

whether the planned increase is only the result of “objective, external factors” contemplated by Order No. 216. If the increase is based on other terms of the contract that are not “objective, external factors,” *i.e.*, based on Article 9, paragraph 2, of the contract, then it must be subject to the usual requirements of a competitive rate change set forth in 39 CFR 3015.5.

Because the basis for the price change in the Notice is not clear, the Commission reopens Docket No. CP2009–29 to review the proposed price change and give interested persons the opportunity to comment on whether the Postal Service’s proposed rate increase is based on “objective, external factors.” If the change is based on such factors, Commission review may be unnecessary under the terms of Order No. 216. Comments may also address, if appropriate, whether the filings in the captioned docket are consistent with the policies of 39 U.S.C. 3632, 3633, or 3652 and 39 CFR part 3015 and 39 CFR 3020, subpart B. Comments are due no later than January 5, 2010.

The Commission appoints Paul L. Harrington to serve as Public Representative in these dockets.

*It is ordered:*

1. The Commission reopens Docket No. CP2009–29 for consideration of the issues raised in this order.

2. Pursuant to 39 U.S.C. 505, Paul L. Harrington is appointed to serve as the officer of the Commission (Public Representative) to represent the interests of the general public in these proceedings.

3. Comments by interested persons in this proceeding are due no later than January 5, 2010.

5. The Secretary shall arrange for publication of this Notice in the **Federal Register**.

By the Commission.

**Shoshana M. Grove,**

*Secretary.*

[FR Doc. E9–31034 Filed 12–30–09; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7710–FW–S**

## POSTAL REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. CP2009–36; Order No. 369]

### Postal Product Price Changes

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The Commission is noticing a recently-filed Postal Service request to change prices for a Direct Entry Parcels contract. This notice provides an opportunity for the public to comment.

**DATES:** Comments are due: January 5, 2010.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit comments electronically via the Commission’s Filing Online system at <http://www.prc.gov>. Commenters who cannot submit their views electronically should contact the person identified in “FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT” by telephone for advice on alternatives to electronic filing.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Stephen L. Sharfman, General Counsel, 202–789–6820 or [stephen.sharfman@prc.gov](mailto:stephen.sharfman@prc.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

- I. Postal Service Filing
- II. Comments
- III. Ordering Paragraphs

#### I. Postal Service Filing

On December 21, 2009, the Postal Service filed a notice of a change in prices under the Direct Entry Parcels contract.<sup>1</sup>

**Background.** On July 31, 2009, the Commission issued Order No. 264 adding Direct Entry Parcels 1 (MC2009–26 and CP2009–36) to the Competitive Product List.<sup>2</sup> In that order, the Commission noted that the Direct Entry Parcels 1 contract “includes provisions that would permit price changes during the 1–year term of the contract.” *Id.* at 9. Price changes could result either from changes in the prices charged by Canada Post Corporation for Xpresspost, or from changes in costs incurred by the Postal Service relative to a specified threshold. *Id.* at 10. Order No. 264 directed the Postal Service to file a notice of any such price changes with the Commission prior to their effective date. *Id.*

**Notice.** The Postal Service states that the price changes it is proposing are “not the sort of automatic change[s] based on external, objective factors for which the Commission has permitted a relatively streamlined, notice-type filing procedure.” Notice at 1, n.1.<sup>3</sup> The Postal Service’s Notice includes (1) A redacted copy of the notice to the customer of new prices and supporting documentation establishing compliance with 39 U.S.C. 3633 and 39 CFR

3015.5;<sup>4</sup> and (2) the certified statement required by 39 CFR 3015.5(c)(2).<sup>5</sup> Non-redacted copies of the customer notice and the certified statement have been filed under seal. The Notice also includes an application for non-public treatment of the non-redacted documents.<sup>6</sup>

#### II. Comments

Interested persons may submit comments on the Postal Service’s December 21, 2009 filing no later than January 5, 2010. The public portion of the filing can be accessed via the Commission’s Web site (<http://www.prc.gov>).

The Commission appoints Emmett Rand Costich to serve as the Public Representative in this proceeding.

#### III. Ordering Paragraphs

*It is ordered:*

1. The Commission reopens Docket No. CP2009–36 to consider the price changes proposed in the Postal Service’s December 21, 2009 filing.

2. Pursuant to 39 U.S.C. 505, Emmett Rand Costich is appointed to serve as officer of the Commission to represent the interests of the general public in these proceedings.

3. Comments by interested persons in these proceedings are to be filed no later than January 5, 2010.

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

By the Commission.

**Shoshana M. Grove,**

*Secretary.*

[FR Doc. E9–31073 Filed 12–30–09; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7710–FW–S**

## OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY POLICY

### Public Access Policies for Science and Technology Funding Agencies Across the Federal Government

**AGENCY:** Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP), Executive Office of the President.

**ACTION:** Notice; extension of comment period.

**SUMMARY:** On December 9, 2009, the Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP) within the Executive Office of the President, published a notice requesting input from the community regarding enhancing public access to archived publications resulting from

<sup>4</sup> Attachment 1 to the Notice.

<sup>5</sup> Attachment 2 to the Notice.

<sup>6</sup> Attachment 3 to the Notice.

<sup>1</sup> Notice of United States Postal Service of Change in Prices, December 21, 2009 (Notice).

<sup>2</sup> Docket Nos. MC2009–26 and CP2009–36, Order Concerning Direct Entry Parcels, International Return Service and Harmonization Service Negotiated Service Agreements, July 31, 2009 (Order No. 264).

<sup>3</sup> Footnote 1 of the Notice refers to PRC Order No. 216, Docket No. CP2009–2, Order Concerning Filing of Additional Global Direct Contracts Negotiated Service Agreement, May 15, 2009, at 7 (Order No. 216). Order No. 216 permitted the Postal Service to make notice-type filings for non-discretionary price changes under Global Direct Contracts due to exchange rate fluctuations and Canada Post Corporation price changes.

research funded by Federal science and technology agencies. That notice stated that the RFI would be active from December 10, 2009 to January 7, 2010. The purpose of this document is to extend that comment period to allow comments until January 21, to accommodate potential respondents who may find it difficult to complete their responses by the original deadline because of the intervening holidays. Respondents are invited to respond online via the Public Access Policy Forum at <http://www.whitehouse.gov/open>, or may submit responses via electronic mail. Responses will be reposted on the online forum. Instructions and a timetable for daily blog topics during this period are described at <http://www.whitehouse.gov/open>.

**DATES:** Comments must be received by January 21, 2010.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit comments by one of the following methods:

*Public Access Policy Forum:* <http://www.whitehouse.gov/open>.

*Via e-mail:* [publicaccess@ostp.gov](mailto:publicaccess@ostp.gov).

*Mail:* Office of Science and Technology Policy, Attn: Open Government Recommendations, 725 17th Street, Washington, DC 20502.

Comments submitted in response to this notice could be made available to the public online or by alternative means. For this reason, please do not include in your comments information of a confidential nature, such as sensitive personal information or proprietary information. If you submit an e-mail comment, your e-mail address will be captured automatically and included as part of the comment that is placed in the public docket and made available on the Internet.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Dr. Diane DiEuliis, Assistant Director, Life Sciences, Office of Science and Technology Policy, Attn: Open Government, 725 17th Street, NW., Washington, DC 20502. 202-456-6059.

#### **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

##### **I. Background**

On his first day in office, the President issued a Memorandum on Transparency and Open Government that called for an “unprecedented level of openness in government” and the rapid disclosure of one of our nation’s great assets—information. Moreover, the Administration is dedicated to maximizing the return on Federal investments made in R&D. Consistent with this policy, the Administration is exploring ways to leverage Federal investments to increase access to information that promises to stimulate scientific and technological innovation

and competitiveness. The results of government-funded research can take many forms, including data sets, technical reports, and peer-reviewed scholarly publications, among others. This RFI focuses on approaches that would enhance the public’s access to scholarly publications resulting from research conducted by employees of a Federal agency or from research funded by a Federal agency.

Increasing public access to scholarly publications resulting from federally funded research may enhance the return on federal investment in research in the following ways:

(a) More timely, easier, and less costly access to scholarly publications resulting from federally funded research for commercial and noncommercial scientists has the potential to promote advances in science and technology, thereby enhancing the return on federal investment in research;

(b) Creating an easily searchable permanent electronic archive of scholarly publications resulting from federally funded research has the potential to allow cross-referencing, continuous long-term access, and retrieval of information whose initial value may only be theoretical, but may eventually have important applications;

(c) Ensuring that the federal agencies that support this research can access the published results has the potential to promote improved cross-government coordination of government funding, and thus improved management of the federal research investments;

(d) More timely, easier, and less costly access to scholarly publications resulting from federally funded research for educators and students, and “end users” of research, such as clinicians, patients, farmers, engineers, and practitioners in virtually all sectors of the economy, has the potential to promote the diffusion of knowledge.

The Executive Branch is considering ways to enhance public access to peer reviewed papers arising from all federal science and technology agencies. One potential model, implemented by the National Institutes of Health (NIH) pursuant to Division G, Title II, Section 218 of Public Law 110–161 (<http://publicaccess.nih.gov/>) requires that all investigators funded by the NIH submit an electronic version of their final, peer-reviewed manuscript upon acceptance for publication no later than 12 months after the official date of publication. Articles collected under the NIH Public Access Policy are archived in PubMed Central and linked to related scientific information contained in other NIH databases. More information about PubMed Central is available: [http://](http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/about/faq.html)

[www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/about/faq.html](http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/about/faq.html).

The NIH model has a variety of features that can be evaluated, and there are other ways to offer the public enhanced access to peer-reviewed scholarly publications. The best models may influenced by agency mission, the culture and rate of scientific development of the discipline, funding to develop archival capabilities, and research funding mechanisms.

##### **II. Invitation To Comment**

Input is welcome on any aspect of expanding public access to peer reviewed publications arising from federal research. Questions that individuals may wish to address include, but are not limited to, the following (please respond to questions individually):

1. How do authors, primary and secondary publishers, libraries, universities, and the federal government contribute to the development and dissemination of peer reviewed papers arising from federal funds now, and how might this change under a public access policy?

2. What characteristics of a public access policy would best accommodate the needs and interests of authors, primary and secondary publishers, libraries, universities, the federal government, users of scientific literature, and the public?

3. Who are the users of peer-reviewed publications arising from federal research? How do they access and use these papers now, and how might they if these papers were more accessible? Would others use these papers if they were more accessible, and for what purpose?

4. How best could Federal agencies enhance public access to the peer-reviewed papers that arise from their research funds? What measures could agencies use to gauge whether there is increased return on federal investment gained by expanded access?

5. What features does a public access policy need to have to ensure compliance?

6. What version of the paper should be made public under a public access policy (e.g., the author’s peer reviewed manuscript or the final published version)? What are the relative advantages and disadvantages to different versions of a scientific paper?

7. At what point in time should peer-reviewed papers be made public via a public access policy relative to the date a publisher releases the final version? Are there empirical data to support an optimal length of time? Should the delay period be the same or vary for

levels of access (e.g., final peer reviewed manuscript or final published article, access under fair use versus alternative license), for federal agencies and scientific disciplines?

8. How should peer-reviewed papers arising from federal investment be made publicly available? In what format should the data be submitted in order to make it easy to search, find, and retrieve and to make it easy for others to link to it? Are there existing digital standards for archiving and interoperability to maximize public benefit? How are these anticipated to change?

9. Access demands not only availability, but also meaningful usability. How can the Federal government make its collections of peer-reviewed papers more useful to the American public? By what metrics (e.g., number of articles or visitors) should the Federal government measure

success of its public access collections? What are the best examples of usability in the private sector (both domestic and international)? And, what makes them exceptional? Should those who access papers be given the opportunity to comment or provide feedback?

### III. Deadline Extension

OSTP received more than 150 substantive responses in the first week of this public forum. OSTP also received several requests to extend the deadline for comments because of the time constraints inherent in the holiday season. As a result, OSTP will extend the deadline for comments through January 21, 2010.

Dated: December 22, 2009.

**M. David Hodge,**

*Operations Manager.*

[FR Doc. E9-30725 Filed 12-30-09; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE P**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Federal Transit Administration

#### **American Recovery and Reinvestment Act Public Transportation on Indian Reservations Program Project Selections and Tribal Transit Program Fiscal Year (FY) 2009 Project Selections**

##### *Correction*

In notice document E9-30197 beginning on page 67302 in the issue of Friday, December 18, 2009, make the following corrections:

On page 67303, before the file line, three photo pages were meant to publish. They are printed in their entirety below: