whether imports of tie down and tubular webbing indeed impacted production at the subject firm and consequently caused workers separations. Upon further review of the previous investigation the Department contacted the major declining customer of the subject firm, which initially reported negligible increases in imports of tie down and tubular webbing. This customer reported that the imports they are buying are not like or directly competitive with the tie down and tubular webbing previously purchased from the subject firm. The customer imports final products, which contain tie down and tubular webbing as components.

In order to establish import impact, the Department must consider imports that are like or directly competitive with those produced at the subject firm. The Department conducted a survey of the subject firm's major declining customers regarding their purchases of tie down and tubular webbing during 2005, 2006 and January through June 2007 over the corresponding 2006 period. The survey revealed that the declining customers did not import tie down and tubular webbing during the relevant period.

## Conclusion

After review of the application and investigative findings, I conclude that there has been no error or misinterpretation of the law or of the facts which would justify reconsideration of the Department of Labor's prior decision. Accordingly, the application is denied.

Signed in Washington, DC this 31st day of October 2007.

## Elliott S. Kushner,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. E7-22059 Filed 11-9-07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-FN-P

## **DEPARTMENT OF LABOR**

# **Employment and Training Administration**

[TA-W-62,161]

## Tifton Aluminum Company, a Subsidiary of ALCOA, Inc., Tifton, GA; Notice of Termination of Investigation

Pursuant to section 221 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, an investigation was initiated on September 19, 2007 in response to a petition filed by a company official on behalf of workers of Tifton Aluminum Company, a subsidiary of Alcoa, Inc., Tifton, Georgia.

The petitioner has requested that the petition be withdrawn. Consequently, the investigation has been terminated. Further investigation in this case would serve no purpose.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 5th day of November, 2007.

## Elliott S. Kushner,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. E7–22061 Filed 11–9–07; 8:45am]

BILLING CODE 4510-FN-P

# NATIONAL CREDIT UNION ADMINISTRATION

## **Sunshine Act; Notice of Meeting**

TIME AND DATE: 10 a.m., Thursday, November 15, 2007.

**PLACE:** Board Room, 7th Floor, Room 7047, 1775 Duke Street, Alexandria, VA 22314–3428.

STATUS: Open.

## MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED:

- 1. Request from Shell New Orleans Federal Credit Union to Convert to a Community Charter.
- 2. NCUA's 2008 Annual Performance Budget.
- 3. NCUA's 2008/2009 Operating Budget.
  - 4. NUCA's Overhead Transfer Rate.
- 5. NCUA's Operating Fee Scale.
- 6. Final Rule: Section 701.23 of NCUA's Rules and Regulations, Eligible Obligations.

RECESS: 11 a.m.

TIME AND DATE: 11:15 a.m., Thursday, November 15, 2007.

**PLACE:** Board Room, 7th Floor, Room 7047, 1775 Duke Street, Alexandria, VA 22314–3428.

STATUS: Closed.

### **MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED:**

- 1. One (1) Administrative Action under Sections 205, 207, and 208 of the Federal Credit Union Act. Closed pursuant to Exemptions (8), (9)(A)(ii), and (9)(B).
- 2. One (1) Administrative Action under Sections 206 and 208 of the Federal Credit Union Act. Closed pursuant to Exemptions (8), (9)(A)(ii), and (9)(B).
- 3. One (1) Personnel Matter. Closed pursuant to Exemptions (2).

## FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mary Pupp, Socretary of the Board

Mary Rupp, Secretary of the Board, Telephone: 703–518–6304.

## Mary Rupp,

Secretary of the Board.
[FR Doc. 07–5650 Filed 11–8–07; 3:11 pm]
BILLING CODE 7535–01–M

## NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

## Agency Information Collection Activities: Comment Request

**AGENCY:** National Science Foundation. **ACTION:** Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request.

**SUMMARY:** The National Science Foundation (NSF) has submitted the following information collection requirement to OMB for review and clearance under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Pub. L. 104-13. This is the second notice for public comment; the first was published in the Federal Register at 72 FR 11912, and no comments were received. NSF is forwarding the proposed renewal submission to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for clearance simultaneously with the publication of this second notice. The full submission may be found at: http:// www.reginfo.gov/public/do/PRAMain. Comments regarding (a) whether the collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of burden including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility and clarity of the information to be collected; 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 should be addressed to: Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs of OMB, Attention: Desk Officer for National Science Foundation, 725-17th Street, NW., Room 10235, Washington, DC 20503, and to Suzanne Plimpton, Reports Clearance Officer, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 295, Arlington, Virginia 22230 or send e-mail to splimpto@nsf.gov. Comments regarding these information collections are best assured of having their full effect if received within 30 days of this notification. Copies of the submission(s) may be obtained by calling 703-292-7556.

## FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Suzanne Plimpton at (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.

NSF may not conduct or sponsor a collection of information unless the collection of information displays a currently valid OMB control number and the agency informs potential persons who are to respond to the collection of information that such persons are not required to respond to the collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Title of Collection: Evaluation of the National Science Foundation-National Institutes for Health Bioengineering and Bioinformatics Summer Institutes (BBSI) Program.

OMB Number: 3145-NEW. Abstract: The National Science Foundation (NSF) and the National Institute of Bioinformatics and Bioengineering (NIBIB), a new component of the National Institutes of Health, established a jointly funded program run by NSF called the Bioengineering and Bioinformatics Summer Institutes (BBSI) Program to begin creating a supply of professionals trained in bioengineering and bioinformatics. This workforce initiative complements research and education efforts in these fields funded by both agencies and constitutes a high profile effort to meet the anticipated human resource needs for bioengineering and bioinformatics.

The program is designed to provide students majoring in the biological sciences, computer sciences, engineering, mathematics, and physical sciences with well-planned interdisciplinary experiences in bioengineering or bioinformatics research and education, in very active 'Summer Institutes'; thereby increasing the number of young people considering careers in bioengineering and bioinformatics at the graduate level and beyond.

NIBIB and NSF's Division of **Engineering Education and Centers** (EEC) wish to learn whether the BBSI Program as originally conceived is achieving its objectives and programlevel outcomes, and to collect lessons learned for improvement of program design and implementation. This shortterm evaluation is expected to provide information on what educational and career decisions have been affected by participation in a Summer Institute, what elements of the students' BBSI affect student outcomes, and how the program can be improved, e.g., through changes in specific program-wide design components, expected outcomes, proposal review criteria, etc. The survey data collection will be done on the World Wide Web.

Estimate of Burden: Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 30 minutes per response.

Respondents: Individuals. Estimated Number of Responses: 765. Estimated Total Annual Burden on Respondents: 387 hours.

Frequency of Response: Once.

Dated: November 7, 2007.

## Suzanne H. Plimpton,

Reports Clearance Officer, National Science Foundation.

[FR Doc. 07–5629 Filed 11–9–07; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 7555–01–M

# NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-271; License No. DPR-28]

# Entergy Nuclear Vermont Yankee, LLC and Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc.; Receipt of Request for Action Under 10 CFR 2.206

Notice is hereby given that by petition dated August 27, 2007, the New England Coalition (NEC or the petitioner) has requested that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC or the Commission) take action with regard to the Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station (Vermont Yankee). The NEC petition requested that NRC promptly restore reasonable assurance of adequate protection of public health and safety that is now degraded by the failure of the licensee and its employees to report adverse conditions leading to a reduction in plant safety margins at the Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station (Vermont Yankee), or otherwise to order a derate or shutdown of Vermont Yankee until it can be determined to what extent Vermont Yankee is being operated in an unanalyzed condition. Specifically, the petition requested the following actions: (1) NRC completion of a Diagnostic Evaluation Team examination or Independent Safety Assessment of Vermont Yankee to determine the extent of condition of non-conformances. reportable items, hazards to safety, and the root causes thereof; (2) NRC completion of a safety culture assessment to determine why worker safety concerns were not previously reported and why assessments of safety culture under the Reactor Oversight Process failed to capture the fact or reasons that safety concerns have gone unreported; (3) derate Vermont Yankee to 50% of licensed thermal power with a mandatory hold at 50% until a thorough and detailed structural and performance analysis of the cooling

towers, including the alternate cooling system, has been completed by the licensee; reviewed and approved by NRC; and until the above steps (1) and (2) have been completed; and (4) NRC investigation and determination of whether or not similar non-conforming conditions and causes exist at other Entergy-run nuclear power plants.

As a basis for the request, the petition cited problems related to the inadequate performance of Vermont Yankee Inservice Inspection, Maintenance, Engineering, and Quality Assurance leading to a cooling tower cell collapse coupled with the employees' assertion of degrading plant conditions inimical

to public health.

The request is being treated pursuant to Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations (10 CFR) section 2.206 of the Commission's regulations. The request has been referred to the Director of the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation. As provided by 10 CFR 2.206, appropriate action will be taken on this petition within a reasonable time. Mr. Raymond Shadis, in his capacity as the petitioner's Staff Technical Advisor, participated in two telephone conference calls with the NRC's Petition Review Board (PRB) on September 12, 2007, and October 3, 2007, to discuss the petition and provide any additional explanation in light of the PRB's initial recommendation. The results of those discussions were considered in the PRB's determination regarding the petitioner's request for action and in establishing the schedule for the review of the petition. The PRB confirmed its initial recommendation to reject action items (1), (2), and (4), which are the diagnostic evaluation team examination, safety culture assessment, and the NRC investigation at other Entergy facilities. These action items were rejected for review under the 2.206 process because these actions are not enforcementrelated. However, the PRB has determined that the petition meets the criteria for review in Management Directive 8.11 with respect to a portion of action item (3). Specifically, the PRB found that the facts presented in the petition related to the cooling tower cell collapse in action (3) were credible and sufficient to warrant further inquiry.

A copy of the petition and supplement and the transcripts of the telephone conference calls are available for inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room (PDR), located at One White Flint North, Public File Area O1 F21, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland and from the NRC's Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS)