

- 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 agencies 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.

Overview of this information collection:

(1) *Type of Information Collection:* Extension of a currently approved collection.

(2) *The title of the Form/Collection:* Victims of Crime Act, Victim Compensation Grant Program, State Performance Report.

(3) *Agency form number, if any, and the applicable component of the Department of Justice sponsoring the collection:* Form Number: OJP ADMIN FORM 7390/6. Office for Victims of Crime, Office of Justice Programs, Department of Justice.

(4) *Affected public who will be asked or required to respond, as well as a brief abstract:* Primary: State Government. The form is used by State Government to submit Annual Performance Report data about claims for victim compensation.

(5) *An estimate of the total number of respondents and the amount of time estimated for an average respondent to respond:* It is estimated that 53 respondents will complete the form within 2 hours.

(6) *An estimate of the total public burden (in hours) associated with the collection:* There are an estimated 106 total annual burden hours associated with this collection.

If additional information is required contact: Lynn Bryant, Department Clearance Officer, U.S. Department of Justice, Justice Management Division, Policy and Planning Staff, Patrick Henry Building, Suite 1600, 601 D Street, NW., Washington, DC 20530.

Dated: August 7, 2007.

**Lynn Bryant,**

*Department Clearance Officer, PRA,  
Department of Justice.*

[FR Doc. E7-15728 Filed 8-10-07; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4410-18-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Employment and Training Administration

#### Proposed Information Collection Request of the ETA 207, Nonmonetary Determination Activities Report; Comment Request

**AGENCY:** Employment and Training Administration, DOL.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Labor, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, conducts a preclearance consultation program to provide the general public and Federal agencies with an opportunity to comment on proposed and/or continuing collection of information in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (PRA95) [44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(2)(A)]. This program helps to ensure that requested data can be provided in the desired format, reporting burden (time and financial resources) is minimized, collection instruments are clearly understood, and the impact of collection requirements on respondents can be properly assessed.

A copy of the proposed information collection request (ICR) can be obtained by contacting the office listed below in the addressee section of this notice or by accessing: <http://www.doleta.gov/OMBGN/OMBControlNumber.cfm>.

**DATES:** Written comments must be submitted to the office listed in the addressee section below on or before October 12, 2007.

**ADDRESSES:** Send comments to Ericka Parker, U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Office of Workforce Security, 200 Constitution Avenue, NW., Frances Perkins Bldg. Room S-4531, Washington, DC 20210, telephone number (202)-693-3208 (this is not a toll-free number) or by e-mail: [parker.ericka@dol.gov](mailto:parker.ericka@dol.gov).

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### I. Background

The ETA 207 Report, Nonmonetary Determination Activities, contains state data on the number and types of issues that are adjudicated when

unemployment insurance (UI) claims are filed. It also has data on the number of disqualifications that are issued for reasons associated with a claimant's separation from employment and reasons related to a claimant's continuing eligibility for benefits. These data are used by the Office of Workforce Security (OWS) to determine workload counts for allocation of administrative funds, to analyze the ratio of disqualifications to determinations, and to examine and evaluate the program effect of nonmonetary activities.

##### II. Desired Focus of Comments

Currently, the Employment and Training Administration is soliciting comments concerning the proposed extension collection of the ETA 207, Nonmonetary Determinations Activities Report. Comments are requested to:

- Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary to assess performance of the nonmonetary determination function, 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 the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, e.g., permitting electronic submissions of responses.

##### III. Current Actions

The continued collection of the information contained on the ETA 207 report is necessary to enable the OWS to continue evaluating state performance in the nonmonetary determination area and to continue using the data as a key input to the administrative funding process.

*Type of Review:* Extension without change.

*Agency:* Employment and Training Administration (ETA).

*Title:* Nonmonetary Determination Activities Report.

*OMB Number:* 1205-0150.

*Agency Number:* ETA 207.

*Affected Public:* State and Local Governments.

*Total Respondents:* 53.

*Frequency:* Quarterly.

*Total Responses:* 224 (212 responses for ETA 207 Regular report and estimated 12 responses for ETA 207 Extended Benefits report).

*Average Time Per Response:* 4 hours.  
*Estimated Total Burden Hours:* 896 hours (848 hours for the ETA 207 Regular report + estimated 48 hours for ETA 207 (Extended Benefits)).

*Total Burden Cost (capital/startup):* \$0.

*Total Burden Cost (operating/maintaining):* \$0.

Comments submitted in response to this notice will be summarized and/or included in the request for Office of Management and Budget approval of the information collection request; they will also become a matter of public record.

Dated: August 3, 2007.

**Cheryl Atkinson,**

*Administrator, Office of Workforce Security.*

[FR Doc. E7-15731 Filed 8-10-07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-FW-P

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-414]

### Duke Power Company, LLC.; Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating License, Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity for a Hearing

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an amendment to Facility Operating License No. NPF-52 issued to Duke Power Company, LLC. (the licensee) for operation of the Catawba Nuclear Station, Unit 2 located in York County, South Carolina.

The proposed amendment would revise the Catawba Nuclear Station, Unit 2, Technical Specification Section 5.5.9 concerning modifications to the steam generator tube repair criteria. Before issuance of the proposed license amendment, the Commission will have made findings required by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), and the Commission's regulations.

The Commission has made a proposed determination that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration. Under the Commission's regulations in Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations (10 CFR), Part 50, Section 50.92, this means that operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not (1) Involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; or (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in a

margin of safety. As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

#### First Standard

A. Does operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated?

*Response:* No.

The previously analyzed accidents are initiated by the failure of plant structures, systems, or components. The proposed change that alters the SG [steam generator] tube repair criteria does not have a detrimental impact on the integrity of any plant structure, system, or component that initiates an analyzed event. The proposed change will not alter the operation of, or otherwise increase the failure probability of any plant equipment that initiates an analyzed accident.

Of the applicable accidents previously evaluated, the limiting transients with consideration to the proposed change to the SG tube repair criteria, are the SG tube rupture event and the steam line break event.

During the SG tube rupture event, the required structural integrity margins of the SG tubes will be maintained by the presence of the SG tubesheet. SG tubes are hydraulically expanded in the tubesheet area. Tube rupture in tubes with cracks in the tubesheet region of the tube is precluded by the constraint provided by the tubesheet. This constraint results from the hydraulic expansion process, thermal expansion mismatch between the tube and tubesheet, and the differential pressure between the primary and secondary side. Based on this design, the structural margins against burst, discussed in the TS are maintained for both normal and postulated accident conditions.

The proposed change does not affect other systems, structures, components, or operational features. Therefore, the proposed changes result in no significant increase in the probability of the occurrence of a SG tube rupture event.

At normal operating pressures, leakage from stress corrosion cracking below the proposed limited tube repair depth is limited by both the tube-to-tubesheet crevice and the limited crack opening permitted by the tubesheet constraint. Consequently, negligible normal operating leakage is expected from cracks within the tubesheet region. The consequences of a SG tube rupture event are affected by the primary-to-secondary leakage flow during the event. Primary-to-secondary leakage flow through a postulated broken tube is not affected by the proposed change since the tubesheet enhances the tube integrity in the region of the hydraulic expansion by precluding tube deformation beyond its initial hydraulically expanded outside diameter.

The probability of a steam line break event is unaffected by the potential failure of a SG tube, as this failure is not an initiator for a steam line break event.

The consequences of a steam line break event are also not significantly affected by

the proposed change. During a steam line break event, the reduction in pressure above the tubesheet on the shell side of the SG creates an axially uniformly distributed load on the tubesheet due to the reactor coolant system pressure on the underside of the tubesheet. The resulting bending action constrains the tubes in the tubesheet, thereby restricting primary-to-secondary leakage below the midplane.

Primary-to-secondary leakage from tube degradation in the tubesheet area during the limiting accident (i.e., a steam line break event) is limited by flow restrictions resulting from the crack and tube-to-tubesheet contact pressures that provide a restricted leakage path above the indications and also limit the degree of potential crack face opening as compared to free span indications. The primary-to-secondary leak rate from tube degradation in the tubesheet region during postulated steam line break event conditions will be no more than twice that allowed during normal operating conditions when the pressure boundary is relocated to the 17-inch depth. Since normal operating leakage is limited to 75 gallons per day through any one SG per the proposed license condition, the associated accident condition leak rate, assuming all leakage to be from lower tubesheet indications, would be limited to 150 gallons per day per SG. This is the value that is assumed in the steam line break dose analysis.

Therefore, the proposed change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

#### Second Standard

B. Does operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated?

*Response:* No.

The proposed change does not introduce any new equipment, create new failure modes for existing equipment, or create any new limiting single failures. Plant operation will not be altered, and all safety functions will continue to be performed as previously assumed in accident analyses. Therefore, the proposed change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated.

#### Third Standard

C. Does operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety?

*Response:* No.

The proposed change maintains the required structural margins of the SG tubes for both normal and accident conditions. NEI [Nuclear Energy Institute] 97-06 and the Catawba TS are used as the bases in the development of the limited tubesheet tube repair depth methodology for determining that SG tube integrity considerations are maintained within acceptable limits. Regulatory Guide 1.121 describes a method acceptable to the NRC for meeting General Design Criterion (GDC) 14, "Reactor coolant pressure boundary," GDC 15, "Reactor