

and Public Affairs, Institute of Museum and Library Services, 1100 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20506.

Dated: June 11, 1997.

**Mamie Bittner,**

*Director of Legislative and Public Affairs,  
Institute of Museum and Library Services.*

[FR Doc. 97-15796 Filed 6-16-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7036-01-M

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50-413, 50-414, 50-369 and 50-370]

### Duke Power Company (Catawba Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2) and (McGuire Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2); Exemption

#### I

Duke Power Company (the licensee) is the holder of Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-35 and NPF-52, for the Catawba Nuclear Station (CNS), Units 1 and 2; and NPF-9 and NPF-17 for the McGuire Nuclear Station (MNS), Units 1 and 2. The licenses provide, among other things, that the licensee is subject to all rules, regulations, and orders of the Commission now or hereafter in effect.

These facilities consist of two pressurized water reactors located at each of the licensee's site in York County, South Carolina, and Mecklenburg County, North Carolina.

#### II

Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR), Section 50.71 "Maintenance of records, making of reports," paragraph (e)(4) states, in part, that "Subsequent revisions [to the Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (UFSAR)] must be filed annually or 6 months after each refueling outage provided the interval between successive updates to the FSAR does not exceed 24 months." The CNS and MNS two-unit sites share a common UFSAR; therefore, this rule requires the licensee to update the same document within 6 months after a refueling outage for either unit.

#### III

Section 50.12(a) of 10 CFR, "Specific exemptions," states that

The Commission may, upon application by any interested person, or upon its own initiative, grant exemptions from the requirements of the regulations of this part, which are (1) Authorized by law, will not present an undue risk to the public health and safety, and are consistent with the common defense and security. (2) The

Commission will not consider granting an exemption unless special circumstances are present.

Section 50.12(a)(2)(ii) of 10 CFR states that special circumstances are present when "Application of the regulation in the particular circumstances would not serve the underlying purpose of the rule or is not necessary to achieve the underlying purpose of the rule \* \* \*." As noted in the staff's Safety Evaluation, the licensee's proposed schedule for UFSAR updates will ensure that the CNS and MNS UFSARs will be maintained current within 24 months of the last revision and the interval for submission of the 10 CFR 50.59 design change report will not exceed 24 months. The proposed schedule fits within the 24-month duration specified by 10 CFR 50.71(e)(4). Literal application of 10 CFR 50.71(e)(4) would require the licensee to update the same document within 6 months after a refueling outage for either unit, a more burdensome requirement than intended. Accordingly, the Commission has determined that special circumstances are present as defined in 10 CFR 50.12(a)(2)(ii). The Commission has further determined that, pursuant to 10 CFR 50.12, the exemption is authorized by law, will not present an undue risk to the public health and safety and is consistent with the common defense and security, and is otherwise in the public interest. The Commission hereby grants the licensee an exemption from the requirement of 10 CFR 50.71(e)(4) to submit updates to the CNS and MNS UFSARs within 6 months of each unit's refueling outage. The licensee will be required to submit updates to the Catawba UFSAR and McGuire UFSAR within six months after each station's Unit 2 refueling outage. With the current length of fuel cycles, UFSAR updates would be submitted every 18 months, but not to exceed 24 months from the last submittal.

Pursuant to 10 CFR 51.32, the Commission has determined that granting of this exemption will have no significant effect on the quality of the human environment (62 FR 28906).

This exemption is effective upon issuance.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 10th day of June 1997.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Samuel J. Collins,**

*Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 97-15833 Filed 6-16-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

### Sunshine Act Meeting

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

**DATE:** Weeks of June 16, 23, 30, and July 7, 1997.

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

**STATUS:** Public and Closed.

**MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED:**

#### Week of June 16

There are no meetings scheduled for the week of June 16.

#### Week of June 23—Tentative

*Wednesday, June 25*

10:00 a.m.

Briefing on Operating Reactors and Fuel Facilities (Public Meeting)  
(Contact: William Dean, 301-415-1726)

11:30 a.m.

Affirmation Session (Public Meeting)  
(if needed)

2:00 p.m.

Briefing on Salem (Public Meeting)  
(Contact: John Zwolinski, 301-415-1453)

#### Week of June 30—Tentative

*Thursday, July 3*

11:30 a.m.

Affirmation Session (Public Meeting)  
(if needed)

#### Week of July 7—Tentative

*Tuesday, July 8*

3:30 p.m.

Affirmation Session (Public Meeting)  
(if needed)

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:** Bill Hill (301) 415-1661.

The NRC Commission Meeting Schedule can be found on the Internet at: <http://www.nrc.gov/SECY/smj/schedule.htm>.

This notice is distributed by mail to several hundred subscribers; if you no longer wish to receive it, or would like to be added to it, please contact the Office of the Secretary, Attn: Operations Branch, Washington, D.C. 20555 (301-415-1661).

In addition, distribution of this meeting notice over the internet system is available. If you are interested in receiving this Commission meeting schedule electronically, please send an

electronic message to wmh@nrc.gov or dkw@nrc.gov.

Dated: June 13, 1997.

**William M. Hill, Jr.,**

*SECY Tracking Officer, Office of the Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 97-15988 Filed 6-13-97; 2:14 pm]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

## OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

### Federal Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee; Cancellation of Open Committee Meeting

According to the provisions of section 10 of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92-463), notice is hereby given that the meeting of the Federal Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee scheduled for Thursday, June 19, 1997, has been canceled.

Information on other meetings can be obtained by contacting the Committee's Secretary, Office of Personnel Management, Federal Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee, Room 5559, 1900 E Street, NW., Washington, DC 20415, (202) 606-1500.

Dated: June 11, 1997.

**Phyllis G. Foley,**

*Chair, Federal Prevailing Rate, Advisory Committee.*

[FR Doc. 97-15822 Filed 6-16-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6325-01-M

## POSTAL RATE COMMISSION

[Order No. 1184; Docket Nos. MC97-4 and C97-1]

### Bulk Parcel Return Service and Shipper-Paid Forwarding Classifications and Fees; and Complaint of the Advertising Mail Marketing Association Regarding Charges for Standard (A) Merchandise Returns; Notice of Request for Changes in Domestic Mail Classification Schedule Provisions and Rates Affecting Forwarding and Return of Standard (A) Parcels and Order Instituting Proceedings

Issued June 11, 1997.

Before Commissioners: Edward J. Gleiman, Chairman; H. Edward Quick, Jr., Vice Chairman; George W. Haley; W.H. "Trey" LeBlanc III.

Notice is hereby given that on June 6, 1997, the United States Postal Service filed a Request with the Postal Rate Commission pursuant to section 3623 of the Postal Reorganization Act, 39 U.S.C. 101 et seq., for a recommended decision

on proposed changes in the Domestic Mail Classification Schedule (DMCS). The proposed revisions also include proposed new rates and fees. The Request includes attachments and is supported by the testimony of two witnesses and two library references. It is on file in the Commission Docket Room and is available for inspection during the Commission's regular business hours.

*Contents of the filing.* The Postal Service requests that the Commission consider two changes affecting the forwarding and return of Standard (A) parcels that were initially considered in Docket No. MC97-2. It requests that Bulk Parcel Return Service (BPRS) and Shipper Paid Forwarding (SPF) be established. Under current practice, forwarding and return of bulk Standard (A) parcels is obtained by endorsing mailpieces "Forwarding and Return Postage Guaranteed" or "Forwarding and Return Postage Guaranteed, Address Correction Requested." At the time that a parcel is returned, postage is paid for return service and indirectly paid for forwarding service, through a weighted fee that is 2.472 times the applicable single piece rate. The 2.472 weighting factor is the sum of one and 1.472. One, multiplied by the single piece rate, is intended to directly cover the cost of return service. 1.472 is the average number of pieces that are forwarded for every piece that is returned. Multiplying 1.472 times the single piece rate is intended to cover the cost of return service. This weighted fee can result in a charge for forwarding and return that is prohibitively high, according to the Postal Service. To provide continuity mailers other options, the Postal Service proposes to establish SPF and BPRS.

SPF would allow mailers to pay forwarding fees (the applicable single piece rate) directly, through the use of the tracking capabilities of the existing electronic Address Change Service (ACS). Only machinable parcels with the required endorsements would be eligible. An advance deposit would be required.

BPRS, through bulk handling of returned parcels, would lower the average cost of return service. BPRS mailers would arrange to pick up their returned parcels at a specified frequency, at a designated postal facility, or would have their returned parcels delivered to them in bulk by the Postal Service. Only machinable parcels weighing less than one pound, with the required endorsements, would be eligible for BPRS. A minimum of 50,000 returned parcels per year would be required. BPRS mailers would be

required to document their returned parcel volume, and to maintain an advance deposit account. A flat \$1.75 per-piece fee and an annual permit fee of \$85 is proposed. SPF and BPRS service could be combined.

The Postal Service's request is supported by the testimony of Postal Service witness Pham (USPS-T-1), which analyzes the costs of BPRS, and the testimony of Postal Service witness Adra (USPS-T-2), which addresses the consistency of the proposed changes in classifications and fees for SPF and BPRS with the applicable standards of the Postal Reorganization Act. The Postal Service asserts that neither SPF nor BPRS would alter existing forwarding or return services or rates for Standard (A) parcels. It also asserts that establishing BPRS would have little financial impact on postal costs and revenues. It contends that it would reduce overall postal costs by approximately \$4 million, and Standard (A) mail's contribution to institutional costs by less than \$1 million. See USPS-T-2, Exhibit USPS-2A.

The Postal Service's request is accompanied by two library references. The first (USPS-LR-1/MC97-4) is the FY 1996 Cost & Revenue Analysis Report. The second (USPS-LR-2/MC97-4) is a mailer survey designed to estimate the volume impact of BPRS.

*Proposed DMCS provisions.* The Postal Service's Request proposes changes in the current Domestic Mail Classification Schedule (DMCS). It proposes establishing separate Special Service Schedules SS-21, for Bulk Parcel Return Service, and SS-22, for Shipper-Paid Forwarding. The DMCS is codified at 39 CFR part 3001, subpart C, Appendix A. In Attachment A to its Request, the Postal Service displays the changes it proposes in the version of the DMCS currently in effect. These proposed revisions accompany this Notice as Attachment A.

*Proposed rate and fee schedules.* In Attachment B to its Request, the Postal Service displays changes it proposes to the various rate and fee schedules currently in effect. It proposes to establish Schedule SS-21, which would specify a flat fee for BPRS of \$1.75 per piece; and to specify a BPRS permit fee of \$85, under existing Schedule 1000. The Postal Service's requested changes in rates and fees accompany this Notice as Attachment B.

*Procedural proposals.* The Postal Service's Request is accompanied by a Motion of the United States Postal Service to Establish Procedural Mechanisms Concerning Settlement. In it, the Postal Service observes that the SPF and BPRS proposals in this docket