consistent with requirements of 10 CFR part 40, appendix A; (2) not be inimical to public health and safety; and (3) not have long-term detrimental impacts on the environment. The following statements summarize the conclusions resulting from the staff's environmental assessment, and support the FONSI:

1. An acceptable environmental and effluent monitoring program is in place to monitor effluent releases and to detect if applicable regulatory limits are exceeded. Radiological effluents from facility operations have been and are expected to remain below the regulatory limits;

2. Present and potential health risks to the public and risks of environmental damage from the proposed reclamation were assessed. Given the remote location, limited activities requested, small area of impact, and past activities on the site, the staff determined that the risk factors for health and environmental hazards are insignificant.

3. Because the staff has determined that there will be no significant impacts associated with approval of the license amendment, there can be no disproportionally high and adverse effects or impacts on minority and low-income populations. Consequently, further evaluation of Environmental Justice concerns, as outlined in Executive Order 12898 and NRC's Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards Policy and Procedures Letter 1–50, Revision 1, is not warranted.

Alternatives to the Proposed Action

The proposed action is to amend NRC Source Material License SUA–648, for reclamation of the A–9 and C–18 cells and site grading, as requested by Umetco. Therefore, the principal alternatives available to the NRC are to:

1. Approve the license amendment request as submitted; or

2. Amend the license with such additional conditions as are considered necessary or appropriate to protect public health and safety and the environment; or

3. Deny the amendment request.

Based on its review, the NRC staff has concluded that the environmental impacts associated with the proposed action do not warrant either the limiting of Umetco's future operations or the denial of the license amendment. Additionally, the staff has reviewed the licensee's proposed action with respect to the criteria for reclamation and has no basis for denial of the proposed action. Therefore, the staff considers that Alternative 1 is the appropriate alternative for selection.

Finding of No Significant Impact

The NRC staff has prepared an EA for the proposed amendment of NRC Source Material License SUA–648. On the basis of this assessment, the NRC staff has concluded that the environmental impacts that may result from the proposed action would not be significant, and therefore, preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement is not warranted.

The EA and other documents related to this proposed action are available for public inspection and copying at the NRC Public Document Room, in the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street NW, Washington, DC 20555.

Notice of Opportunity for Hearing

The Commission hereby provides notice that this is a proceeding on an application for a licensing action falling within the scope of Subpart L, ''Informal Hearing Procedures for Adjudications in Materials and Operators Licensing Proceedings,'' of the Commission's Rules of Practice for Domestic Licensing Proceedings and Issuance of Orders in 10 CFR part 2 (54 FR 8269). Pursuant to § 2.1205(a), any person whose interest may be affected by this proceeding may file a request for a hearing. In accordance with § 2.1205(c), a request for a hearing must be filed within thirty (30) days from the date of publication of this **Federal Register** notice. The request for a hearing must be filed with the Office of the Secretary either:

(1) By delivery to the Rulemakings and Adjudications Staff of the Office of the Secretary at One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, MD 20852; or

(2) By mail or telegram addressed to the Secretary, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, Attention: Rulemakings and Adjudications Staff.

Each request for a hearing must also be served, by delivering it personally or by mail to:

(1) The applicant, Umetco Minerals Corporation, PO Box 1029, Grand Junction, CO 81502;

(2) The NRC staff, by delivery to the Executive Director of Operations, One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, MD 20852, or

(3) By mail addressed to the Executive Director for Operations, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555.

In addition to meeting other applicable requirements of 10 CFR part 2 of the Commission's regulations, a request for a hearing filed by a person other than an applicant must describe in detail:

(1) The interest of the requestor in the proceeding;

(2) How that interest may be affected by the results of the proceeding, including the reasons why the requestor should be permitted a hearing, with particular reference to the factors set out in § 2.1205(g);

(3) The requestor's areas of concern about the licensing activity that is the subject matter of the proceeding; and

(4) The circumstances establishing that the request for a hearing is timely in accordance with § 2.1205(c).

Any hearing that is requested and granted will be held in accordance with the Commission's ''Informal Hearing Procedures for Adjudications in Materials and Operator Licensing Proceedings'' in 10 CFR part 2, subpart L.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 17th day of November 1999.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

John J. Surmeier,

Chief, Uranium Recovery and Low-Level Waste Branch, Division of Waste Management, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.

[FR Doc. 99–30734 Filed 11–24–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Workshop Concerning the Revision of the Baseline Safety Inspection Program for Nuclear Fuel Cycle Facilities

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC).

ACTION: Notice of public workshop.

SUMMARY: NRC will host a public workshop at the Doubletree Hotel in Rockville, Maryland for those regulated by the NRC and other stakeholders to provide and explain their views concerning NRC plans to revise its safety inspection program for nuclear fuel cycle facilities. This workshop follows the recent public stakeholder meetings held at NRC Headquarters on September 16 and October 20, 1999. Presentations given at each meeting together with a transcript of the meeting will be placed on the NRC INTERNET web page (http://www.nrc.gov). Similar to the revisions of the inspection and oversight program for commercial nuclear power plants, NRC initiated an effort to improve its inspection program for nuclear fuel cycle facilities. This is described in SECY–99–188 titled, EVALUATION AND PROPOSED REVISION OF THE NUCLEAR FUEL CYCLE FACILITY SAFETY

INSPECTION PROGRAM. SECY–99–188 is available in the Public Document Room and on the NRC Web Page at http://www.nrc.gov/NRC/COMMISSION/SECYS/index.html.

Purpose: To provide those regulated by the NRC and other stakeholders an opportunity to explain their views concerning the NRC's planned revision of the fuel cycle safety inspection program. The safety inspection program applies to nuclear fuel cycle facilities regulated under 10 CFR parts 40, 70 and 76. The facilities currently include gaseous diffusion plants, highly enriched uranium fuel fabrication facilities, low-enriched uranium fuel fabrication facilities, and a uranium hexafluoride (UF_6) production facility. These facilities possess large quantities of materials that are potentially hazardous (*i.e.,* radioactive, toxic, and/or flammable) to the workers, public, and/or environment. In revising the inspection program, the goals are to have an inspection program that: (1) Provides earlier and more objective indications of acceptable and changing safety performance, (2) increases stakeholder confidence in the NRC, and (3) increases regulatory effectiveness and efficiency. In this regard, the NRC desires the revised inspection program to be more risk-informed and performance-based and more focused on significant risks. Where practicable, the program will use more objective safety performance indicators (PIs) with accompanying performance thresholds.

The safety rationale for NRC inspection commensurate with risk (hazards and controls) will be discussed in the context of establishing indicators of licensee performance. The focus of the workshop will be consideration of performance indicators (i.e., precursors) that will reliably indicate when there is a need for corrective action to preclude exceeding regulatory limits which were established to preclude adverse impacts on the public or worker health and safety or the environment.

DATES: The workshop is scheduled for Wednesday, December 15, 1999, from 8:30 a.m. to 5 p.m. and is open to the public.

ADDRESSES: Doubletree Hotel, Regency Conference Room, 1750 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland 20852. Parking is limited around the hotel; however, the hotel is located adjacent to the Twinbrook Station on the Metro Red Line.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Walter Schwink, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, telephone (301) 415–7253, e-mail wss@nrc.gov.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland this 22nd day of November, 1999.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Philip Ting,

Chief, Operations Branch, Division of Fuel Cycle Safety and Safeguards.

[FR Doc. 99–30733 Filed 11–24–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

POSTAL RATE COMMISSION

[Docket No. MC2000–2; Order No. 1272]

Mailing Online Experimental Classification Proceeding

AGENCY: Postal Rate Commission.

ACTION: Notice of new experimental filing.

SUMMARY: This document establishes a docket to consider a proposed experimental classification and fee schedule for a new Mailing Online service. It also addresses related administrative matters, including dates for conferences and deadlines for certain filings. Publication of this document provides interested persons with information on important preliminary steps in the Commission's consideration of the case.

DATES: Key dates include:

1. December 2, 1999 (1:30 p.m): technical conference in PRC hearing room.
2. December 8, 1999 (2 p.m.): deadline for filing notices of intervention, statements opposing consideration of the request under experimental rules, and answers to Postal Service motion for expedition and waiver of certain provisions of rules 161 and 64(h).
3. December 13, 1999 (2 p.m.): prehearing conference in PRC hearing room.
4. December 16, 1999: deadline for filing issue statements and answers to Postal Service motion for designation of testimony and cross-examination from previous docket [No. MC98–1].

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Stephen L. Sharfman, General Counsel, Postal Rate Commission, 1333 H Street NW., Washington, DC 20268–0001, 202–789–6820.

ADDRESSES: Send correspondence regarding this docket to the attention of Margaret P. Crenshaw, Secretary, Postal Rate Commission, 1333 H Street NW., Suite 300, Washington, DC 20268–0001.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Regulatory History

The Commission provided notice of a predecessor case (Docket No. MC98–1) in Order No. 1216 (63 FR 39600, July 23, 1998). The preamble discusses that case and its subsequent withdrawal pursuant to action of the Postal Service's Governors.

Background

Notice is hereby given that on November 16, 1999, the United States Postal Service (Postal Service or USPS) filed a request with the Postal Rate Commission (Commission or PRC) pursuant to section 3623 of the Postal Reorganization Act, 39 U.S.C. 101 *et seq.*, for a recommended decision on adding a proposed Mailing Online service to the Domestic Mail Classification Schedule (DMCS) on an experimental basis. The request also incorporates a proposal for the establishment of associated new fees. The request includes attachments and is supported by the testimony of five witnesses. The Postal Service has separately filed two library references in support of this request. The request, attachments, and library references are on file in the Commission docket room and are available for inspection during the Commission's regular business hours. For interested persons who have access to the internet, the request and related documents are available on the Commission's home page at http://www.prc.gov.

Description of Request

The proposed Mailing Online service would enable individuals and organizations with access to a personal computer and an internet connection to transmit documents created on their computers to the Postal Service in digital form for printing and entry as mail, paying online in a single transaction. Users would transmit digital document files generated in any of several selected word processing and desktop publishing applications, together with recipient information and other data, to a designated Postal Service site on the world wide web. The Postal Service would offer users a number of choices regarding printing and finishing specifications, customization of output by recipient variables in the user's database, and scheduling of a specific mailing date.

Users of the proposed Mailing Online service would be charged existing postage rates for mailing, plus a fee for production and other pre-mailing services. Depending upon the character of the material being sent and the user's service preference, mail pieces