

of the Historian and the Advisory Committee on Historical Diplomatic Documentation, and diplomatic and consular card files.

16. Export-Import Bank of the United States, Agency-wide (N1-275-10-5, 3 items, 3 temporary items). Master files and outputs of an electronic information system used to aggregate and report data on agency financial products.

17. Office of the Director of National Intelligence, Office of the Deputy Director of National Intelligence for Analysis (N1-576-09-3, 28 items, 13 temporary items). Records include non-substantive working papers and drafts, lower-level working group and committee files, analyst telephone books and resources catalog, office copies of budget files, training materials, analytic metrics, routine briefings files, community support files, and other records of a routine or transitory nature associated with the analysis program. Proposed for permanent retention are outgoing correspondence, other program records, and appointment calendars of the Deputy Director, board and working group files, analytic mission program files, records associated with final national intelligence priorities, daily compendium of finished intelligence documents, outreach and presentation files, ombudsman final recommendation files, evaluations of intelligence products, analytic initiatives case files, analytic improvement guidance, major briefing materials, program records for analytic technology and transformation, and substantive working papers and drafts.

Dated: September 17, 2010.

Michael J. Kurtz,

Assistant Archivist for Records Services—Washington, DC.

[FR Doc. 2010-23806 Filed 9-22-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7515-01-P

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND HUMANITIES

SES Performance Review Board

AGENCY: National Endowment for the Arts.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given of the names of members of the Performance Review Board for the National Endowment for the Arts. This notice supersedes all previous notices of the PRB membership of the Agency.

DATES: Upon publication.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Craig McCord, Sr., Director of Human Resources, National Endowment for the

Arts, 1100 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Room 627, Washington, DC 20506, (202) 682-5473.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: See 4314 (c)(1) through (5) of Title 5, U.S.C., requires each agency to establish, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Office of Personnel Management, one or more SES Performance Review Boards. The Board shall review and evaluate the initial appraisal of a senior executive's performance by the supervisor, along with any response by the senior executive, and make recommendations to the appointing authority relative to the performance of the senior executive.

The following persons have been selected to serve on the Performance Review Board of the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA):

Joan Shigekawa—Senior Deputy Chairman.

Larry Baden—Deputy Chairman for Management and Budget.

Michael Burke—Chief Information Officer.

Sunil Iyengar—Director, Research & Analysis.

William O'Brien—Senior Advisor for Program Innovation.

Kathleen Edwards,

Director of Administrative Services, National Endowment for the Arts.

[FR Doc. 2010-23770 Filed 9-22-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7537-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[NRC-2010-0302]

Evaluation of the Groundwater Task Force Report: Public Meeting

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Notice of public meeting; solicitation of public comments.

SUMMARY: In response to incidents involving radioactive contamination of groundwater wells and soils at nuclear power plants, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) convened a Groundwater Task Force (GTF) in March 2010 to determine whether past, current, and planned actions should be augmented. The GTF, in its final report dated June 2010, determined that the NRC is meeting its mission of protecting public health, safety, and the environment. However, in view of stakeholder concerns, the GTF recommended that the NRC consider changes to its oversight of licensed material outside of its designed

confinement. The NRC established a senior management review group to evaluate the GTF report, identify next steps, and make recommendations to the Commission about potential policy changes. The NRC will host a meeting with the public to discuss and solicit input on the potential policy changes being considered. The meeting will serve as a forum for members of the public to provide oral comments. The NRC is also requesting written comments on the potential policy issues, particularly for those members of the public unable to attend the meeting. The potential policy issues can be found in Section C, "Topics for Discussion: Potential Policy Issues," in the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section of this notice.

DATES: *Public Meeting Date:* Monday, October 4, 2010, from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m.

Comment Dates: For individuals who wish to provide written comments on the potential policy issues, the comments are requested by October 15, 2010. Comments received after this date will be considered if it is practical to do so, but the NRC is able to assure consideration only for comments received on or before this date.

ADDRESSES: The public meeting will be held in the Commission Hearing Room at the NRC Headquarters building, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland 20852. The NRC Headquarters building is located across the street from the White Flint metro station. For most attendees, the metro system is likely the most convenient mode of transportation, as there is very limited parking available. Please also allow time to register with building security. Individuals unable to travel to the NRC Headquarters building may participate by teleconference or observe by live Webcast. Please contact the individual listed below to get details for participating in this manner.

You may submit comments by any one of the following methods. Please include Docket ID NRC-2010-0302 in the subject line of your comments. Comments submitted in writing or in electronic form will be posted on the NRC Web site and on the Federal rulemaking Web site Regulations.gov. Because your comments will not be edited to remove any identifying or contact information, the NRC cautions you against including any information in your submission that you do not want to be publicly disclosed.

The NRC requests that any party soliciting or aggregating comments received from other persons for submission to the NRC inform those persons that the NRC will not edit their

comments to remove any identifying or contact information, and therefore, they should not include any information in their comments that they do not want publicly disclosed.

Federal Rulemaking Web site: Go to <http://www.regulations.gov> and search for documents filed under Docket ID NRC-2010-0302. Address questions about NRC dockets to Carol Gallagher 301-492-3668; e-mail Carol.Gallagher@nrc.gov.

Mail comments to: Cindy Bladey, Chief, Rules, Announcements and Directives Branch (RADB), Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration, Mail Stop: TWB-05-B01M, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, or by fax to RADB at (301) 492-3446.

You can access publicly available documents related to this notice using the following methods:

NRC's Public Document Room (PDR): The public may examine and have copied for a fee publicly available documents at the NRC's PDR, Public File Area O1 F21, One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland.

NRC's Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS): Publicly available documents created or received at the NRC are available electronically at the NRC's Electronic Reading Room at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html>. From this page, the public can gain entry into ADAMS, which provides text and image files of NRC's public documents. If you do not have access to ADAMS or if there are problems in accessing the documents located in ADAMS, contact the NRC's PDR reference staff at 1-800-397-4209, 301-415-4737, or by e-mail to pdr.resource@nrc.gov. The potential policy issues are available electronically under ADAMS Accession Number ML102460172.

Federal Rulemaking Web site: Public comments and supporting materials related to this notice can be found at <http://www.regulations.gov> by searching on Docket ID: NRC-2010-0302.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Barry Miller, (301) 415-4117, e-mail address Barry.Miller@nrc.gov. Public meeting attendees are requested to pre-register with the meeting contact by September 30, 2010.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

A. Background and Purpose of the Public Meeting

The NRC convened the GTF in March 2010 (ADAMS Accession No. ML100640188) to evaluate NRC actions

taken in response to recent releases of tritium into groundwater by nuclear facilities, reevaluate the recommendations made in the Liquid Radioactive Release Lessons Learned Task Force Final Report dated September 1, 2006 (ADAMS Accession No. ML062650312), and review the actions taken in SECY-09-0174 (Staff Progress in Evaluation of Buried Piping at Nuclear Reactor Facilities, ADAMS Accession No. ML093160004). The purpose of the review was to determine whether the actions taken in response to recent events need to be augmented.

The GTF completed its work in June 2010, and provided the final report to the NRC Executive Director for Operations (EDO) (ADAMS Accession No. ML101680435). The GTF final report identified four major themes that provided focus for the report's conclusions: Theme 1—Reassess NRC's Regulatory Framework for Groundwater Protection, Theme 2—Maintain Barriers as Designed to Confine Licensed Material, Theme 3—Create More Reliable NRC Response, and Theme 4—Strengthen Trust.

As a result of this report, the EDO tasked a senior management review group to evaluate the report's conclusions and recommendations and identify actions that can be taken now, in addition to issues of policy that should be raised for Commission consideration. The senior management review group has completed their evaluation and compiled a list of potential policy issues for consideration. The purpose of this meeting is to receive input on these potential policy issues from a diverse group of public and industry stakeholders to ensure we have identified and are considering the right issues on which to focus our attention as we move forward. The potential policy issues can be found in Section C, Topics for Discussion: Potential Policy Issues, of this notice. Many of the issues listed in Section C contain specific references to the GTF report, with the references provided in parentheses following the specific issue.

B. Public Meeting Agenda

A meeting notice and detailed agenda are available on the NRC public meeting schedule Web site <http://www.nrc.gov/public-involve/public-meetings/index.cfm>. The meeting will take place from 9 a.m.–5 p.m. and consist of four sessions with a short break in between each one. Each session will correspond to one of the four themes identified in the GTF final report: Theme 1, Reassess NRC's Regulatory Framework for Groundwater Protection; Theme 2,

Maintain Barriers as Designed to Confine Licensed Material; Theme 3, Create More Reliable NRC Response; and Theme 4, Strengthen Trust. Each session will have a panel consisting of public and industry stakeholders, with the aim of representing an array of perspectives. Each panelist will give an approximately ten-minute presentation summarizing their views on the policy issues covered by their session topic. These presentations will be followed by a facilitated open discussion with the general attendees, thereby providing an opportunity for any attendee to provide input.

C. Topics for Discussion: Potential Policy Issues

Provided below are the potential policy issues identified by the senior management review group from the GTF final report. The parenthetical notation following many of the potential policy issues is a reference to a conclusion in the GTF final report. For example, C.3.2 is referencing conclusion C.3.2 in Appendix C of the report.

Theme 1: Reassess NRC's Regulatory Framework for Groundwater Protection

Should NRC's programs be modified to ensure harmonization of the approaches we have taken to groundwater protection that are applied to different licensees under NRC regulations? (C.3.2)

How should the NRC's programs accommodate or encourage industry initiatives that go beyond NRC requirements?

- *E.g.*, for reactors, is the industry's voluntary initiative on groundwater protection sufficiently comprehensive? Should it be taken into account in NRC's regulatory framework? (B.3.4)

How should NRC's programs address protection of the environment?

- Should requirements be promulgated to require prompt remediation of unintended releases of radioactive liquids? (C.3.3)

- Should the NRC consider modifying Part 20 to address those portions of International Commission on Radiological Protection (ICRP) 103 related to environmental protection? (E.3.4)

Should changes be made to the radiological effluent performance indicator in the Reactor Oversight Process to make it more reflective of performance in the area of plant releases, both planned and unplanned? Should the performance indicator take into account public confidence in addition to the current risk-informed approach to radiation protection that

verifies the effluent release program performance? (B.3.1)

Should a policy statement be developed based upon NRC's existing regulations and guidance to address: (1) Protection of the environment within NRC's regulatory framework, (2) NRC's expectations of licensees, (3) the relationship to other regulatory schemes, and (4) NRC's desire to work cooperatively with other Federal agencies and States in protecting the environment?

Should NRC's regulatory framework be informed by experience or guidance developed or applied by the International Atomic Energy Agency, the international community or by other U.S. agencies, *e.g.*, Department of Energy directives (DOE STD 1153) and activities?

Theme 2: Maintain Barriers as Designed To Confine Licensed Material

Should NRC's programs be modified to ensure that systems and components better contain radioactive liquids and gases?

- Are additional requirements appropriate for the design, operation and maintenance of systems and components that contain radioactive liquids and gases? (C.3.1)

- Should a more quantitative definition of the "As Low As Is Reasonably Achievable" (ALARA) concept be adopted with respect to leakage of radioactive liquids and gases?
 - Is it feasible to apply the ALARA concept in 10 CFR 50.36a to "unmonitored releases" and to restricted areas as well as unrestricted areas?

- How could the principles in 10 CFR 20.1406 be applied to operating reactors?

- Do the existing General Design Criteria (GDC) (*e.g.*, GDC 60 and 64) in 10 CFR part 50, appendix A, provide a basis to require new licensee programs with respect to leakage of radioactive liquids and gases?

Theme 3: Create More Reliable NRC Response

Should NRC's programs be modified to ensure greater consistency when addressing low risk, high public interest/confidence issues?

- Should NRC's oversight programs be modified to include more specific guidance on responding to reported incidents where risk is low but there is high stakeholder interest? Should this guidance address the follow up and disposition of a licensee's immediate actions, extent of condition, root cause, corrective action, and communication with the stakeholders? (A.3.1, A.3.2, B.3.3)

How can the NRC improve communications and support to other regulatory agencies, such as the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and the States, in understanding and exercising respective roles and responsibilities related to groundwater protection? (D.3.3)

Theme 4: Strengthen Trust

How can the NRC increase confidence in its actions and communications related to groundwater protection?

What role could third party verification or assessment play in responding to groundwater protection? (D.3.3)

What would be the benefit of using the International Nuclear Event Scale for communicating the safety significance of events at Levels 0 or 1 that attract high domestic or international public interest? Would this approach lead to confusion on the significance of the issue?

How can greater clarity be given to the interplay between NRC regulations and existing State and other Federal regulations with respect to the objectives and level of protection provided by adherence to the regulations?

D. Conduct of the Meeting.

This is a Category 3 Meeting. The public is invited to participate in this meeting by providing comments and asking questions throughout the meeting. The NRC's Policy Statement, "Enhancing Public Participation on NRC Meetings," (May 28, 2002; 67 FR 36920), applies to this meeting. The policy contains information regarding visitors and security. The NRC provides reasonable accommodation to individuals with disabilities where appropriate. If a member of the public needs a reasonable accommodation to participate in the meeting, or needs the meeting notice or the transcript or other information from the meeting in another format (*e.g.*, Braille, large print), please notify the NRC's meeting contacts. Determinations on requests for reasonable accommodations will be made on a case-by-case basis.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 16th day of September 2010.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Michael R. Johnson,

Deputy Executive Director for Reactor and Preparedness Programs, Acting Office of the Executive Director for Operations.

[FR Doc. 2010-23877 Filed 9-22-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

POSTAL REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. RM2010-11; Order No. 531]

Exceptions from Periodic Reporting Rules

AGENCY: Postal Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Postal Service has requested semi-permanent exceptions to certain recently-adopted service performance measurement reporting requirements. This order grants most of the requested exceptions. The Commission asks the Postal Service to explore other measurement options or use of proxies for reporting purposes for the exceptions not granted. This order also addresses the question of the need to request an exception or waiver prior to the use of a proxy as a substitute for a direct measurement.

DATES: Request for waivers from the Postal Service: October 1, 2010.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: *Regulatory History, 75 FR 38757 (JULY 6, 2010).*

Table of Contents

- I. Introduction
- II. Statutory Provisions
- III. Use of Proxies
- IV. Disposition of Individual Requests for Exceptions
- V. Ordering Paragraphs

I. Introduction

The Commission issued an Order Establishing Final Rules Concerning Periodic Reporting of Service Performance Measurements and Customer Satisfaction (Order No. 465) on May 25, 2010, bringing Docket No. RM2009-11 to a conclusion. Within this order, the Commission established a two-step process to achieve full compliance with all reporting requirements by the filing date of the FY 2011 Annual Compliance Report (ACR). See Order No. 465 at 18-24.

The first step in the process, and the subject matter of the instant order, consists of the Postal Service petitioning the Commission for semi-permanent exceptions from reporting pursuant to rule 3055.3. *Id.* at 21-22. The second step, and the subject matter of a future proceeding, consists of the Postal Service petitioning the Commission for temporary waivers of reporting until such time that reporting can be provided. The Commission further indicated that the Postal Service may seek a temporary waiver of reporting for