under the proposed rule change, all trades reported by dealers on trade date would be made visible on T+1.

The MSRB's proposed rule change is part of the MSRB's longstanding plan to introduce transparency in measured steps. The MSRB believes that these steps allow the market time to adjust to new situations presented by each new

<sup>1</sup> 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1) and 17 CFR 240.19b-4 thereunder.

<sup>2</sup> See Release No. 34-47650 (April 8, 2003) 68 FR 18313.

<sup>3</sup> May 7, 2003 letter from Kevin Olson, Municipalbonds.com to SEC Commissioners, Commission ("Olsen letter"); May 9, 2003 letter from John M. Ramsay, Senior Vice President and Regulatory Counsel, The Bond Market Association to Jonathan G. Katz, Secretary, Commission ("TBMA letter").

level of price transparency. The proposed rule change would increase the number of trades and issues appearing each day on the T+1 Daily Report. Furthermore, the MSRB believes that the proposal will increase price transparency for municipal securities by increasing the amount of price data available on the day after trade date.

### II. Summary of Comments

The Commission received two comment letters relating to the proposed rule change that express concerns. The TBMA letter expressed concerns about "the potential impact of real-time transparency on the market for less-frequently traded bonds." Although TBMA indicated that it does not oppose the move to next-day transparency, it suggests that "it should only be undertaken in connection with a more deliberate study of potential liquidity effects from a move to real-time transparency, consistent with the approach taken by the NASD and endorsed by the Commission in the area of corporate bond transparency."<sup>4</sup> It expressed concern about the possible negative effects on liquidity from price dissemination. TBMA believes that "for inactively traded bonds, the publication of price information, particularly in block size, may provide information to other market participants that would affect the ability of a holder of the same bonds to sell them without incurring a loss." Thus, TBMA supports the MSRB's proposal to display a large trade indicator for trades of \$1 million or more instead of revealing the actual par value traded in the T+1 Daily Report. TBMA has formed a "Price Transparency Task Force" to conduct an analysis of the liquidity issue.<sup>5</sup> TBMA believes that examining the impact of next-day price transparency could be useful for considering potential liquidity impacts in the move towards real-time dissemination and that further steps to increase transparency in both the municipal and corporate bond markets should be delayed until the conclusion of such a study.

The Olsen letter supports the MSRB's proposed elimination of the trading threshold in the T+1 Daily Report.<sup>6</sup> However, he strongly opposes the MSRB's proposal to use a large trade indicator instead of the specific amount of trades of \$1 million or more. Olsen

<sup>4</sup> See TBMA letter at 1.

<sup>5</sup> *Id.* at 3.

<sup>6</sup> Providing next-day transparency has been one of Olsen's key market demands. Olsen's other demands include, "(1) dealer identifiers be attached, and (2) if there are reporting errors [sic] they be corrected and explained in a dedicated and public error report." See Olsen letter at 1.