

longer wish to receive it, or would like to be added to the distribution, please contact the Office of the Secretary, Washington, D.C. 20555 (301-415-1969). 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 [dkw@nrc.gov](mailto:dkw@nrc.gov).

Dated: March 22, 2001.

**David Louis Gamberoni,**

*Technical Coordinator, Office of the Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 01-7503 Filed 3-22-01; 12:16 pm]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-213]

### Connecticut Yankee Atomic Power Company, Haddam Neck Plant; Issuance of Director's Decision Under 10 CFR 2.206

Notice is hereby given that the Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, has taken action with regard to a Petition for action under 10 CFR 2.206 received from Rosemary Bassilakis and Deborah Katz (Petitioners) of the Citizens Awareness Network, dated September 26, 2000, with regard to the operation of the Connecticut Yankee Atomic Power Company's (CYAPCO's or the licensee's) Haddam Neck Plant (Haddam Neck). The Petition was supplemented by the Petition Review Board's (PRB) October 10, 2000, transcript.

The Petition requested that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC or the Commission) (1) Conduct a full investigation of CYAPCO's garment laundering practices and specifically of the September 20, 2000, incident at a public laundry facility in which the Petitioners contend that the licensee may have laundered radioactively contaminated clothing; (2) revoke CYAPCO's license, or suspend it until an investigation is completed and any contamination found as a result of that investigation is remediated; (3) report any violation of regulations to the Department of Justice; and (4) conduct an informal public hearing.

As the basis for the September 26, 2000, request, the Petitioners raised concerns stemming from a September 20, 2000, incident in which CYAPCO laundered bright yellow coveralls, rubber boots, and gloves at a public laundromat in East Hampton, Connecticut. The Petition contends that, although it is not clear whether or not

the garments were radioactively contaminated, "Laundering the Haddam Neck reactor's protective garments at a public facility constitutes a serious loss of radiological control, and blatant disregard for public and worker health and safety, the environment, and NRC rules and regulations."

The Petitioners addressed the Petition Review Board (PRB) on October 10, 2000, in a telephone conference call to clarify the basis for the Petition. The transcript of this discussion may be examined, and/or copied for a fee at the NRC Public Document Room, located at One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland. The transcript (ADAMS Accession No.: ML003768237) is also available at the ADAMS Public Library component of the NRC's Web site, <http://www.nrc.gov> (the Public Electronic Reading Room).

The NRC sent a copy of the proposed Director's Decision to the Petitioners and to the licensee for comment by letter dated December 19, 2000. The Petitioners responded with comments on January 4, 2001, and the licensee responded on January 5, 2001. These comments and the NRC staff's response to them are Enclosures to the Director's Decision.

Of the four actions requested by the Petitioner, the Director of the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation has granted one action (an investigation of the licensee's laundering practices and this incident), granted in principle one action (an informal public hearing), denied one action (suspend or revoke the operating license), and one action (report any violations of regulations to the Department of Justice) became moot because no violations were identified. The reasons for this decision are explained in the Director's Decision pursuant to 10 CFR 2.206 (DD-01-02), the complete text of which is available in ADAMS for inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, located at One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland, and from the ADAMS Public Library component on the NRC's Web site, <http://www.nrc.gov> (the Public Electronic Reading Room).

The issues raised in the September 26, 2000, Petition have been resolved. Inspection efforts conducted by NRC in response to the Petition determined that protective clothing at the licensee's training facility was free from radioactive contamination. Furthermore, the NRC inspection report concluded that effective controls were in place to assure that training garments had not and would not become contaminated.

A copy of the Director's Decision will be filed with the Secretary of the

Commission for the Commission's review in accordance with 10 CFR 2.206 of the Commission's regulations. As provided for by this regulation, the Director's Decision will constitute the final action of the Commission 25 days after the date of issuance, unless the Commission, on its own motion, institutes a review of the Director's Decision in that time.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 20th day of March, 20, 2001.

For The Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Samuel J. Collins,**

*Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 01-7351 Filed 3-23-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

## OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

### Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request for Review of a Revised Information Collection; IS-10

**AGENCY:** U.S. Office of Personnel Management.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (Public Law 104-13) and 5 CFR 1320.5 (a)(1)(iv), this notice announces that OPM has submitted to the Office of Management and Budget, a request for clearance of a revised information collection. The Mail Reinterview Form, IS-10, is completed by individuals who have been interviewed by a contract investigator during the course of a personnel investigation. This form, a quality assurance instrument, asks questions regarding the performance of the investigator.

We estimate that 5700 forms are completed annually. Each form requires approximately 6 minutes to complete. The annual estimated burden is 570 hours.

For copies of this proposal contact Mary Beth Smith-Toomey at (202) 606-8358 or fax (202) 418-3251 or by e-mail to [mbtoomey@opm.gov](mailto:mbtoomey@opm.gov).

**DATES:** Comments on this proposal should be received on or before April 25, 2001.

**ADDRESSES:** Send or deliver written comments to:

Richard A. Ferris, Associate Director, Investigations Service, U.S. Office of Personnel Management, Room 5416, 1900 E Street NW., Washington, DC 20415-4000, and

Joseph Lackey, OPM Desk Officer, Office of Information & Regulatory

Affairs, Office of Management & Budget, New Executive Office Building, NW., Room 10235, Washington, DC 20503.

**Steven R. Cohen,**

*Acting Director.*

[FR Doc. 01-7385 Filed 3-23-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6325-40-P

## POSTAL RATE COMMISSION

[Docket No. C2001-1; Order No. 1307]

### Notice and Order on Complaint Concerning Sunday and Holiday Mail Collections

**AGENCY:** Postal Rate Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice and order on complaint docket no. C2000-1.

**SUMMARY:** This document addresses a complaint and related motion practice concerning Sunday and holiday mail collections. It established deadlines for certain actions. It also addresses other aspects of the filing.

**DATES:** Notice and order issued March 20, 2001; complainant's filing due April 3, 2001; participants' responses due April 10, 2001.

**ADDRESSES:** Send filings to the attention of Steven W. Williams, acting secretary, 1333 H Street NW., suite 300, Washington, DC 20268-0001.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Stephen L. Sharfman, General Counsel, 202-789-6820.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

#### Authority to Consider the Complaint 39 U.S.C. 3662

#### Background

On October 27, 2000, Douglas F. Carlson filed a complaint with the Commission pursuant to 39 U.S.C. 3662, rate and service complaints, alleging that the Postal Service has made changes to the nature of mail service without first seeking an advisory opinion from the Commission as required by section 3661(b).<sup>1</sup> He alleges that the Postal Service has made changes to the nature of mail service on either a nationwide or a substantially nationwide basis by eliminating: (1) Sunday collection and processing of outgoing First-Class Mail; (2) processing of outgoing First-Class Mail on several holidays; and (3) normal mail collections on Christmas eve and possibly on New Year's eve. As a second basis to sustain his section 3662

complaint, Carlson further alleges that the current level of Sunday, holiday, Christmas eve, and New Year's eve service does not conform to the requirements delineated in the Postal Service's postal operations manual (POM).

Carlson requests that the Commission issue a public report documenting the alleged Postal Service's noncompliance with collection and outgoing mail processing on Sundays, holidays, Christmas eve, and New Year's eve as delineated in the POM. Furthermore, he requests that the Commission consider conducting a hearing to determine: (1) The extent to which the Postal Service provides collection service on Christmas eve and New Year's eve; (2) the extent to which customers have access to collection and processing of outgoing First-Class Mail on holidays; and (3) whether the Postal Service provides adequate postal services within the meaning of section 3661(a) when customers do not have access to outgoing First-Class Mail service on Sundays, holidays, or for any two consecutive days.

#### Postal Service Answer and Motion to Dismiss

On November 27, 2000, the Postal Service filed an answer to the Complaint concurrent with a motion to dismiss.<sup>2</sup> The answer demonstrates considerable agreement as to the events that have occurred, but disagreement in interpreting these events as they relate to the requirements of the Postal Service. Procedurally important, the Postal Service acknowledges that it did not seek advisory opinions for any of the three service changes alleged by Carlson. The facts that follow briefly describe the Postal Service's position on Sunday, holiday, and holiday eve service, and the significance of the POM.

The Postal Service admits that Sunday collection and outgoing mail processing were eliminated effective February 14, 1988. The Service specifically denies that an advisory opinion was required to take this action. The Service acknowledges that this policy change was never incorporated into the POM. However, the Service states that the POM is in the process of being amended to reflect the current policy.

The POM discusses Sunday and holiday collections "to ensure that the mail will connect with dispatches of value \* \* \*." Specifically for Sunday

collections, the Postal Service alleges that there are no longer dispatches of value because outgoing mail processing does not occur on Sundays. Therefore, the Postal Service infers that the POM does not require Sunday collections. Answer at 4-12.

The Service concedes that in the 1970s and early 1980s it tended to do more processing of outgoing mail on holidays than it does now. The Service states that collection and outgoing mail processing tend not to be done on several widely observed holidays, and outgoing mail processing is now rare on Christmas day and New Year's day. However, the Service denies outgoing mail processing has been phased out over time. If a holiday occurs on a Monday, the Service admits that there may be two consecutive days without collections or outgoing mail processing.

The Postal Service acknowledges instances of Christmas eve, and possibly New Year's eve, final collections occurring prior to the times posted on the collection boxes, and that customers were not given prior notice that this would happen. However, the Postal Service notes that the POM allows the Service to make exceptions to the specific level of service provided. The Service denies that service exceptions were not granted, as alleged by Carlson.

The Postal Service notes that the POM allows exceptions to be made to holiday and holiday eve service levels. There is evidence that the POM and the Domestic Mail Manual (DMM) exception provisions are in conflict. However, the Service denies the allegation that the provisions in the POM control the provisions in the DMM. The Postal Service also contends that the POM is not intended to be relied upon by the general public.

The Postal Service separately discusses allegations of providing service inconsistent with the POM, Sunday collections, and holiday and holiday eve collections as part of the motion to dismiss as allowed by rule 84(b)-(c). The Service first states that the provisions of the POM "are not necessarily commensurate with the policies of the [Postal Reorganization] Act." It then asserts that the complaint fails to allege that the complainant is not receiving postal services in accordance with the policies of title 39. From this, the Postal Service concludes that the allegations regarding the POM are outside the scope of section 3662 and should be dismissed. In conjunction with the above argument, the Postal Service argues that the Commission lacks jurisdiction to entertain a complaint, such as the instant complaint, which does not allege that

<sup>1</sup> Douglas F. Carlson complaint on Sunday and holiday collections, filed October 27, 2000 (complaint).

<sup>2</sup> Answer of the United States Postal Service and motion to dismiss, filed November 27, 2000 (answer).