Room 295, Arlington, VA 22230, or by e-mail to *splimpton@nsf.gov.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Suzanne Plimpton on (703) 292–7556 or send e-mail to *splimpton@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:

Title of Collection: Data Collection for the Evaluation of the Historically Black Colleges and Universities—University (HBCU–UP) Program.

OMB Control No.: 3145–0204.

Expiration Date of Approval: October 31, 2009.

Abstract: The National Science Foundation (NSF) requests revision and extension of a currently approved data collection (e.g., interviews, surveys, focus groups, site visits protocols) measuring NSF's contribution to the Nation's Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU) enterprise and overall science and engineering workforce. This continuation expands the data collection most recently approved through October 2009 (OMB 3145–0204) beyond the student respondents to administrators, faculty and other participants, observers, or beneficiaries in undergraduate programs in Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) at Historically Black Colleges and Universities. NSF is reissuing this notice because the first notice did not make clear that there would be both individual and institutional respondents to these data collections.

NSF funds a program, called Historically Black Colleges and Universities Undergraduate Program (HBCU–UP), designed to help institutions strengthen the quality of their undergraduate STEM programs. For more information about HBCU–UP please visit the NSF Web site at: *http://www.nsf.gov/funding/pgm_summ.jsp?pims_id=5481&org=HRD&from=home.*

The Urban Institute (UI) is conducting an evaluation of the HBCU–UP program which received initial approval from the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) on 31 October 2006.

Using a multiple-methods approach, UI researchers are conducting an evaluation to study the effectiveness of the program. The evaluation will include both process and summative components. The process component will document how different models within the Program are being implemented, thus helping evaluators to link strategies to outcomes, identify crucial components of different models, and contribute to the construction of general theories to guide future initiatives to increase the diversity of the STEM workforce. The summative component of the evaluation will focus on the extent to which the Program has produced outcomes that meet stated goals for students, faculty and institutions. The process evaluation relies mainly on qualitative data collected during case study site visits and interviews; the summative evaluation will rely primarily on data collected through a survey of graduates and faculty.

NSF uses the UI analysis to prepare and publish reports and to respond to requests from Committees of Visitors, Congress and the Office of Management and Budget, particularly as related to the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) and the Program Effectiveness Rating Tool (PART). The HBCU–UP study's broad questions include but are not limited to:

What do individuals following post-participation in HBCU–UP or other NSF-funded undergraduate education opportunities do? Do HBCU–UP or other NSF-funded opportunities provide graduates with the professional and/or research skills needed to work in science and engineering? Are HBCU–UP or other NSF-sponsored students and faculty satisfied that their NSF-funded experience advanced their careers in science or engineering? To what extent do HBCU–UP or other former-NSF-sponsored graduates engage in the science and engineering workforce conduct inter- or multi-disciplinary science? Is there evidence of a legacy from NSF-funding that changed a degree-granting department beyond number of students supported and degrees awarded? To what extent have projects achieved or contributed to individual project goals or the NSF program goals? To what extent have NSF-funded projects or programs broadened participation by diverse individuals, particularly individuals traditionally underemployed in science or engineering, including but not limited to women, minorities, and persons-with-disabilities?

Respondents: Individuals or households, not-for-profit institutions, business or other for profit, and Federal, State, Local or Tribal Government.

Estimated Number of Annual Respondents: 5000.

Burden on the Public: 1250 hours.

Dated: March 9, 2007.

Suzanne H. Plimpton,

Reports Clearance Officer, National Science Foundation.

[FR Doc. E7–4619 Filed 3–13–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Agency Information Collection Activities: Proposed Collection; Comment Request

AGENCY: U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC).

ACTION: Notice of pending NRC action to submit an information collection request to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) and solicitation of public comment.

SUMMARY: The NRC is preparing a submittal to OMB for review of continued approval of information collection under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35).

Information pertaining to the requirement to be submitted:

1. *The titles of the information collection:* (1) NRC Form 212, ''Qualifications Investigation, Professional, Technical, and Administrative Positions'' (other than clerical positions); (2) NRC Form 212A, ''Qualifications Investigation, Secretarial/Clerical''.

2. *Current OMB approval numbers:* (1) 3150–0033; (2) 3150–0034.

3. *How often the collection is required:* On occasion.

4. *Who is required or asked to report:* Current/former supervisors, co-workers of applicants for employment.

5. *The estimated number of annual respondents:* (1) NRC Form 212: 1200; (2) NRC Form 212A: 400.

6. *The estimate of the total number of hours needed annually to complete the requirement or request:* (1) NRC Form 212: 300 hours (15 minutes per response); (2) NRC Form 212A: 100 hours (15 minutes per response).

7. *Abstract:* Information requested on NRC Form 212, ''Qualifications Investigation, Professional, Technical, and Administrative Positions (other than clerical positions)'' and NRC Form 212A, ''Qualifications Investigation, Secretarial/Clerical'' is used to determine the qualifications and suitability of external applicants for employment with NRC. The completed forms may be used to examine, rate and/or assess the prospective employee's qualifications. The information regarding the qualifications of

applicants for employment is reviewed by professional personnel of the Office of Human Resources, in conjunction with other information in the NRC files, to determine the qualifications of the applicant for appointment to the position under consideration.

Submit, by May 14, 2007, comments that address the following questions:

1. Is the proposed collection of information necessary for the NRC to properly perform its functions? Does the information have practical utility?

2. Is the burden estimate accurate?

3. Is there a way to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected?

4. How can the burden of the information collection be minimized, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology?

A copy of the draft supporting statement may be viewed free of charge at the NRC Public Document Room, One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Room O–1 F21, Rockville, MD 20852. OMB clearance requests are available at the NRC worldwide Web site: *http://www.nrc.gov/public-involve/doc-comment/omb/index.html.* The document will be available on the NRC home page site for 60 days after the signature date of this notice.

Comments and questions about the information collection requirements may be directed to the NRC Clearance Officer, Margaret A. Janney, Mail Stop: T–5F52, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001, by telephone at 301–415–7245, or by Internet electronic mail to *InfoCollects@nrc.gov.*

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 8th day of March, 2007.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Margaret A. Janney,

NRC Clearance Officer, Office of Information Services.

[FR Doc. E7–4672 Filed 3–13–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Notice of Opportunity for Comment on Model Safety Evaluation for Technical Specification Task Force (TSTF) Traveler To Provide Actions for One Steam Supply to Turbine Driven AFW/EFW Pump Inoperable Using the Consolidated Line Item Improvement Process

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Request for comment.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the staff of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) has prepared a model safety evaluation (SE) relating to proposed changes to Actions in the Standard Technical Specifications (STS) relating to One Steam Supply to Turbine Driven Auxiliary Feedwater / Emergency Feedwater (AFW/EFW) Pump Inoperable. This change would establish a Completion Time in the Standard Technical Specifications for the Condition where one steam supply to the turbine driven AFW/EFW pump is inoperable concurrent with an inoperable motor driven AFW/EFW train. The NRC staff has also prepared a model application and model no significant hazards consideration (NSHC) determination relating to this matter. The purpose of these models is to permit the NRC to efficiently process amendments that propose to adopt the associated changes into plant-specific technical specifications (TS). Licensees of nuclear power reactors to which the models apply can request amendments confirming the applicability of the SE and NSHC determination to their reactors. The NRC staff is requesting comments on the Model SE, Model Application and Model NSHC determination prior to announcing their availability for referencing in license amendment applications.

DATES: The comment period expires 30 days from the date of this publication. Comments received after this date will be considered if it is practical to do so, but the Commission can only ensure consideration for comments received on or before this date.

ADDRESSES: Comments may be submitted either electronically or via U.S. mail.

To submit comments or questions on a proposed standard technical specification change via the Internet, use *Form for Sending Comments* on NRC Documents, then select Proposed Changes to Technical Specifications. If you are commenting on a proposed change, please match your comments with the correct proposed change by copying the title of the proposed change from column one to the previous table into the appropriate field of the comment form.

Submit written comments to: Chief, Rulemaking, Directives and Editing Branch, Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration, Mail Stop T–6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001.

Hand deliver comments to 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland, between 7:45 a.m. and 4:15 p.m. on Federal workdays.

Copies of comments received may be examined at the NRC's Public Document Room, located at One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland.

Comments may be submitted by electronic mail to *CLIIP@nrc.gov*.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Trent L. Wertz, Technical Specifications Branch, Division of Inspection and Regional Support, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, Mail Stop O–12H2, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001, telephone 301–415–1568.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

Regulatory Issue Summary 2000–06, ''Consolidated Line Item Improvement Process for Adopting Standard Technical Specification Changes for Power Reactors,'' was issued on March 20, 2000. The consolidated line item improvement process (CLIIP) is intended to improve the efficiency and transparency of NRC licensing processes. This is accomplished by processing proposed changes to the Standard Technical Specifications (STS) (NUREGs 1430–1434) in a manner that supports subsequent license amendment applications. The CLIIP includes an opportunity for the public to comment on proposed changes to the STS following a preliminary assessment by the NRC staff and finding that the change will likely be offered for adoption by licensees. The CLIIP directs the NRC staff to evaluate any comments received for a proposed change to the STS and to either reconsider the change or proceed with announcing the availability of the change to licensees. Those licensees opting to apply for the subject change to TS are responsible for reviewing the NRC staff's evaluation, referencing the applicable technical justifications, and providing any necessary plant specific information. Each amendment application submitted in response to the notice of availability would be processed and noticed in accordance with applicable rules and NRC procedures.

This notice for comment involves establishing a Completion Time in the Limiting Condition for Operation (LCO) 3.7.5 of the STS for the Condition where one steam supply to the turbine driven AFW/EFW pump is inoperable concurrent with an inoperable motor driven AFW/EFW train. In addition, this notice for comment involves changes to the STS that establish specific Conditions and Action requirements for