methodologies appropriate for these sorts of modern detection systems with data logging. Other comments received on draft MARSSIM, Revision 2, included the need for additional guidance on the use of radiation data mapping generated by continuous data-logging systems.

Because MARSSIM only addresses radiological surveys for surface residual radioactivity, additional guidance is also needed on surveys of radiologically contaminated subsurface materials. The MARSSIM methodology relies heavily on scan surveys to evaluate the presence of elevated areas between discrete sample locations. Subsurface soils cannot be effectively scanned due to attenuation of residual radioactivity in the soil column and, therefore, scanning is only effective for surface or excavated materials. Thus, NRC licensees could benefit from additional information regarding acceptable methods for collecting and analyzing data in the subsurface to support decommissioning sites and license termination. Proposed NRC guidance topics include approaches to optimizing subsurface survey design given access difficulties and costly sampling, and data analysis methods to support remedial and compliance decision-making.

III. Specific Request for Comment

The NRC requests comments from stakeholders, including nuclear licensees, professional organizations, nuclear industry consultants, vendors, academic researchers, and interested individuals. The focus of this request is to obtain responses aimed at gathering information that will permit the NRC staff to better understand trends in radiological survey instrumentation development and data analysis approaches, including those for survey of both surface and subsurface residual radioactivity.

IV. Requested Information and Comments

Additional guidance is needed to provide NRC licensees with increased transparency on acceptable approaches to collection and analysis of data collected using more modern data logging systems and associated instrumentation. Additionally, guidance is needed on acceptable approaches for radiological survey of subsurface residual radioactivity to demonstrate compliance with radiological criteria for license termination.

The NRC requests responses to a set of general questions. The following questions are focused on providing the NRC with an understanding of the state-of-art in approaches used to collect and process radiological survey and other data (surface and subsurface) to support decommissioning and license termination. Responses to these questions are expected to assist the NRC with obtaining information that it needs to develop guidance in the areas of (i) design and analysis of continuously collected radiological survey data without a surveyor listening to the audible output, and (ii) subsurface survey design optimization and data analysis to support decommissioning decision-making. Respondents can respond to any subset of the questions posed (*i.e.,* responses do not need to address every question). Please consider providing information to allow NRC staff to contact organizations or individuals directly to clarify submitted responses.

Note: When answering these questions, consider providing details on when multiple systems are used for redundancy and/or variety and how that influences your response.

Questions Related to Continuously Collected Data Surveys Without a Surveyor Listening to the Audible Output

1. What types of system(s) or equipment (*i.e.,* instrumentation, including radiation detectors, and software) do you use or plan to use to record radiation detector location and raw instrument response?

2. What methods do you use to calculate scan minimum detectable concentrations to ensure sufficient sensitivity to detect risk-significant levels of residual radioactivity or to better understand measurement uncertainty?

3. What methods have you used to post-process data to identify areas for follow-up investigation (*e.g.,* use of radiation surveys maps, and statistical tests and measures to identify anomalous radioactivity to be targeted for follow-up investigation)?

4. Have you experienced technical issues with data collection and analysis during previous surveys and what methods did you use to troubleshoot those issues? Do you have any lessons learned you could share related to the technical issues?

5. What areas do you see as challenges or gaps to radiological survey design and data analysis that could be addressed in future guidance (*e.g., a priori* scan minimum detectable concentrations calculation) or tool development (*e.g.,* data integration and post-processing)?

Questions Related to Subsurface Survey Design and Data Analysis

6. What types of instrumentation and approaches do you use to collect subsurface radiological survey data in the field? Specifically, what types of instrumentation and approaches has your organization used to perform surveys of hard to access locations in the subsurface (embedded piping, sumps, soils located at depth or underneath buildings, and bedrock)?

7. What types of methods and software (*e.g.,* geophysical methods and related software) have been used and subsurface data (*e.g.,* hard and soft data) have been collected, and what novel approaches have been used to combine or condition data to develop site conceptual models or mathematical models, or to show release criteria have been met?

8. What statistical approaches have you used to show subsurface residual radioactivity meets release standards including consideration of uncertainty (*e.g.,* number and depth of samples, type of data and statistical approaches used to demonstrate compliance)?

9. What approaches have you used to optimize subsurface survey designs including initial scoping to final status survey designs (*e.g.,* geometrical or geostatistical techniques)?

10. What areas do you see as challenges or gaps with respect to subsurface surveys and data analysis that could be addressed in future guidance or tool development?

Dated: May 1, 2023.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Christepher A. McKenney,

Chief, Risk and Technical Analysis Branch, Division of Decommissioning, Uranium Recovery and Waste Programs, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.

[FR Doc. 2023–09513 Filed 5–3–23; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

POSTAL SERVICE

Product Change—Priority Mail, First-Class Package Service & Parcel Select Negotiated 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 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:* May 4, 2023.

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), on April 26, 2023, it filed with the Postal Regulatory Commission a *Request of the United States Postal Service to Add Priority Mail, First-Class Package Service & Parcel Select Contract 8 to Competitive Product List.* Documents are available at *www.prc.gov,* Docket Nos. MC2023–139, CP2023–141.

Sarah Sullivan,

Attorney, Ethics & Legal Compliance.

[FR Doc. 2023–09442 Filed 5–3–23; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7710–12–P

POSTAL SERVICE

Product Change—Priority Mail Express, Priority Mail, First-Class Package Service, and Parcel Select Service Negotiated 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 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:* May 4, 2023.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Sean 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), on April 28, 2023, it filed with the Postal Regulatory Commission a *USPS Request to Add Priority Mail Express, Priority Mail, First-Class Package Service, and Parcel Select Service Contract 116 to Competitive Product List.* Documents are available at *www.prc.gov,* Docket Nos. MC2023–140, CP2023–143.

Sarah Sullivan,

Attorney, Ethics & Legal Compliance.

[FR Doc. 2023–09437 Filed 5–3–23; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7710–12–P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34–97398; File No. SR–FINRA–2023–007]

Self-Regulatory Organizations; Financial Industry Regulatory Authority, Inc.; Notice of Filing of a Proposed Rule Change To Adopt Supplementary Material .18 (Remote Inspections Pilot Program) Under FINRA Rule 3110 (Supervision)

April 28, 2023.

Pursuant to Section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (''Act'')[1] and Rule 19b–4 thereunder,[2] notice is hereby given that on April 14, 2023, the Financial Industry Regulatory Authority, Inc. (''FINRA'') filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission (''SEC'' or ''Commission'') the proposed rule change as described in Items I, II, and III below, which Items have been prepared by FINRA. The Commission is publishing this notice to solicit comments on the proposed rule change from interested persons.

I. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Terms of Substance of the Proposed Rule Change

FINRA is proposing to amend FINRA Rule 3110 (Supervision) to adopt a voluntary, three-year remote inspections pilot program to allow member firms to elect to fulfill their obligation under paragraph (1) to Rule 3110(c) (Internal Inspections) by conducting inspections of some or all branch offices and locations remotely without an on-site visit to such office or location, subject to specified terms. As detailed below, the key terms would include, among others: (1) a requirement for a firm to conduct and document a risk assessment for inspecting an office or location remotely and providing a non-exhaustive list of factors to consider for this risk assessment; (2) criteria that would make a member firm ineligible to participate in the program; (3) conditions a member firm must satisfy before becoming a pilot program participant relating to the firm's recordkeeping system, and surveillance and technology tools; (4) criteria that would make ineligible for remote inspection certain member firm offices or locations; (5) conditions a member firm's office or location must satisfy to be able to undergo a remote inspection relating to electronic communications, correspondence, and books and records; (6) a requirement that a participating firm provide FINRA specified data and information on a quarterly basis; and (7) authorization for FINRA to determine in the public interest that a firm is no longer eligible to participate in the proposed program.

The proposed Remote Inspections Pilot Program would not change the current requirements under Rule 3110(c). Instead, the proposed program would provide firms the flexibility to satisfy their Rule 3110(c)(1) inspection obligation with or without an on-site visit to the office or location, subject to the proposed terms described herein. FINRA believes that proposed Rule 3110.18, on balance, preserves investor protection objectives through the proposed safeguards while also providing FINRA the opportunity to gauge the effectiveness of remote inspections as part of a modernized, reasonably designed supervisory system that reflects the current work environment and availability of technologies that did not exist when the on-site inspection originally was conceived.

Subject to further clarifications to proposed Rule 3110.18 as described below, the terms of the proposed rule change herein are largely similar to File No. SR–FINRA–2022–021 filed in July 2022,[3] then amended in December 2022[4] (together, the ''2022 Remote Inspections Pilot Program Rule Filing''). FINRA withdrew File No. SR–FINRA–2022–021 on April 11, 2023 to consider whether more safeguards and clarifications to the filing would be appropriate in response to concerns raised by commenters.[5] This proposed rule change is organized in five sections: (1) the background, which provides a historical overview of Rule 3110(c), and discusses the environmental changes that have occurred over the years relating to technology and the workplace; (2) FINRA's observations of evolving inspection practices; (3) the emergence of remote inspections as a new approach to evaluation under Rule 3110(c)(1); (4) a description of the terms of the proposed rule change; and (5) an overview of FINRA's monitoring and compliance with proposed Rule 3110.18.

The text of the proposed rule change is available on FINRA's website at *http://www.finra.org,* at the principal

[1] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1).

[2] 17 CFR 240.19b–4.

[3] *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 95452 (August 9, 2022), 87 FR 50144 (August 15, 2022) (Notice of Filing of File No. SR–FINRA–2022–021) (''Initial Rule Filing''); *see also* Exhibit 2a.

[4] *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 96520 (December 16, 2022), 87 FR 78737 (December 22, 2022) (Notice of Partial Amendment No. 1 to File No. SR–FINRA–2022–021) (''Amended Rule Filing''); *see also* Exhibit 2b.

[5] *See* Exhibit 2d.