

action could occur. Both potential radiological and non-radiological impacts were considered. If the NRC grants the exemption, the low-activity SLC waste would be disposed of at the USEI site. The USEI site includes an operating disposal facility, and disposition of the low-activity SLC waste would occur in an existing waste disposal cell at the site. The NRC staff concludes that USEI facility's RCRA permit requirements, site and facility design features, and engineering and administrative controls ensure the protection of workers, members of the public, and the environment. Also, prior major earth disturbances to create the waste disposal cell and other site facilities, and ongoing site operations associated with waste handling and disposal would preclude the existence of listed threatened or endangered species or critical habitat and of historic properties.

The US Ecology request (ADAMS Accession No. ML13198A017) includes a radiological dose assessment for the transport and disposal of the SLC waste material. According to 10 CFR 20.2002, the analysis must show that the radiological doses arising from the proposed action will be ALARA and within the 10 CFR part 20 dose limits. The dose assessment evaluates worker doses for transporting the material to USEI, doses for the onsite workers at the USEI facility, and landfill post closure doses for members of the general public. The analysis used Microshield and RESRAD Version 6.5, as appropriate, to calculate the doses. The NRC staff reviewed and evaluated this dose assessment and performed independent dose calculations, and found the dose assessment to be acceptable under 10 CFR part 20.

The dose assessment uses a conservative source term and site-specific parameter values, and assessed a range of possible exposure scenarios. Estimated doses to workers associated with both the transport and disposal processes were all below 0.01 millisievert/year (mSv/yr) (1 millirem/year (mrem/yr)). Regardless of the radionuclide concentrations used, the post-closure dose to a member of the public was also below 0.01 mSv/yr (1 mrem/yr). By comparison, the 10 CFR part 20 dose limits, as total effective dose equivalents, are 50 mSv/yr (5000 mrem/yr) to workers (10 CFR 20.1201(a)(1)(i)) and 1 mSv/yr (100 mrem/yr) to individual members of the public (10 CFR 20.1301(a)(1)). Also, based on the results of these analyses, the staff concludes that the proposed disposal action will not significantly add to the annual cumulative dose from

all exempted and naturally occurring radioactive material received at the USEI disposal facility.

As a result of the dose assessment and other considerations, the staff concludes that the exemption of the USEI site from NRC licensing requirements will not significantly increase the probability or consequences of accidents, no changes are being made in the types of any effluents that may be released off site, and there is no significant increase in occupational or public radiation exposure.

The staff considered the no-action alternative as an alternative to the proposed action. Under the no-action alternative, the NRC would deny the present US Ecology exemption request and the SLC waste could not be received and disposed at the USEI RCRA disposal facility. However, the staff assumes that the subject SLC waste would still be generated under the USEPA's CERCLA response action and, for this response action to be in compliance with the OSR, the SLC waste would still need to be transported to and disposed at another acceptable offsite facility. This facility could be another appropriately permitted disposal site, such as another RCRA hazardous disposal facility, a municipal landfill, or a licensed LLRW disposal site. Under these circumstances, the potential environmental impacts of the proposed action and the no-action alternative at the disposal facilities would be similar, although denial of the US Ecology request by the NRC may result in delayed demolition of the structures at the SLC site or delayed offsite shipment of the demolition wastes, potentially resulting in increased exposure of site workers and members of the public to the low-activity materials. Also, disposal of the material at a LLRW disposal facility would be at higher cost than at a RCRA hazardous waste landfill or municipal landfill permitted to accept low-activity radioactive wastes but with little or no commensurate reduction of risk, and disposal in a RCRA hazardous waste or municipal landfill would conserve LLRW disposal capacity for higher activity wastes.

### III. Finding of No Significant Impact

The NRC staff has prepared an EA in support of the proposed action. The staff has concluded that the proposed action, for the NRC to grant an exemption from licensing for the USEI RCRA Subtitle C hazardous and low-activity radioactive waste facility to receive and dispose of specified low-activity radioactive wastes from the SLC Superfund Site, will not significantly impact the quality of the

human environment, and that the proposed action is the preferred alternative. The USEI site includes an operating disposal facility where the low-activity SLC waste would be disposed of pursuant to a RCRA permit in an existing waste disposal cell. The protection of workers, members of the public, and the environment are ensured by USEI permit requirements, site and facility design features, and engineering and administrative controls. Further, estimated radiological doses associated with transport and disposal of the waste to workers and members of the public would be below 0.01 mSv/yr (1 mrem/yr), which is orders of magnitude below the 10 CFR part 20 dose limits of 50 mSv/yr (5000 mrem/yr) to workers and 1 mSv/yr (100 mrem/yr) to individual members of the public. Also, the staff concludes that the proposed disposal action will not significantly add to the annual cumulative dose from all exempted and naturally occurring radioactive material received at the USEI disposal facility.

On the basis of the conclusion of the EA, the NRC finds that there are no significant environmental impacts from the proposed action, and that preparation of an environmental impact statement is not warranted. Accordingly, the NRC has determined that a Finding of No Significant Impact is appropriate.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 25th day of October 2013.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Kevin Hsueh,**

*Acting Deputy Director, Environmental Protection and Performance Directorate, Division of Waste Management and Environmental Protection, Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs.*

[FR Doc. 2013-25965 Filed 10-30-13; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7590-01-P**

## POSTAL SERVICE

### Product Change—Parcel Return Service Negotiated Service Agreement

**AGENCY:** Postal Service™.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The Postal Service gives notice of filing a request with the Postal Regulatory Commission to add a domestic shipping services contract to the list of Negotiated Service Agreements in the Mail Classification Schedule's Competitive Products List.

**DATES:** *Effective date:* October 31, 2013.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Elizabeth A. Reed, 202-268-3179.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The United States Postal Service® hereby gives notice that, pursuant to 39 U.S.C. 3642 and 3632(b)(3), on October 23, 2013, it filed with the Postal Regulatory Commission a *Request of the United States Postal Service To Add Parcel Return Service Contract 5 to Competitive Product List*. Documents are available at [www.prc.gov](http://www.prc.gov), Docket Nos. MC2014–4, CP2014–4.

**Stanley F. Mires,**  
*Attorney, Legal Policy & Legislative Advice.*  
[FR Doc. 2013–25807 Filed 10–30–13; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7710–12–P**

## POSTAL SERVICE

### Product Change—Priority Mail Express and Priority Mail Negotiated Service Agreement

**AGENCY:** Postal Service™.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The Postal Service gives notice of filing a request with the Postal Regulatory Commission to add a domestic shipping services contract to the list of Negotiated Service Agreements in the Mail Classification Schedule's Competitive Products List.

**DATES:** *Effective date:* October 31, 2013.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Elizabeth A. Reed, 202–268–3179.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The United States Postal Service® hereby gives notice that, pursuant to 39 U.S.C. 3642 and 3632(b)(3), on October 23, 2013, it filed with the Postal Regulatory Commission a *Request of the United States Postal Service To Add Priority Mail Express & Priority Mail Contract 15 to Competitive Product List*. Documents are available at [www.prc.gov](http://www.prc.gov), Docket Nos. MC2014–3, CP2014–3.

**Stanley F. Mires,**  
*Attorney, Legal Policy & Legislative Advice.*  
[FR Doc. 2013–25810 Filed 10–30–13; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7710–12–P**

## POSTAL SERVICE

### Product Change—Priority Mail Negotiated Service Agreement

**AGENCY:** Postal Service™.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The Postal Service gives notice of filing a request with the Postal Regulatory Commission to add a domestic shipping services contract to the list of Negotiated Service Agreements in the Mail Classification Schedule's Competitive Products List.

**DATES:** *Effective date:* October 31, 2013.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Elizabeth A. Reed, 202–268–3179.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The United States Postal Service® hereby gives notice that, pursuant to 39 U.S.C. 3642 and 3632(b)(3), on October 23, 2013, it filed with the Postal Regulatory Commission a *Request of the United States Postal Service To Add Priority Mail Contract 66 to Competitive Product List*. Documents are available at [www.prc.gov](http://www.prc.gov), Docket Nos. MC2014–2, CP2014–2.

**Stanley F. Mires,**  
*Attorney, Legal Policy & Legislative Advice.*  
[FR Doc. 2013–25812 Filed 10–30–13; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7710–12–P**

## SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 30764; File No. 812–14189]

### Ameritas Life Insurance Corp., et al; Notice of Application

October 25, 2013.

**AGENCY:** The Securities and Exchange Commission (“Commission”).

**ACTION:** Notice of application for an order approving the substitution of certain securities pursuant to Section 26(c) of the Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended (the “1940 Act”).

**APPLICANTS:** Ameritas Life Insurance Corp., Ameritas Life Insurance Corp. of New York, The Union Central Life Insurance Company (each, a “Life Insurance Company” and, collectively, the “Life Insurance Companies”), and their respective separate accounts: Ameritas Variable Separate Account VA–2, Ameritas Variable Separate Account V, Ameritas Variable Separate Account VA, Ameritas Variable Separate Account VL (the “Ameritas Life Accounts”); Ameritas Life of NY Separate Account VA, Ameritas Life of NY Separate Account VUL (the “Ameritas Life of NY Accounts”); and the Carillon Life Account (each an “Account” and together with the Life Insurance Companies, the “Applicants”).

**SUMMARY OF APPLICATION:** The Applicants seek an order under Section 26(c) of the 1940 Act approving the substitution of shares of the VIP Money Market Portfolio, Initial Class (the “Replacement Portfolio”) of the Variable Insurance Products Fund V (“VIPFV”) for shares of the Calvert VP Money Market Portfolio (the “Current Portfolio”) of the Calvert Variable Series, Inc. (“CVSI”) held by the

Accounts to support certain variable annuity contracts or variable life insurance contracts (collectively, the “Contracts”) issued by the Life Insurance Companies (the “Substitution”).

**DATES:** *Filing Date:* The application was filed on July 31, 2013, and an amended and restated application was filed on October 25, 2013.

**HEARING OR NOTIFICATION OF HEARING:** An order granting the application will be issued unless the Commission orders a hearing. Interested persons may request a hearing by writing to the Commission’s Secretary and serving Applicants with a copy of the request, personally or by mail. Hearing requests should be received by the Commission by 5:30 p.m. on November 14, 2013, and should be accompanied by proof of service on the Applicants, in the form of an affidavit or, for lawyers, a certificate of service. Hearing requests should state the nature of the requester’s interest, the reason for the request, and the issues contested. Persons may request notification of a hearing by writing to the Secretary of the Commission.

**ADDRESSES:** Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, 100 F Street NE., Washington, DC 20549–1090. Applicants: Ameritas Life Insurance Corp., Ameritas Variable Separate Account VA–2, Ameritas Variable Separate Account V, Ameritas Variable Separate Account VA, and Ameritas Variable Separate Account VL, 5900 “O” Street, Lincoln, Nebraska 68510; Ameritas Life Insurance Corp. of New York, Ameritas Life of NY Separate Account VA, Ameritas Life of NY Separate Account VUL, 1350 Broadway, Suite 2201, New York, New York 10018; and The Union Central Life Insurance Company and Carillon Life Account, 5900 “O” Street, Lincoln, Nebraska 68510.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Michelle Roberts, Senior Counsel, or Joyce M. Pickholz, Branch Chief, Insured Investments Office, Division of Investment Management at (202) 551–6795.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The following is a summary of the application. The complete application may be obtained via the Commission’s Web site by searching for the file number, or an applicant using the Company name box, at <http://www.sec.gov/search/search.htm> or by calling (202) 551–8090.