clarified the application, did not expand the scope of the application as originally noticed, and did not change the staff's original proposed no significant hazards consideration determination as published in the **Federal Register**.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated July 20, 2007.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 2nd day of August 2007.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Catherine Haney,

Director, Division of Operating Reactor Licensing, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. E7–15459 Filed 8–13–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Notice of Availability of the Final License Renewal Interim Staff Guidance LR–ISG–2006–03: Staff Guidance for Preparing Severe Accident Mitigation Alternatives Analyses

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC).

ACTION: Notice of Availability.

SUMMARY: NRC is issuing its Final License Renewal Interim Staff Guidance LR–ISG–2006–03 for preparing severe accident mitigation alternatives (SAMA) analyses. This LR–ISG recommends that applicants for license renewal use the Guidance Document Nuclear Energy Institute 05–01, Revision A, (ADAMS Accession No. ML060530203) when preparing their SAMA analyses. The NRC staff issues LR–ISGs to facilitate timely implementation of the license renewal rule and to review activities associated with a license renewal application. The NRC staff will also incorporate the approved LR–ISG into the next revision of Supplement 1 to Regulatory Guide 4.2, ''Preparation of Supplemental Environmental Reports for Applications to Renew Nuclear Power Plant Operating Licenses.''

ADDRESSES: The NRC maintains an Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS), which provides text and image files of NRC's public documents. These documents may be accessed through the NRC's Public Electronic Reading Room on the Internet 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 Public Document Room (PDR) reference staff at 1–800–397–4209, 301–415–4737, or by e-mail at *pdr@nrc.gov.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Richard L. Emch, Jr., Senior Project Manager, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001; telephone 301–415–1590 or by e-mail at *rle@nrc.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Attachment 1 to this **Federal Register** notice, entitled *Staff Position and Rationale for the Final License Renewal Interim Staff Guidance LR–ISG–2006–03: Staff Guidance for Preparing Severe Accident Mitigation Alternatives (SAMA)* Analyses contains the NRC staff's rationale for publishing the Final LR–ISG–2006–03. Attachment 2 to this **Federal Register** notice, entitled *Proposed License Renewal Interim Staff Guidance LR–ISG–2006–03: Staff Guidance for Preparing Severe Accident Mitigation Alternatives (SAMA) Analyses,* contains the guidance for preparing SAMA analyses related to license renewal applications. The NRC staff approves this LR–ISG for NRC and industry use. The NRC staff will also incorporate the approved LR–ISG into the next revision of Supplement 1 to Regulatory Guide 4.2, ''Preparation of Supplemental Environmental Reports for Applications to Renew Nuclear Power Plant Operating Licenses.''

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 2nd day of August 2007.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Pao-Tsin Kuo,

Director, Division of License Renewal, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

Attachment 1—Staff Position and Rationale for the Final License Renewal Interim Staff Guidance LR–ISG–2006–03: Staff Guidance for Preparing Severe Accident Mitigation Alternatives Analyses

Staff Position: The NRC staff recommends that applicants for license renewal follow the guidance provided in Nuclear Energy Institute (NEI) 05–01, ''Severe Accident Mitigation Alternatives (SAMA) Analysis—Guidance Document,'' Revision A, when preparing their SAMA analyses.

Rationale: The NEI developed a generic Guidance Document NEI 05–01, Revision A, to help clarify the NRC staff's expectations regarding the information that needs to be included in SAMA analyses. The NRC staff reviewed and concluded that NEI 05–01, Revision A, describes existing NRC regulations and facilitates complete preparation of SAMA analysis submittals. The staff finds that utilization of the guidance provided in NEI 05–01, Revision A, will result in improved quality in SAMA analyses and a reduction in the number of requests for additional information.

Attachment 2—Final License Renewal Interim Staff Guidance LR–ISG–2006–03: Staff Guidance for Preparing Severe Accident Mitigation Alternatives Analyses

Introduction

A severe accident mitigation alternatives (SAMA) analyses is required as part of a license renewal application, if a SAMA analysis has not already been performed for the plant and reviewed by the NRC staff. SAMA analyses have been performed and submitted to the NRC for all applications for license renewal received by the staff thus far. Therefore, this LR–ISG is being recommended as guidance consistent with our goal to more effectively and efficiently resolve license renewal issues identified by the staff or the industry.

Background and Discussion

After receiving extensive requests for additional information regarding the SAMA analyses, several applicants for license renewal concluded that they did not fully understand the kind of information that the NRC staff was expecting to see in SAMA analyses.

The Nuclear Energy Institute (NEI) developed a generic guidance document to help clarify the NRC staff's expectations regarding the information that should be submitted in SAMA analyses. On April 8, 2005, NEI submitted NEI 05–01, ''Severe Accident Mitigation Alternatives (SAMA) Analysis—Guidance Document.'' The NRC staff reviewed this guidance document, and by letter, dated July 12, 2005, provided comments on NEI 05–01. The NRC staff's comments were discussed during a public meeting between NEI and NRC on July 21, 2005.

On February 17, 2006, NEI submitted its NEI 05–01, Revision A, dated November 2005. The NRC staff reviewed and concluded that this version fully resolved the NRC staff's comments. In addition, the NRC staff concluded that NEI 05–01, Revision A, describes existing NRC regulations, and facilitates complete preparation of SAMA analysis submittals.

Some applicants for license renewal have submitted SAMA analyses using the guidance provided in NEI 05–01, Revision A. The NRC staff found improved quality in the submitted SAMA analyses and a reduction in the

number of requests for additional information for those applications that followed the guidance provided in NEI 05–01, Revision A.

Recommended Action

The staff is recommending that applicants for license renewal follow the guidance provided in NEI 05–01, Revision A, when preparing their SAMA analyses. The staff finds that NEI 05–01, Revision A, describes existing NRC regulations, and facilitates complete preparation of SAMA analysis submittals.

Although this proposed LR–ISG does not convey a change in the NRC's regulations or how they are interpreted, it is being provided to facilitate complete preparation of future SAMA analysis submittals in support of applications for license renewal. The NRC staff plans to incorporate the guidance provided in NEI 05–01, Revision A, into a future update of Supplement 1 to Regulatory Guide 4.2, ''Preparation of Supplemental Environmental Reports for Applications to Renew Nuclear Power Plant Operating Licenses.'' This LR–ISG provides a clarification of existing guidance with no additional requirements. For those that are interested in reviewing NEI 05–01, Revision A, the Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS) Accession Number is ML060530203.

[FR Doc. E7–15926 Filed 8–13–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

POSTAL REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. MC2007–4; Order No. 23]

Negotiated Service Agreement

AGENCY: Postal Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Notice and order.

SUMMARY: This document establishes a docket for consideration of the Postal Service's request for approval of contract rates with The Bradford Group. It identifies key elements of the proposed agreement, which involves Standard Mail letters and flats rates, and addresses preliminary procedural matters.

DATES: 1. August 24, 2007: Deadline for intervention and responses to limitation of issues. 2. August 28, 2007: Prehearing conference, 11 a.m. in the Commission's hearing room.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments electronically via the Commission's Filing Online system at *http://www.prc.gov.*

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

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On August 3, 2007, the United States Postal Service filed a request seeking a recommended decision from the Postal Regulatory Commission approving a Negotiated Service Agreement (NSA) with The Bradford Group.[1] The NSA is proffered as functionally equivalent to the Bookspan NSA recommended by the Commission in Docket No. MC2005–3 (baseline agreement). [70 FR 42602.] The Request, which includes six attachments, was filed pursuant to chapter 36 of title 39, United States Code.[2]

The Postal Service has identified The Bradford Group, along with itself, as parties to the NSA. This identification serves as notice of intervention by The Bradford Group. It also indicates that The Bradford Group shall be considered a co-proponent, procedurally and substantially, of the Postal Service's Request during the Commission's review of the NSA. Rule 191(b) [39 CFR 3001.191(b).] An appropriate Notice of The Bradford Group of Appearance and Filing of Testimony as Co-Proponent, August 3, 2007, has been filed.

In support of the direct case, the Postal Service has filed Direct Testimony of Broderick A. Parr on Behalf of the United States Postal Service, August 3, 2007 (USPS–T–1) and library reference USPS–LR–L–1, MC2004–3 Opinion and Further Recommended Decision Analysis for The Bradford Group NSA. The Bradford Group has separately filed direct testimonies of Steve Gustafson (BG–T–1) and Wendy Ring (BG–T–2) both on behalf of The Bradford Group, August 3, 2007. The Postal Service has reviewed The Bradford Group testimony and, in accordance with rule 192(b) [39 CFR 3001.192(b)], states that such testimony may be relied upon in presentation of the Postal Service's direct case. USPS–T–1 at 3.

The Request relies on record testimony entered in the baseline docket. This material is identified in the Postal Service's Compliance Statement, Request Attachment E.

Requests that are proffered as functionally equivalent to baseline NSAs are handled expeditiously, until a final determination has been made as to their proper status. The Postal Service's Compliance Statement, Request Attachment E, is noteworthy in that it provides valuable information to facilitate rapid review of the Request to aid participants in evaluating whether or not the procedural path suggested by the Postal Service is appropriate.

The Postal Service submitted several contemporaneous related filings with its Request. The Postal Service has filed a proposal for limitation of issues in this docket.[3] Rule 196(a)(6) [39 CFR 3001.196(a)(6)]. The proposal identifies issues that were previously decided in the baseline docket, and key issues that are unique to the instant Request.

Rule 196(b) [39 CFR 3001.196(b)] requires the Postal Service to provide written notice of its Request, either by hand delivery or by First Class Mail, to all participants of the baseline docket. This requirement provides additional time, due to an abbreviated intervention period, for the most likely participants to decide whether or not to intervene. A copy of the Postal Service's notice was filed with the Commission on August 3, 2007.[4]

The Request, accompanying testimonies of witnesses Parr (USPS–T–1), Gustafson (BG–T–1), and Ring (BG–T–2), the baseline agreement, and other related material can be accessed electronically, via the Internet, on the Commission's Web site (*http://www.prc.gov*).

I. Background: Baseline Bookspan Negotiated Service Agreement, Docket No. MC2005–3

If a request predicated on a NSA is found to be functionally equivalent to a previously recommended, and currently in effect, NSA, it may be afforded accelerated review. Rule 196 [39 CFR 3001.196]. The Postal Service asserts that the NSA in the instant Request is functionally equivalent to the now in effect Bookspan NSA recommended by the Commission in Docket No. MC2005–

[1] Request of the United States Postal Service for a Recommended Decision on Classifications and Rates to Implement a Functionally Equivalent Negotiated Service Agreement with Bradford Group, August 3, 2007 (Request).

[2] Attachments A and B to the Request contain proposed changes to the Domestic Mail Classification Schedule and associated rate schedules; Attachment C is a certification required by Commission rule 193(i) specifying that the cost statements and supporting data submitted by the Postal Service, which purport to reflect the books of the Postal Service, accurately set forth the results shown by such books; Attachment D is an index of testimony and exhibits; Attachment E is a compliance statement addressing satisfaction of various filing requirements; and Attachment F is a copy of the Negotiated Service Agreement.

[3] United States Postal Service Proposal for Limitation of Issues, August 3, 2007.

[4] Notice of the United States Postal Service Concerning the Filing of a Request for a Recommended Decision on a Functionally Equivalent Negotiated Service Agreement, August 3, 2007.