

fulfill this responsibility by initiating and supporting merit-selected research and education projects in all the scientific and engineering disciplines. NSF receives more than 40,000 proposals annually for new projects, and makes approximately 10,500 new awards.

Support is made primarily through grants, contracts, and other agreements awarded to more than 2,800 colleges, universities, academic consortia, nonprofit institutions, and small businesses. The awards are based mainly on evaluations of proposal merit submitted to the Foundation (proposal review is currently cleared under OMB Control No. 3145-0060).

The Foundation has a continuing commitment to monitor the operations of its information collection to identify and address excessive reporting burdens as well as to identify any real or apparent inequities based on gender, race, ethnicity, or disability of the proposed principal investigator(s)/project director(s) or the co-principal investigator(s)/co-project director(s).

#### Proposal Evaluation Process

The Foundation relies heavily on the advice and assistance of external advisory committees, ad-hoc proposal reviewers, and to other experts to ensure that the Foundation is able to reach fair and knowledgeable judgments. These scientists and educators come from colleges and universities, nonprofit research and education organizations, industry, and other Government agencies.

In making its decisions on proposals the counsel of these merit reviewers has proven invaluable to the Foundation both in the identification of meritorious projects and in providing sound basis for project restructuring.

Review of proposals may involve large panel sessions, small groups, or use of a mail-review system. Proposals are reviewed carefully by scientists or engineers who are expert in the particular field represented by the proposal. About 54% are reviewed exclusively by panels of reviewers who gather, usually in Arlington, VA, to discuss their advice as well as to deliver it. About 33% are reviewed first by mail reviewers expert in the particular field, then by panels, usually of persons with more diverse expertise, who help the NSF decide among proposals from multiple fields or sub-fields. Finally, about 9% are reviewed exclusively by mail.

#### Use of the Information

The information collected is used to support grant programs of the

Foundation. The information collected on the proposal evaluation forms is used by the Foundation to determine the following criteria when awarding or declining proposals submitted to the Agency: (1) What is the intellectual merit of the proposed activity? (2) What are the broader impacts of the proposed activity?

The information collected on reviewer background questionnaire (NSF 428A) is used by managers to maintain an automated database of reviewers for the many disciplines represented by the proposals submitted to the Foundation. Information collected on gender, race, and ethnicity is used in meeting NSF needs for data to permit response to Congressional and other queries into equity issues. These data also are used in the design, implementation, and monitoring of NSF efforts to increase the participation of various groups in science, engineering, and education.

#### Confidentiality

When a decision has been made (whether an award or a declination), verbatim copies of reviews, excluding the names of the reviewers, and summaries of review panel deliberations, if any, are provided to the PI. A proposer also may request and obtain any other releasable material in NSF's file on their proposal. Everything in the file except information that directly identifies either reviewers or other pending or declined proposals is usually releasable to the proposer.

While a listing of panelists' names is released annually, the names of individual reviewers, associated with individual proposals, are not released to anyone.

Because the Foundation is committed to monitoring and identifying any real or apparent inequities based on gender, race, ethnicity, or disability of the proposed principal investigator(s)/project director(s) or the co-principal investigator(s)/co-project director(s), the Foundation also collects information regarding race, ethnicity, disability, and gender. This information also is protected by the Privacy Act.

*Burden on the Public:* For the Grant Proposal Guide, NSF estimates that an average of 120 hours is expended for each proposal submitted. An estimated 45,000 proposals are expected during the course of one year for a total of 5,400,000 public burden hours annually.

For the proposal review process, NSF estimates that anywhere from one hour to twenty hours may be required to review a proposal. It is estimated that approximately five hours are required to review an average proposal. Each

proposal receives an average of 6 reviews, with a minimum requirement of three reviews for an estimated total of 1,350,000 hours. The estimated burden for the Reviewer Background Information (NSF 428A) is estimated at 5 minutes per respondent with up to 10,000 potential new reviewers for a total of 83 hours. The estimated total is 1,350,083 for the reviewer process and the reviewer background information.

The estimated aggregated total for both the Grant Proposal Guide and the proposal review process is 6,750,083 hours.

Dated: November 7, 2006.

**Suzanne H. Plimpton,**

*Reports Clearance Officer, National Science Foundation.*

[FR Doc. E6-19104 Filed 11-9-06; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7555-01-P**

## NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

### Proposal Review, Notice of Meetings

In accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92-463, as amended), the National Science Foundation (NSF) announces its intent to hold proposal review meetings throughout the year. The purpose of these meetings is to provide advice and recommendations concerning proposals submitted to the NSF for financial support. The agenda for each of these meetings is to review and evaluate proposals as part of the selection process for awards. The review and evaluation may also include assessment of the progress of awarded proposals. The majority of these meetings will take place at NSF, 4201 Wilson Blvd., Arlington, Virginia 22230.

These meetings will be closed to the public. The proposals being reviewed include information of a proprietary or confidential nature, including technical information; financial data, such as salaries; and personal information concerning individuals associated with the proposals. These matters are exempt under 5 U.S.C. 552b(c), (4) and (6) of the Government in the Sunshine Act. NSF will continue to review the agenda and merits of each meeting for overall compliance of the Federal Advisory Committee Act.

These closed proposal review meetings will not be announced on an individual basis in the **Federal Register**. NSF intends to publish a notice similar to this on a quarterly basis. For an advance listing of the closed proposal review meetings that include the names of the proposal review panel and the time, date, place, and any information on changes, corrections, or

cancellations, please visit the NSF Web site: <http://www.nsf.gov>. This information may also be requested by telephoning, 703/292-8182.

Dated: November 7, 2006.

**Susanne Bolton,**

*Committee Management Officer.*

[FR Doc. 06-9182 Filed 11-9-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555-01-M

## NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

### Advisory Committee for International Science and Engineering; Notice of Meeting

In accordance with Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92-463, as amended), the National Science Foundation announces the following meeting:

*Name:* Advisory Committee for International Science and Engineering (25104).

*Date/Time:* December 4, 2006; 8:30 a.m. to 5 p.m.

*Place:* National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Room 1235, Arlington, VA.

*Type of Meeting:* Open.

*Contact Person:* Eduardo Feller, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, (suite 935), Arlington, VA 22230 (703) 292-8100.

If you are attending the meeting and need access to the NSF, please contact the individual listed above so your name may be added to the building access list.

*Purpose of Meeting:* To provide advice on the programs of the Office of International Science and Engineering.

*Agenda:* Presentation of new Committee Members.

Update on work of the Office.

Briefings on Current International Initiatives.

Discussion of International Program Initiatives.

Dated: November 7, 2006.

**Susanne Bolton,**

*Committee Management Officer.*

[FR Doc. 06-9181 Filed 11-9-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555-01-M

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50-373 and 50-374]

### Exelon Generation Company, LLC; Notice of Denial of Amendment to Facility Operating License and Opportunity for Hearing

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC or the Commission) has denied a request by Exelon Generation Company, LLC (the licensee) for an amendment to Facility Operating

Licenses NPF-11 and NPF-12, issued to the licensee for operation of the LaSalle County Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, located in LaSalle County, Illinois.

Notice of Consideration of Issuance of this amendment was published in the **Federal Register** on March 28, 2006 (71 FR 15483).

The purpose of the licensee's amendment request was to revise the technical specifications (TS) to change Surveillance Requirement (SR) 3.7.3.1 which verifies the cooling water temperature supplied to the plant from the core standby cooling system (CSCS) pond (*i.e.*, ultimate heat sink (UHS)) is  $\leq 100$  °F. Currently, if the temperature of the cooling water supplied to the plant from the CSCS pond is  $> 100$  °F, the UHS must be declared inoperable in accordance with TS 3.7.3. The license amendment request proposed to increase the temperature limit of the cooling water supplied to the plant from the CSCS pond to  $\leq 101.5$  °F by reducing the temperature measurement uncertainty by replacing the existing thermocouples with higher precision temperature measuring equipment. Should the UHS indicated temperature exceed 101.5 °F, Required Action B.1 would be entered and both units would be placed in Mode 3 within 12 hours and Mode 4 within 36 hours.

The NRC staff has concluded that the licensee's request cannot be granted. The licensee was notified of the Commission's denial of the proposed change by telephone on November 2, 2006.

By 30 days from the date of publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**, the licensee may demand a hearing with respect to the denial described above. Any person whose interest may be affected by this proceeding may file a written petition for leave to intervene pursuant to the requirements of 10 CFR 2.309.

A request for a hearing or a petition for leave to intervene must be filed by: (1) First class mail addressed to the Office of the Secretary of the Commission, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, Attention: Rulemaking and Adjudications Staff; (2) courier, express mail, and expedited delivery services: Office of the Secretary, Sixteenth Floor, One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, MD 20852, Attention: Rulemaking and Adjudications Staff; (3) E-mail addressed to the Office of the Secretary, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, [HEARINGDOCKET@NRC.GOV](mailto:HEARINGDOCKET@NRC.GOV); or (4) facsimile transmission addressed to the Office of the Secretary, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington,

DC 20555-0001, Attention: Rulemakings and Adjudications Staff at (301) 415-1101, verification number is (301) 415-1966. A copy of the request for hearing and petition for leave to intervene should also be sent to the Office of the General Counsel, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, and it is requested that copies be transmitted either by means of facsimile transmission to (301) 415-3725 or by e-mail to [OGCMailCenter@nrc.gov](mailto:OGCMailCenter@nrc.gov). A copy of the request for hearing and petition for leave to intervene should also be sent to Mr. Bradley J. Fewell, Assistant General Counsel, Exelon Generation Company, LLC, 200 Exelon Way, Kennett Square, PA 19348, attorney for the licensee. For further details with respect to this action, see (1) the application for amendment dated March 13, 2006, as supplemented by letters dated July 13 and August 4, 2006, and (2) the Commission's letter to the licensee dated November 3, 2006.

Documents may be examined, and/or copied for a fee, at the NRC's Public Document Room (PDR), located at One White Flint North, Public File Area O1 F21, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland, and will be accessible electronically through the Agencywide Documents Access and Management System's (ADAMS) Public Electronic Reading Room link at the NRC Web site <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html>. Persons who do not have access to ADAMS or who encounter problems in accessing documents located in ADAMS should contact the NRC PDR Reference staff by telephone at 1-800-397-4209, (301) 415-4737, or by e-mail to [pdr@nrc.gov](mailto:pdr@nrc.gov).

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 3rd day of November 2006.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Catherine Haney,**

*Director, Division of Operating Reactor Licensing, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. E6-19097 Filed 11-9-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 030-29319; License No. 42-26838-01; EA-06-021]

### In the Matter of H&G Inspection Company, Inc., Houston, TX; Confirmatory Order (Effective Immediately)

I

H&G Inspection Company, Inc. (H&G), is the holder of Materials License No.