

year, and assumes that 10 of the applications will be approved. Quarterly reports would be required only for those ten funded projects. It further assumes an average of four quarterly project reports per project.

**Respondent Pool:** State agency staff, local government staff, non-governmental organizations, tribal governments, and natural resource user group association staff or members.

**Estimated Number of Respondents (per year):** 15.

**Proposed Frequency of Response:** One response per application, plus up to four quarterly progress reports per year.

**Respondent Time Burden Estimates:**

**Time per Response for Initial Application:** Eight hours.

**Time per Responder for Quarterly Reports:** 4 hours per year (1 hour per report).

**Total Burden Per Year for Applications:** 120 hours for 15 applicants.

**Total Burden Per Year for Quarterly Reports:** 40 hours for ten projects.

**Respondent Cost Burden Estimates (managerial level salary at \$55 per hour):**

Capital or start-up costs .....	\$0
Cost per Respondent per application .....	440
Cost per Project for Quarterly Reports .....	220
Total Annual Cost Burden for 15 Applications .....	6,600
Total Annual Cost Burden for Quarterly Reports .....	2,200
Total Annual Cost Burden .....	8,800
Total Cost Burden, Two Years .....	17,600

Send comments on the Agency's need for this information, the accuracy of the provided burden estimates, and any suggested methods for minimizing respondent burden, including through use of automated collection techniques to the addresses listed above. Please refer to ECR Participation Program in any correspondence.

(Authority: 20 USC Sec. 5601–5609).

Dated the 25th day of January 2002.

**Christopher L. Helms,**

*Executive Director, Morris K. Udall Foundation.*

[FR Doc. 02–2317 Filed 1–30–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6820–FN–P

## NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

### Notice of Intent To Seek Approval To Extend and Revise a Current Information Collection

**AGENCY:** National Science Foundation.

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

**SUMMARY:** The National Science Foundation (NSF) is announcing plans to request renewal of this collection. In accordance with the requirement of section 3505(c)(2)(A) of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104–13), 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 April 1, 2002, to be assured of consideration. Comments received after that date will be considered to the extent practicable.

**For Additional Information or Comments:** Contact Suzanne H. Plimpton, Reports Clearance Officer, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 295, Arlington, Virginia 22230; telephone 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 between 8 a.m. and 8 p.m., Eastern time, Monday through Friday. You also may obtain a copy of the date collection instrument and instructions from Ms. Plimpton.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

**Title of Collection:** Survey of Graduate Students and Postdoctorates in Science and Engineering.

**OMB Approval Number:** 3145–0062.

**Expiration Date of Approval:** September 30, 2002.

**Type of Request:** Intent to seek approval to extend with revision an information collection for three years.

**Proposed Project:** Graduate students in science, engineering, and health fields in U.S. colleges and universities, by source and mechanism of support and by demographic characteristics. An electronic/mail survey, the Survey of Graduate Students and Postdoctorates in Science and Engineering originated in 1966 and has been conducted annually since 1972. The survey is the academic graduate enrollment component of the NSF statistical program that seeks to

“provide” a central clearinghouse for the collection, interpretation, and analysis of data on the availability of, and the current and projected need for, scientific and technical resources in the United States, and to provide a source of information for policy formulation by other agencies of the Federal government” as mandated in the National Science Foundation Act of 1950.

The proposed project will continue the current survey cycle for three to five years. The annual Fall surveys for 2002 through 2006 will survey the universe of approximately 725 reporting units at approximately 600 institutions offering accredited graduate programs in science, engineering, or health. The survey has provided continuity of statistics on graduate school enrollment and support for graduate students in all science & engineering (S&E) and health fields, with separate data requested on demographic characteristics (race/ethnicity and gender by full-time and part-time enrollment status). Statistics from the survey are published in NSF's annual publication series *Graduate Students and Postdoctorates in Science and Engineering*, in NSF publication *Science and Engineering Indicators*, *Women, Minorities, and Persons with Disability in Science and Engineering*, and are available electronically on the World Wide Web.

The survey will be sent primarily to the administrators at the Institutional Research Offices. To minimize burden, NSF instituted a Web-based survey in 1998 through which institutions can enter data directly or upload preformatted files. The Web-based survey includes a complete program for editing and trend checking and allows institutions to receive their previous year's data for comparison. Respondents will be encouraged to participate in this Web-based survey should they so wish. Traditional paper questionnaires will also be available, with editing and trend checking performed as part of the survey processing. Overall burden is expected to be reduced from 2002 to 2004 due to expanded use by institutions of the Web-based data collection system.

In Fall 2000, the survey achieved a total response rate of 99.4 percent for institutions and 99.0 percent for departments.

**Estimate of Burden:** Burden estimates are as follows:

	Total number of institutions	Department	Burden hours
FY 1998 .....	722	11,718	1.83
FY 1999 .....	720	11,833	2.53
FY 2000 .....	717	11,899	2.42

*Respondents:* Individuals.

*Estimated Number of Responses:* 11,899 (from the 2000 collection).

*Estimated Total Annual Burden on Respondents:* 28,796 hours (from the 2000 collection).

*Frequency of Responses:* Annually.

*Comments:* Comments are invited on (a) whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Agency, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the Agency'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; 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: January 28, 2002.

**Suzanne H. Plimpton,**

*Reports Clearance Officer, National Science Foundation.*

[FR Doc. 02-2416 Filed 1-30-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555-01-M

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket NO. 50-346]

### FirstEnergy Nuclear Operating Company, Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1; Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is considering issuance of an amendment to an existing exemption from title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations (10 CFR) part 50, section III.G, appendix R, for Facility Operating License No. NPF-3, issued to FirstEnergy Nuclear Operating Company (the licensee), for operation of the Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station (DBNPS), Unit 1, located in Ottawa County, Ohio. Therefore, as required by 10 CFR 51.21, the NRC is issuing this environmental assessment and finding of no significant impact.

### Environmental Assessment

#### Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed action would amend an existing exemption concerning certain requirements of Section III.G of Appendix R, "Fire Protection Program for Nuclear Power Facilities Operating Prior to January 1, 1979." Specifically, this amendment to the existing exemption applies to requirements for the DBNPS Component Cooling Water (CCW) Heat Exchanger and Pump Room (Room 328).

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application dated December 21, 2000.

#### The Need for the Proposed Action

The proposed action is needed because an underlying basis for the existing exemption, namely, the use of fire protection wrap for certain equipment, is no longer necessary due to plant modifications. Section III.G of Appendix R requires, in part, 20 feet of separation between redundant trains of systems necessary for hot shutdown in the same fire area, with no intervening combustibles. Contrary to this requirement, all three CCW pumps for the DBNPS are located at one end of Room 328, and although the redundant CCW pumps are more than 20 feet apart, the third pump, a "swing" component, is located between the redundant pumps. The centerline of the swing pump is approximately 11 feet from the centerline of each of the other two pumps. Only one CCW pump is needed for safe shutdown. In order to maintain the remainder of the room in compliance with Appendix R requirements, certain electrical conduits and valves in Room 328 associated with the CCW system were, at the time of the request for the existing exemption, protected against fire to ensure that a fire would not lead to the inoperability of both CCW pumps. Since the issuance of the existing exemption, the necessity of protecting these conduits and valves from fire has evolved to the point where their fire protection wrapping is no longer required in order to ensure safe shutdown.

#### Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The NRC has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes

that the proposed exemption does not involve radioactive wastes, release of radioactive material into the atmosphere, solid radioactive waste, or liquid effluents released to the environment.

The Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station systems were evaluated in the Final Environmental Statement (FES) dated October 1975 (NUREG 75/097). The proposed exemption will not involve any change in the waste treatment systems described in the FES.

The proposed action will not significantly increase the probability or consequences of accidents, no changes are being made in the types of effluents that may be released off site, and there is no significant increase in occupational or public radiation exposure. Therefore, there are no significant radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

With regard to potential non-radiological impacts, the proposed action does not have a potential to affect any historic sites. It does not affect non-radiological plant effluents and has no other environmental impact. Therefore, there are no significant non-radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

Accordingly, the NRC concludes that there are no significant environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

#### Environmental Impacts of the Alternatives to the Proposed Action

As an alternative to the proposed action, the staff considered denial of the proposed action (i.e., the "no-action" alternative). Denial of the application would result in no change in current environmental impacts. The environmental impacts of the proposed action and the alternative action are similar.

#### Alternative Use of Resources

The action does not involve the use of any different resource than those previously considered in the Final Environmental Statement for the DBNPS, dated October 1975.

#### Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on January 16, 2002, the NRC staff consulted with Ohio State official, C.