

guarantees may be issued that are not filed with the Commission.

Accordingly, staff has estimated the number of firms upwards to account for those guaranties. Staff estimated the burden hours based on an estimate of the time for each firm to conduct testing, issue guaranties, and to establish and maintain associated records.

- **Burden Hours per Firm**—An estimated 5 hours for testing per firm, using either the test and conditioning procedures in the regulations or alternate methods. Although many firms are exempt from testing to support guaranties under 16 CFR 1610.1(d), CPSC staff does not know the proportion of those firms that are testing vs. those that are exempt. Thus, staff has included testing for all firms in the burden estimates.

- **Guaranties Issued per Firm**—On average, 20 new guaranties are issued per firm per year for new fabrics or garments.

- **Estimated Annual Testing Time per Firm**—100 hours per firm (5 hours for testing × 20 guaranties issued = 100 hours per firm).

- **Estimated Annual Recordkeeping per Firm**—1 hour to create, record, and enter test data into a computerized dataset; 20 minutes (= 0.3 hours) for annual review/removal of records; 20 minutes (= 0.3 hours) to respond to one CPSC records request per year; for a total of 1.6 recordkeeping hours per firm (1 hour + .3 hours + .3 hours = 1.6 hours per firm).

- **Total Estimated Annual Burden Hours per Firm**—100 hours estimated annual testing time per firm + 1.6 estimated annual recordkeeping hours per firm = 101.6 hours per firm.

- **Total Estimated Annual Industry Burden Hours**—101.6 hours per firm × 1,000 firms issuing guaranties = 101,600 industry burden hours. The total annual industry burden imposed by the flammability standards for clothing textiles and vinyl plastic film and enforcement regulations on manufacturers and importers of garments, fabrics, and related materials is estimated to be about 101,600 hours (101.6 hours per firm × 1,000 firms).

- **Total Annual Industry Cost**—The hourly wage for the testing and recordkeeping required by the standards is approximately \$66.19 (for management, professional, and related occupations in goods-producing industries, Bureau of Labor Statistics, June 2016), for an estimated annual cost to the industry of approximately \$6.7 million (101,600 × \$66.19 = \$6,724,904).

C. Request for Comments

The Commission solicits written comments from all interested persons about the proposed collection of information. The Commission specifically solicits information relevant to the following topics:

- Whether the collection of information described above is necessary for the proper performance of the Commission's functions, including whether the information would have practical utility;
- Whether the estimated burden of the proposed collection of information is accurate;
- Whether the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected could be enhanced; and
- Whether the burden imposed by the collection of information could be minimized by use of automated, electronic or other technological collection techniques, or other forms of information technology.

Dated: January 18, 2017.

Todd A. Stevenson,

Secretary, Consumer Product Safety Commission.

[FR Doc. 2017-01644 Filed 1-24-17; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6355-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Application for New Awards; Expanding Opportunity Through Quality Charter Schools Program (CSP)—Grants to Charter Management Organizations for the Replication and Expansion of High-Quality Charter Schools

Correction

In notice document 2017-00748, appearing on pages 4322 through 4332 in the issue of Friday, January 13, 2017, make the following corrections:

1. On page 4326, in the second column, in the seventh paragraph, beginning on the second line, “[INSERT DATE OF PUBLICATION IN THE **Federal Register**]” should read, “January 13, 2017.”

2. On the same page, in the third column, in the sixth paragraph, beginning on the second line, “[INSERT DATE 105 DAYS AFTER DATE OF PUBLICATION IN THE **Federal Register**]” should read, “April 28, 2017.”

[FR Doc. C1-2017-00748 Filed 1-24-17; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 1301-00-D

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Notice of Request for Information (RFI) on Fostering Energy Innovation Ecosystems

AGENCY: Office of the Under Secretary for Science and Energy, Department of Energy (DOE).

ACTION: Request for Information (RFI).

SUMMARY: The U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) invites public comment on this Request for Information (RFI) regarding regional innovation ecosystems and regional cooperation. The purpose of this RFI is to support a public discussion about how to create and foster regional and local “innovation ecosystems,” specifically for energy technologies and energy use. DOE is establishing through this RFI a temporary public “ideation” tool to serve as a resource of ideas for individuals and organizations interested in promoting regional innovation ecosystems.

DATES: Written comments and information are requested on or before February 28, 2017.

ADDRESSES: Interested parties should submit their comments using the IdeaBuzz.com platform at: <https://ideabuzz.com/a/buzz/challenge/19113/ideas/top>. Rules and guidelines for the Web-based tool can be found there, along with background information, the suggested topics included in this RFI, and opportunities to post ideas and to review, comment on, and “vote for” ideas submitted by other people.

The public can view the submitted ideas and comments without creating a user-name on the IdeaBuzz platform, but IdeaBuzz does require users to register a user-name in order to participate (submit ideas, comment, and “vote”). DOE employees may not submit comments via this platform. DOE will not respond to individual submissions and may or may not publish a compendium of responses.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Randy Steer, U.S. Department of Energy, Office of the Under Secretary for Science and Energy (S4-1), 1000 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, DC 20585. Telephone: 202-586-2600, email: energy-innovation-ideation@ee.doe.gov

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

- I. Background
- II. Purpose
- III. Request for Information Suggested Topics
- IV. Confidential Information

I. Background

DOE is interested in understanding and fostering self-sustaining local and

regional energy “innovation ecosystems”¹ that bring together all the factors needed to translate research and ideas into successful new products and services, whether through start-up companies or new products and business lines in existing companies.

The value of a regional focus to promote innovation, economic development, and job-creation is widely recognized. For example, a decade ago, the Council on Competitiveness reported that “although national and state policies create a platform for innovation, the locus of innovative activities is at the regional level, where workers, companies, universities, research institutions and government interface most directly . . . Regions are the building blocks of national innovation capacity because they offer proximity and can provide specialized assets that foster firm-level differentiation.”² A 2011 report from Jobs for the Future identified a need for “structures at the regional level to bring together key leaders from across public, private, and nonprofit sectors to formulate growth strategies that make the best use of regions’ competitive assets.”³ And in 2012, the National Research Council’s Committee on Comparative National Innovation Policies made several observations⁴ that speak directly to the value of regional innovation ecosystems and regional partnerships:

- Historically, federally funded R&D has not been connected to state and regional industrial development; bridging that gap can create the local

talent and technology base needed to convert these U.S. investments into domestic companies, industries, and jobs.

- Private businesses and local education institutions and economic development agencies are in the best position to identify opportunities, gauge competitive strengths, and mobilize wide community support for regional cluster initiatives.

- Regional innovation cluster initiatives should be built upon existing knowledge clusters and comparative strengths of each geographic region.

Also, recent reviews of the capabilities of DOE’s National Laboratories have strongly encouraged the laboratories to broaden their participation in regional innovation ecosystems.^{5,6} This was supported by what DOE officials heard about varying regional energy concerns and capabilities—and interest in national laboratory capabilities—as they participated in a series of university-hosted events during the spring and summer of 2016.⁷

II. Purpose

Based on the background above and on the broad range of ideas heard from university, State, and industry participants at the recent university-hosted events, DOE believes that there is much more yet to be said by the broader public, which could benefit all interested parties, including State and local governments, universities, policy groups, companies, and national organizations.

As a result, DOE is making this temporary ideation and knowledge-sharing tool available as a national “town hall” to support a public dialogue on regional energy innovation and innovation ecosystems. The ideation tool suggests a number of potentially fruitful topic areas for suggestions and ideas, although any ideas relating to innovation ecosystems and to local and regional collaboration to support innovation are welcome.

III. Request for Information Suggested Topics

This RFI and its associated web-based ideation tool does not require responses to all of the suggested topics, and would encourage all interested entities/individuals to offer ideas and comments in any of the topic areas, or in new topic areas where relevant. In general, the web-based ideation will work best when ideas regarding different topics are submitted individually, rather than bundling multiple ideas into a single submission.

Suggested Topics

The following topics and questions may guide—but should not restrict—ideas, suggestions, and comments submitted using the IdeaBuzz ideation Web site:

1. Key Elements of an Innovation Ecosystem: What are the essential “puzzle pieces” or “moving parts” that make up a successful, self-sustaining innovation ecosystem or technology “cluster”? They include businesses, educational institutions, research centers, people, policies, and financial resources—but are there specific *sub-types* of those categories that are especially important or frequently overlooked? Are there other categories of regional assets that are important as well?

2. Ecosystem Sustainability: Which of those key elements are most important for supporting the start-up of new businesses? Which are most important to make sure that the innovation ecosystem itself is self-sustaining and enduring? Are there supply-chain considerations that are often overlooked?

3. Economic Benefits: Which of those key elements are most important for supporting workforce development as part of the ecosystem? Which are crucial to accelerating the innovation cycle?

4. Performance Metrics: What identifiable metrics would provide useful measures of the economic or innovation impact of efforts to promote a regional energy innovation ecosystem?

5. Regional Gaps: Are there specific “ecosystem” components that are missing from a geographic region you’re interested in? (Indicate region.) How could that region fill the gaps?

6. Geographic Scales and Defining a “Region”: Most existing examples of innovation ecosystems and industry or technology clusters are fairly local or metropolitan in scale—meetings and site visits aren’t more than an hour or two drive away. But energy concerns, challenges, and resources are often shared across a much larger geographic

¹ Much has been written about innovation ecosystems, innovation clusters, industry clusters, and related concepts. The following links are only an illustrative sample: http://erc-assoc.org/sites/default/files/topics/policy_studies/DJackson_Innovation%20Ecosystem_03-15-11.pdf (National Science Foundation, 3/15/2011); <http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/623971467998460024/pdf/100899-REVISED-WP-PUBLIC-Box393259B-Tech-Innovation-Ecosystems.pdf> (World Bank, 1/11/2015); <http://www.innovationmanagement.se/2011/05/16/what-are-innovation-ecosystems-and-how-to-build-and-use-them/> (InnovationManagement.se blog, 5/16/2011); <http://masstech.org/innovation-ecosystem> (Massachusetts Technology Collaborative, undated).

² *Regional Innovation: National Prosperity, Summary Report of the Regional Competitiveness Initiative & Proceedings of the 2005 National Summit on Regional Innovation*, Council on Competitiveness, February 2006, <http://www.compete.org/storage/images/uploads/File/PDFFiles/RegionalInnovationNationalProsperity.pdf>.

³ P. Carlson, R. Holm, and R. Uhalde, *Building Regional Partnerships for Economic Growth and Opportunity*, Jobs for the Future, 2011, www.jff.org/sites/default/files/publications/Building_Regional_paper_020211.pdf.

⁴ C.W. Wessner and A.W. Wolff, eds., *Rising to the Challenge: U.S. Innovation Policy for the Global Economy*, National Academies Press, 2012, <https://www.nap.edu/read/13386/chapter/1>.

⁵ S. Andes, M. Muro, and M. Stepp, *Going Local: Connecting the National Labs to their Regions to Maximize Innovation and Growth*, Advanced Industries Series, Brookings/ITIF/CCEI, September 2014, www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/BMPP_DOE_Brief.pdf.

⁶ T.J. Glauchier and J.L. Cohon, co-chairs, *Securing America’s Future: Realizing the Potential of the Department of Energy’s National Laboratories. Final Report of the Commission to Review the Effectiveness of the National Energy Laboratories*, Vol. 1, October 2015, <http://energy.gov/sites/prod/files/2015/10/f27/FinalReportVolume1.pdf>.

⁷ Information and a report on the events can be found at <http://www.energy.gov/mission-innovation/university-forums>.

region. How should regional strategies or coalitions try to bridge those geographic scales? The university-hosted events that DOE attended defined their “regions” in different ways—how should a regional energy cluster or innovation ecosystem define its scope or boundaries?

7. Cooperating Regionally: If local or regional organizations want to collaborate to help foster or enhance a regional energy innovation ecosystem, how should they organize or collaborate? Does the answer differ depending on geographic scale?

8. Regional Opportunities: What are the energy challenges, resources, or technologies that offer the most innovation opportunity to your region? (Identify region.) What would be the greatest strengths or weaknesses of your region in trying to create or enhance an energy innovation ecosystem?

9. References and Models: Recommend references, studies, data sources, or models (including foreign innovation centers).

IV. Confidential Information

Because all idea and comments submissions are publicly visible, respondents are strongly advised to not include any information in their responses that might be considered business sensitive, proprietary, or otherwise confidential. Because the IdeaBuzz platform is not a government Web site, DOE is not able to provide any confidentiality protections for ideas submitted on the IdeaBuzz platform.

Issued in Washington, DC, on January 18, 2017.

Franklin M. Orr, Jr.,

Under Secretary for Science and Energy.

[FR Doc. 2017-01694 Filed 1-24-17; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. CP17-31-000]

Tallgrass Interstate Gas Transmission, LLC; Notice of Request Under Blanket Authorization

Take notice that on January 9, 2017, Tallgrass Interstate Gas Transmission, LLC (Tallgrass), Post Office Box 281304, Lakewood, Colorado 80228-8304, filed in Docket No. CP17-31-000 and pursuant to Sections 157.205 and 157.216 of the Commission’s regulations, a prior notice under its Part 157 blanket certificate that it intends to abandon in place two 12-inch loop pipeline segments, a total of

approximately 15,335 feet, along its Palco to Phillipsburg Pipeline in Rooks County, Kansas, all as more fully set forth in the application which is on file with the Commission and open to public inspection. The filing may also be viewed on the web at <http://www.ferc.gov> using the “eLibrary” link. Enter the docket number excluding the last three digits in the docket number field to access the document. For assistance, contact FERC at FERCOnlineSupport@ferc.gov or call toll-free, (866) 208-3676 or TTY, (202) 502-8659.

Tallgrass states that the pipe segments, which loop the 12-inch Palco to Phillipsburg Pipeline where it crosses the South Fork Solomon River and near the Webster Reservoir respectively are redundant and no longer necessary. Abandoning the pipe segments from service will eliminate a potential safety hazard. The proposed abandonment will not result in or cause any interruption, reduction, or termination of transportation service presently rendered by TALLGRASS. Therefore, TALLGRASS proposes to abandon in place the two 12-inch pipe segments.

Any questions regarding this Application should be directed to David Haag, Vice President of Regulatory, Tallgrass Interstate Gas Transmission, LLC, 370 Van Gordon St., Lakewood, Colorado 80228-1519, phone (303) 763-3258.

Any person may, within 60 days after the issuance of the instant notice by the Commission, file pursuant to Rule 214 of the Commission’s Procedural Rules (18 CFR 385.214) a motion to intervene or notice of intervention. Any person filing to intervene or the Commission’s staff may, pursuant to section 157.205 of the Commission’s Regulations under the NGA (18 CFR 157.205) file a protest to the request. If no protest is filed within the time allowed therefore, the proposed activity shall be deemed to be authorized effective the day after the time allowed for protest. If a protest is filed and not withdrawn within 30 days after the time allowed for filing a protest, the instant request shall be treated as an application for authorization pursuant to section 7 of the NGA.

Pursuant to section 157.9 of the Commission’s rules, 18 CFR 157.9, within 90 days of this Notice the Commission staff will either: Complete its environmental assessment (EA) and place it into the Commission’s public record (eLibrary) for this proceeding; or issue a Notice of Schedule for Environmental Review. If a Notice of Schedule for Environmental Review is issued, it will indicate, among other

milestones, the anticipated date for the Commission staff’s issuance of the final environmental impact statement (FEIS) or EA for this proposal. The filing of the EA in the Commission’s public record for this proceeding or the issuance of a Notice of Schedule for Environmental Review will serve to notify federal and state agencies of the timing for the completion of all necessary reviews, and the subsequent need to complete all federal authorizations within 90 days of the date of issuance of the Commission staff’s FEIS or EA.

Persons who wish to comment only on the environmental review of this project should submit an original and two copies of their comments to the Secretary of the Commission. Environmental commenter’s will be placed on the Commission’s environmental mailing list, will receive copies of the environmental documents, and will be notified of meetings associated with the Commission’s environmental review process. Environmental commenter’s will not be required to serve copies of filed documents on all other parties. However, the non-party commentary, will not receive copies of all documents filed by other parties or issued by the Commission (except for the mailing of environmental documents issued by the Commission) and will not have the right to seek court review of the Commission’s final order.

The Commission strongly encourages electronic filings of comments, protests, and interventions via the internet in lieu of paper. See 18 CFR 385.2001(a) (1) (iii) and the instructions on the Commission’s Web site (www.ferc.gov) under the “e-Filing” link. Persons unable to file electronically should submit original and 5 copies of the protest or intervention to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street NE., Washington, DC 20426.

Dated: January 18, 2017.

Kimberly D. Bose,
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2017-01671 Filed 1-24-17; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

Combined Notice of Filings #2

Take notice that the Commission received the following electric rate filings:

Docket Numbers: ER10-2532-008; ER10-2534-002; ER10-2535-003.