

notice. To verify the status of meetings call (recording)—(301) 415-1292. Contact person for more information: Michelle Schroll, (301) 415-1662.

\* \* \* \* \*

The NRC Commission Meeting Schedule can be found on the Internet at: <http://www.nrc.gov/what-we-do/policy-making/schedule.html>

\* \* \* \* \*

The NRC provides reasonable accommodation to individuals with disabilities where appropriate. If you need a reasonable accommodation to participate in these public meetings, or need this meeting notice or the transcript or other information from the public meetings in another format (e.g. braille, large print), please notify the NRC's Disability Program Coordinator, Deborah Chan, at 301-415-7041, TDD: 301-415-2100, or by e-mail at [DLC@nrc.gov](mailto:DLC@nrc.gov). Determinations on requests for reasonable accommodation will be made on a case-by-case basis.

\* \* \* \* \*

This notice is distributed by mail to several hundred subscribers; if you no longer wish to receive it, or would like to be added to the distribution, please contact the Office of the Secretary, Washington, DC 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: April 13, 2006.

**R. Michelle Schroll,**

*Office of the Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 06-3746 Filed 4-14-06; 2:13 pm]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

### NUREG-1842, "Evaluation of Human Reliability Analysis Methods Against Good Practices, Draft Report for Comment"

**AGENCY:** Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice of availability of NUREG-1842, "Evaluation of Human Reliability Analysis Methods Against Good Practices, Draft Report for Comment," and request for public comment.

**SUMMARY:** The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is announcing the availability of and is seeking comments on NUREG-1842, "Evaluation of Human Reliability Analysis Methods Against

Good Practices, Draft Report For Comment."

**DATES:** Comments on this document should be submitted by June 19, 2006. Comments received after that date will be considered to the extent practical. To ensure efficient and complete comment resolution, comments should include references to the section, page, and line numbers of the document to which the comment applies, if possible.

**ADDRESSES:** Members of the public are invited and encouraged to submit written comments to Michael Lesar, Chief, Rules and Directives Branch, Office of Administration, Mail Stop T6-D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001. Hand-deliver comments attention to Michael Lesar, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, MD, between 7:30 a.m. and 4:15 p.m. on Federal workdays. Comments may also be sent electronically to [NRCREP@nrc.gov](mailto:NRCREP@nrc.gov).

This document, NUREG-1842, is available at the Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS) Public Electronic Reading Room on the Internet at the NRC Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html> under Accession No. ML060960216; on the NRC Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/doc-collections/nuregs/docs4comment>; and at the NRC Public Document Room, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, MD. The PDR's mailing address is USNRC PDR, Washington, DC 20555; telephone (301) 415-4737 or (800) 397-4205; fax (301) 415-3548; e-mail [PDR@NRC.GOV](mailto:PDR@NRC.GOV).

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION, CONTACT:** Erasmia Lois, Human Factors and Reliability Branch, Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research, telephone (301) 415-6560, e-mail [exl1@nrc.gov](mailto:exl1@nrc.gov)

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

#### NUREG-1842, "Evaluation of Human Reliability Analysis Methods Against Good Practices, Draft Report for Comment, Draft for Comment"

The NRC is developing guidance for performing or evaluating human reliability analyses (HRAs) to support risk-informed regulatory decision-making and, in particular, the implementation of Regulatory Guide 1.200, "An Approach for Determining the Technical Adequacy of Probabilistic Risk Assessment Results for Risk-Informed Activities," dated February 2004. The guidance is developed in two phases. The first phase focused on developing "Good Practices for Implementing Human Reliability Analysis," that is documenting the processes and analytical tasks and judgments expected to have been

performed in order for the HRA results to sufficiently represent the anticipated operator performance in risk-informed decisions. The good practices were submitted for public comment, NUREG-1792, Good Practices for Implementing Human Reliability Analysis, Draft Report for Comment," August 2004, and were published as a final NUREG-1792 in April 2005. The second phase, summarized in draft NUREG-1842, evaluated the various HRA methods that are commonly used in regulatory applications, with a particular focus on their capabilities to satisfy the good practices, as well as their respective strengths and limitations regarding their underlying knowledge and data bases.

The NRC is seeking public comment in order to receive feedback from the widest range of interested parties and to ensure that all information relevant to developing this document is available to the NRC staff. This document is issued for comment only and is not intended for interim use. The NRC will review public comments received on the document, incorporate suggested changes as necessary, and issue the final NUREG-1842 for use.

The NRC will hold a public meeting on May 23, 2006 at the NRC headquarters, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland, Room: Commission Briefing Room (8:30 a.m.-5 p.m., preliminary agenda enclosed). The purpose of the meeting is to discuss the findings and conclusions documented in NUREG-1842 in order to allow stakeholders develop a better understanding of the contents of the report and ask clarification questions. The NRC is not soliciting comments on draft NUREG-1842 as part of this meeting. Public comments on the draft NUREG-1842 can be provided as discussed above.

Dated at Rockville, MD, this 11th day of April 2006.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.  
**Farouk Eltwila,**  
*Director, Division of Risk Assessment and  
 Special Projects, Office of Nuclear Regulatory  
 Research.*

**Agenda—Public Meeting on NUREG–  
 1842 “Evaluation of Human Reliability  
 Analysis Methods Against Good  
 Practices, Draft Report for Comment,”**

May 23, 2006.

*U.S. NRC Headquarters, 11555  
 Rockville Pike, Rockville, MD 20852,  
 Room Commission Briefing Room*

**PRELIMINARY AGENDA**

Morning	Topic
8:30–9 .....	Introduction/Overview.
9–10:30 .....	Evaluation of Methods. —Approach and Summary of results. —Brief discussion of each method.
10:30–10:45 .....	Break.
10:45–12 .....	Evaluation of Methods (Continued). —Comparison of methods against some key char- acteristics. —Implications—What methods should be used when? Lunch. Discussion on method evaluation (continued). Questions and Answers (as needed).

[FR Doc. E6–5736 Filed 4–17–06; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7590–01–P**

**OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT  
 CORPORATION**

**April 27, 2006 Board of Directors  
 Meeting**

*Time and Date:* Thursday, April 27,  
 2006, 10 a.m. (Open Portion); 10:15 a.m.  
 (Closed Portion).

*Place:* Offices of the Corporation,  
 Twelfth Floor Board Room, 1100 New  
 York Avenue, NW., Washington, DC.

*Status:* Meeting Open to the Public  
 from 10 a.m. to 10:15 a.m. Closed  
 portion will commence at 10:15 a.m.  
 (approx.).

*Matters to be Considered:*

1. President's Report.
2. Confirmation of Vice President.
3. Confirmation of Vice President.
4. Approval of January 19, 2006

Minutes (Open Portion).

*Further Matters to be Considered:*  
 (Closed to the Public 10:15 a.m.).

1. Finance Project—Eastern Europe  
 and NIS Countries.
2. Finance Project—Global.

3. Finance Project—Global.
4. Finance Project—Caribbean  
 Community and Common Market/  
 Dominican Republic.
5. Finance Project—Central America,  
 Panama, Colombia, and Mexico.
6. Finance Project—Africa.
7. Finance Project—Southern Africa.
8. Approval of January 19, 2006  
 Minutes (Closed Portion).
6. Pending Major Projects.
7. Reports.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Information on the meeting may be  
 obtained from Connie M. Downs at (202)  
 336–8438.

Dated: January 6, 2006.

**Connie M. Downs,**

*Corporate Secretary, Overseas Private  
 Investment Corporation.*

[FR Doc. 06–3740 Filed 4–14–06; 12:40 pm]

**BILLING CODE 3210–01–M**

**POSTAL RATE COMMISSION**

**[Docket No. C2004–3; Order No. 1460]**

**Order and Notice of Proceeding**

**AGENCY:** Postal Rate Commission.

**ACTION:** Order denying motion to  
 dismiss and notice of proceeding.

**SUMMARY:** This document announces the  
 Commission's decision to institute a  
 formal proceeding to consider issues  
 raised in a complaint concerning  
 stamped stationery. Conducting this  
 proceeding will allow the Commission  
 to determine whether the complaint  
 raises any genuine issues of material  
 fact and to make related determinations.

**DATES:** 1. Deadline for filing issue  
 statements and notices of intervention:  
 April 27, 2006. 2. Deadline for filing  
 replies to issue statements: May 4, 2006.

**ADDRESSES:** File all documents referred  
 to in this order electronically via the  
 Commission's Filing Online system at  
<http://www.prc.gov>.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**  
 Stephen L. Sharfman, 202–789–6820.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The  
 Commission has before it a complaint  
 filed by Douglas F. Carlson (Carlson or  
 Complainant) concerning stamped  
 stationery<sup>1</sup> and a motion to dismiss the  
 complaint filed by the Postal Service.<sup>2</sup>  
 The central issue presented by these  
 pleadings is whether stamped stationery  
 is a postal or philatelic product. If the

former, it is subject to the Commission's  
 jurisdiction; if the latter, it is not.

The Postal Service's motion to  
 dismiss is denied. This should not,  
 however, be read as a finding on the  
 merits on the jurisdictional question  
 presented. The pleadings raise mixed  
 questions of fact and law. Based solely  
 on the pleadings, the Commission is  
 disinclined to determine whether or not  
 genuine issues of material fact remain in  
 dispute. Accordingly, by this order the  
 Commission hereby notices the  
 proceeding and, as discussed below,  
 provides interested persons an  
 opportunity to address whether or not  
 genuine issues of material fact remain to  
 be presented in this case. Following  
 submission of responsive pleadings, the  
 Commission will determine whether to  
 proceed with or without hearing. If no  
 genuine material issue of fact is  
 presented, the Commission will  
 establish a briefing schedule affording  
 participants an opportunity to address  
 the principal legal issue whether or not  
 stamped stationery is a postal service.

**I. Background**

*The Complaint.* In his Complaint,  
 filed pursuant to 39 U.S.C. 3662,  
 Carlson contends that stamped  
 stationery is a postal service subject to  
 the Commission's jurisdiction. The  
 specific stationery in question consists  
 of sheets of 6.25" x 14.31" paper  
 imprinted with "The Art of Disney:  
*Friendship*" postage stamps or indicia.  
 Each pre-stamped sheet has room for a  
 message and address; the sheet is  
 designed to be folded, sealed, and  
 mailed.<sup>3</sup>

While Carlson makes several claims,  
 the gravamen of his complaint is that  
 stamped stationery is a postal service  
 within the meaning of 39 U.S.C. 3621,  
 3622, and 3623. *Id.* at 2, para. 10. In  
 support, he compares stamped  
 stationery to stamped envelopes and  
 stamped cards, both of which are postal  
 services. *Id.* at 3, paras. 14–15. He  
 observes that section 960 of the  
 Domestic Mail Classification Schedule  
 (DMCS) is entitled "Stamped Paper"  
 and that it includes stamped envelopes  
 and stamped cards. *Ibid.* paras. 16–17.  
 He contends that stamped stationery is  
 a form of stamped paper within the  
 meaning of section 960 of the DMCS.  
*Ibid.* para. 21. In addition, Carlson notes  
 that the Postal Service describes

<sup>1</sup> Douglas F. Carlson Complaint on Stamped  
 Stationery, June 24, 2004 (Complaint).

<sup>2</sup> Motion of the United States Postal Service to  
 Dismiss Complaint, January 18, 2006 (Motion to  
 Dismiss).

<sup>3</sup> At the time the Complaint was filed, the  
 stamped stationery sold in pads of 12 for \$14.95,  
 while the face value of the postage was \$4.44.  
 Complaint at 2, para. 8.