Item	Responses (yr)	Postage \$	Total non-hour cost burden
	(a)	(b)	(a × b) (c)
Statutory Invention Registration	5 1 2	\$1.28 1.28 1.28	\$6.00 1.00 3.00
Totals	8		10.00

There is annual (non-hour) cost burden in the way of filing fees associated with this collection of \$8,160, as shown in the accompanying table

Item	Responses (yr)	Filing fee \$	Total non-hour cost burden
	(a)	(b)	(a × b) (c)
Statutory Invention Registration (Requested prior to mailing of first office action, 37 CFR 1.17(n)) Statutory Invention Registration (Requested after mailing of final office action, 37 CFR 1.17(o)) Petition to Review Final Refusal to Publish (37 CFR 1.295) Petition to Withdraw Publication Request (37 CFR 1.296) Petition to Withdraw Publication Request (on or after Date of Notice of Intent to Publish (37 CFR 1.296))	2 3 1 1	\$920.00 1,840.00 200.00 200.00 400.00	\$1,840.00 5,520.00 200.00 200.00 400.00
Totals	8		8,160.00

The USPTO estimates that the total (non-hour) respondent cost burden for this collection in the form of postage costs and filing fees will be \$8,170.

IV. Request for 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 (including hours and cost) of the proposed collection of information; (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 information on respondents, e.g., the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

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

Dated: July 14, 2011.

Susan K. Fawcett,

Records Officer, USPTO, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 2011-18092 Filed 7-18-11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-16-P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Navy

Notice of Availability of Government-Owned Inventions; Available for Licensing

AGENCY: Department of the Navy, DoD. **ACTION:** Notice.

SUMMARY: The inventions listed below are assigned to the United States Government as represented by the Secretary of the Navy and are available for domestic licensing by the Department of the Navy. U.S. Patent No. 7,561,261: LADAR Stream Formatting and Processing Method//U.S. Patent No. 7,616,817: Three Dimensional Shape Correlator//U.S. Patent No. 7,948,610 B2: Combined Coherent and Incoherent Imaging LADAR.

ADDRESSES: Requests for copies of the inventions cited should be directed to Naval Air Warfare Center Weapons Division, Code 4L4000D, 1900 N. Knox Road Stop 6312, China Lake, CA 93555–6106 and must include the Navy Case number.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Michael D. Seltzer, Ph.D., Head, Technology Transfer Office, Naval Air Warfare Center Weapons Division, Code 4L4000D, 1900 N. Knox Road Stop 6312, China Lake, CA 93555–6106, telephone 760–939–1074, FAX 760– 939–1210, E-mail: michael.seltzer@navv.mil.

Dated: July 12, 2011.

L.M. Senay,

Lieutenant, Judge Advocate General's Corps, U.S. Navy, Federal Register Liaison Officer. [FR Doc. 2011–18116 Filed 7–18–11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3810-FF-P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

DOE Response to Recommendation 2011–1 of the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board, Safety Culture at the Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant

 $\label{eq:AGENCY: Department of Energy.} \textbf{AGENCY: } Department of Energy.$

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: On June 09, 2011, the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board affirmed their Recommendation 2011–1, concerning Safety Culture at the Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant, to the Department of Energy. In accordance with section 315(b) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, 42 U.S.C. 2286d(b), The following represents the Secretary of Energy's response to the recommendation.

ADDRESSES: Send comments, data, views, or arguments concerning the Secretary's response to: Defense Nuclear