four. Water supplies world-wide are vulnerable to threats such as contaminants, changes in land use, shifting and increasing population, climate change, and extreme weather. And one in nine people (750 million worldwide) lack access to clean drinking water. Although sea water is widely available, it currently costs approximately $2,000 to desalinate an acre foot of water (or about $6 per 1000 gallons)—about twice the rate a typical homeowner pays for tap water.

Advances in nanotechnology, such as nanoporous materials for separation membranes and nanoparticles that remove contaminants, offer the possibility of much faster, cheaper, and more environmentally-friendly methods for desalination and other treatment applications that could dramatically improve the global supply of drinkable water.

6. Determine the environmental, health, and safety characteristics of a nanomaterial in a month. The need to more quickly and accurately determine whether engineered nanomaterials may pose a risk to the public and the environment continues to be a major challenge to the commercialization of nanotechnology for societal and public benefit. Much more efficient methods, including high-throughput toxicity measurements, sensors to detect nanomaterials in the environment, and accurate, predictive models for risk assessment, are needed to ensure that the safety of each product containing engineered nanomaterials is understood throughout its lifecycle, enabling new products to be quickly and confidently made available to the public.

Questions

Respondents are asked to address the following general questions for each grand challenge proposed, including for any of the grand challenge concepts listed above (or proposed variations):

- What is the audacious yet achievable goal proposed?
- Why is it important for the Federal government and others to invest in solving this challenge?
- What would success look like? How would you know the challenge has been met? For the examples provided, are the proposed end points appropriate and ambitious yet achievable?
- What would be potential nanotechnology solutions to the challenge and what intermediate steps and activities are necessary to develop those solutions?
- What potential metrics and milestones could be used to measure intermediate progress towards solving the challenge?
- Can the challenge be achieved in the next decade? If not, how long will it take?
- Why is this challenge worth pursuing now? What recent advances, trends, or research point to this challenge being solvable in the proposed time frame?
- What opportunities are there for partnerships between the Federal government, State and regional governments, foundations, industry, and academia to support the solution of the challenge?
- Why do you expect this challenge to capture the public’s imagination?

Ted Wacker, Deputy Chief of Staff and Assistant Director.
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BILLING CODE 3270–F5–P

POSTAL SERVICE

Temporary Emergency Committee of the Board of Governors; Sunshine Act Meeting

DATES AND TIMES: June 10, 2015, at 1:30 p.m.
PLACE: Washington, DC, via Teleconference.

STATUS: Committee Votes to Close June 10, 2015, Meeting: By telephone vote on June 10, 2015, members of the Temporary Emergency Committee of the Board of Governors of the United States Postal Service met and voted unanimously to close to public observation its meeting held in Washington, DC, via teleconference. The Committee determined that no earlier public notice was possible.

MATTERS CONSIDERED:
Wednesday, June 10, 2015, at 1:30 p.m.

1. Strategic Issues.
2. Pricing.

GENERAL COUNSEL CERTIFICATION: The General Counsel of the United States Postal Service has certified that the meeting was properly closed under the Sunshine Act.

CONTACT PERSON FOR MORE INFORMATION:

Julie S. Moore, Secretary, Board of Governors.

[FR Doc. 2015–14949 Filed 6–16–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7710–12–P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION


Self-Regulatory Organizations; EDGX Exchange, Inc.; Notice of Filing and Immediate Effectiveness of a Proposed Rule Change Related to Fees for Use of EDGX Exchange, Inc.

June 11, 2015.

Pursuant to Section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (the “Act”),1 and Rule 19b–4 thereunder,2 notice is hereby given that on June 9, 2015, EDGX Exchange, Inc. (the “Exchange”) filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission (“Commission”) the proposed rule change as described in Items I, II and III below, which Items have been prepared by the Exchange.3 The Exchange has designated the proposed rule change as one establishing or changing a member due, fee, or other charge imposed by the Exchange under Section 19(b)(3)(A)(ii) of the Act4 and Rule 19b–4(f)(2) thereunder,5 which renders the proposed rule change effective upon filing with the Commission. The Commission is publishing this notice to solicit comments on the proposed rule change from interested persons.

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

The Exchange filed a proposal to amend its fees and rebates applicable to Members6 of the Exchange pursuant to EDGX Exchange Rule 15.1(a) and (c) (“Fee Schedule”) to increase the fee for orders placing in NASDAQ OMX PSX (“PSX”) using ROUC or ROUE routing strategy.

The text of the proposed rule change is available at the Exchange’s Web site at www.batstooling.com, at the principal office of the Exchange, and at the Commission’s Public Reference Room.

3 The Commission notes that a previous version of the proposal was filed as SR–EDGX–2015–25. The proposal was withdrawn on June 9, 2015.
6 The term “Member” is defined as “any registered broker or dealer, or any person associated with a registered broker or dealer, that has been admitted to membership in the Exchange. A Member will have the status of a “member” of the Exchange as that term is defined in Section 3(a)(3) of the Act.” See Exchange Rule 1.5(n).