

position contained in the CA BTP. The Commission agreed with the staff's approach to revise the blending guidance to be risk-informed and performance-based, which supports the agency's regulatory goals. With this direction from the Commission, the staff is initiating revisions to the entire CA BTP to include the Commission's new position on blending, as well as to consider risk-informed, performance-based approaches for the remainder of the CA BTP.

## II. Questions Related to Branch Technical Position

This section identifies questions associated with revising the CA BTP. These questions are not meant to be a complete or final list, but are intended to initiate discussion. These questions will help to focus the discussion at the public meeting. All public feedback will be considered in developing a draft for later public review and comment.

1. NUREG-1854, "NRC Staff Guidance for Activities Related to U.S. Department of Energy Waste Determinations—Draft Final Report for Interim Use," issued August 2007," contains extensive guidance for site-specific evaluations of intruder protection. The approach in the NUREG was endorsed by NRC's Advisory Committee on Nuclear Waste and Materials, which also recommended that the staff evaluate a broader application of the new concentration averaging methodology to wastes other than "waste incidental to reprocessing." How could approaches in that guidance be used in revising the CA BTP?

2. Part 61 limits the disposal of Cs-137 to 4,600 Ci/m<sup>3</sup>, yet the CA BTP guidance for disposal of discrete Cs-137 sources recommends a limit of 30 Ci in 0.2 m<sup>3</sup> (150 Ci/m<sup>3</sup>). Given the large disparity between the CA BTP guidance and Part 61, and given the need to dispose of large Cs-137 sources, should NRC consider revising the 30 Ci in 0.2 m<sup>3</sup> recommendation found in the CA BTP?

3. The rulemaking for unique waste streams (see SECY-08-0147 and the SRM-SECY-08-0147) will protect the inadvertent human intruder by requiring a site- and waste-specific assessment. The current CA BTP defines acceptable practices for applying the 61.55 tables, to insure that inadvertent human intruder is protected (as intended in the draft and final Environmental Impact Statement for Part 61). Given the NRC's move towards site- and waste-specific analyses to demonstrate protection of the intruder—is the CA BTP necessary, or could it be eliminated?

4. The volume over which waste concentrations are averaged has a significant effect on waste classification. The current CA BTP addresses averaging over a waste package. Others have suggested that averaging occur over the volume of waste that an inadvertent intruder would be exposed to, or the volume of a disposal trench. What are the pros and cons of these approaches?

5. For blending homogeneous waste types, the NRC will be requiring a site- and waste-specific intruder analysis, so as to be risk-informed and performance-based. In requiring a site- and waste-specific analysis for homogeneous waste types, the NRC is moving away from the CA BTP's "factor of 10 rule" for individual contributors to a mixture of homogeneous waste types. Should NRC also move away from the "factor of 10 rule" for non-primary gamma emitters and away from the "factor of 1.5 rule" for primary gamma emitters?

6. What limits on the types of LLW that can be blended should be specified in the CA BTP? Specifically, should blending of cartridge filters and sealed sources to form homogeneous mixtures be addressed in the CA BTP?

7. In the Commission's October 13, 2010, decision on LLRW blending, it stated that "\* \* \* [Greater than Class C] GTCC waste is a Federal responsibility and \* \* \* should not be made into a State responsibility, even if the waste has been blended into a lower classification." What unique guidance will GTCC waste require in the BTP, given this direction? For example, when should waste be classified? (Waste is currently not required to be classified until it is shipped for disposal).

8. How should NRC consider heterogeneity in waste concentrations in the site-specific intruder analysis? Does there need to be guidance on how to interpret intruder analysis results with respect to waste heterogeneity?

9. 10 CFR 61.55(a)(8), allows for averaging of waste concentrations in determining the classification of waste. Such averaging should continue to protect an inadvertent intruder in a waste disposal facility, one of the four performance objectives in 10 CFR Part 61.

- How do other programs for managing and disposing of waste treat protection of an inadvertent intruder?
- Do they allow for averaging, and if so, what are the constraints?
- Could or should NRC harmonize its approach with these other programs? If so, would changes need to be made to NRC regulations, or could they be made in guidance?

Dated at Rockville, Maryland this 20th day of January 2011.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Gregory F. Suber,**

*Acting 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. 2011-1611 Filed 1-25-11; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7590-01-P**

## PENSION BENEFIT GUARANTY CORPORATION

### Submission of Information Collection for OMB Review; Comment Request; Liability for Termination of Single-Employer Plans

**AGENCY:** Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation.

**ACTION:** Notice of request for extension of OMB approval.

**SUMMARY:** The Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation ("PBGC") is requesting that the Office of Management and Budget ("OMB") extend approval, under the Paperwork Reduction Act, of a collection of information in its regulation on Liability for Termination of Single-Employer Plans, 29 CFR Part 4062 (OMB control number 1212-0017; expires March 31, 2011). This notice informs the public of PBGC's request and solicits public comment on the collection of information.

**DATES:** Comments should be submitted by February 25, 2011.

**ADDRESSES:** Comments should be sent to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, Attention: Desk Officer for Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, via electronic mail at [OIRA\\_DOCKET@omb.eop.gov](mailto:OIRA_DOCKET@omb.eop.gov) or by fax to (202) 395-6974. Copies of the collection of information may also be obtained without charge by writing to the Disclosure Division of the Office of the General Counsel of PBGC at the above address or by visiting the Disclosure Division or calling 202-326-4040 during normal business hours. (TTY and TDD users may call the Federal relay service toll-free at 1-800-877-8339 and ask to be connected to 202-326-4040.) PBGC's regulation on Liability for Termination of Single-employer Plans may be accessed on PBGC's Web site at <http://www.pbgc.gov>.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Thomas H. Gabriel, Attorney, or Catherine B. Klion, Manager, Regulatory and Policy Division, Legislative and

Regulatory Department, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, 1200 K Street, NW., Washington, DC 20005-4026, 202-326-4024. (For TTY/TDD users, call the Federal relay service toll-free at 1-800-877-8339 and ask to be connected to 202-326-4024.)

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Section 4062 of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, as amended, provides that the contributing sponsor of a single-employer pension plan and members of the sponsor's controlled group ("the employer") incur liability ("employer liability") if the plan terminates with assets insufficient to pay benefit liabilities under the plan. PBGC's statutory lien for employer liability and the payment terms for employer liability are affected by whether and to what extent employer liability exceeds 30 percent of the employer's net worth.

Section 4062.6 of PBGC's employer liability regulation (29 CFR 4062.6) requires a contributing sponsor or member of the contributing sponsor's controlled group who believes employer liability upon plan termination exceeds 30 percent of the employer's net worth to so notify PBGC and to submit net worth information. PBGC needs this information to determine whether and to what extent employer liability exceeds 30 percent of the employer's net worth.

OMB approved this collection of information under the regulation (OMB control number 1212-0017, expires March 31, 2011). PBGC is requesting that OMB extend its approval for three years. An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number.

PBGC estimates that (1) an average of five contributing sponsors or controlled group members per year will respond to this collection of information; and (2) the average annual burden of this collection of information will be 12 hours and \$3,996 per respondent, with an average total annual burden of 60 hours and \$19,980.

Issued in Washington, DC, this 20th day of January 2011.

**John H. Hanley,**

*Director, Legislative and Regulatory Department, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation.*

[FR Doc. 2011-1596 Filed 1-25-11; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7709-01-P**

## OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

### Hispanic Council on Federal Employment

**AGENCY:** Office of Personnel Management.

**ACTION:** Establishment of advisory committee.

**SUMMARY:** The Hispanic Council on Federal Employment will hold its initial meeting on February 11, 2011, at the time and location shown below. The Council is an advisory committee composed of representatives from Hispanic organizations and senior government officials. Along with its other responsibilities, the Council shall advise the Director of the Office of Personnel Management on matters involving the recruitment, hiring, and advancement of Hispanics in the Federal workforce. The Council is co-chaired by the Chief of Staff of the Office of Personnel Management and the Assistant Secretary for Human Resources and Administration at the Department of Veterans Affairs.

The meeting is open to the public. Please contact the Office of Personnel Management at the address shown below if you wish to present material to the Council at the meeting. The manner and time prescribed for presentations may be limited, depending upon the number of parties that express interest in presenting information.

**DATES:** February 11, 2011 at 2 p.m.

**LOCATION:** U.S. Office of Personnel Management, Theodore Roosevelt Executive Conference Room, 5th Floor, Theodore Roosevelt Building, 1900 E St. NW., Washington, DC 20415.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Veronica E. Villalobos, Director for the Office of Diversity and Inclusion, Office of Personnel Management, 1900 E St., NW., Suite 5305, Washington, DC 20415. Phone (202) 606-1611 FAX (202) 606-2183 or e-mail at [Michael.LaRosa@opm.gov](mailto:Michael.LaRosa@opm.gov).

U.S. Office of Personnel Management.

**John Berry,**

*Director.*

[FR Doc. 2011-1581 Filed 1-25-11; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6325-46-P**

## POSTAL REGULATORY COMMISSION

### Sunshine Act Meetings

**TIME AND DATE:** Wednesday, February 2, 2011, at 11 a.m.

**PLACE:** Commission hearing room, 901 New York Avenue, NW., Suite 200, Washington, DC 20268-0001.

**STATUS:** Part of this meeting will be open to the public. The rest of the meeting will be closed to the public. The open part of the meeting will be audiocast. The audiocast can be accessed via the Commission's Web site at <http://www.prc.gov>.

**MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED:** The agenda for the Commission's February 2011 meeting includes the items identified below.

#### Portions Open to the Public

1. Report on Legislative Review and review of postal-related congressional activity.

2. Review of active cases.

3. Report on recent activities of the Joint Periodicals Task Force and status of the report to the Congress pursuant to Section 708 of the PAEA.

4. Status report on contracts to study the social benefit of the mail.

5. Report on international activities.

#### Portions Closed to the Public

6. Discussion of pending litigation.

7. Discussion of confidential personnel issues.

8. Discussion of contracts involving confidential commercial information.

**CONTACT PERSON FOR MORE INFORMATION:** Stephen L. Sharfman, General Counsel, Postal Regulatory Commission, 901 New York Avenue, NW., Suite 200, Washington, DC 20268-0001, at [stephen.sharfman@prc.gov](mailto:stephen.sharfman@prc.gov) or 202-789-6820 (for agenda-related inquiries) and Shoshana M. Grove, Secretary of the Commission, at 202-789-6800 or [shoshana.grove@prc.gov](mailto:shoshana.grove@prc.gov) (for inquiries related to meeting location, access for handicapped or disabled persons, the audiocast, or similar matters).

*Dated:* January 21, 2011.

By the Commission.

**Ruth Ann Abrams,**

*Acting Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 2011-1698 Filed 1-24-11; 11:15 am]

**BILLING CODE 7710-FW-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF STATE

[Public Notice: 7243]

### U.S. National Commission for UNESCO Notice of Closed Teleconference Meeting

The U.S. National Commission for UNESCO will hold a conference call on Tuesday, February 15, 2011, beginning at 1 p.m. Eastern Time. The teleconference meeting will be closed to