

a direct result of ground motion caused by an earthquake centered in Mineral, Virginia, approximately 10 miles from North Anna 1 and 2. The licensee has not determined the root cause of this event, nor has it explained why the reactor tripped on “negative flux rate” rather than on loss of offsite power.

(2) Subsequent to the earthquake, the licensee initiated various inspection activities and tests to discover the extent of damage to the nuclear facility, but these inspection and testing activities continue and remain incomplete and non-validated.

(3) The licensee had set an overly aggressive schedule for restarting North Anna 1 and 2 that was based on economic considerations rather than safety.

(4) The licensee needs to amend its licensing documents, including its licenses and the updated facility analysis report. As a result of ground motion experienced at, and damage sustained to, North Anna 1 and 2, due to the earthquake of August 23, 2011, which is greater than the licensee’s design and safety bases, North Anna 1 and 2, are in an unanalyzed condition and current licensing documents are erroneous and incomplete. As a result, the licensee cannot rely on them to provide reasonable assurance to the NRC that these nuclear reactors can be operated in a safe and reliable manner to protect public health and safety.

(5) The licensee needs to conduct new seismic and geological evaluations of the North Anna 1 and 2, site that are independent. These evaluations should ascertain the degree and magnitude of future earthquake events and address a “worst case” earthquake.

(6) There are numerous issues with the seismic instrumentation at North Anna 1 and 2, including lack of free field instrumentation, issues associated with conversion of analog data to digital data, issues with lack of on-site personnel with sufficient training in seismic measurements, and potential skewing of ground motion data due to the location of the “scratch plates.”

(7) Retrofitting of North Anna 1 and 2, is required due to damage to North Anna 1 and 2, from the earthquake of August 23, 2011.

(8) There are concerns with the impact of the August 23, 2011, earthquake on the North Anna 1 and 2, Independent Spent Fuel Storage Installation (ISFSI) including the fact that 25 casks weighing over 115 tons were not supposed to shift as much as 4.5 inches during a predicted earthquake, validation of the integrity of the seals inside the spent fuel casks, assessing whether spent nuclear fuel

storage facilities could topple or otherwise sustain significant damage resulting in a release, and assessing whether the licensee’s emergency plans adequately addressed damage to the ISFSI as a result of a severe earthquake.

(9) The petitioner is concerned that the licensee cannot be trusted to communicate reliable information to the public or the regulator based on the fact that the licensee in the 1970s failed to promptly disclose the discovery of geological information and was subjected to a monetary fine for the violation.

The request is being treated pursuant to Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations (10 CFR) 2.206, “Requests for action under this subpart,” of the Commission’s regulations. The request has been referred to the Director of the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation. As provided by § 2.206, appropriate action will be taken on this petition within a reasonable time. The petitioner met with the NRR petition review board on September 29, 2011 (transcript at ADAMS Accession No. ML11332A046), and November 7, 2011 (transcript at ADAMS Accession No. ML113530035), to discuss the petition. The results of these discussions were considered in the PRB’s final recommendation to accept the petition for review and in establishing the schedule for the review of the petition.

A copy of the petition is available for inspection at the Commission’s Public Document Room, located at One White Flint North, Public File Area O1-F21, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland 20852. Publicly available documents created or received at the NRC are accessible electronically through the NRC’s Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS) in the NRC Library at <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 by email to [PDR.Resource@nrc.gov](mailto:PDR.Resource@nrc.gov)

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 22nd day of February, 2012.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Eric J. Leeds,**

*Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 2012-5150 Filed 3-1-12; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7590-01-P**

## POSTAL REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. CP2012-17; Order No. 1261]

### 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 International Business Reply Service contract. This document invites public comments on the request and addresses several related procedural steps.

**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 for advice on alternatives to electronic filing.

**DATES:** *Comments are due:* March 6, 2012.

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

### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

#### Table of Contents

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

#### I. Introduction

On February 24, 2012, the Postal Service filed a notice announcing that it has entered into an additional International Business Reply Service (IBRS) contract.<sup>1</sup> The Postal Service asserts that the instant contract is functionally equivalent to the IBRS 3 baseline contract originally filed in Docket Nos. MC2011-21 and CP2011-59 and supported by Governors’ Decision No. 08-24 (IBRS 3 baseline contract). *Id.*, Attachment 3. The notice explains that Order No. 684, which established IBRS Competitive Contracts 3 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 1-2.

<sup>1</sup> Notice of the United States Postal Service Filing of a Functionally Equivalent International Business Reply Service Competitive Contract 3 Negotiated Service Agreement, February 24, 2012 (notice).

*The instant contract.* The Postal Service filed the instant contract pursuant to 39 CFR 3015.5, and states that the instant contract is also in compliance with Order No. 178. The instant contract will remain in effect until 1 year after its effective date, unless termination of the agreement occurs earlier. *Id.* The Postal Service shall notify the mailer of the effective date of the instant contract within 30 days of its approval by the Commission. *Id.*, Attachment 1 at 4. The instant contract may be terminated by either party upon 30 days' written notice. *Id.*, Attachment 1 at 10.

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

- Attachment 1—a redacted copy of the contract and applicable annexes;
- Attachment 2—a certified statement required by 39 CFR 3015.5(c)(2);
- Attachment 3—a redacted copy of Governors' Decision No. 08–24, which establishes prices and classifications for IBRS contracts, a description of applicable IBRS contracts, formulas for prices, an analysis of the formulas, a certification as to the formulas for prices offered under applicable IBRS contracts, and certification of the Governors' vote; and
- Attachment 4—an application for non-public treatment of materials to maintain redacted portions of the contract and file supporting documents under seal.

The notice enumerates the reasons why the instant IBRS Competitive Contract allegedly fits within the Mail Classification Schedule language for IBRS Competitive Contract 3. The Postal Service identifies general contract terms that distinguish the instant contract from the IBRS 3 baseline contract, such as (1) a revised sentence in Article 15 stating that the Postal Service may be required to file information in connection with the contract in other Commission dockets; and (2) an additional Article 30 concerning intellectual property, co-branding, and licensing. *Id.* at 5. The Postal Service states that the differences affect neither the fundamental service that the Postal Service is offering nor the fundamental structure of the contract. *Id.*

The Postal Service concludes that its filing demonstrates that the new IBRS contract complies with the requirements of 39 U.S.C. 3633 and is functionally equivalent to the IBRS 3 baseline contract filed in Docket Nos. MC2011–21 and CP2011–59. *Id.* at 6. Therefore, it requests that the instant contract be included within the IBRS Competitive Contract 3 (MC2011–21) product. *Id.*

## II. Notice of Filing

The Commission establishes Docket No. CP2012–17 for consideration of matters related to the contract identified in the Postal Service's notice.

Interested persons may submit comments on whether the Postal Service's contract is consistent with the policies of 39 U.S.C. 3633 and 39 CFR 3015.5. Comments are due no later than March 6, 2012. The public portions of this filing 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 the captioned proceeding.

## III. Ordering Paragraphs

*It is ordered:*

1. The Commission establishes Docket No. CP2012–17 for consideration of matters raised by the Postal Service's notice.

2. Comments by interested persons in this proceeding are due no later than March 6, 2012.

3. Pursuant to 39 U.S.C. 505, James F. Callow is appointed to serve as the officer of the Commission (Public Representative) to represent the interests of the general public in this proceeding.

4. The Secretary shall arrange for publication of this order in the **Federal Register**.

By the Commission.

**Shoshana M. Grove,**

*Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 2012–5161 Filed 3–1–12; 8:45 am]

**BILLING P**

## POSTAL REGULATORY COMMISSION

### Notice of Sunshine Act Meetings

**DATES:** *Time and Date:* Wednesday, March 14, 2012, at 11 a.m.

**PLACE:** Commission Hearing Room, 901 New York Avenue NW., Suite 200, Washington, DC 20268–0001.

**STATUS:** Part of this meeting will be open to the public. The rest of the meeting will be closed to the public. The open session will be audiocast. The audiocast may be accessed via the Commission's Web site at <http://www.prc.gov>. A period for public comment will be offered following consideration of the last numbered item in the open session.

**MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED:** The agenda for the Commission's March 14, 2012 meeting includes the items identified below.

**PORTIONS OPEN TO THE PUBLIC:** 1. Report on legislative activities.

2. Report on status of Commission dockets.

3. Report from the Office of the Secretary and Administration.

4. Report on analytical tools used by Commission staff.

5. Report on international activities and inbound international mail revenues and costs.

6. Strategic overview of the military postal service.

Chairman's public comment period.

### **PORTION CLOSED TO THE PUBLIC:**

7. Discussion of pending litigation.

### **CONTACT PERSON FOR MORE INFORMATION:**

Stephen L. Sharfman, General Counsel, Postal Regulatory Commission, 901 New York Avenue NW., Suite 200, Washington, DC 20268–0001, at 202–789–6820 (for agenda-related inquiries) and Shoshana M. Grove, Secretary of the Commission, at 202–789–6800 or [shoshana.grove@prc.gov](mailto:shoshana.grove@prc.gov) (for inquiries related to meeting location, access for handicapped or disabled persons, the audiocast, or similar matters).

By the Commission.

Dated: February 29, 2012.

**Shoshana M. Grove,**

*Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 2012–5294 Filed 2–29–12; 4:15 pm]

**BILLING CODE 7710–FW–P**

## PRESIDIO TRUST

### Notice of Public Meeting

**AGENCY:** The Presidio Trust.

**ACTION:** Notice of Public Meeting.

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with § 103(c)(6) of the Presidio Trust Act, 16 U.S.C. 460bb appendix, and in accordance with the Presidio Trust's bylaws, notice is hereby given that a public meeting of the Presidio Trust Board of Directors will be held commencing 6:30 p.m. on Wednesday, March 14, 2012, at the Golden Gate Club, 135 Fisher Loop, Presidio of San Francisco, California. The Presidio Trust was created by Congress in 1996 to manage approximately eighty percent of the former U.S. Army base known as the Presidio, in San Francisco, California.

The purposes of this meeting are to take action on the minutes of a previous Board meeting, to take action on forming Board Committees, to provide the Chairperson's report, to provide the Executive Director's report, to provide partners' reports, to provide program updates, and to receive public comment on other matters in accordance with the Trust's Public Outreach Policy.

Individuals requiring special accommodation at this meeting, such as