Personnel Management (OPM) publish appropriate notice of the 2006 locality payments in the **Federal Register**.

GS employees receive locality payments under 5 U.S.C. 5304. Locality payments apply in the 48 contiguous States and the District of Columbia. In 2006, locality payments ranging from 12.52 percent to 28.68 percent apply to GS employees in 32 locality pay areas. (Changes in the 2006 locality pay areas definitions can be found at *http://www.opm.gov/oca/06tables/locdef.asp*.) These 2006 locality pay percentages, which replaced the locality pay percentages that were applicable in 2005, become effective on the first day of the first pay period beginning on or after January 1, 2006. An employee's locality-adjusted annual rate of pay is computed by increasing his or her scheduled annual rate of basic pay (as defined in 5 U.S.C. 5302(8) and 5 CFR 531.602) by the applicable locality pay percentage. (See 5 CFR 531.604 and 531.607.)

Executive Order 13393 establishes the new Executive Schedule, which incorporates a 1.9 percent increase required under 5 U.S.C. 5318 (rounded to the nearest $100). By law, Executive Schedule officials are not authorized to receive locality payments.

Executive Order 13393 establishes the range of rates of basic pay for senior executives in the Senior Executive Service (SES), as established pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 5382. The minimum rate of basic pay for the SES may not be less than the minimum rate payable under 5 U.S.C. 5376 for senior-level positions ($109,808 in 2006), and the maximum rate of basic pay may not exceed the rate for level III of the Executive Schedule ($152,000 in 2006). The maximum rate of the SES rate range will increase to level II of the Executive Schedule ($165,200 in 2006) for SES members covered by performance appraisal systems that are certified under 5 U.S.C. 5307(d) as making meaningful distinctions based on relative performance. By law, SES members are not authorized to receive locality payments. Agencies with certified performance appraisal systems in 2006 for senior executives and/or senior-level (SL) and scientific or professional (ST) positions also must apply a higher aggregate limitation on pay—up to the Vice President's salary ($212,100 in 2006).

The Executive order adjusted the rates of basic pay for administrative law judges (ALJs) by 2.1 percent (rounded to the nearest $100). The maximum rate of basic pay for ALJs is set by law at the rate for level IV of the Executive Schedule, which is now $143,000. The rate of basic pay for AL–2 is $139,500. The rates of basic pay for AL–3/A through 3/F range from $95,500 to $132,000. (See 5 U.S.C. 5372.)

The rates of basic pay for members of Contract Appeals Boards are calculated as a percentage of the rate for level IV of the Executive Schedule. (See 5 U.S.C. 5372a.) Therefore, these rates of basic pay were increased by approximately 1.9 percent. Also, the maximum rate of basic pay for SL/ST positions was increased by approximately 1.9 percent (to $143,000) because it is tied to the rate for level IV of the Executive Schedule. The minimum rate of basic pay for SL/ST positions is equal to 120 percent of the minimum rate of basic pay for GS–15 and thus was increased by 2.1 percent (to $109,808). (See 5 U.S.C. 5376.)

On November 22, 2005, the President's Pay Agent extended the 2006 locality-based comparability payments to certain categories of non-GS employees. The Government-wide categories include employees in SL/ST positions, ALJs, and Contract Appeals Board members. The maximum locality rate of pay for these employees is the rate for level III of the Executive Schedule ($152,000 in 2006).

On December 22, 2005, OPM issued a memorandum (CPM 2005–25) on the January 2006 pay adjustments. (See *http://www.opm.gov/oca/compmemo/2005/2005–25.asp*.) The memorandum transmitted Executive Order 13393 and provided the 2006 salary tables, locality pay areas and percentages, and information on general pay administration matters and other related information. The ''2006 Salary Tables'' posted on OPM's Web site at *http://www.opm.gov/oca/06tables/index.asp* are the official rates of pay for affected employees and are hereby incorporated as part of this notice.

Office of Personnel Management.

Linda M. Springer,

Director.

[FR Doc. E6–680 Filed 1–20–06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6325–39–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:

Reports of Evidence of Material Violations, SEC File No. 270–514, OMB Control No. 3235–0572.

Notice is hereby given that pursuant to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, 44 U.S.C. sections 3501–3520, the Securities and Exchange Commission (''Commission'') is soliciting comments on the collection of information summarized below. The Commission plans to submit the existing collection of information to the Office of Management and Budget (''OMB'') for extension.

On February 6, 2003, the Commission published final rules, effective August 5, 2003, entitled ''Standards of Professional Conduct for Attorneys Appearing and Practicing Before the Commission in the Representation of an Issuer'' (17 CFR 205.1–205.7). The information collection embedded in the rules is necessary to implement the Standards of Professional Conduct for Attorneys prescribed by the rule and required by section 307 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002. The rules impose an ''up-the-ladder'' reporting requirement when attorneys appearing and practicing before the Commission become aware of evidence of a material violation by the issuer or any officer, director, employee, or agent of the issuer. An issuer may choose to establish a qualified legal compliance committee (''QLCC'') as an alternative procedure for reporting evidence of a material violation. In the rare cases in which a majority of a QLCC has concluded that an issuer did not act appropriately, the information may be communicated to the Commission. The collection of information is, therefore, an important component of the Commission's program to discourage violations of the federal securities laws and promote ethical behavior of attorneys appearing and practicing before the Commission.

The respondents to this collection of information are attorneys who appear and practice before the Commission and, in certain cases, the issuer, and/or officers, directors and committees of the issuer. We believe that, in providing quality representation to issuers, attorneys report evidence of violations to others within the issuer, including the Chief Legal Officer, the Chief Executive Officer, and, where necessary, the directors. In addition, officers and directors investigate evidence of violations and report within the issuer the results of the investigation and the remedial steps they have taken or sanctions they have imposed. Except as discussed below, we therefore believe that the reporting requirements imposed by the rule are ''usual and customary''

activities that do not add to the burden that would be imposed by the collection of information.

Certain aspects of the collection of information, however, may impose a burden. For an issuer to establish a QLCC, the QLCC must adopt written procedures for the confidential receipt, retention, and consideration of any report of evidence of a material violation. We estimate for purposes of the PRA that there are approximately 17,710 issuers that are subject to the rules.[1] Of these, we estimate that approximately ten percent, or 1,771, will establish a QLCC.[2] Establishing the written procedures required by the rule should not impose a significant burden. We assume that an issuer would incur a greater burden in the year that it first establishes the procedures than in subsequent years, in which the burden would be incurred in updating, reviewing, or modifying the procedures. For purposes of the PRA, we assume that an issuer would spend 6 hours every three-year period on the procedures. This would result in an average burden of 2 hours per year. Thus, we estimate for purposes of the PRA that the total annual burden imposed by the collection of information would be 3,542 hours. Assuming half of the burden hours will be incurred by outside counsel at a rate of $300 per hour would result in a cost of $531,300.

The estimate of average burden hours is made solely for the purposes of the Paperwork Reduction Act, and is not derived from a comprehensive or even a representative survey or study. An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number.

Written comments are requested on: (a) Whether the collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Commission, including whether the information has practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the Commission's estimate of the burden[s] 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/Chief Information Officer, Office of Information Technology, Securities and Exchange Commission, 100 F St., NE., Washington, DC 20549.

Dated: January 12, 2006.

Nancy M. Morris,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. E6–667 Filed 1–20–06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8010–01–P

[1] This estimate is based, in part, on the total number of operating companies that filed annual reports on Form 10–K, Form 20–F, or Form 40–F, during the 2005 fiscal year and an estimate of the average number of issuers that may have a registration statement filed under the Securities Act pending with the Commission at any time (13,660). In addition, we estimate that approximately 4,050 investment companies currently file periodic reports on Form N–SAR.

[2] Indications are that the 2003 estimate of the percentage of issuers that would establish QLCC's (20%) was high. Our adjusted estimate in the percentage of QLCC's (10%) results in a reduced burden estimate as compared to the previously approved collection.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[File No. 1–11535]

Issuer Delisting; Notice of Application of Burlington Northern Santa Fe Corporation To Withdraw its Common Stock, $.01 par value, From Listing and Registration on the Chicago Stock Exchange, Inc.

January 13, 2006.

On January 11, 2006, Burlington Northern Santa Fe Corporation, a Delaware corporation (''Issuer''), filed an application with the Securities and Exchange Commission (''Commission''), pursuant to Section 12(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (''Act'') [1] and Rule 12d2–2(d) thereunder,[2] to withdraw its common stock, $.01 par value (''Security''), from listing and registration on the Chicago Stock Exchange, Inc. (''CHX'').

The Board of Directors (''Board'') of the Issuer approved resolutions on December 8, 2005 to withdraw the Security from CHX. The Issuer stated that the Board decided to withdraw the Security from CHX because the benefits of continued listing on CHX do not outweigh the incremental cost of the listing fees and the administrative burden associated with listing on CHX. The Issuer stated that the Security is listed on the New York Stock Exchange, Inc. (''NYSE'') and will continue to list on NYSE.

The Issuer stated in its application that it has complied with applicable rules of CHX by complying with all applicable laws in the State of Delaware, the state in which the Issuer is incorporated, and by providing CHX with the required documents governing the withdrawal of securities from listing and registration on CHX. The Issuer's application relates solely to the withdrawal of the Security from listing on CHX and shall not affect its continued listing on NYSE or its obligation to be registered under Section 12(b) of the Act.[3]

Any interested person may, on or before February 9, 2006, comment on the facts bearing upon whether the application has been made in accordance with the rules of CHX, and what terms, if any, should be imposed by the Commission for the protection of investors. All comment letters may be submitted by either of the following methods.

Electronic Comments

- Send an e-mail to *rule-comments@sec.gov.* Please include the File Number 1–11535 or;

Paper Comments

- Send paper comments in triplicate to Nancy M. Morris, Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, 100 F Street, NE., Washington, DC 20549–9303.

All submissions should refer to File Number 1–11535. This file number should be included on the subject line if e-mail is used. To help us process and review your comments more efficiently, please use only one method. The Commission will post all comments on the Commission's Internet Web site (*http://www.sec.gov/rules/delist.shtml*). Comments are also available for public inspection and copying in the Commission's Public Reference Room. All comments received will be posted without change; we do not edit personal identifying information from submissions. You should submit only information that you wish to make available publicly.

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.[4]

Nancy M. Morris,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. E6–677 Filed 1–20–06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8010–01–P

[1] 15 U.S.C. 78*l*(d).

[2] 17 CFR 240.12d2–2(d).

[3] 15 U.S.C. 78*l*(b).

[4] 17 CFR 200.30–3(a)(1).