in the fiscal year covered by the report.'' Section 1116(d)(2) of OMB Circular A–11, which implements the GPRA process, cites the Reports Consolidation Act of 2000 to emphasize the need for data validation by requiring that the agency's annual performance report ''contain an assessment of the completeness and reliability of the performance data included in it [that] * * * describes any material inadequacies in the completeness and reliability of the data.'' (OMB Circular A–11, section 230.2(f).) The President's Management Agenda has also emphasized the importance of complete information for program monitoring and improving program results to improve the management and performance of the Federal government.

The UI DV system checks the validity of 1,275 data elements reported on 12 benefits reports and one tax report. The Department uses many of these elements for key performance measures as well as for allocating administrative funds among states, and for critical economic reports.

II. *Desired Focus of Comments:* Currently, the Department is soliciting comments concerning the extension of the UI DV Program 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.

III. *Current Actions:* The validation process assesses the validity (accuracy) of the counts of transactions or measurements of status as follows. In the validation process, guided by a detailed handbook, the state first constructs extract files containing all pertinent individual transactions for the desired report period to be validated. Each transaction contains the necessary characteristics or dimensions that enable it to be summed into an independent recount of what the state has already reported. Standardized software edits the extract file, e.g., to remove duplicate transactions, then aggregates the transactions to produce an independent reconstruction or ''validation count'' of the reported figure. The reported count is considered valid by this ''quantity'' validation test if it is within ±2% of the validation count (±1% for a GPRA-related element). The software also draws samples of most transaction types from the extract files; guided by a state-specific handbook, the validators review these against documentation in the state's management information system to determine whether the transactions in the extract file are supported by system documentation and thus that the validation count can be trusted as accurate. The extract files are considered to pass this ''quality'' review if random samples indicate that no more than 5% of the records contain errors.

Beginning in FY 2008 and beyond, all states will be required to conduct a complete validation every three years. There are two exceptions to this rule: (1) Groups of reported counts that are summed for purposes of making a Pass/Fail determination and do not pass validation by being within ±2% of the reconstructed counts (±1% in the case of report elements used to calculate GPRA measures) must be revalidated within one year; the same is true for random samples that show that the underlying population from which they are drawn contains more than 5% of its transactions in error; and (2) all samples and counts used for GPRA measures must be validated annually regardless of whether they pass validity standards or not.

Type of Review: Extension without change.

Agency: Employment and Training Administration (ETA).

Title: Unemployment Insurance Data Validation Program.

OMB Number: 1205–0431.

Agency Number: ETA Handbook 361.

Recordkeeping: States are required to retain validation results and supporting documentation for three years to support an audit.

Affected Public: State Workforce Agencies (SWAs).

Total Respondents: 53.

Frequency: Annual.

Total Responses: 53 per year.

Estimated Time per Response: 550 hours.

Total Burden Hours: 29,150 hours.

Total Burden Cost (capital/startup): N/A.

Total Burden Cost (operating/maintaining): $1,060,769.

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

Dated: February 6, 2008.

Cheryl Atkinson,

Administrator, Office of Workforce Security, Washington, DC.

[FR Doc. E8–2555 Filed 2–11–08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–FW–P

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

[Notice (08–013)]

NASA Advisory Council; Science Committee; Planetary Science Subcommittee; Meeting

AGENCY: National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

ACTION: Notice of meeting.

SUMMARY: The National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) announces a meeting of the Planetary Science Subcommittee of the NASA Advisory Council (NAC). This Subcommittee reports to the Science Committee of the NAC. The Meeting will be held for the purpose of soliciting from the scientific community and other persons scientific and technical information relevant to program planning.

DATES: Monday, March 3, 2008, 8:30 a.m. to 5:30 p.m., and Tuesday, March 4, 2008, 8:30 a.m. to 5 p.m.

ADDRESSES: The Carnegie Institution of Washington, Greenewalt Lecture Hall, 5241 Broad Band Road, NW., Washington, DC 20015.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Marian Norris, Science Mission Directorate, NASA Headquarters, Washington, DC 20546, (202) 358–4452, fax (202) 358–4118, or *mnorris@nasa.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The meeting will be open to the public up to the capacity of the room. The agenda for the meeting includes the following topics:

—Planetary Science Division Update.
—Analysis Group and Management Operations Working Group Reports.
—Lunar Architecture Team 2 Study.
—Alternative Launch Vehicles Study.

It is imperative that the meeting be held on this date to accommodate the scheduling priorities of the key participants. Attendees will be requested to sign a visitor's register.

Dated: February 5, 2008.

P. Diane Rausch,

Advisory Committee Management Officer, National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

[FR Doc. E8–2513 Filed 2–11–08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7510–13–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Biweekly Notice; Applications and Amendments to Facility Operating Licenses Involving No Significant Hazards Considerations

I. Background

Pursuant to section 189a. (2) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission or NRC staff) is publishing this regular biweekly notice. The Act requires the Commission publish notice of any amendments issued, or proposed to be issued and grants the Commission the authority to issue and make immediately effective any amendment to an operating license upon a determination by the Commission that such amendment involves no significant hazards consideration, notwithstanding the pendency before the Commission of a request for a hearing from any person.

This biweekly notice includes all notices of amendments issued, or proposed to be issued from January 17, 2008, to January 30, 2008. The last biweekly notice was published on (73 FR 5215).

Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendments to Facility Operating Licenses, Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity for a Hearing

The Commission has made a proposed determination that the following amendment requests involve no significant hazards consideration. Under the Commission's regulations in 10 CFR 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. The basis for this proposed determination for each amendment request is shown below.

The Commission is seeking public comments on this proposed determination. Any comments received within 30 days after the date of publication of this notice will be considered in making any final determination.

Normally, the Commission will not issue the amendment until the expiration of 60 days after the date of publication of this notice. The Commission may issue the license amendment before expiration of the 60-day period provided that its final determination is that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration. In addition, the Commission may issue the amendment prior to the expiration of the 30-day comment period should circumstances change during the 30-day comment period such that failure to act in a timely way would result, for example in derating or shutdown of the facility. Should the Commission take action prior to the expiration of either the comment period or the notice period, it will publish in the **Federal Register** a notice of issuance. Should the Commission make a final No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, any hearing will take place after issuance. The Commission expects that the need to take this action will occur very infrequently.

Written comments may be submitted by mail to the Chief, Rulemaking, Directives and Editing Branch, Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001, and should cite the publication date and page number of this **Federal Register** notice. Written comments may also be delivered to Room 6D22, Two White Flint North, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland, from 7:30 a.m. to 4:15 p.m. Federal workdays. Copies of written comments received may be examined at the Commission's Public Document Room (PDR), located at One White Flint North, Public File Area O1F21, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland. The filing of requests for a hearing and petitions for leave to intervene is discussed below.

Within 60 days after the date of publication of this notice, person(s) may file a request for a hearing with respect to issuance of the amendment to the subject facility operating license and any person whose interest may be affected by this proceeding and who wishes to participate as a party in the proceeding must file a written request via electronic submission through the NRC E-Filing system for a hearing and a petition for leave to intervene. Requests for a hearing and a petition for leave to intervene shall be filed in accordance with the Commission's ''Rules of Practice for Domestic Licensing Proceedings'' in 10 CFR Part 2. Interested person(s) should consult a current copy of 10 CFR 2.309, which is available at the Commission's PDR, located at One White Flint North, Public File Area 01F21, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland. Publicly available records will be accessible from the Agencywide Documents Access and Management System's (ADAMS) Public Electronic Reading Room on the Internet at the NRC Web site, *http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/doc-collections/cfr/*. If a request for a hearing or petition for leave to intervene is filed within 60 days, the Commission or a presiding officer designated by the Commission or by the Chief Administrative Judge of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, will rule on the request and/or petition; and the Secretary or the Chief Administrative Judge of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board will issue a notice of a hearing or an appropriate order.

As required by 10 CFR 2.309, a petition for leave to intervene shall set forth with particularity the interest of the petitioner in the proceeding, and how that interest may be affected by the results of the proceeding. The petition should specifically explain the reasons why intervention should be permitted with particular reference to the following general requirements: (1) The name, address, and telephone number of the requestor or petitioner; (2) the nature of the requestor's/petitioner's right under the Act to be made a party to the proceeding; (3) the nature and extent of the requestor's/petitioner's property, financial, or other interest in the proceeding; and (4) the possible effect of any decision or order which may be entered in the proceeding on the requestor's/petitioner's interest. The petition must also set forth the specific contentions which the petitioner/requestor seeks to have litigated at the proceeding.

Each contention must consist of a specific statement of the issue of law or fact to be raised or controverted. In addition, the petitioner/requestor shall provide a brief explanation of the bases for the contention and a concise statement of the alleged facts or expert opinion which support the contention and on which the petitioner/requestor intends to rely in proving the contention at the hearing. The petitioner/requestor must also provide references to those specific sources and documents of which the petitioner is aware and on which the petitioner/requestor intends to rely to establish those facts or expert opinion. The petition must include sufficient information to show that a genuine dispute exists with the