9th Floor, Washington, DC 20036. Telephone: (202) 653–4676.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The National Museum and Library Services Board is established under the Museum and Library Services Act, 20 U.S.C. Section 9101 *et seq*. The Board advises the Director of the Institute on general policies with respect to the duties, powers, and authorities related to Museum and Library Services. If you need special accommodations due to a disability, please contact: Institute of Museum and Library Services, 1800 M Street, NW., 9th Fl., Washington, DC 20036. Telephone: (202) 653–4676; TDD (202) 653–4614 at least seven (7) days prior to the meeting date.

Dated: June 2, 2008.

Kate Fernstrom,

Chief of Staff.

[FR Doc. E8–12919 Filed 6–11–08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7036–01–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, Public Law 104–13. This is the second notice for public comment; the first was published in the **Federal Register** at 73 FR 14276, 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; (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 H. Plimpton, Reports Clearance Officer, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 295, Arlington, Virginia 22230 or via 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.

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: Monitoring for the National Science Foundation's Math and Science Partnership (MSP) Program.

OMB Control No.: 3145–0199.

Expiration Date of Approval: September 30, 2008.

1. Abstract

This document has been prepared to support the clearance of data collection instruments to be used in the evaluation of the Math and Science Partnership (MSP) program. The goals for the program are to (1) ensure that all K–12 students have access to, are prepared for, and are encouraged to participate and succeed in challenging curricula and advanced mathematics and science courses; (2) enhance the quality, quantity, and diversity of the K–12 mathematics and science teacher workforce; and (3) develop evidence-based outcomes that contribute to our understanding of how students effectively learn mathematics and science. The motivational force for realizing these goals is the formation of partnerships between institutions of higher education (IHEs) and K–12 school districts. The role of IHE content faculty is the cornerstone of this intervention. In fact, it is the rigorous involvement of science, mathematics, and engineering faculty—and the expectation that both IHEs and K–12 school systems will be transformed—that distinguishes MSP from other education reform efforts.

The components of the overall MSP portfolio include active projects whose initial awards were made prior to MSP competitions: (1) Comprehensive Partnerships that implement change in mathematics and/or science educational practices in both higher education institutions and in schools and school districts, resulting in improved student achievement across the K–12 continuum; (2) Targeted Partnerships that focus on improved K–12 student achievement in a narrower grade range or disciplinary focus within mathematics or science; (3) Institute Partnerships: Teacher Institutes for the 21st Century that focus on the development of mathematics and science teachers as school- and district-based intellectual leaders and master teachers; and (4) Research, Evaluation and Technical Assistance (RETA) projects that build and enhance large-scale research and evaluation capacity for all MSP awardees and provide them with tools and assistance in the implementation and evaluation of their work.

The MSP monitoring information system, comprised of eight Web-based surveys and one paper survey, collects a common core of data about each component of MSP. The Web application for MSP has been developed with a modular design that incorporates templates and self-contained code modules for rapid development and ease of modification. A downloadable version will also be available for respondents who prefer a paper version that they can mail or fax to the external contractor.

Use of the information: This information is required for effective program planning, administration, communication, program and project monitoring and evaluation, and for measuring attainment of NSF's program, project and strategic goals, as required by the President's Management agenda as represented by the Office of Management and Budget's (OMB's) Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART); the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 (Pub. L. 109–171) which established the Academic Competitiveness (ACC) and the NSF's Strategic Plan. The Foundation's FY 2006–2011 Strategic Plan describes four strategic outcome goals of Discovery, Learning, Research Infrastructure, and Stewardship. NSF's complete strategic plan may be found at: *http://www.nsf.gov/publications/pub_summ.jsp?ods_key=nsf0648.*

2. Expected Respondents

Individuals or households, not-for-profit institutions, business or other for profit, and Federal, State, local or tribal government. The expected respondents

are principal investigators of all partnership and RETA projects; STEM and education faculty members and administrators who participated in MSP; school districts and IHEs that are partners in an MSP project; and teachers participating in Institute Partnerships.

3. Burden on the Public

Number of Respondents: 3,149.

Burden on the Public: The total estimate for this collection is 50,322 annual burden hours.

This figure is based upon the previous 3 years of collecting information under this clearance and anticipated collections. The average annual reporting burden is estimated to be between 2 and 22 hours per respondent depending on whether a respondent is a direct participant who is self-reporting or representing a project and reporting on behalf of many project participants. The majority of respondents (60%) are estimated to require fewer than two hours to complete the survey. The burden on the public is negligible because the study is limited to project participants that have received funding from the MSP Program.

Dated: June 9, 2008.

Suzanne H. Plimpton,

Reports Clearance Officer, National Science Foundation.

[FR Doc. E8–13186 Filed 6–11–08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50–389]

Florida Power & Light Company; 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–16 issued to the Florida Power and Light Company (the licensee) for operation of the St. Lucie Plant, Unit 2, located in St. Lucie County, Florida. The proposed amendment would change the Technical Specifications to modify the facilities operating licensing bases to adopt the alternative source term as allowed in 10 CFR 50.67 and described in Regulatory Guide 1.183. Through reanalysis of the following radiological consequences of the Updated Final Safety Analysis Report Chapter 15 accidents: Loss-of-Coolant Accident, Fuel Handling Accident, Main Steam Line Break, Steam Generator Tube Rupture, Reactor Coolant Pump Shaft Seizure, Control Element Assembly Ejection, Letdown Line Break, and Feedwater Line Break.

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), 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:

1. The proposed amendment does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

Alternative source term calculations have been performed for St. Lucie Unit 2 which demonstrate that the dose consequences remain below limits specified in NRC Regulatory Guide 1.183 and 10 CFR 50.67. The proposed changes modify the setpoint for Control Room Isolation radiation monitoring instrumentation and add a new surveillance requirement. Control Room Isolation radiation monitoring instrumentation does not adversely affect accident initiators or precursors or prevent the ability of structures, systems, and components to perform their intended function to mitigate the consequences of an initiating event within the assumed acceptance limits. The modified setpoint and new surveillance requirement will ensure that the Control Room is isolated within the limits assumed in the AST analysis. The use of the AST only changes the regulatory assumptions regarding the analytical treatment of the design basis accidents and has no direct effect on the probability of any accident. The AST has been utilized in the analysis of the limiting design basis accidents listed above. The results of the analyses, which include the proposed changes to the Technical Specifications, demonstrate that the dose consequences of these limiting events are all within the regulatory limits.

The proposed Technical Specification [TS] changes are consistent with, or more restrictive than, the current TS requirements, with the possible exception of the alarm/trip setpoint for Control Room Isolation radiation monitoring instrumentation. The current alarm/trip setpoint of ≤ 2 times background is variable. A background reading of approximately 40 cpm is typical for the Control Room Isolation radiation monitors. It is possible that the background reading could increase to above 160 cpm. Revising the Control Room Isolation alarm/trip setpoint from ≤ 2 times background to ≤ 320 cpm will establish a maximum setpoint value and ensure automatic actuation of the control room emergency ventilation system for the limiting case event with adequate margin for the bounding total loop uncertainty of 200%. None of the affected systems, components or programs are related to accident initiators. As such, the revised TS requirements can not affect the probability of an accident and can only reduce the consequences of analyzed accidents.

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

2. The proposed amendment does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

Other than discussed below, the proposed change does not affect any plant structures, systems, or components. The operation of plant systems and equipment will not be affected by this proposed change. Neither implementation of the alternative source term methodology nor establishing more restrictive TS requirements have the capability to introduce any new failure mechanisms or cause any analyzed accident to progress in a different manner.

The proposed changes associated with the Control Room Isolation radiation monitoring instrumentation setpoint and new surveillance requirement are not accident initiators. These proposed changes do not involve a physical alteration of the plant (i.e., no new or different type of equipment will be installed) or a significant change in the methods governing normal plant operation. These changes do not alter any safety analysis assumptions and will not affect or degrade the ability of structures, systems, and components to perform their specified safety function.

Therefore, the proposed change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

3. The proposed amendment does not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety.

The proposed implementation of the alternative source term methodology is consistent with NRC Regulatory Guide 1.183. The proposed Technical Specification changes are consistent with, or more restrictive than, the current TS requirements with the possible exception of the alarm/trip setpoint for Control Room Isolation radiation monitoring instrumentation. The current alarm/trip setpoint of ≤ 2 times background is variable. A background reading of approximately 40 cpm is typical for the Control Room Isolation radiation monitors. It is possible that the background reading could increase to above 160 cpm. Revising the Control Room Isolation radiation monitoring