

Federal Credit Union Act, 12 U.S.C. 1762, specifically requires federal credit unions to report the identity of credit union officials. Section 741.6(a) requires federally-insured credit unions to submit a Report of Officials annually to NCUA containing the annual certification of compliance with security requirements. The branch information is requested under the authority of § 741.6 of the NCUA Rules and Regulations.

NCUA utilizes the information to monitor financial conditions in corporate credit unions, §§§ and to allocate supervision and examination resources.

*Affected Public:* Private Sector: Not-for-profit institutions.

*Estimated Number of Respondents:* 11.

*Estimated Number of Responses per Respondent:* 13.

*Estimated Total Annual Responses:* 143.

*Estimated Burden Hours per Response:* 3.77.

*Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours:* 539.

*Reason for Change:* The changes to the NCUA Form 5310, Corporate Credit Union Call Report, are being made to align the form with recently approved Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP) related to ASC 326 Current Expected Credit Losses (CECL). These changes will allow corporate credit unions to early adopt CECL. A corporate credit union would continue to complete the form as is or they can voluntarily elect to early adopt ASC 326 and report under the CECL standard. Additional changes will also be made to better defined investments, consolidate duplicative questions, and clarify other data collection elements. These revisions will not alter the estimated burden hours necessary to review the instrument and complete the form.

*OMB Number:* 3133-0186.

*Title:* Higher-Risk Mortgage Appraisals.

*Type of Review:* Extension of a currently approved collection.

*Abstract:* Section 1471 of the Dodd-Frank Act established Truth in Lending section 129H, which contains appraisal requirements applicable to higher-risk mortgages and prohibits a creditor from extending credit in the form of a higher-risk mortgage loan to any consumer without meeting those requirements. A higher-risk mortgage is defined as a residential mortgage loan secured by a principal dwelling with an annual percentage rate that exceeds the average prime offer rate for a comparable transaction as of the date the interest rate is set by certain enumerated

percentage point spreads. To implement this statutory requirement, a final rule was promulgated to amend 12 CFR part 1026, Regulation Z, by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Federal Housing Finance Authority, the NCUA, and the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency.

The information collections under § 1026.35(c) include (1) providing a disclosure within three days of application that informs the consumer regarding the purpose of the appraisal, that the creditor will provide the consumer a copy of any appraisal, and that the consumer may choose to have a separate appraisal conducted at the expense of the consumer (Initial Appraisal Disclosure); (2) requiring creditors to obtain a written appraisal meeting certain standards for HPMLs and provide a free copy of the appraisal to consumers (Written Appraisal); and (3) requiring an additional written appraisal for properties resold within the 180 days (at a higher price meeting certain thresholds) and providing free copies of these appraisals to consumers (Additional Written Appraisal).

The information collections are required by statute, are necessary to protect consumers, and promote the safety and soundness of creditors making higher-risk mortgage loans.

*Affected Public:* Private Sector: Not-for-profit institutions.

*Estimated Number of Respondents:* 2,400.

*Estimated Number of Responses per Respondent:* 0.46.

*Estimated Total Annual Responses:* 1,104.

*Estimated Burden Hours per Response:* 0.25.

*Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours:* 276.

*Request for Comments:* Comments submitted in response to this notice will be summarized and included in the request for Office of Management and Budget approval. All comments will become a matter of public record. The public is invited to submit comments concerning: (a) Whether the collection of information is necessary for the proper execution of the function of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the

burden of the collection of the information on the respondents, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

By Melane Conyers-Ausbrooks, Secretary of the Board, the National Credit Union Administration, on October 8, 2020.

Dated: October 9, 2020.

**Dawn D. Wolfgang,**

*NCUA PRA Clearance Officer.*

[FR Doc. 2020-22770 Filed 10-14-20; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7535-01-P**

---

## NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

### Notice of Intent To Seek Approval To Establish an Information Collection

**AGENCY:** National Science Foundation.

**ACTION:** Notice and request for comments.

---

**SUMMARY:** The National Science Foundation (NSF) is announcing plans to request approval for the collection of research and development data through the 2021 Merit Review Survey. In accordance with the requirement of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, we are providing opportunity for public comment on this action. After obtaining and considering public comment, NSF will prepare the submission requesting that OMB approve clearance of this collection for no longer than 3 years.

**DATES:** Written comments on this notice must be received by December 14, 2020 to be assured of consideration. Comments received after that date will be considered to the extent practicable.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Suzanne H. Plimpton, Reports Clearance Officer, National Science Foundation, 2415 Eisenhower Avenue, Alexandria, VA 22314; 703-292-7556, or send email to [splimpto@nsf.gov](mailto: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, which is accessible 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, 365 days a year (including federal holidays).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

*Title of Collection:* Merit Review Survey—2021 Assessment of Applicant and Reviewer Experiences.

*OMB Approval Number:* 3145-NEW.

*Expiration Date of Current Approval:* Not applicable.

*Type of Request:* Intent to establish an information collection.

*Abstract:* The National Science Foundation (NSF) receives close to 50,000 proposals for funding annually, each of which undergoes a rigorous

merit review process that is designed to ensure all proposals are fairly and thoroughly reviewed. The merit review process comprises three phases:

1. NSF announces funding opportunities on the NSF website and *Grants.gov*. Applicants prepare proposals in response to these opportunities and submit their proposals via FastLane (NSF’s web-based system for proposal submission and review) or *Grants.gov*.

2. Proposals are assigned to the appropriate program(s) for review. Each proposal is assigned a Program Officer (PO) who selects external reviewers to evaluate the proposal according to the two NSF merit review criteria, Intellectual Merit and Broader Impacts. The Intellectual Merit criterion encompasses the potential to advance knowledge. The Broader Impacts criterion encompasses the potential to benefit society and contribute to the achievement of specific, desired societal outcomes. Programs may have additional review criteria particular to the goals and objectives of the program. The NSF guidelines for the selection of reviewers are designed to ensure selection of experts who can give program officers the proper information needed to make a recommendation in accordance with the merit review criteria. POs utilize the proposal’s reference list, the investigator’s suggested reviewers, and personal knowledge of individual reviewers to identify a pool of diverse experts with respect to type of organization represented, demographics, experience, and geographic balance, selecting appropriate reviewers with no apparent potential conflicts. Most proposals are reviewed by three to ten content expert reviewers who provide written feedback on the proposal through FastLane. POs synthesize reviewer comments and issue a recommendation to either decline or award funding based on reviewer feedback, panel discussions, the amount of available funding, and

portfolio balances (*i.e.*, the diversity of a portfolio, including factors such as award type, career stage, demographic characteristics, geographic location, institution type, research topic, laboratory funding status, and intellectual risk). The proposal and PO recommendation is then forwarded to the appropriate Division Director or other NSF official for additional review and action to either decline or award.

3. Each proposal recommended for award undergoes an administrative review conducted by NSF’s Office of Budget, Finance, and Award Management. If it passes this review, the proposal is awarded.

Through this review process, NSF aims to identify the highest quality proposals to receive funding. The success of this process hinges on the assumptions that applicants will continue to submit to NSF their ideas for cutting-edge research and that experts in their respective fields will continue to provide high-quality reviews of those proposals.

The goal of this data collection is to assess the experiences of applicants and reviewers and their satisfaction with the NSF’s merit review process. The data collection for which this OMB approval is requested includes a Web-based survey that will be administered to all applicants and reviewers who participated in the merit review process between fiscal years (FY) 2018 and FY 2020. The specific research objectives are to—

1. Examine applicant and reviewer perceptions of, and satisfaction with, the merit review process, including how it may vary by respondent gender or race.
2. Document the time burden the proposal submission and merit review process places on applicants and reviewers.
3. Examine applicant and reviewer perceptions of the quality of reviews and of proposals, including how it may vary by respondent demographics such as gender or race.

4. Describe the extent to which respondent familiarity with NSF’s reviewer orientation pilot is associated with reported use of review strategies to mitigate bias.

5. Describe the extent to which the experience with proposal deadlines has affected applicants and reviewer burden and satisfaction.

6. Examine applicants’ and reviewers’ experiences receiving financial support as a student.

Data from the survey will be used to improve NSF’s implementation of the merit review process.

*Use of the information:* The primary purpose of collecting this information is program evaluation. The data collected will enable NSF to assess the satisfaction, including perceptions of burden and quality, of applicants and reviewers who participate in the merit review process in order to monitor and improve the program and assess its implementation. Findings will inform continual improvement activities related to the merit review process.

*Respondents:* All applicants who have submitted proposals and reviewers who have reviewed NSF proposals between FY 2018 and 2020 will be invited to participate in the survey. This is estimated to be approximately 87,000 individuals.

*Estimated number of respondents:* It is estimated that there will be 26,000 respondents (representing an approximate 30 percent response rate).

*Average time per reporting:* The online survey is comprised primarily of close-ended questions and is designed to be completed by respondents in under 30 minutes.

*Frequency:* Eligible applicants and reviewers will be asked to complete the 2021 Merit Review survey one time in fall 2021.

*Estimate burden on the public:* The collection occurs once for each respondent. The total estimate for this collection is 8,667 burden hours. The calculation is shown in table 1.

TABLE 1—ESTIMATED BURDEN TO SURVEY MERIT REVIEW APPLICANTS AND REVIEWERS

Category of respondent	Number of respondents	Participation time (minutes)	Burden (hours)
NSF applicants and reviewers .....	26,000	20	8,667
Totals .....	26,000	20	8,667

*Comments:* Comments are invited on (a) whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the

NSF, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the NSF’s estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of

information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information on respondents, including through the use of automated collection

techniques or other forms of information technology; and (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.

Dated: October 8, 2020.

**Suzanne H. Plimpton,**

*Reports Clearance Officer, National Science Foundation.*

[FR Doc. 2020-22755 Filed 10-14-20; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7555-01-P**

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50-338 and 50-339; NRC-2020-0201]

### Virginia Electric and Power Company; North Anna Power Station, Units 1 and 2

**AGENCY:** Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**ACTION:** Subsequent license renewal application; opportunity to request a hearing and to petition for leave to intervene.

**SUMMARY:** The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is considering an application for the subsequent license renewal of Renewed Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-4 and NPF-7, which authorize Virginia Electric and Power Company (Dominion or the applicant) to operate North Anna Power Station, Units 1 and 2 (North Anna). The subsequent renewed licenses would authorize the applicant to operate North Anna for an additional 20 years beyond the period specified in each of the current renewed licenses. The current renewed operating licenses for North Anna expire as follows: Unit 1 on April 1, 2038, and Unit 2 on August 21, 2040.

**DATES:** A request for a hearing or petition for leave to intervene must be filed by December 14, 2020.

**ADDRESSES:** Please refer to Docket ID NRC-2020-0201 when contacting the NRC about the availability of information regarding this document. You may obtain publicly-available information related to this document using any of the following methods:

- *Federal Rulemaking Website:* Go to <https://www.regulations.gov> and search for Docket ID NRC-2020-0201. Address questions about Docket IDs in *Regulations.gov* to Jennifer Borges; telephone: 301-287-9127; email: [Jennifer.Borges@nrc.gov](mailto:Jennifer.Borges@nrc.gov). For technical questions, contact the individual listed

in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section of this document.

- *NRC's Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS):* You may obtain publicly-available documents online in the ADAMS Public Documents collection at <https://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html>. To begin the search, select "Begin Web-based ADAMS Search." For problems with ADAMS, please contact the NRC's Public Document Room (PDR) reference staff at 1-800-397-4209, 301-415-4737, or by email to [pdr.resource@nrc.gov](mailto:pdr.resource@nrc.gov). The ADAMS accession number for each document referenced (if it is available in ADAMS) is provided the first time that it is mentioned in this document.

- *Public Library:* A copy of the subsequent license renewal application for North Anna can be accessed at the following public library (library access and hours are determined by local policy): Louisa County Library, 881 Davis Hwy., Mineral, VA 23117.

- *NRC's PDR:* The PDR where you may examine and order copies of public documents, is currently closed. You may submit your request to the PDR via email at [PDR.Resource@nrc.gov](mailto:PDR.Resource@nrc.gov) or call 1-800-397-4209 between 8:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. (EST), Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

David Drucker, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001; telephone: 301-415-6223, email: [David.Drucker@nrc.gov](mailto:David.Drucker@nrc.gov).

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### I. Introduction

By letter dated August 24, 2020 (ADAMS Package Accession No. ML20246G703), Virginia Electric and Power Company (Dominion or the applicant) filed an application pursuant to Section 103 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), and part 54 of title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR), to renew the operating licenses for North Anna, which authorize each unit to operate at 2,940 megawatts thermal. The North Anna units are pressurized-water reactors designed by Westinghouse Electric Company and are located in Louisa, Virginia. A notice of receipt of the subsequent license renewal application (SLRA) was published in the **Federal Register** (FR) on September 21, 2020 (85 FR 59334).

The NRC staff has determined that Dominion has submitted sufficient information in accordance with 10 CFR 54.19, 54.21, 54.22, 54.23, 51.45, and 51.53(c), to enable the staff to undertake

a review of the application, and that the application is, therefore, acceptable for docketing. The current Docket Nos. 50-338 and 50-339 for Renewed Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-4 and NPF-7, respectively, will be retained. The determination to accept the SLRA for docketing does not constitute a determination that a subsequent renewed license should be issued, and does not preclude the NRC staff from requesting additional information as the review proceeds.

Before issuance of the requested subsequent renewed licenses, the NRC will have made the findings required by the Act, and the Commission's rules and regulations. In accordance with 10 CFR 54.29, the NRC may issue a subsequent renewed license on the basis of its review if it finds that actions have been identified and have been or will be taken with respect to: (1) Managing the effects of aging during the period of extended operation on the functionality of structures and components that have been identified as requiring aging management review; and (2) time-limited aging analyses that have been identified as requiring review, such that there is reasonable assurance that the activities authorized by the renewed licenses will continue to be conducted in accordance with the current licensing basis and that any changes made to the plant's current licensing basis will comply with the Act and the Commission's regulations.

Additionally, in accordance with 10 CFR 51.95(c), the NRC will prepare an environmental impact statement as a supplement to the Commission's "Generic Environmental Impact Statement for License Renewal of Nuclear Power Plants," NUREG 1437, dated June 2013. In considering the SLRA, the Commission must find that the applicable requirements of subpart A of 10 CFR part 51 have been satisfied, and that any matters raised under 10 CFR 2.335 have been addressed. Pursuant to 10 CFR 51.26, and as part of the environmental scoping process, the staff intends to hold public scoping meetings. Detailed information regarding the environmental scoping meetings will be the subject of a separate **Federal Register** notice.

##### II. Opportunity To Request a Hearing and Petition for Leave To Intervene

Within 60 days after the date of publication of this notice, any person (petitioner) whose interest may be affected by this action may file a request for a hearing and petition for leave to intervene (petition) with respect to the action. Petitions shall be filed in accordance with the Commission's