Title: National Longitudinal Survey of Youth 1979.

OMB Control Number: 1220–0109.

Estimated Number of Annual Respondents: 11,265.

Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours: 11,044.

Affected Public: Individuals or households.

Description: The information obtained in this survey will be used by the Department of Labor, other government agencies, academic researchers, the news media, and the general public to understand the employment experiences and life-cycle transitions of men and women born in the years 1957 to 1964 and living in the United States when the survey began in 1979.

Darrin A. King,

Acting Departmental Clearance Officer.

[FR Doc. E7–16405 Filed 8–20–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–24–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Office of the Secretary

Submission for OMB Review: Comment Request

August 15, 2007.

The Department of Labor has submitted the following public information collection request (ICR) to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104–13, 44 U.S.C. chapter 35). Copies of this ICRs, with applicable supporting documentation; including among other things a description of the likely respondents, proposed frequency of response, and estimated total burden may be obtained from the RegInfo.gov Web site at *http://www.reginfo.gov/public/do/PRAMain* or by contacting Darrin King on 202–693–4129 (this is not a toll-free number)/e-mail: *king.darrin@dol.gov.*

Comments should be sent to Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Attn: John Kraemer, OMB Desk Officer for the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), Office of Management and Budget, 725 17th Street, NW., Room 10235, Washington, DC 20503, Telephone: 202–395–4816/ Fax: 202–395–6974 (these are not a toll-free numbers), E-mail: *OIRA_submission@omb.eop.gov* within 30 days from the date of this publication in the **Federal Register**. In order to ensure the appropriate consideration, comments should reference the OMB Control Number (see below).

The OMB is particularly interested in comments which:

• Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility;

• Evaluate the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;

• Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and

• Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, e.g., permitting electronic submission of responses.

Agency: Occupational Safety and Health Administration.

Type of Review: Extension without change of currently approved collection.

Title: Student Data Form.

OMB Control Number: 1218–0172.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 2,000.

Estimated Total Burden Hours: 167.

Affected Public: Individuals or households.

Description: The form is used to collect student group and emergency contact information from Training Institute students. Student group data is used for reports, and tuition receipts.

Darrin A. King,

Acting Departmental Clearance Officer.

[FR Doc. E7–16406 Filed 8–20–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–26–P

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Emergency Clearance; Public Information Collection Requirements Submitted to the Office of Management and Budget; Notice

AGENCY: National Science Foundation.

ACTION: Emergency Clearance: Public Information Collection Requirements Submitted to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB).

SUMMARY: The National Science Foundation (NSF) is announcing plans to request approval of this collection. In accordance with the requirement of Section 3506(c)(2)(A) of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104–13), we are providing an opportunity for public comment on this action. After obtaining and considering public comment, NSF will prepare the submission requesting that OMB approve clearance of this collection for no longer than 3 years.

DATES: Interested persons are invited to send comments regarding the burden or any other aspect of these collections of information requirements by September 20, 2007.

ADDRESSES: Written comments regarding the information collection and requests for copies of the proposed information collection request should be addressed to Suzanne Plimpton, Reports Clearance Officer, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Blvd., Rm. 295, Arlington, VA 22230, or by e-mail to *splimpto@nsf.gov,* and Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, Room 10235, New Executive Office Building, Washington, DC 20503. Attn: John Kraemer, NSF Desk Officer.

Comments: Written comments are invited on (a) whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Agency, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the Agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology; or (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

NSF has determined that it cannot reasonably comply with the normal clearance procedures under 5 CFR 1320 because normal clearance procedures are reasonably likely to prevent or disrupt the collection of information. NSF is requesting emergency review from OMB of this information collection to enable the Emergency review and approval of this ICR will assure continuation of the PFF evaluation that is also funded by the Atlantic Philanthropies. OMB approval has been requested for September 24, 2007. If granted, the emergency approval is only valid for 90 days.

During this same period, a regular review of this information collection will be undertaken. During the regular review period, the NSF requests written comments and suggestions from the public and affected agencies concerning this information collection. Comments are encouraged and will be accepted until October 22, 2007 to be assured of consideration. Comments received after that date will be considered to the extent practicable.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Suzanne H. Plimpton, Reports Clearance Officer, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 295, Arlington, Virginia 22230; telephone (703) 292–7556; or send e-mail to *splimpto@nsf.gov.* Individuals who use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) may call the Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) at 1–800–877–8339 between 8 a.m. and 8 p.m., Eastern time, Monday through Friday.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

OMB Approval Number: OMB 3145–0058.

Expiration Date: January 31, 2010.

Overview of this information collection: The *Federal Funding Accountability* and *Transparency Act (FFATA)* of 2006 (Pub. L. 109–282) requires agencies to make award and sub-award information available to be searched by the public in a single searchable Web site developed by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). The impetus for this Act was the lack of a single source of accurate, complete and timely information on federal government spending.[1] The requirements and residual technical and policy impacts of FFATA were unanticipated at the time the prior information clearance package was cleared by OMB. In order to meet the legislative mandate and Congressional intent of FFATA, NSF needs a reliable source of data and the ability to validate the accuracy of that data. The change that is being proposed by NSF, therefore, is essential to ensuring compliance with FFATA requirements. If NSF cannot collect and validate the accuracy of award data, NSF will miss the deadline imposed by Congress to make award data publicly available by January 1, 2008.

NSF is committed to providing citizens accurate, complete, and timely information regarding the expenditure of taxpayer funds. The policy change for which NSF is seeking approval will enable the Foundation to accomplish this goal. If NSF must follow the normal OIRA clearance review process, the result will be incomplete and inaccurate award data on OMB's single searchable Web site.

[1] Source: Chairman's Statement, Senator Tom Coburn, N.D. (R–OK), What You Don't Know Can Hurt You: S. 2590, the ''Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006'' (July 18, 2006).

Consult With Other Agencies & the Public

The policy change identified is consistent with a previously established Government-wide standard imposed by Grants.gov as part of its registration process. (Reference OMB Clearance Number: 4040–0001, Expiration Date: 04/30/2008). Grants.gov currently has 103,000 Authorized Organizational Representatives registered in the system. As reiterated below, 93.1% of organizations that submitted proposals to NSF in FY06 are already registered in CCR. Implementing this policy change, will make NSF's registration requirement consistent with that currently in use by all other Federal granting agencies.

NSF also plans to announce this proposed change at an upcoming Federal Demonstration Partnership meeting in September to gauge community response to this policy change. Finally, NSF plans to communicate with its small business community to obtain feedback as well as post a notice on the NSF Web site regarding the Foundation's plans in this area. The estimated impact of this change is described more fully below.

Background

FFATA specifies requisite information (14 data elements) that must be included for each award, one of which is the unique identifier for the entity. OMB Memorandum, ''Reporting of Data Elements Required by the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act,'' (dated March 30, 2007) defines the unique identifier for the entity as the Data Universal Numbering System (DUNS) number.

In accordance with the OMB policy ''Use of a Universal Identifier by Grant Applicants,'' (June 27, 2003) [68 FR 38402], NSF collects DUNS numbers for all awardees. While NSF collects this information, NSF currently does not have a mechanism to validate the accuracy of the DUNS number provided by the organization during the FastLane proposal submission process.

In order to meet the legislative mandate and Congressional intent of FFATA, NSF needs a reliable source of data to validate the accuracy of the DUNS number provided by the organization. NSF has identified the Central Contractor Registration (CCR) database as the most complete and accurate data source. The CCR system is managed under the Integrated Acquisition Environment (IAE) Presidential Management Agenda (PMA) E-Gov initiative. IAE is sponsored by OMB and managed by the General Services Administration. CCR is the primary registrant database for the U.S. Government. CCR collects, validates, stores, and disseminates data in support of agency acquisition missions, including Federal agency contract and assistance awards.

All contractors that do business with the Federal government and all grantees that use Grants.gov are required to register in CCR prior to conducting any transactions (e.g. submitting a grant application). Any organization that registers with the CCR must have a valid DUNS number. To ensure each organization receiving an NSF award and/or subaward has a valid DUNS number, NSF will require potential proposers to register in the CCR prior to proposal submission. This approach aligns with the government-wide efforts described above. The proposed effective date for this policy change is October 1, 2007. Requiring CCR registration effective October 1, 2007 will provide NSF with sufficient time to change NSF proposal preparation requirements to mandate this requirement, as well as validate DUNS numbers in preparation for meeting the FFATA January 1, 2008 milestone to make award data publicly available.

Impact of Policy Change

NSF has analyzed the impact of this proposed policy change and the additional burden associated with it on the Foundation's proposer community. The results of this assessment are as follows:

- CCR states it takes approximately one hour for an organization to complete the online registration, depending upon the size and complexity of the organization. The one hour to complete registration includes the time to read the instructions and to complete the form online. CCR does have handbook users may refer during the registration process. CCR recommends factoring in an additional 15 minutes in the instance the user references the handbook.
- NSF retrieved a list of organizations that submitted proposals to the Foundation in FY 2006 and used a sample (5% error) to determine the percentage of these organizations registered in the CCR.
- A total of 2,677 organizations submitted proposals to NSF in FY 2006.
- Out of the 2,677 organizations that submitted proposals to NSF in FY06, a random sample of 247 organizations was used to verify CCR registration.
- Of the 247 sample organizations, 230 were registered in CCR (93.1%).

• Based on the sample analysis of FY06 data (the 247 sample organizations), it can be concluded that:

• 93.1% of organizations that submitted proposals to NSF in FY06 are already registered in CCR.

• 6.9% of organizations that submitted proposals to NSF in FY06 are not registered in CCR.

• Of the 2,677 organizations that submitted proposals to NSF in FY06, 184 organizations (6.9%) would be impacted by this policy change.

The amount of additional burden associated with this policy change is 230 hours (184 organizations * 1.25 hour to register = 230 hours). On average, it takes CCR three days to process a registration submission.

Respondents: Not-for-profit institutions, for-profit institutions, individuals.

Number of Respondents: 184.

Burden on the Public: 230 additional hours.

Dated: August 15, 2007.

Suzanne H. Plimpton,

Reports Clearance Officer, National Science Foundation.

[FR Doc. 07–4087 Filed 8–20–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555–01–M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50–346, 50–440, 50–334, and 50–412; License Nos. NPF–3, NPF–58, DPR–66 and NPF–73; EA 07–199]

In the Matter of FirstEnergy Nuclear Operating Company; Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1; Beaver Valley Power Station, Units 1 and 2; Confirmatory Order (Effective Immediately)

I

FirstEnergy Nuclear Operating Company (FENOC or licensee) is the holder of four NRC Facility Operating Licenses issued by the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC or Commission) pursuant to 10 CFR Part 50, which authorizes the operation of the specifically-named facilities in accordance with the conditions specified in each license. License No. NPF–3 was issued on April 22, 1977, to operate the Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station, Unit No. 1. License No. NPF–58 was issued on November 13, 1986, to operate the Perry Nuclear Power Plant, Unit No. 1. License Nos. DPR–66 and NPF–73 to operate the Beaver Valley Power Station, Units 1 and 2, were issued on July 2, 1976, and August 14, 1987, respectively. Davis-Besse is located near Toledo, Ohio; Perry is located near Painesville, Ohio; and Beaver Valley is located near McCandless, Pennsylvania.

II

The events leading up to this Confirmatory Order date back several years. In 2005, the NRC took enforcement action against FENOC, imposing a $5,450,000 civil penalty for regulatory violations associated with the 2002 reactor pressure vessel head degradation event at the Davis-Besse Plant. In response to that event, FENOC performed root cause evaluations. Among other things, FENOC's root cause reports determined that the reactor pressure vessel head degradation was the result of ongoing and undetected Control Rod Drive Mechanism nozzle leakage that had lasted more than four years.

In February 2007, the licensee informed the NRC that Davis-Besse was initiating a condition report based on information contained in a letter received from Nuclear Electric Insurance Limited (NEIL). The NEIL letter referenced a new analysis that FENOC had commissioned of the Davis-Besse reactor pressure vessel head degradation event. The new analysis, submitted to NEIL as expert testimony in an insurance arbitration on December 18, 2006, was performed by Exponent Failure Analysis Associates and Altran Solutions Corporation (Exponent) and concluded that the time period between the beginning of substantial leakage from the reactor pressure vessel head nozzle and the development of the large cavity next to the nozzle may have been as short as four months.

On April 2, 2007, after several conference calls with the licensee and Exponent to assess whether the Exponent Report raised any immediate safety concerns (it did not), the NRC requested FENOC to respond in writing to four questions regarding information and conclusions presented in the Exponent Report. Among other things, the NRC's request for information asked FENOC to ''discuss any differences between the Exponent Report information and conclusions drawn therein, and information previously provided in the Root Cause Analysis Report and Licensee Event Report for the Davis-Besse reactor pressure vessel head wastage event.''

In its May 2, 2007, response to the NRC's request for information, FENOC stated that it ''ha[d] not specifically evaluated all of the assumptions used by Exponent'' but nevertheless concluded that the Exponent Report ''more accurately characterizes the time line of the reactor head degradation event based on [Exponent's] use of more recently available test data in conjunction with detailed analytical modeling.'' FENOC's response did not include a detailed discussion of the differences between the operational experience data and the Exponent Report assumptions.

Consequently, on May 14, 2007, the NRC issued FENOC a Demand for Information (DFI) pursuant to 10 CFR 2.204 to determine whether further enforcement action was necessary to provide reasonable assurance that FENOC would continue to operate its licensed facilities in accordance with the terms of its licenses and the Commission's regulations. The DFI required FENOC to provide a detailed discussion of the process used to determine if the Exponent Report assumptions, analyses, conclusions, or other related information should have been reported to the NRC in a more prompt manner; a detailed discussion of the differences in assumptions, analyses, conclusions, and other related information of the Exponent Report and technical and programmatic root cause reports developed in 2002; and a position on whether FENOC endorsed the conclusions of a second contractor report prepared in connection with the NEIL insurance arbitration.

FENOC responded to the DFI in writing on June 13, 2007. In that response, FENOC stated that its May 2, 2007, response ''was primarily focused on the detailed analytical studies that form the basis for the Exponent Report's time line for the crack growth and wastage phenomenon * * * and was not a comprehensive review of the differences between our root cause reports and the Exponent Report.'' According to the June 13 response, FENOC ''continues to believe'' that its earlier root cause reports ''provide a comprehensive explanation of the progression and causal factors of the Davis-Besse reactor pressure vessel head degradation event and, hence, contain the most appropriate information to have used in development and implementation of corrective actions to prevent recurrence.'' FENOC's June 13, 2007, response further acknowledged that it ''should have communicated more effectively internally and more promptly with the NRC'' about the Exponent Report, and included commitments to implement corrective actions in those areas.

On June 27, 2007, the NRC held a public meeting with FENOC to discuss the DFI response. During the meeting, the NRC questioned the corporate safety culture at FirstEnergy and whether FENOC had changed its position