published in the Federal Register on October 17, 2011 (76 FR 64127–64128). Detailed meeting agendas and meeting transcripts are available on the NRC Web site at http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/doc-collections/acrs. Information regarding topics to be discussed, changes to the agenda, whether the meeting has been canceled or rescheduled, and the time allotted to present oral statements can be obtained from the Web site cited above or by contacting the identified DFO. Moreover, in view of the possibility that the schedule for ACRS meetings may be adjusted by the Chairman as necessary to facilitate the conduct of the meeting, persons planning to attend should check with these references if such rescheduling would result in a major inconvenience.

If attending this meeting, please enter through the One White Flint North building, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, MD. After registering with security, please contact Mr. Theron Brown (Telephone (240) 888–9835) to be escorted to the meeting room.

Dated: November 17, 2011.

Antonio F. Dias,
Technical Advisor, Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards.

[FR Doc. 2011–30240 Filed 11–22–11; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

CFC–50 Commission

AGENCY: Office of Personnel Management.

ACTION: Establishment of advisory committee.

SUMMARY: The CFC–50 Advisory Commission will hold its second meeting on December 6, 2011, at the time and location shown below. The Commission shall advise the Director of the U.S. Office of Personnel Management (OPM) on strengthening the integrity, the operation and effectiveness of the Combined Federal Campaign (CFC) to ensure its continued growth and success. The Commission is an advisory committee composed of Federal employees, private campaign administrators, charitable organizations and “watchdog” groups. The Commission is co-chaired by Thomas Davis and Beverly Byron.

The meeting is open to the public. Please contact the Office of Personnel Management at the address shown below if you wish to present material to the Commission at the meeting. The manner and time prescribed for presentations may be limited, depending upon the number of parties that express interest in presenting information.

DATES: December 6, 2011 at 2 p.m.


FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:


Phone: (202) 606–2564 FAX (202) 606–5056 or email at cfc@opm.gov.


John Berry, Director.

[Docket No. R2012–4; Order No. 981]

INTERNATIONAL MAIL CONTRACT

AGENCY: Postal Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Commission is noticing a recently-filed Postal Service request to enter into an additional bilateral agreement with Hong Kong Post Group. This document invites public comments on the request and addresses several related procedural steps.

DATES: Comments are due: November 30, 2011, 4:30 p.m., Eastern Time

ADDRESSES: Submit comments electronically by accessing the “Filing Online” link in the banner at the top of the Commission’s Web site (http://www.prc.gov) or by directly accessing the Commission’s Filing Online system at https://www.prc.gov/proc-pages/filing-online/login.aspx. Commenters who cannot submit their views electronically should contact the person identified in the FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT section as the source for case-related information for advice on alternatives to electronic filing.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Stephen L. Sharfman, General Counsel, at (202) 789–6820 (case-related information) or DocketAdmins@prc.gov (electronic filing assistance).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Introduction
II. Notice of Filing
III. Ordering Paragraphs

I. Introduction

On November 14, 2011, the Postal Service filed a notice, pursuant to 39 CFR 3010.40 et seq., and Order No. 549, that it has entered into a bilateral agreement with Hong Kong Post Group (Hong Kong Post 2012 Agreement or Agreement), which it seeks to include in the Inbound Market Dominant Multi-Service Agreements with Foreign Postal Operators 1 product. The Notice concerns the portion of a bilateral agreement with the Hong Kong Post Group for inbound competitive services that the Postal Service contends is similar and functionally equivalent to agreements already included in the Inbound Market Dominant Multi-Service Agreements with Foreign Postal Operators 1 product. Id. at 2.

In support of its Notice, the Postal Service filed two attachments as follows: Attachment 1—an application for non-public treatment of materials to maintain redacted portions of the agreement and supporting documents under seal and Attachment 2—a redacted copy of the Hong Kong Post 2012 Agreement. The Postal Service also provided a redacted version of the supporting financial documentation as a separate Excel file.

In Order No. 549, the Commission approved the Inbound Market Dominant Multi-Service Agreements with Foreign Postal Operators 1 product and the Strategic Bilateral Agreement between United States Postal Service and Koninklijke TNT Post BV and TNT Post Pakketservice Benelux BV (TNT Agreement) and the China Post Group–United States Postal Service Letter Post Bilateral Agreement (CPG Agreement). In Order No. 700, the Commission approved the functionally equivalent Hong Kong Post Agreement (Hong Kong Post Agreement). In Order 871, the Commission approved the functionally equivalent China Post 2011 Agreement.

Hong Kong Post 2012 Agreement. The Postal Service and Hong Kong Post, the postal operator for Hong Kong, are parties to the Hong Kong Post 2012 Agreement. The Agreement covers, inter alia, the delivery of inbound Letter Post, ...
in the form of letters, flats, small packets, bags, and International Registered Mail service for Letter Post. It also includes an ancillary service for delivery confirmation scanning with Letter Post small packets. Notice at 4; Attachment 2 at 10. The Postal Service states that the proposed inbound market dominant rates are intended to become effective on January 1, 2012, and to remain in effect for 1 year. Id. at 3; Attachment 2 at 6. The HongKong Post 2012 Agreement provides that it becomes effective after all regulatory approvals have been received, notification to HongKong Post, and mutual agreement on an effective date. Id., Attachment 2 at 1. The Agreement however, may be terminated by either party on no less than 30 days’ written notice. Id., Attachment 2 at 2.

Requirements under part 3010. The Postal Service states that the projected financial performance of the HongKong Post 2012 Agreement is provided in the Excel file included with its filing. It contends that improvements should enhance mail efficiency and other functions for Letter Post items under the Agreement. Id. at 4–5.

The Postal Service asserts that the Agreement should not cause unreasonable harm in the marketplace since it is unaware of any significant competition in this market. Id. at 5–6. Under 39 CFR 3010.43, the Postal Service is required to submit a data collection plan. The Postal Service indicates that it intends to report information on this Agreement through its Annual Compliance Report. While indicating its willingness to provide information on mailflows within the annual compliance review process, the Postal Service proposes that no special data collection plan be established for this Agreement. With respect to performance measurement, it requests that the Commission exempt the HongKong Post 2012 Agreement from separate reporting requirements under 39 CFR 3055.3(a)(3) as determined in Order Nos. 549, 700, and 871 for the Agreements in Docket Nos. R2010–5 and R2010–6, R2011–4, and R2011–7, respectively. Id. at 7.

The Postal Service advances reasons why the instant Agreement is functionally equivalent to the previously filed CPG Agreement, TNT Agreement, HongKong Post Agreement and China Post 2011 Agreement. It contends that it contains the same attributes and methodology and fits within the Mail Classification Schedule language for the Inbound Multi-Service Agreements with the Foreign Postal Operators 1 product. Id. at 8–10. Additionally, it states that the HongKong Post 2012 Agreement includes similar terms and conditions, e.g., is with a foreign postal operator, conforms to a common description, and relates to rates for Letter Post tendered from the postal operator’s territory. Id. at 9.

The Postal Service identifies specific terms that distinguish the instant Agreement from the three existing agreements. These distinctions include clarifying legal requirements, revised rates, term, signatory, and other changes. Id. at 10–11. The Postal Service contends that the instant Agreement is nonetheless functionally equivalent to existing agreements. Id. at 11.

In its Notice, the Postal Service maintains that certain portions of the Agreement, prices, and related financial information should remain under seal. Id. at 11–12; id. Attachment 1.

The Postal Service concludes that the HongKong Post 2012 Agreement should be added as a functionally equivalent agreement under the Inbound Market Dominant Multi-Service Agreements with Foreign Postal Operators 1 product. Id. at 12.

II. Notice of Filing

Interested persons may submit comments on whether the Postal Service’s filing in the captioned docket is consistent with the policies of 39 U.S.C. 3622 and 39 CFR part 3010.40. Comments are due no later than November 30, 2011. The public portions of these filings can be accessed via the Commission’s Web site (http://www.prc.gov). The Commission appoints James F. Callow to serve as Public Representative in this docket.

III. Ordering Paragraphs

It is ordered:

1. The Commission establishes Docket No. R2012–4 to consider matters raised by the Postal Service’s Notice. Pursuant to 39 U.S.C. 505, James F. Callow is appointed to serve as officer of the Commission (Public Representative) to represent the interests of the general public in this proceeding.

2. Comments by interested persons in this proceeding are due no later than November 30, 2011. The Secretary shall arrange for publication of this order in the Federal Register.

3. By the Commission.

Ruth Ann Abrams,
Acting Secretary.

POSSIBLE ADDITIONAL TEXT:

POSTAL REGULATORY COMMISSION
[Docket No. A2012–49; Order No. 978]

Post Office Closing

AGENCY: Postal Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: This document informs the public that an appeal of the closing of the Waverly, Washington post office has been filed. It identifies preliminary steps and provides a procedural schedule. Publication of this document will allow the Postal Service, petitioners, and others to take appropriate action.

DATES:

November 18, 2011: Administrative record due (from Postal Service);
December 12, 2011, 4:30 p.m., Eastern Time: Deadline for notices to intervene. See the Procedural Schedule in the SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION section for other dates of interest.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments electronically by accessing the “Filing Online” link in the banner at the top of the Commission’s Web site (http://www.prc.gov) or by directly accessing the Commission’s Filing Online system at https://www.prc.gov/prc-pages/filing-online/login.aspx. Commenters who cannot submit their views electronically should contact the person identified in the FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT section as the source for case-related information or advice on alternatives to electronic filing.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:
Stephen L. Sharfman, General Counsel, at (202) 789–6820 [case-related information] or DocketAdmins@prc.gov [electronic filing assistance].

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Notice is hereby given that, pursuant to 39 U.S.C. 404(d), on November 3, 2011, the Commission received a petition for review of the Postal Service’s determination to close the Waverly post office in Waverly, Washington. The petition for review was filed by Evelyn Heinevetter (Petitioner) and is postmarked October 26, 2011. The Commission hereby institutes a proceeding under 39 U.S.C. 404(d)(5) and establishes Docket No. A2012–49 to consider Petitioner’s appeal. If Petitioner would like to further explain her position with supplemental information or facts, Petitioner may either file a Participant Statement on PRC Form 61 or file a brief with the Commission no later than December 8, 2011.

Categories of issues apparently raised: Petitioner contends that (1) the Postal Service failed to consider the effect of