collection are covered in § 4.331 of title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations (10 CFR) Compliance Reviews, which indicates that the NRC may conduct compliance reviews and Pre-Award reviews of recipients or use other similar procedures that will permit it to investigate and correct violations of the act and these regulations. The NRC may conduct these reviews even in absence of a complaint against a recipient. The reviews may be as comprehensive as necessary to determine whether a violation of these regulations has occurred.

6. Who will be required or asked to respond: Recipients of Federal Financial Assistance provided by the NRC (including Educational Institutions, Other Nonprofit Organizations receiving Federal Assistance, and Agreement States).

7. The estimated number of annual responses: 600.

8. The estimated number of annual respondents: 200.

9. An estimate of the total number of hours needed annually to comply with the information collection requirement or request: 3,600 (3,000 hrs. for reporting (5 hrs. per respondent) and 600 hrs. for recordkeeping (3 hrs. per record keeper).


Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 12th day of October 2017.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

David Cullison,
NRC Clearance Officer, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 2017–22448 Filed 10–16–17; 8:45 am]
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SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION section of this document.

For further information contact:

I. Obtaining Information and Submitting Comments

A. Obtaining Information

Please refer to Docket ID NRC–2011–0012 when contacting the NRC about the availability of information for this action. You may obtain publicly-available information related to this action by any of the following methods:

- Federal Rulemaking Web site: Go to http://www.regulations.gov and search for Docket ID NRC–2011–0012. Address questions about NRC dockets to Carol Gallagher; telephone: 301–415–3463; email: Carol.Gallagher@nrc.gov. For technical questions contact the individual listed in the FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT section of this document.

- Email comments to: Rulemaking.Comments@nrc.gov. If you do not receive an automatic email reply confirming receipt, then contact us at 301–415–1677.

- Mail comments to: Secretary, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission at 301–415–1101.

- Fax comments to: Secretary, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001, ATTN: Rulemakings and Adjudications Staff.

- Hand deliver comments to: 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland 20852, between 7:30 a.m. and 4:15 p.m. (Eastern Time) Federal workdays; telephone: 301–415–1677.

For additional direction on obtaining information and submitting comments, see “Obtaining Information and Submitting Comments” in the
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. Background

The NRC’s licensing requirements for the disposal of commercial low-level radioactive waste (LLRW) in near-surface disposal facilities can be found in part 61 of title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations (10 CFR).

“Licensing Requirements for Land Disposal of Radioactive Waste.” The NRC originally adopted 10 CFR part 61 on December 27, 1982 (47 FR 57446). The existing LLRW disposal facilities are located in and licensed by Agreement States, and those Agreement States have incorporated many of the requirements in 10 CFR part 61 into their corresponding regulations and as license conditions for their licensees.

On March 26, 2015, the NRC published a proposed rule, “Low-level Radioactive Waste Disposal,” for an initial 120-day comment period in the Federal Register (80 FR 16082). The 2015 proposed rule would have implemented changes to require new and revised site specific technical analyses and other requirements that would have permitted the development of site-specific waste acceptance criteria (WAC) based on the results of these analyses. In the 2015 proposed rule, the NRC explained that the changes would better align the requirements with current health and safety standards (i.e., 10 CFR part 20) and identify any additional measures that would be prudent to implement for continued disposal of radioactive LLRW at a particular land disposal facility. In summary, the 2015 proposed rule would have specified requirements for:

- Technical analyses for demonstrating compliance with the public dose limits;
- Technical analyses for demonstrating compliance with dose limits for protection of inadvertent intruders;
- Identification and description of defense-in-depth protections that, taken together with the technical analyses, constitute the safety case;

The regulator may use a case-by-case basis (i.e., “grandfather provision”) for applying new requirements to only those sites that plan to accept large quantities of depleted uranium for disposal.

III. Discussion

In addition to specified rule language changes, the Commission, in SRM–SECY–16–0106, also directed the NRC staff to “be informed by broader and more fully integrated, but reasonably foreseeable costs and benefits to the U.S. waste disposal system resulting from the proposed rule changes, including pass-through costs to waste generators and processors.” To support development of the new supplemental proposed rule as directed by the Commission in SRM–SECY–16–0106, the NRC staff is seeking comment on how to improve the approach/methodology and actual cost data currently used in the draft final rule regulatory analysis to provide more accurate cost and benefit data in the final regulatory analysis. In particular, the NRC is seeking information on any cost changes that should be incorporated into the regulatory analysis in light of the Commission’s changes to the draft final rule identified in table 1.

All comments provided will be considered in improving the regulatory analysis to ensure that it is sufficiently informed by broader and more fully integrated, but reasonably foreseeable, costs and benefits to the U.S. waste disposal system; however, the NRC staff does not plan to provide responses to these comments. In addition, the NRC staff is requesting that comments be limited to focus on the regulatory analysis itself—the NRC plans to issue a separate notice and comment period on the changes being proposed in the supplemental proposed rule in 2018. At that time, members of the public will also be provided another opportunity to provide comments on the revised regulatory analysis, which will be updated based on comments from this action.

During the comment period for this action, the NRC will conduct a public meeting at the NRC’s Headquarters that will explain the cost and benefit information it is seeking in this notice and to address questions. Information regarding the public meeting is posted on the NRC’s public meeting Web site. The NRC’s public meeting Web site is located at https://www.nrc.gov/public-involve.html.

The NRC has also posted the meeting notice on the Federal rulemaking Web site at http://www.regulations.gov under Docket ID NRC–2011–0012. The NRC will post additional materials related to this document, including any public comments received, on the Federal rulemaking Web site. The Federal rulemaking Web site allows you to receive alerts when changes or additions occur in a docket folder. To subscribe:

(1) Navigate to the docket folder (NRC–
IV. Requested Information and Comments

This section provides specific questions associated with the draft regulatory analysis (ADAMS Accession No. ML16189A050). These questions will also be discussed at the public meeting. The NRC staff will consider the responses to these questions as it revises the regulatory analysis.

Question 1: Is the NRC considering appropriate alternatives for the regulatory action described in the draft regulatory analysis?

Question 2: Are there additional factors that the NRC should consider in the regulatory action? What are these factors?

Question 3: Is there additional information concerning regulatory impacts that the NRC should include in its regulatory analysis for this rulemaking?

Question 4: Are all costs and benefits properly addressed to determine the economic impact of the rulemaking alternatives? What cost differences would be expected from moving from the discussed 1,000 year and 10,000 year compliance periods to a single 1,000 year compliance period? Are there any unintended consequences of making this revision?

Question 5: Are there any costs that should be assigned to those sites not planning to accept large quantities of depleted uranium for disposal in the future?

Question 6: Is NRC’s assumption that only two existing LLRW sites (i.e., EnergySolutions’ Clive Utah disposal facility and Waste Control Specialists’ Texas disposal facility) plan to accept large quantities of depleted uranium for disposal in the future reasonable?

Question 7: What additional costs or cost savings, not already considered in the draft regulatory analysis, will the supplemental proposed rulemaking or alternatives cause to society, industry, and government? What are the potential transfer (‘‘pass-through’’) costs to the waste generators and processors?

V. Availability of Documents

The documents identified in the following table are available to interested persons through one or more of the following methods, as indicated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>ADAMS Accession No./ Federal Register Citation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December 27, 1982 10 CFR part 61 Statement of Considerations</td>
<td>ML16189A050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 26, 2015, 10 CFR part 61 proposed rule</td>
<td>ML16189A290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECY–16–0106, FINAL RULE: Low-Level Radioactive Waste Disposal (10 CFR part 61) (RIN 3150–A192)</td>
<td>ML16189A371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECY–16–0106 draft Federal Register notice</td>
<td>ML16189A050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECY–16–0106 draft regulatory analysis</td>
<td>ML17251B147</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 12th day of October 2017.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Daniel S. Collins,
Director, Division of Material Safety, State, Tribal and Rulemaking Programs, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.

[FR Doc. 2017–22459 Filed 10–16–17; 8:45 am]
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POSTAL REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. R2018–1; Order No. 4153]

Market Dominant Price Adjustment

AGENCY: Postal Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Commission is noticing a recently-filed Postal Service notice of inflation-based rate adjustments affecting market dominant domestic and international products and services, along with numerous proposed classification changes. The adjustments and other changes are scheduled to take effect January 21, 2018. This notice informs the public of the filing, invites public comment, and takes other administrative steps.

DATES: Comments are due: October 26, 2017.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments electronically via the Commission’s Filing Online system at http://www.prc.gov. Those who cannot submit comments electronically should contact the person identified in the FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT section by telephone for advice on filing alternatives.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: David A. Trissell, General Counsel, at 202–789–6820.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:
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I. Introduction and Overview

On October 6, 2017, the Postal Service filed a notice of inflation-based rate adjustments affecting market dominant domestic and international products and services, along with related product description changes to the Mail Classification Schedule (MCS).¹ The intended effective date is January 21, 2018. Notice at 2.

Contents of filing. The Postal Service’s filing consists of the Notice, which the Postal Service represents addresses the data and information required under 39 CFR 3010.12; four attachments (Attachments A–D) to the Notice; and eight sets of workpapers filed as library references.

Attachment A presents the proposed price and related product description changes to the MCS. Id. Attachment B and C address workshare discounts and related information and the price cap calculation. Notice, Attachments B and C, respectively. Attachment D is a copy of Governors’ Resolution No. 16–18, Notice, Attachment D.

Several library references present supporting financial documentation for the five classes of mail and for First-Class Mail International. Notice at 6 n.9. The First-Class Mail International library reference was filed under seal.² Library Reference USPS–LR–R2018–1/6 documents modifications to the cost avoidance models for USPS Marketing Mail and Periodicals.³ The Postal Service states that these modifications reflect the elimination of Flats Sequencing System (FSS)-specific pricing in Docket No. R2017–1 and the proposed Domestic Mail Manual (DDM) changes related to 5-Digit pallets. Id. Library Reference USPS–LR–R2018–1/7 provides census data and volumes related to the Move Update assessment change.⁴ Planned price adjustments. The Postal Service’s planned percentage changes by class are, on average, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market dominant class</th>
<th>Planned price adjustment (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First-Class Mail</td>
<td>1.905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USPS Marketing Mail</td>
<td>1.908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periodicals</td>
<td>1.924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Package Services</td>
<td>1.960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Services</td>
<td>1.986</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Notice of Market Dominant Price Adjustment, October 6, 2017, at 3 (Notice).