

geochemical parameters in a site-specific analysis for disposal of significant quantities of depleted uranium?

*Issue III-6. Modeling of Radon in the Environment in a Site-Specific Analysis*

Over time, the uranium isotopes comprising depleted uranium decay to multiple progeny radionuclides. Many of these progeny radionuclides are different elements, and differ from depleted uranium in their radiotoxicity and mobility in the environment. Among the progeny radionuclides exhibiting these differing characteristics, radon-222 is of particular interest because it exists as a gas under typical environmental conditions and presents a unique challenge to evaluate in a site-specific analysis of the performance of a near-surface, low-level radioactive waste disposal facility. Analyzing the mobility of radon-222 in the environment involves demonstrating a reasonable understanding of the emanation of the radon gas from the depleted uranium solids, and migration to the surface of the disposal facility. Additionally, NRC anticipates that radon migration may require policy considerations of societal uncertainties in developing appropriate exposure scenarios.

Question III-6.1—What new approaches for modeling radon emanation, migration, and exposure pathways, including the effects of differences in the physical and chemical properties between radon and its progeny, should NRC consider?

Question III-6.2—Should NRC require licensees to evaluate the effects of radon in a site-specific analysis for disposal of significant quantities of depleted uranium in near-surface facilities?

Question III-6.3—Should NRC specify by regulation, or develop guidance on, the technical parameters for evaluating radon emanation, migration, and exposure in a site-specific analysis of significant quantities of depleted uranium?

Question III-6.4—If NRC should specify by regulation the technical parameters for evaluating radon emanation, migration, and exposure, what factors should NRC consider in specifying technical parameters for a site-specific analysis for significant quantities of depleted uranium?

Question III-6.5—If NRC should develop guidance on the technical parameters for evaluating radon emanation, migration, and exposures to accompany regulatory criteria, then what factors should NRC consider in the development of guidance for evaluating technical parameters for a site-specific

analysis for disposal of significant quantities of depleted uranium?

Question III-6.6—What societal uncertainties should NRC consider when developing guidance for scenarios of exposure to radon gas released from the disposal of significant quantities of depleted uranium?

Question III-6.7—What alternative methods should NRC consider when developing guidance on evaluating the impacts of radon gas exposures? For instance, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency standards at 40 CFR Part 192 for the control of residual radioactive materials from inactive uranium mill tailings sites specify that releases of radon-222 to the atmosphere will not exceed an average release rate of 20 picoCuries per square meter per second or increase the annual average concentration of radon-222 in air at or above any location outside the disposal site by more than 0.5 picoCuries per liter.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland this 16th day of June, 2009.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Patrice M. Bubar,**

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

[FR Doc. E9-14820 Filed 6-23-09; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7590-01-P**

## POSTAL REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. CP2009-37; Order No. 222]

### Priority Mail Contract

**AGENCY:** Postal Regulatory Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The Commission is noticing a recently-filed Postal Service request to add an additional Priority Mail contract to the Competitive Product List. This notice addresses procedural steps associated with this filing.

**DATES:** Comments are due June 26, 2009.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit comments electronically via the Commission's Filing Online system at <http://www.prc.gov>.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Stephen L. Sharfman, General Counsel, 202-789-6820 and [stephen.sharfman@prc.gov](mailto:stephen.sharfman@prc.gov).

### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

#### I. Background

On June 11, 2009, the Postal Service filed a notice, pursuant to 39 U.S.C.

3632(b)(3) and 39 CFR 3015.5, announcing that it has entered into an additional contract (Priority Mail Contract 11), which it contends fits within the previously proposed Priority Mail Contract Group product.<sup>1</sup> In support, the Postal Service filed the proposed contract and referenced Governors' Decision 09-6 filed in Docket No. MC2009-25. *Id.* at 1.

The Notice states that the "contract differs from the contract filed as Priority Mail Contract 6 only in regards to negotiated prices and a difference in termination provisions." *Id.* at 2. In addition, it states that the contract is scheduled to become effective the day that the Commission issues all necessary regulatory approval. *Id.* at 1.

**The instant contract.** The Postal Service filed the instant contract pursuant to 39 U.S.C. 3632(b)(3) and 39 CFR 3015.5. It submitted the contract and supporting material under seal and attached a redacted copy of the contract and certified statement required by 39 CFR 3015.5(c)(2) to the Notice. *Id.*, Attachments A and B respectively.

The Postal Service maintains that the contract and related financial information, including the customer's name and the accompanying analyses that provide prices, terms, conditions, and financial projections should remain under seal. *Id.* at 2.

#### II. Notice of Filing

The Commission establishes Docket No. CP2009-37 for consideration of the matters related to the contract identified in the Postal Service's Notice.

The Notice does not expressly use the term functionally equivalent to describe proposed Priority Mail Contract 11. Instead, it appears to implicitly make that claim by distinguishing the instant contract from Priority Mail Contract 6, filed in Docket No. CP2009-30 as part of the proposed Priority Mail Contract Group. *Id.* at 2. As the Postal Service recognizes, the scope of the Priority Mail Contract Group product is currently pending before the Commission. To that end, it acknowledges that the Commission's decision in Docket No. MC2009-25 may have an impact on the sufficiency of the Postal Service's filings in this case. *Id.* at 1, n.1. Depending on the outcome of Docket No. MC2009-25, the Postal Service may need to file additional support as required in 39 CFR 3020 subpart B. Such filings, if any, shall be due within three days of the Commission's order in Docket No.

<sup>1</sup> Notice of Establishment of Rates and Class Not of General Applicability (Priority Mail Contract 11), June 11, 2009 (Notice).

MC2009–25 addressing the scope of the proposed Priority Mail Contract Group product.

Interested persons may submit comments on whether the instant contract is consistent with the policies of 39 U.S.C. 3632, 3633, or 3642 and 39 CFR part 3015 and 39 CFR part 3020, subpart B, and whether it should be classified within the Priority Mail Contract Group or as a separate product. Comments in this case are due no later than June 26, 2009.

The public portions of these filings can be accessed via the Commission's Web site (<http://www.prc.gov>).

The Commission appoints Paul L. Harrington to serve as Public Representative in this docket.

### III. Supplemental Information

Pursuant to 39 CFR 3015.6, the Commission requests the Postal Service to provide the following supplemental information by June 23, 2009:

1. (a) Please explain the cost adjustments made to each contract;  
(b) Explain the mailer activities or characteristics that:

(i) yield cost savings to the Postal Service,

(ii) impose additional costs on the Postal Service;

(c) Please address every instance where an NSA partner's cost differs from the average cost.

2. (a) Please provide a timeframe of when NSA partner volumes and cubic feet measurements were collected for each contract.

(b) Please provide a unit of analysis for volumes in each contract, *e.g.*, whole numbers, thousands, etc.

3. In the Excel files accompanying the instant contract, unit transportation costs are hard coded (See tab: "Partner Unit Cost" rows 18 and 19). Please provide up-to-date sources and show all calculations.

### IV. Ordering Paragraphs

It is Ordered:

1. The Commission establishes Docket No. CP2009–37 for consideration of the issues raised in this docket.

2. As discussed in this Order, the Postal Service shall file supplemental information, if necessary, within three days of the Commission's order in Docket No. MC2009–25 addressing the scope of the proposed Priority Mail Contract Group product.

3. Comments by interested persons in these proceedings are due no later than June 26, 2009.

4. The Postal Service is to provide the information requested in section III of this Order no later than June 23, 2009.

Pursuant to 39 U.S.C. 505, Paul L. Harrington is appointed to serve as

officer of the Commission (Public Representative) to represent the interests of the general public in these proceedings.

5. The Secretary shall arrange for publication of this Order in the **Federal Register**.

By the Commission.

**Steven W. Williams,**  
*Secretary.*

[FR Doc. E9–14777 Filed 6–23–09; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7710–FW–P**

### SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

[License No. 02/72–0625]

#### Founders Equity SBIC I, L.P.; Notice Seeking Exemption Under Section 312 of the Small Business Investment Act, Conflicts of Interest

Notice is hereby given that Founders Equity SBIC I, L.P., 711 Fifth Avenue, 5th Floor, New York, NY 10022, a Federal Licensee under the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, as amended ("the Act"), in connection with the financing of a small concern, has sought an exemption under Section 312 of the Act and Section 107.730, *Financings which Constitute Conflicts of Interest of the Small Business Administration ("SBA") Rules and Regulations* (13 CFR 107.730). Founders Equity SBIC I, L.P. proposes to provide equity security financing to Richardson Foods, Inc., 101 Erie Blvd., Canajoharie, NY 13317. The financing will provide the company with additional capital to fund an acquisition and to meet working capital requirements, and for debt repayment.

The financing is brought within the purview of § 107.730(a) of the Regulations because Founders Equity NY, L.P., an Associate of Founders Equity SBIC I, L.P., owns more than ten percent of Richardson Foods, Inc. and therefore Richardson Foods, Inc. is considered an Associate of Founders Equity SBIC I, L.P. as defined in § 107.50 of the Regulations.

Notice is hereby given that any interested person may submit written comments on the transaction to the Associate Administrator for Investment, U.S. Small Business Administration, 409 Third Street, SW., Washington, DC 20416.

Dated: June 9, 2009.

**Harry Haskins,**  
*Acting Associate Administrator for Investment.*

[FR Doc. E9–14813 Filed 6–23–09; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE P**

### SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

#### Delegation of Authority

**AGENCY:** U.S. Small Business Administration.

**ACTION:** Notice of delegation of authority.

**SUMMARY:** This document provides the public notice of the delegation of authority for certain investment activities by the Administrator of the Small Business Administration (SBA) to the Chief of Staff and the Agency Licensing Committee.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Harry Haskins, Acting Associate Administrator for Investment, U.S. Small Business Administration, 409 3rd Street, SW., Washington, DC 20416; (202) 205–6694 or [sbic@sba.gov](mailto:sbic@sba.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** This document provides the public notice of the Administrator's delegation of authority to the Agency Licensing Committee to review and recommend to the Administrator for approval applications for licenses to operate as a small business investment company under the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, as amended.

*This delegation of authority reads as follows:*

Pursuant to the authority vested in me pursuant to section 301 of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, as amended, the authority to take any and all actions necessary to review applications for licensing under section 301 of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, as amended, and to recommend to the Administrator which such applications should be approved is delegated to the Agency Licensing Committee.

The Agency Licensing Committee shall be composed of the following members:

Associate Administrator for Capital Access, Chair, Associate Administrator for Investment, General Counsel, Deputy General Counsel, Chief Financial Officer.

This authority revokes all other authorities granted by the Administrator to recommend and approve applications for a license to operate as a small business investment company under the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, as amended. This authority may not be re-delegated; however, in the event that the person serving in one of the positions listed as a member of the Agency Licensing Committee is absent from the office, as defined in SBA Standard Operating Procedure 00 01 2, Chapter 3, paragraph 2, or is unable to perform the functions and duties of his