Reactor Security Requirements, 74 FR 13926 (March 27, 2009). The licensee currently maintains a security system acceptable to the NRC and will continue to provide acceptable physical protection of Palisades in lieu of the new requirements in 10 CFR Part 73. Therefore, the extension of the implementation date of the new requirements in 10 CFR Part 73 would not have any significant environmental impacts.

The NRC staff's safety evaluation will be provided in the exemption that will be issued as part of the letter to the licensee approving the exemption to the regulation, if granted.

Environmental Impacts of the Alternatives to the Proposed Action

As an alternative to the proposed actions, the NRC staff considered denial of the proposed actions (i.e., the “no-action” alternative). Denial of the exemption request would result in no change in current environmental impacts. If the proposed action was denied, the licensee would have to comply with the March 31, 2010, implementation deadline. The environmental impacts of the proposed exemption and the “no action” alternative are similar.

Alternative Use of Resources


Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, March 8, 2010, the NRC staff consulted with the Michigan State official, Mr. Ken Yale, regarding the environmental impact of the proposed action. The State official had no comments.

Finding of No Significant Impact

On the basis of the environmental assessment, the NRC concludes that the proposed action will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment. Accordingly, the NRC has determined not to prepare an environmental impact statement for the proposed action.

For further details with respect to the proposed action, see the licensee's letter dated January 14, 2010, as supplemented by letter dated February 16, 2010, Portions of January 14, 2010, and February 16, 2010, submittals contain security related information and, accordingly, are not available to the public. Other parts of these documents may be examined, and/or copied for a fee, at the NRC’s Public Document Room (PDR), located at One White Flint North, Room 0–1F21, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland 20852. Publicly available records will be accessible electronically from the Agencywide Document Access and Management System (ADAMS) Public Electronic Reading Room on the Internet at the NRC Web site: http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html. Persons who do not have access to ADAMS or who encounter problems in accessing the documents located in ADAMS should contact the NRC PDR Reference staff by telephone at 1–800–397–4209 or 301–415–4737, or send an e-mail to pdr.resource@nrc.gov.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 18th day of March 2010.

Mahesh Chawla, Project Manager, Plant Licensing Branch LPL III–1, Division of Operating Reactor Licensing, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 2010–6634 Filed 3–24–10; 8:45 am]
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STP Nuclear Operating Company; Notice of Availability of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Combined Licenses for Units 3 and 4 at the South Texas Project Site

Notice is hereby given that the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), Galveston District, have published “NUREG–1937, Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Combined Licenses (COLs) at the South Texas Project Electric Generating Station Units 3 and 4” (DEIS). The site for the proposed South Texas Project Units 3 and 4 is located in Matagorda County, Texas, along the west bank of the Colorado River. The application for the COLs was submitted by letter dated October 1, 2007, pursuant to 10 CFR Part 52. A notice of receipt and availability of the application, which included the environmental report (ER), was published in the Federal Register on October 24, 2007 (72 FR 60394). A notice of acceptance for docketing of the COL application was published in the Federal Register on December 5, 2007 (72 FR 68597). A notice of intent to prepare an environmental impact statement (EIS) and to conduct the scoping process was published in the Federal Register on December 21, 2007 (72 FR 72774).

The purpose of this notice is to inform the public that NUREG–1937 is available for public inspection. The DEIS can be accessed (1) in the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission’s (NRC’s) Public Document Room (PDR) located at One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland 20852, or (2) from NRC’s Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS). ADAMS is accessible from the NRC Web site at http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html. The accession number for the DEIS is ML100700576. Persons who do not have access to ADAMS, or who encounter problems in accessing the documents located in ADAMS, should contact the PDR reference staff at 1–800–397–4209 or 301–415–4737, or by e-mail to pdr.resource@nrc.gov. In addition, the Bay City Public Library, located at 1100 7th Street, Bay City, Texas, has agreed to make the DEIS available to the public.

The NRC and Corps staff will hold two public meetings to present an overview of the DEIS and to accept public comments on the document on Thursday, May 6, 2010, at the Bay City Civic Center, 201 7th Street, Bay City, Texas. The first meeting will convene at 1:30 p.m. and will continue until 4:30 p.m., as necessary. The second meeting will convene at 7 p.m., with a repeat of the overview portions of the first meeting, and will continue until 10 p.m., as necessary. The meetings will be transcribed and will include: (1) A presentation of the contents of the DEIS; and (2) the opportunity for interested government agencies, organizations, and individuals to provide comments on the draft report. Additionally, the NRC and Corps staff will host informal discussions one hour before the start of each meeting during which members of the public may meet and talk with NRC and Corps staff members. To be considered, comments must be provided during the transcribed public meeting either orally or in writing. No formal comments on the DEIS will be accepted during the informal discussions.

Persons may pre-register to attend or present oral comments at the meeting by contacting Ms. Jessie Muir by telephone at 1–800–368–5642, extension 0491, or by e-mail at STP.COLA@nrc.gov no later than April 21, 2010. Members of the public may also register to speak at the meeting within 15 minutes of the start of the meeting. Individual oral comments may be limited by the time available, depending on the number of
persons who register. Members of the public who have not registered may also have an opportunity to speak, if time permits. If special equipment or accommodations are needed to attend or present information at the public meeting, Ms. Jessie Muir should be contacted no later than April 21, 2010, so that the NRC staff can determine whether the request can be accommodated.

Members of the public may also submit comments on the DEIS by (1) e-mail, (2) mail, or (3) delivery to the NRC. Comments may also be submitted via email at STP.COLEAS@nrc.gov. Electronic submissions should be sent no later than June 9, 2010. Written comments on the DEIS can be mailed to the Chief, Rulemaking, Directives, and Editing Branch, Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration, Mailstop T–6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001, and should cite the publication date and page number of this Federal Register Notice. To be considered, written comments should be postmarked by June 9, 2010. Comments may also be delivered to Room T–6D59, Two White Flint North, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland, from 7:30 a.m. to 4:15 p.m. during Federal workdays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Jessie Muir, Environmental Projects Branch 2, Division of Site and Environmental Reviews, Office of New Reactors, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Mail Stop T7–E30, Washington, DC 20555–0001. Ms. Muir may also be contacted at the aforementioned telephone number or e-mail address.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 19th day of March 2010.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Scott Flanders,
Director, Division of Site and Environmental Reviews, Office of New Reactors.

[FR Doc. 2010–6642 Filed 3–24–10; 8:45 am]
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New Postal Product

AGENCY: Postal Regulatory Commission.
ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Commission is noticing a recently-filed Postal Service request to add three Global Expedited Package Services 2 contracts to the Competitive Product List. The Postal Service has also filed a related contract. This notice addresses procedural steps associated with these filings.

DATES: Comments are due: March 29, 2010.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments electronically via the Commission’s Filing Online system at http://www.prc.gov. Commenters who cannot submit their views electronically should contact the person identified in the FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT section by telephone for advice on alternatives to electronic filing.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Stephen L. Sharfman, General Counsel, 202–789–6820 or stephen.sharfman@prc.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:
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I. Introduction

On March 18, 2010, the Postal Service filed a notice announcing that it has entered into three additional Global Expedited Package Services 2 (GEPS 2) contracts.1 The Postal Service believes the instant contracts are functionally equivalent to previously submitted GEPS 2 contracts, and are supported by Governors’ Decision No. 08–7, attached to the Notice and originally filed in Docket No. CP2008–4. Id. at 1, Attachment 3. The Notice also explains that Order No. 86, which established GEPS 1 as a product, also authorized functionally equivalent agreements to be included within the product, provided that they meet the requirements of 39 U.S.C. 3633. Id. at 1. In Order No. 290, the Commission approved the GEPS 2 product.2

The instant contracts. The Postal Service filed the instant contracts pursuant to 39 CFR 3015.5. In addition, the Postal Service contends that each contract is in accordance with Order No. 86. The term of each contract is 1 year from the date the Postal Service notifies the customer that all necessary regulatory approvals have been received. Notice at 2–3.

In support of its Notice, the Postal Service filed four attachments as follows:

1. Attachments 1A, 1B and 1C—redacted copies of the three contracts and applicable annexes;
2. Attachments 2A, 2B and 2C—a certified statement required by 39 CFR 3015.5(c)(2) for each of the three contracts;
3. Attachment 3—a redacted copy of Governors’ Decision No. 08–7 which establishes prices and classifications for GEPS contracts, a description of applicable GEPS contracts, formulas for prices, an analysis and certification of the formulas and certification of the Governors’ vote; and
4. Attachment 4—an application for non-public treatment of materials to maintain redacted portions of the contracts and supporting documents under seal.

The Notice advances reasons why the instant GEPS 2 contracts fit within the Mail Classification Schedule language for GEPS 2. The Postal Service identifies customer specific information, general contract terms and other differences that distinguish the instant contracts from the baseline GEPS 2 agreement, all of which are highlighted in the Notice. Id. at 3–6. These modifications as described in the Postal Service’s Notice apply to each of the instant contracts.

The Postal Service contends that the instant contracts are functionally equivalent to the GEPS 2 contracts filed previously notwithstanding these differences. Id. at 6–7.

The Postal Service asserts that several factors demonstrate the contracts’ functional equivalence with previous GEPS 2 contracts, including the product being offered, the market in which it is offered, and its cost characteristics. Id. at 3. The Postal Service concludes that because the GEPS agreements “incorporate the same cost attributes and methodology, the relevant cost and market characteristics are similar, if not the same...” despite any incidental differences. Id. at 6.

The Postal Service contends that its filings demonstrate that each of the new GEPS 2 contracts comply with the requirements of 39 U.S.C. 3633 and is functionally equivalent to previous GEPS 2 contracts. It also requests that the contracts be included within the GEPS 2 product. Id. at 7.

II. Notice of Filing


Interested persons may submit comments on whether the Postal Service’s contract is consistent with the policies of 39 U.S.C. 3632, 3622 or 3642.