

required to provide information to the NRC when requested on the cleared individual and maintain records to ensure that only individuals with the adequate level of protection are provided access to NRC classified information and material.

### III. Specific Requests for Comments

The NRC is seeking comments that address the following questions:

1. Is the proposed collection of information necessary for the NRC to properly perform its functions? Does the information have practical utility? Please explain your answer.

2. Is the estimate of the burden of the information collection accurate? Please explain your answer.

3. Is there a way to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected?

4. How can the burden of the information collection on respondents be minimized, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology?

*Authority:* 42 U.S.C. 2011 *et seq.*

Dated: August 3, 2026.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Kristen Benney,**

*NRC Clearance Officer, Office of the Chief Information Officer.*

[FR Doc. 2026-15858 Filed 8-4-26; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7590-01-P**

## POSTAL REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. PI2020-1; Order No. 9670]

### Public Inquiry

**AGENCY:** Postal Regulatory Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The Commission is acknowledging the granting of a Postal Service motion and the extension of both comment deadlines in this proceeding.

**DATES:** *Comments are due:* September 30, 2026. *Reply comments are due:* October 14, 2026.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit responses electronically via the Commission's Filing Online system at <https://www.prc.gov>. Those who cannot submit responses electronically should contact the person identified in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section by telephone for advice on filing alternatives.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** David A. Trissell, General Counsel, at 202-789-6820.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

### Table of Contents

- I. Discussion of Motion
- II. Rule 124(c) Violation
- III. Ordering Paragraphs

#### I. Discussion of Motion

On June 26, 2026, in Order No. 9625, the Commission set the scope of further proceedings in the instant public inquiry docket and provided an opportunity for interested persons to submit comments within the scope of these further proceedings.<sup>1</sup> In doing so, the Commission established deadlines for the submission of comments and reply comments. *See* Order No. 9625 at 13. On July 30, 2026, the Postal Service filed a motion requesting that each of these deadlines be extended by 30 days.<sup>2</sup> According to the Postal Service, “[t]he additional time is being requested due to the magnitude of data requiring review . . . and to afford the Postal Service the opportunity to adequately evaluate that information and present its comments in a manner most helpful to all parties involved.” Postal Service Motion for Extension at 1.

The Rural Carrier Protection & Accountability Alliance (RCPAA) filed an objection to the extension and requests that the extension be denied or, if extraordinary circumstances are found to exist, that any extension be limited to 7 days.<sup>3</sup> RCPAA asserts that the Postal Service had not affirmatively shown good cause and instead made a generalized assertion regarding the magnitude of data to review. RCPAA Objection to Extension at 1. RCPAA asserts that reviewing Postal Service data and non-public materials does not warrant an additional 30 days. *Id.* at 2. RCPAA asserts that granting the requested extension would compress the reply opportunity for other participants and negatively affect their ability to meaningfully review and

<sup>1</sup> Order on the Scope of Further Proceedings, Notice of Filing of Library References PRC-LR-PI2020-1-NP3 and PRC-LR-PI2020-1-1, and Request for Comments, June 26, 2026 (Order No. 9625). The issues for consideration in the further proceedings in the instant docket are: (1) the use of Rural Route Evaluated Compensation System (RRECS) data in the methodology for estimating the value of the postal monopoly and mailbox monopoly (Estimation Methodology); and (2) the Estimation Methodology workpapers issued together with Order No. 9625 in non-public Library Reference PRC-LR-PI2020-1-NP3 and in public Library Reference PRC-LR-PI2020-1-1. Order No. 9625 at 8. The “postal monopoly” refers to the Postal Service’s combined letter and mailbox monopolies. *See id.* at 1.

<sup>2</sup> Motion for Extension of Time to File Comments Responsive to Order No. 9625, July 30, 2026 (Postal Service Motion for Extension).

<sup>3</sup> Rural Carrier Protection & Accountability Alliance Objection to USPS Motion for Extension of Time, July 31, 2026, at 4 (RCPAA Objection to Extension).

respond to the Postal Service’s filing. *Id.* at 3. RCPAA asserts that stakeholders have relied on the established schedule and some have submitted early comments. *Id.*

Rule 162 permits any person to seek an extension by motion filed before the applicable deadline expires. 39 CFR 3010.162(a)–(b). “The motion shall only be granted upon consideration of the potential adverse impact, if any, on other participants and the overall impact on the procedural schedule.” 39 CFR 3010.162(c).

The Postal Service’s motion is timely. Therefore, the Commission evaluates potential adverse impacts on other participants and on the procedural schedule, including participants’ ability to provide meaningful comment.

RCPAA’s primary objection focuses on the sufficiency of the Postal Service’s justification. The Commission’s library references accompanying Order No. 9625 contain the Commission’s analysis of the FY 2024 Value of the Postal and Mailbox Monopolies as well as files used in the application of the Estimation Methodology. These library references are voluminous and complex. As Order No. 9625 explains, the goal of this proceeding is to determine whether and how to enhance the Estimation Methodology; broader RRECS concerns are relevant only insofar as they directly bear on that goal. *See* Order No. 9625 at 9. The Postal Service represents that, given the magnitude of the data requiring review, an extension is necessary to allow adequate evaluation and to provide helpful comments. *See* Motion for Extension at 1. That justification aligns with the proceeding’s stated goal and Rule 162(c).<sup>4</sup>

Given the volume of materials and the technical focus, a modest, time-limited extension will improve the quality and completeness of the record and aid Commission decision-making without materially disrupting the schedule. Reviewing the Commission’s library references requires not only re-reading Postal Service information but correctly applying it to the topics within the established scope to prepare written comments. This is the first request to extend the deadlines established by Order No. 9625, and a 30-day extension for both initial and reply comments is reasonable. Granting the requested extension affords all participants additional time to prepare both initial and reply comments.

<sup>4</sup> RCPAA writes “[u]nder 39 [CFR] 3010.162, an extension requires an affirmative showing of good cause.” RCPAA Objection to Extension at 1. This language does not appear in the text of 39 CFR 3010.162.

RCPAA's reliance arguments are unpersuasive. Rule 162 contemplates that schedules may be adjusted before deadlines expire. 39 CFR 3010.162(b). Participants who have already filed will not be disadvantaged. Additional time for reply comments maintains equity among participants by preserving time for responsive analysis on the issues defined in Order No. 9625. *See* Order No. 9625 at 8–13. Any reliance interests are minimal and are outweighed by the benefits to the record's completeness and usefulness. Although some participants filed significantly before the established deadline, doing so is not required. "Filers are encouraged to consolidate their arguments into concise, well-supported documents that directly address the issues within the scope of the further proceedings in this docket." Order No. 9625 at 14.

RCPAA also asserts that a 30-day extension would compress reply opportunities and impair meaningful response. The Postal Service, however, seeks to extend both deadlines by 30 days. Extending both deadlines proportionally preserves the reply interval. The reply period remains 14 days under both Order No. 9625's established schedule and the Postal Service's proposed schedule. Accordingly, the asserted prejudice does not arise under the requested relief.

Because extending the comment deadlines as requested is unlikely to have any adverse impact on other participants and on the procedural schedule of this docket, the Postal Service Motion for Extension is granted. *See* 39 CFR 3010.162(c).

## II. Rule 124(c) Violation

Rule 124(c) of the rules of practice provides that the title of a document filed with the Commission "shall identify each participant on whose behalf the filing is made . . . ." 39 CFR 3010.124(c). In Order No. 9625, the Commission found that the Postal Service had violated Rule 124(c) in the instant docket because the title of Postal Service's May 26, 2026 Notice of Errata did not identify the Postal Service.<sup>5</sup> The Commission reminded all participants

that they must comply with Rule 124(c). Order No. 9625 at 16.

The title of the Postal Service Motion for Extension, Motion for Extension of Time to File Comments Responsive to Order No. 9625, also does not identify the Postal Service. Consequently, the Commission finds that the Postal Service violated Rule 124(c) by improperly titling the Postal Service Motion for Extension. The Commission reiterates that the Postal Service, and all participants, must comply with Rule 124(c).

## III. Ordering Paragraphs

*It is ordered:*

1. The Motion for Extension of Time to File Comments Responsive to Order No. 9625, filed July 30, 2026, is granted.
2. Comments within the scope of the further proceedings established in Order No. 9625 are due September 30, 2026.
3. Reply comments within the scope of the further proceedings established in Order No. 9625 are due October 14, 2026.
4. This order, or an abstract thereof, shall be published in the **Federal Register**.

By the Commission.

**Ashley Demchak,**

*Alternate Federal Register Liaison.*

[FR Doc. 2026–15872 Filed 8–4–26; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7710–FW–P**

## POSTAL SERVICE

### International Product Change—Priority Mail Express International, Priority Mail International & First-Class Package International Service Agreement

**AGENCY:** Postal Service.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The Postal Service gives notice of filing a request with the Postal Regulatory Commission to add a Priority Mail Express International, Priority Mail International & First-Class Package International Service contract to the list of Negotiated Service Agreements in the Competitive Product List in the Mail Classification Schedule.

**DATES:** Date of notice: August 5, 2026.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Christopher C. Meyerson, (202) 268–7820.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The United States Postal Service hereby gives notice that, pursuant to 39 U.S.C. 3642 and 3632(b)(3), on July 27, 2026, it filed with the Postal Regulatory Commission a *USPS Request to Add Priority Mail Express International, Priority Mail International & First-Class Package International Service Contract 119 to Competitive Product List*. Documents are available at [www.prc.gov](http://www.prc.gov), Docket Nos. MC2026–322 and K2026–317.

**Colleen Hibbert-Kapler,**

*Attorney, Ethics and Legal Compliance.*

[FR Doc. 2026–15834 Filed 8–4–26; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7710–12–P**

## POSTAL SERVICE

### Product Change—Priority Mail Express, Priority Mail, and USPS Ground Advantage Negotiated Service Agreements; Priority Mail, and USPS Ground Advantage Negotiated Service Agreements

**AGENCY:** Postal Service.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The Postal Service gives notice of filing a request with the Postal Regulatory Commission to add a domestic shipping services contract to the list of Negotiated Service Agreements in the Mail Classification Schedule's Competitive Products List.

**DATES:** *Date of required notice:* August 5, 2026.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Sean C. Robinson, 202–268–8405.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The United States Postal Service hereby gives notice that, pursuant to 39 U.S.C. 3642 and 3632(b)(3), it filed with the Postal Regulatory Commission the following requests:

| Date filed with Postal Regulatory Commission | Negotiated service agreement product category and No. | MC docket No.    | K docket No. |
|----------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|------------------|--------------|
| 07/27/26 .....                               | PM–GA 1053 .....                                      | MC2026–323 ..... | K2026–318    |
| 07/28/26 .....                               | PME–PM–GA 1504 .....                                  | MC2026–324 ..... | K2026–319    |
| 07/29/26 .....                               | PM–GA 1054 .....                                      | MC2026–325 ..... | K2026–320    |
| 07/29/26 .....                               | PM–GA 1055 .....                                      | MC2026–326 ..... | K2026–321    |
| 07/29/26 .....                               | PM–GA 1056 .....                                      | MC2026–329 ..... | K2026–324    |
| 07/30/26 .....                               | PM–GA 1057 .....                                      | MC2026–330 ..... | K2026–325    |

<sup>5</sup> Order No. 9625 at 15; *see* Notice of Errata, May 26, 2026.