

Administrative Judge Ivan Smith,
Presiding Officer, Atomic Safety and
Licensing Board Panel, U.S. Nuclear
Regulatory Commission, Washington,
D.C. 20555-0001

Dr. Richard F. Cole, Special Assistant,
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board
Panel, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory
Commission, Washington, D.C.
20555-0001

Issued at Rockville, Maryland, this 1st day
of October 2001.

G. Paul Bollwerk III,

*Chief Administrative Judge, Atomic Safety
and Licensing Board Panel.*

[FR Doc. 01-25189 Filed 10-5-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 40-8767; License No. SUC-
1380]

Removal of the Lake City Army Ammunition Plant From the Site Decommissioning Management Plan

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory
Commission.

ACTION: Notice of removal from the site
decommissioning management plan.

This notice is to inform the public
that the United States Nuclear
Regulatory Commission (NRC) is
removing the Lake City Army
Ammunition Plant (LCAAP) from the
Site Decommissioning Management
Plan (SDMP). The SDMP is a program,
created by the Commission, to ensure
that the NRC focuses special attention
on certain sites to ensure timely
decommissioning of those sites. LCAAP
is one of the sites included in the
SDMP.

LCAAP is located in Independence,
Missouri. The U.S. Department of the
Army (the licensee) is the holder of NRC
Materials License SUC-1380, which
covers a number of facilities including
LCAAP. LCAAP is a facility that was
used for the production and testing of
munitions containing depleted uranium
(DU). LCAAP, in addition to being
included in NRC's SDMP, is also
included in the U.S. Environmental
Protection Agency's (EPA's) Superfund
Program, the National Contingency
Plan.

The licensee recently completed
remediation of both the LCAAP 600-
Yard Bullet Catcher and the DU
contaminated portion of Building 3A.
Remediation of the remaining DU
contaminated areas will not be
completed for a number of years
because of both Resource Conservation
and Recovery Act related issues and the

continuing use of the LCAAP firing
range. EPA, the Missouri Department of
Natural Resources (MDNR), NRC, and
the licensee agreed that DU remediation
for the remaining portions of LCAAP
could be regulated under the provisions
of Comprehensive Environmental
Response, Compensation, and Liability
Act, the LCAAP Federal Facility
Agreement, and Executive Order 12580.
Both EPA and MDNR will provide
regulatory oversight of the DU
remediation during this period. NRC
Material License SUC-1380 will
continue to cover LCAAP until DU
contamination is remediated. Once a
determination is made that the
remainder of the DU contamination has
been remediated, NRC will review the
documentation supporting that
determination. In addition, NRC may
perform a confirmatory survey. Once
NRC agrees with that determination,
NRC will remove LCAAP from NRC
Materials License SUC-1380. Based on
the agreement between the agencies and
successful remediation of both the
LCAAP 600-Yard Bullet Catcher and
Building 3A, NRC has determined that
LCAAP no longer requires the special
attention associated with the SDMP.
Therefore, LCAAP is being removed
from the SDMP.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 1st day
of October 2001.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Stewart Brown,

*Facilities Decommissioning Section,
Decommissioning Branch, Division of Waste
Management, Office of Nuclear Material
Safety and Safeguards.*

[FR Doc. 01-25187 Filed 10-5-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Draft Regulatory Guide; Issuance, Availability

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission
has issued for public comment a draft of
a new guide in its Regulatory Guide
Series. This series has been developed
to describe and make available to the
public such information as methods
acceptable to the NRC staff for
implementing specific parts of the
NRC's regulations, techniques used by
the staff in evaluating specific problems
or postulated accidents, and data
needed by the staff in its review of
applications for permits and licenses.

The draft guide, temporarily
identified by its task number, DG-1077
(which should be mentioned in all
correspondence concerning this draft
guide), is "Guidelines for

Environmental Qualification of
Microprocessor-Based Equipment
Important to Safety in Nuclear Power
Plants." This draft guide is being
developed to provide guidance to
licensees and applicants on methods
acceptable to the NRC staff for
evaluating the environmental
qualification procedures for
microprocessor-based equipment that is
important to safety for service in nuclear
power plants.

This draft guide has not received
complete staff approval and does not
represent an official NRC staff position.

Comments may be accompanied by
relevant information or supporting data.
Written comments may be submitted to
the Rules and Directives Branch, Office
of Administration, U.S. Nuclear
Regulatory Commission, Washington,
DC 20555. Copies of comments received
may be examined at the NRC Public
Document Room, 11555 Rockville Pike,
Rockville, MD. Comments will be most
helpful if received by December 14,
2001.

You may also provide comments via
the NRC's interactive rulemaking web
site through the NRC home page ([http://
www.nrc.gov](http://www.nrc.gov)). This site provides the
ability to upload comments as files (any
format) if your web browser supports
that function. For information about the
interactive rulemaking web site, contact
Ms. Carol Gallagher, (301) 415-5905; e-
mail cag@nrc.gov. For information about
the draft guide and the related
documents, contact Ms. C. Antonescu at
(301)415-6792; e-mail cea1@nrc.gov.

Although a time limit is given for
comments on this draft guide,
comments and suggestions in
connection with items for inclusion in
guides currently being developed or
improvements in all published guides
are encouraged at any time.

Regulatory guides are available for
inspection at the NRC's Public
Document Room, 11555 Rockville Pike,
Rockville, MD; the PDR's mailing
address is USNRC PDR, Washington, DC
20555; telephone (301) 415-4737 or
(800) 397-4205; fax (301) 415-3548;
email pdr@nrc.gov. Requests for single
copies of draft or final guides (which
may be reproduced) or for placement on
an automatic distribution list for single
copies of future draft guides in specific
divisions should be made in writing to
the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory
Commission, Washington, DC 20555,
Attention: Reproduction and
Distribution Services Section; or by e-
mail to distribution@nrc.gov; or by fax
to (301) 415-2289. Telephone requests
cannot be accommodated. Regulatory
guides are not copyrighted, and

Commission approval is not required to reproduce them.

(5 U.S.C. 552(a))

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 25th day of September 2001.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Michael E. Mayfield,

*Director, Division of Engineering Technology,
Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research.*

[FR Doc. 01-25188 Filed 10-5-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

POSTAL SERVICE

Request for Comments on an Outline for Discussion: Concepts for Postal Transformation

AGENCY: Postal Service.

ACTION: Request for comments.

SUMMARY: At the request of Congress and the Comptroller General, the Postal Service is preparing a comprehensive plan for the structural transformation of the postal system to meet the challenges of serving the American public through the remainder of this decade. The Comprehensive Transformation Plan will be presented to Congress and the General Accounting Office on December 31, 2001. As an interim step, the Postal Service has issued a paper entitled *An Outline for Discussion: Concepts for Postal Transformation*. This *Outline for Discussion* describes the framework and process that we are using to prepare the plan. We invite comments and suggestions from all interested parties to help us to complete a plan that serves the public interest and advances public engagement in shaping the future of America's postal system.

DATES: Comments must be received by November 1, 2001.

ADDRESSES: Those responding are encouraged to email their comments to transformation@email.usps.gov. Those wishing to send written comments should mail them to Julie S. Moore, Executive Director, Office of Transformation, Strategic Planning, Room 4011, United States Postal Service Headquarters, 475 L'Enfant Plaza, SW, Washington, DC 20260-1520.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Paul Van Coverden (202) 268-8130.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On April 4, 2001, David M. Walker, Comptroller General of the United States, advised the House of Representatives Committee on Government Reform that the Postal Service "faces major challenges that collectively call for a structural

transformation if it is to remain viable in the 21st century." He called on the Postal Service, in conjunction with all stakeholders, to prepare a comprehensive plan identifying "the actions needed to address the Service's financial, operational, and human capital challenges and establish a time frame and specify key milestones for achieving positive results." On April 24, 2001, Mr. Bernard L. Ungar, Director, Physical Infrastructure Issues, U.S. General Accounting Office, wrote to former Postmaster General William J. Henderson formally recommending that the Postal Service develop such a comprehensive plan. On June 14, 2001, following Mr. Walker's testimony before the Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs on May 15, 2001, the chair and ranking members of the committee and its Postal Oversight Subcommittee wrote to Postmaster General John E. Potter endorsing the Comptroller General's recommendation and asking for the plan by the end of calendar year 2001. On July 25, 2001, Postmaster General Potter advised Congress that the Postal Service agreed to prepare a Comprehensive Transformation Plan, as requested.

Outline for Discussion: Concepts for Postal Transformation

As an interim step in the process, on September 30, 2001, the Postal Service provided to Congress and the Comptroller General a paper entitled *Outline for Discussion: Concepts for Postal Transformation*. This paper is available on the Postal Service's public Web site at www.usps.com/strategicdirection or at www.usps.com keyword: transformation. The *Outline for Discussion* describes in greater detail the background and purpose of the Comprehensive Transformation Plan and the process that the Postal Service is using to develop the plan, including extensive outreach to interested stakeholders. After preliminary, informal discussion with many of those who have taken part in the public debate over postal reform in recent years, the *Outline for Discussion* frames the guiding question on the table as follows: *To best serve the needs of the American people and the American economy in the 21st century, what should America's postal system look like (or transform to) by year 2010?*

The *Outline for Discussion* describes the fundamental obstacle faced by the current postal system that is a clash between service and economics. As a nation, how can we best structure our postal system in the years ahead so that we pay what we are willing to pay for as much service as we can get?

The Postal Service has a mission to serve every address in a growing nation. Its networks, with associated costs, are constantly expanding to accommodate new deliveries, adding new facilities and delivery routes roughly equivalent to those for a city the size of Chicago, year after year. Until recently, during a long period of strong economic expansion in the United States, the Postal Service benefited from growing mail volumes, with increasing postage revenue sufficient to pay for the expanding network, and kept postage rates in line with inflation. Over the past year, though, as the economy has slowed, mail volume and revenue have also suffered. The Postal Service has improved its productivity during this period at an unprecedented rate, but lacks many of the tools that private businesses have to deal with financial setbacks. In particular, its service responsibilities prevent abandoning unprofitable locations or new addresses.

To break even, the Postal Service currently must earn, on average, about \$1.85 per delivery address every day to cover the entire cost of the postal system. The *Outline for Discussion* explains that this figure may well rise by one third to \$2.46 by 2010. If the robust pattern of mail volume growth in past years should return, then this may not be a problem. But changes in competition and technology suggest that, while a system for delivery of hard-copy mail will still be important, the volume of mail in the system may not grow enough in the future to keep pace with the growth in infrastructure required to serve an ever-growing number of addresses.

By all indications, success in 21st century markets will belong to those nimble enough to adjust rapidly and continuously, to keep pace with advancing technology and changes in business methods and customer demand. Yet the Postal Service today is organized under an aging statutory framework designed to favor and protect the status quo and to route all change through slow, deliberative processes seeking a high level of consensus among disparate interests.

Solicitation of Comments

The United States Postal Service solicits comments on the *Outline for Discussion* that is posted on the Postal Service's Strategic Direction web page at: www.usps.com/strategicdirection or at www.usps.com keyword: transformation.

Comments would be welcome on the following core question:

- *To best serve the needs of the American people and the American*