

publicly available, by any of the following methods:

- *Federal Rulemaking Web site*: Go to <http://www.regulations.gov> and search for Docket ID NRC–2013–0136.

- *NRC's Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS)*: You may access publicly-available documents online in the NRC Library at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html>. To begin the search, select “ADAMS Public Documents” and then select “Begin Web-based ADAMS Search.” For problems with ADAMS, please contact the NRC's Public Document Room (PDR) reference staff at 1–800–397–4209, 301–415–4737, or by email to [pdr.resource@nrc.gov](mailto:pdr.resource@nrc.gov). The ADAMS accession number for each document referenced in this notice (if that document is available in ADAMS) is provided the first time that a document is referenced. The draft report is available electronically in ADAMS under Accession No. ML13133A132.

- *NRC's PDR*: You may examine and purchase copies of public documents at the NRC's PDR, Room O1–F21, One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland 20852.

#### B. Submitting Comments

Please include Docket ID NRC–2013–0136 in the subject line of your comment submission, in order to ensure that the NRC is able to make your comment submission available to the public in this docket.

The NRC cautions you not to include identifying or contact information that you do not want to be publicly disclosed in your comment submission. The NRC will post all comment submissions at <http://www.regulations.gov> as well as enter the comment submissions into ADAMS. The NRC does not routinely edit comment submissions to remove identifying or contact information.

If you are requesting or aggregating comments from other persons for submission to the NRC, then you should inform those persons not to include identifying or contact information that they do not want to be publicly disclosed in their comment submission. Your request should state that the NRC does not routinely edit comment submissions to remove such information before making the comment submissions available to the public or entering the comment submissions into ADAMS.

## II. Discussion

The draft report documents a consequence study that continues the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's examination of the risks and

consequences of postulated spent fuel pool accidents. The purpose of this study is to examine if faster removal of spent reactor fuel from pools to dry cask storage significantly reduces risks to public health and safety. Based on previous research showing earthquakes present the dominant risk for spent fuel pools, the draft study evaluated how a potential pool leakage from an unlikely severe earthquake might cause the used fuel to overheat and release radioactive material to the environment. A spent fuel pool's robust concrete structure and stainless steel liner keep more than 20 feet of water above the spent fuel stored within it ensuring ample cooling for the spent fuel and adequate radiation shielding for plant personnel. This study compared potential accident consequences from a pool nearly filled with spent fuel and a pool in which fuel that has cooled sufficiently has been removed at a selected U.S. Mark I boiling-water reactor spent fuel pool.

The staff first evaluated whether a severe, though unlikely, earthquake would damage the spent fuel pool to the point of leaking. In order to assess the consequences that might result from a spent fuel pool leak, the study assumed seismic forces greater than the maximum earthquake reasonably expected to occur at the reference plant location. The NRC expects that the ground motion used in this study is more challenging for the spent fuel pool structure than that experienced at the Fukushima Dai-ichi nuclear power plant from the earthquake that occurred off the coast of Japan on March 11, 2011. That earthquake did not result in any spent fuel pool leaks. In the small likelihood that such an extreme earthquake caused a leak, the staff then analyzed how the spent fuel could overheat and potentially release radioactive material into the environment. Finally, the staff analyzed what the public health and environmental effects of a radiological release would be in the area surrounding the plant.

This draft study's results for the specific reference plant and earthquake analyzed are consistent with past studies' conclusions that spent fuel pools are likely to withstand severe earthquakes without leaking. The draft study shows the likelihood of a radiological release from the spent fuel after the analyzed severe earthquake at the reference plant to be very low. The regulatory analysis for this study indicates that expediting movement of spent fuel from the pool does not provide a substantial safety enhancement for the reference plant. The NRC will use this study in a

broader regulatory analysis of the spent fuel pools at all U.S. operating nuclear reactors as part of its Japan Lessons-Learned activities. The NRC continues to believe, based on this study and previous studies that spent fuel pools provide adequate protection of public health and safety.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 24th day of June, 2013.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Richard Lee,**

*Chief, Fuel and Source Term Code Development Branch, Division of Systems Analysis, Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research.*

[FR Doc. 2013–15840 Filed 7–1–13; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7590-01-P**

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[NRC–2013–0001]

### Sunshine Act Meeting

**AGENCY HOLDING THE MEETINGS:** Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**DATE:** Weeks of July 1, 8, 15, 22, 29, August 5, 2013.

**PLACE:** Commissioners' Conference Room, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland.

**STATUS:** Public and Closed.

#### Week of July 1, 2013

There are no meetings scheduled for the week of July 1, 2013.

#### Week of July 8, 2013—Tentative

*Tuesday, July 9, 2013*

9:30 a.m. Briefing on Security Issues (Closed—Ex. 1).

*Wednesday, July 10, 2013*

9:00 a.m. Briefing on NRC International Activities (Part 1) (Public Meeting) (Contact: Karen Henderson, 301–415–0202).

This meeting will be webcast live at the Web address—[www.nrc.gov](http://www.nrc.gov).

10:30 a.m. Briefing on NRC International Activities (Part 2) (Closed—Ex. 1 & 9) (Contact: Karen Henderson, 301–415–0202)

*Thursday, July 11, 2013*

9:30 a.m. Meeting with the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards (ACRS) (Public Meeting) (Contact: Ed Hackett, 301–415–7360).

This meeting will be webcast live at the Web address—[www.nrc.gov](http://www.nrc.gov).

#### Week of July 15, 2013—Tentative

There are no meetings scheduled for the week of July 15, 2013.

**Week of July 22, 2013—Tentative**

There are no meetings scheduled for the week of July 22, 2013.

**Week of July 29, 2013—Tentative**

There are no meetings scheduled for the week of July 29, 2013.

**Week of August 5, 2013—Tentative**

There are no meetings scheduled for the week of August 5, 2013.

\* \* \* \* \*

\*The schedule for Commission meetings is subject to change on short notice. To verify the status of meetings, call (recording)—301-415-1292.

Contact person for more information: Rochelle Baval, 301-415-1651.

\* \* \* \* \*

The NRC Commission Meeting Schedule can be found on the Internet at: <http://www.nrc.gov/public-involve/public-meetings/schedule.html>.

\* \* \* \* \*

The NRC provides reasonable accommodation to individuals with disabilities where appropriate. If you need a reasonable accommodation to participate in these public meetings, or need this meeting notice or the transcript or other information from the public meetings in another format (e.g. braille, large print), please notify Kimberly Meyer, NRC Disability Program Manager, at 301-287-0727, or by email at [kimberly.meyer-chambers@nrc.gov](mailto:kimberly.meyer-chambers@nrc.gov). Determinations on requests for reasonable accommodation will be made on a case-by-case basis.

\* \* \* \* \*

This notice is distributed electronically to subscribers. If you no longer wish to receive it, or would like to be added to the distribution, please contact the Office of the Secretary, Washington, DC 20555 (301-415-1969), or send an email to [darlene.wright@nrc.gov](mailto:darlene.wright@nrc.gov).

Dated: June 27, 2013.

**Rochelle C. Baval,**

*Policy Coordinator, Office of the Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 2013-15976 Filed 6-28-13; 4:15 pm]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

**POSTAL REGULATORY COMMISSION**

[Docket Nos. MC2013-54 and CP2013-70; Order No. 1764]

**New Postal Product**

**AGENCY:** Postal Regulatory Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The Commission is noticing a recently-filed Postal Service request to add a new product to the competitive

product list. This document invites public comments on the request and addresses several related procedural steps.

**DATES:** *Comments are due:* July 5, 2013.

**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.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Stephen L. Sharfman, General Counsel, 202-789-6820.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

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

**I. Introduction**

In accordance with 39 U.S.C. 3642 and 39 CFR 3020.30 *et seq.*, the Postal Service filed a request and associated supporting information to add Priority Mail Contract 60 to the competitive product list.<sup>1</sup> It asserts that Priority Mail Contract 60 is a competitive product “not of general applicability” within the meaning of 39 U.S.C. 3632(b)(3). Request at 1. The Request has been assigned Docket No. MC2013-54. The Postal Service contemporaneously filed a redacted contract related to the proposed new product under 39 U.S.C. 3632(b)(3) and 39 CFR 3015.5. *Id.* Attachment B. The instant contract has been assigned Docket No. CP2013-70.

*Request.* To support its Request, the Postal Service filed six attachments as follows:

- Attachment A—a redacted copy of Governors’ Decision No. 11-6, authorizing the new product;
- Attachment B—a redacted copy of the contract;
- Attachment C—proposed changes to the Mail Classification Schedule competitive product list with the addition underlined;
- Attachment D—a Statement of Supporting Justification as required by 39 CFR 3020.32;
- Attachment E—a certification of compliance with 39 U.S.C. 3633(a); and

<sup>1</sup> Request of the United States Postal Service to Add Priority Mail Contract 60 to Competitive Product List and Notice of Filing (Under Seal) of Unredacted Governors’ Decision, Contract, and Supporting Data, June 25, 2013 (Request).

- Attachment F—an application for non-public treatment of materials to maintain redacted portions of the contract and related financial information under seal.

In the Statement of Supporting Justification, Dennis R. Nicoski, Manager, Field Sales Strategy and Contracts, asserts that the contract will cover its attributable costs and increase contribution toward the requisite 5.5 percent of the Postal Service’s total institutional costs. *Id.* Attachment D at 1. Mr. Nicoski contends that there will be no issue of market dominant products subsidizing competitive products as a result of this contract. *Id.*

*Related contract.* The Postal Service included a redacted version of the related contract with the Request. *Id.* Attachment B. The contract is scheduled to become effective one business day after the Commission issues all necessary regulatory approval. *Id.* at 3. The contract will expire 3 years from the effective date unless, among other things, either party terminates the agreement upon 30 days’ written notice to the other party. *Id.* The contract also allows two 90-day extensions of the agreement if the preparation of a successor agreement is active and the Commission is notified. *Id.* The Postal Service represents that the contract is consistent with 39 U.S.C. 3633(a). *Id.* Attachment E.

The Postal Service filed much of the supporting materials, including the related contract, under seal. *Id.* Attachment F. It maintains that the redacted portions of the Governors’ Decision, contract, customer-identifying information, and related financial information should remain confidential. *Id.* at 3. This information includes the price structure, underlying costs and assumptions, pricing formulas, information relevant to the customer’s mailing profile, and cost coverage projections. *Id.* The Postal Service asks the Commission to protect customer-identifying information from public disclosure indefinitely. *Id.* at 7.

**II. Notice of Filings**

The Commission establishes Docket Nos. MC2013-54 and CP2013-70 to consider the Request pertaining to the proposed Priority Mail Contract 60 product and the related contract, respectively.

Interested persons may submit comments on whether the Postal Service’s filings in the captioned dockets are consistent with the policies of 39 U.S.C. 3632, 3633, or 3642, 39 CFR 3015.5, and 39 CFR part 3020, subpart B. Comments are due no later than July 5, 2013. The public portions of these