

to comply with all requirements in this license pending NRC action on the Trustee's request for relief from specified requirements under this subsection.

3. Cooperate with the NRC (or its contractor) in NRC's site inspections.

4. Cooperate with the U.S.

Department of Energy (DOE) in matters relating to the transfer of the site to DOE, including preparation by DOE of the site Long-Term Surveillance Plan required by 10 C.F.R. 40.28.

5. Use reasonable efforts to secure all Title X funds from the Department of Energy pursuant to section 1001 of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (42 U.S.C. 13201 et seq.) to which it is legally entitled, including requests for additional Title X funds from DOE based on remediation work at the site performed by or on behalf of the Trust.

6. Notify the Director, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, NRC, Washington, DC 20555-0001, and the Regional Administrator, NRC Region IV, NRC Region IV, 611 Ryan Plaza Drive, Suite 400, Arlington, TX 76011-8064, by certified registered mail, no later than 180 days prior to the anticipated date, that all contractual and other projected obligations will have reasonably exhausted the Trust Fund.

7. Upon notification required by paragraph 6 of this Part, cease remediation work as set forth in this Order, and commence passive maintenance and monitoring only of the site in order to provide for the protection of the public health and safety using the remaining assets in the Reclamation Trust to fund monitoring and maintenance until further order of the NRC.

B. Upon completion of the NRC inspection to determine that the site has been remediated in conformance with the requirements in 10 C.F.R. Part 40 and the conditions set forth in the license to the extent practicable given the funding available to the Trustee, title to the real property and the remaining byproduct material at the Moab Mill Site will be transferred in accordance with section 83 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and the Commission's regulations, and this license shall be modified or terminated accordingly.

C. Notwithstanding any of the foregoing requirements, the NRC shall not require the Trustee to perform or pay for any reclamation, remediation, monitoring, or surveillance, the cost of which would exceed the amount of money available to the Trustee from the Trust assets and receivables. The Trustee's responsibilities, liabilities and authority under this license shall

terminate upon further order of the NRC.

D. The requirements identified in this Order may only be modified in writing by the Director, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.

VI.

Any person adversely affected by this Order, other than Atlas or the Trustee, may request a hearing within 20 days of its issuance. Any request for a hearing shall be submitted to the Secretary, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. 20555-0001. Copies of any hearing requests also shall be sent to the Director, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. 20555-0001; to the Assistant General Counsel for Materials Litigation and Enforcement, at the same address; to the Regional Administrator, NRC Region IV, 611 Ryan Plaza Drive, Suite 400, Arlington, TX 76011-8064 and to the Trustee, PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP, Attention: Mr. Keith E. Eastin, Director, 1201 Louisiana, Suite 2900, Houston, TX 77002-5678. If a hearing is requested, the requester shall set forth with particularity the manner in which his or her interest is adversely affected by this Order and shall address the criteria set forth in 10 C.F.R. 2.1306 and 2.1308.

If a hearing is requested by a person whose interest is adversely affected by this Order, the Commission will consider the hearing request pursuant to 10 C.F.R. Part 2, Subpart M, and will issue an Order designating the time and place of any hearing. If a hearing is held, the procedures of Subpart M will be applied as provided by the Order designating the time and place of the hearing. The issue to be considered at such hearing shall be whether this Order transferring the license should be sustained. Any request for a hearing shall not stay the effectiveness of this Order.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 27th day of December 1999.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**William F. Kane,**

*Director, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.*

[FR Doc. 99-34053 Filed 12-30-99; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7590-01-P**

## **NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

### **Risk-Informed Revisions to Technical Requirements; Workshop and Website**

**AGENCY:** Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice of public workshop and NRC Part 50 (Option 3) website.

**SUMMARY:** The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has instructed its staff to explore changes to specific technical requirements of 10 CFR Part 50, to incorporate risk-informed attributes. The staff is studying the ensemble of technical requirements contained in 10 CFR Part 50 (and its associated implementing documents, such as regulatory guides and standard review plan sections) to (1) identify individual or sets of requirements potentially meriting change; (2) prioritize which of these requirements (or sets of requirements) should be changed; and (3) develop the technical bases to an extent that is sufficient to demonstrate the feasibility of changing the requirements. This work will result in recommendations to the Commission on any specific regulatory changes that should be pursued. Public participation in the development of these recommendations will be obtained via workshops and information on a website.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** This notice serves as initial notification of a public workshop, and website, to provide for the exchange of information with all stakeholders regarding the staff's efforts to risk-inform the technical requirements of 10 CFR Part 50. The subject of the workshop will be to discuss the preliminary work being performed by the NRC staff on risk-informing the technical requirements of 10 CFR Part 50. The meeting will focus on the overall framework of the risk-informing process, the criteria used to identify and prioritize candidate regulations and design basis accidents (DBAs), the results of the staff's initial efforts in risk-informing the two trial implementation issues (i.e., 10 CFR 50.44 and special treatment rules), a list of some additional candidate requirements and DBAs to be examined, and discussion of preliminary issues associated with the development and implementation of the entire process.

This notice provides only the date, the location and a brief summary of the workshop; the workshop agenda and other details will be provided in a forthcoming notice. The address for the Part 50 (Option 3) website is as follows: <http://nrc-part50.sandia.gov>.

The Part 50 (Option 3) website can also be accessed from the NRC website (<http://www.nrc.gov>), by selecting "Nuclear Reactors," and then "Risk-Informed Part 50 (Option 3)."

**Workshop Meeting Information**

The staff intends to conduct a workshop to provide for an exchange of information related to the risk-informed revisions to the technical requirements of 10 CFR Part 50. Persons other than NRC staff and NRC contractors interested in making a presentation at the workshop should notify Mary Drouin, Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research, MS: T10-E50, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington D.C. 20555-0001, (301) 415-6675, email: mxd@nrc.gov.

*Date:* February 24, 2000 (with possible extension to February 25, 2000).

*Agenda:* To be provided.

*Location:* NRC Auditorium, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland 20852.

*Registration:* No registration fee for workshop; however, notification of attendance is requested so that adequate space, materials, etc., for the workshop can be arranged. Notification of attendance should be directed to Alan Kuritzky, Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research, MS: T10-E50, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. 20555-0001, (301) 415-6255, email: ask1@nrc.gov.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Alan Kuritzky, Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research, MS: T10-E50, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. 20555-0001, (301) 415-6255, email: ask1@nrc.gov.

Dated this 23d day of December 1999.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Mark A. Cunningham,**

*Probabilistic Risk Analysis Branch, Division of Risk Analysis and Applications, Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research.*

[FR Doc. 99-34052 Filed 12-30-99; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7590-01-P**

**POSTAL SERVICE****Quality Control Reviews for Discounted Letters (Presorted/Automation Rate Mail)**

**AGENCY:** Postal Service.

**ACTION:** Notice and request for comments.

**SUMMARY:** The Postal Service is implementing more efficient quality control procedures to check letter mail preparation for rates claimed on postage statements. An automated, in-depth review of selected letter size mailings will be conducted using the Mail Quality Analysis (MQA) program, in addition to verification procedures now in use for all mailings. MQA will use

existing automated equipment and reports to compare actual presort to mailer documentation for sampled mail. MQA also will provide feedback on the readability of mailer-applied barcodes. The Postal Service seeks comments on the Mail Quality Analysis (MQA) program.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** Phase one of the Mail Quality Analysis Program will begin on January 3, 2000. All written comments must be received on or before February 2, 2000.

**ADDRESSES:** Written comments should be mailed or delivered to Rates and Classification Service Center, U.S. Postal Service, 5904 Richmond Highway, Suite 500, Alexandria VA 22303-2736.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mark Richards, (703) 329-3684.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

Improperly prepared mail results in additional USPS handling and related costs that eventually are passed on to all customers in the form of rate increases. Since 1982, the Postal Service has applied quality controls in the form of standardized mail acceptance and mail verification procedures to support the goal of keeping postage rates stable. Along with the National Bulk Mail Verification Program (NBMVP) in 1982, the Postal Service has taken many steps to control operating costs, assess postage fairly for each mailer, and charge postage commensurate with the preparation of the mail. Classification reform in 1996 and the last rate case (R97-1) gave rate incentives for properly preparing mail that is compatible with automated processing and presorted to avoid certain processing operations.

As further background, revisions to the National Bulk Mail Verification Program through two Postal Bulletin articles in 1989 reduced the acceptable tolerance level for presort errors from 10 percent to 5 percent before a postage adjustment was calculated. Mailers were later advised in a Postal Bulletin article in 1989 that tolerance levels for errors would be reduced to 2 percent at a future date. Further, in 1996, classification reform formalized the requirement that only mail meeting automation requirements is eligible for automation rates. MQA does not involve a change in the current 5 percent presort error tolerance level.

Today, both mailer production and Postal Service processing are highly automated processes. Large mailings are more easily created and produced with each advance in mail production hardware and software. It has become increasingly important for mailers to introduce quality assurance features

into mail production operations in the design and set-up stages. Once production of a mailing begins, problems not identified through internal quality controls may not be easily corrected. Problems discovered by the Postal Service related to presorting and automation specifications generally surface during mail processing, which is often far from the acceptance point for the mailing. It is therefore critical for mailers to use the tools noted below and effective quality assurance procedures to produce mail that follows Domestic Mail Manual requirements for the postage rates claimed.

Using mailer's input, the Postal Service has provided a variety of tools to improve mail quality in the design and set-up stages. Included are a variety of address management programs, Presort Accuracy Validation and Evaluation (PAVE), the Mailpiece Quality Control Program (MQC), the Mail Preparation Total Quality Management Program (MPTQM), various handbooks and brochures, the Domestic Mail Manual, and Customer Support Rulings. Information on many of these tools is available on the Postal Service Internet sites. Postal business centers, business mail entry managers, mailpiece design analysts, and the National Customer Service Center are available to assist customers in design of mail. The net effect of these efforts is the expectation that today's business mailings should be of exceptionally high quality.

Current Postal Service quality controls focus on manual verification of a small number of mail pieces and were designed when mail production and mail processing environments were not highly automated. Under MQA, larger portions of selected mailings will be reviewed as they are run on Postal Service barcode sorters. MQA will use reports already available from this equipment (which has been performing this function with documented accuracy for years) to compare the mailing, or a portion of the mailing, to the postage statement and supporting mailer documentation for that specific mailing. MQA will assist the Postal Service in providing improved diagnostic feedback to mailers on the quality of sampled mail. These procedures will lead to improved mail quality, reduction in costs, and correct payment of postage.

Mail will be isolated at postal facilities and detached mail units. The business mail entry unit, revenue assurance, and mail processing will work together using automated equipment already in place to perform the analysis of MQA samples. Initial runs will focus on large volume