

The Postal Service's FY 2009 ACR discusses the evolution of its measurement of service standards to meet the mandate of 39 U.S.C. 3652(a)(2)(B)(i). The Postal Service reports that its hybrid IMb-based system for obtaining service performance results for bulk market dominant products is still under development. The Postal Service intends to use data from this system to measure service performance of its bulk mail products in the future. *Id.* at 9–10. Also of interest is the expansion of the coverage of the Postal Service's EXFC system for measuring the service performance of single-piece First-Class Mail from 463 3–digit ZIP Code areas to 892 3–digit ZIP Code areas. It notes that on-time performance in the expansion ZIP Codes initially lagged the on-time performance of the legacy ZIP Codes by 13.5 percent, but that management initiatives reduced that gap to less than 1 percent by the end of FY 2009. *Id.* at 12–13.

In its most recent compliance determination, the Commission raised concerns about the customer satisfaction measurement survey used by the Postal Service in its FY 2008 ACR. The Postal Service describes new modifications it made to improve that system, *id.* at 16–17, and customer satisfaction measurement instruments it has developed and is implementing for use in its FY 2010 ACR. *Id.* at 19.

Generally, market dominant products that were flat shaped or parcel shaped failed to cover their attributable costs in FY 2009. For example, Periodicals lost \$642 million, earning revenues that were only 76 percent of attributable costs. *Id.* at 40, Table 3. Standard Regular flats, and Standard Regular parcels and NFMs together lost \$830 million. Flats were roughly 82 percent of attributable costs, and revenues for parcels and NFMs were roughly 75 percent of attributable costs. *Id.* at 26, Table 2. Package Services, as a class, lost \$53 million. Among package services products, only Bound Printed Matter flats and Inbound Surface Parcel Post covered their attributable costs. *Id.* at 42–43, Table 4. Four Special Services failed to recover their attributable costs—Registered Mail, Stamped Cards, International Ancillary Services, and Confirm. *Id.* at 52–53, Table 5. Finally, International Inbound Single-Piece First-Class Mail failed to cover its costs, earning revenues that were approximately 60 percent of attributable costs. *Id.* at 22. Additionally, the Postal Service provides a discussion of the competing policy considerations that impact workshare discounts and the reasons a substantial number of workshare discounts may have

exceeded avoided costs in FY 2009. *Id.* at 58–73.

With respect to competitive products, seven international products failed to recover their attributable costs—Inbound International Expedited Services 1 and 2; Inbound Surface Parcel Post at Non-UPU Rates; International Money Transfer Service; Competitive Registered Mail; Competitive Insurance; Competitive Return Receipt; and Competitive International Business Reply Service negotiated service agreement contracts. *Id.* at 77–79.

The Postal Service estimates that competitive products as a whole covered their incremental costs, calculated two alternative ways, and therefore pass the test for identifying cross-subsidy of competitive products by market dominant products. It, therefore, concludes competitive products were in compliance with 39 U.S.C. 3633(a)(1).

*It is ordered:*

1. The Commission establishes Docket No. ACR2009 to consider matters raised by the Postal Service's FY 2009 Annual Compliance Report.

2. Comments on the United States Postal Service FY 2009 Annual Compliance Report to the Commission, including the Comprehensive Statement of Postal Operations and other reports, are due on or before February 1, 2010.

3. Reply comments are due on or before February 16, 2010.

4. The Secretary shall arrange for publication of this order in the **Federal Register**.

By the Commission.

**Shoshana M. Grove,**  
*Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 2010–295 Filed 1–11–10; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7710–FW–S**

## **SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION**

### **Data Collection Available for Public Comments and Recommendations**

**ACTION:** Notice and request for comments.

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, this notice announces the Small Business Administration's intentions to request approval on a new and/or currently approved information collection.

**DATES:** Submit comments on or before March 15, 2010.

**ADDRESSES:** Send all comments regarding whether these information collections are necessary for the proper performance of the function of the

agency, whether the burden estimates are accurate, and if there are ways to minimize the estimated burden and enhance the quality of the collection, to Cynthia Pitts, Director, Disaster Administrative Services, Small Business Administration, 409 3rd Street, 6th Floor, Washington, DC 20416.

#### **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Cynthia Pitts, *mailto:* Director, 202–205–7570 *cynthia.pitts@sba.gov* Curtis B. Rich, Management Analyst, 202–205–7030 *curtis.rich@sba.gov*

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Per OMB Circular A–123, Appendix B. Agencies must perform credit score inquiries and analysis prior to issuing travel credit cards. When credit score inquiry results in no score, this form will be used as an alternative means to assess credit history as required by the Circular.

*Title:* “Alternatives Creditworthiness Assessment.”

*Description of Respondents:*

Applicants applying for Disaster Loans.

*Form Number:* 2294.

*Annual Responses:* 1,849.

*Annual Burden:* 8.

#### **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Carol Fendler, *mail to:* System Accountant, Office of Investment 202–205–7559, *carol.fendler@sba.gov*; Curtis B. Rich, Management Analyst, 202–205–7030, *curtis.rich@sba.gov*.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** SBA Forms 2181, 2182 and 2183 provide SBA with the necessary information to make properly supported decisions regarding the approval denial of an applicant for a small business investment company (SBIC) license. SBA uses this information to assess an applicants ability to successfully operate an SBIC within the scope of the Small Business Investment Act, as amended.

*Title:* “SBIC Management Assessment Questionnaire (MAQ) & License Application; Exhibits to SBIC License Applications/MAQ.”

*Description of Respondents:* Small Business Owners and Farmers.

*Form Number's:* 2181, 2182, 2183.

*Annual Responses:* 255.

*Annual Burden:* 4,300.

**Jacqueline White,**

*Chief, Administrative Information Branch.*

[FR Doc. 2010–322 Filed 1–11–10; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 8025–01–P**

## **SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION**

### **Disaster Declaration # 12006 and # 12007; New York Disaster # NY–00086**

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