

those produced by the subject worker group.

The intent of the Department is for a certification to cover all workers of a subject firm or appropriate subdivision who were adversely affected by increased imports of an article produced by the firm or a shift in production of the article, based on the investigation of the TAA petition. Therefore, the Department requested voluntary remand to address the allegations made by the two sets of plaintiffs, to determine whether the subject worker group is eligible to apply for TAA under the Trade Act of 1974, as amended (hereafter referred to as the Act), and to issue an appropriate remand determination.

To apply for worker adjustment assistance under Section 222(a) of the Act, 19 U.S.C. 2272(a), the following criteria must be met:

I. The first criterion (set forth in section 222(a)(1) of the Act, 19 U.S.C. 2272(a)(1)) requires that a significant number or proportion of the workers in the workers' firm must have become totally or partially separated or be threatened with total or partial separation.

II. The second criterion (set forth in section 222(a)(2) of the Act, 19 U.S.C. 2272(a)(2)) may be satisfied if either:

(i)(I) There has been a shift by the workers' firm to a foreign country in the production of articles or supply of services like or directly competitive with those produced/supplied by the workers' firm; or

(i)(II) there has been an acquisition from a foreign country by the workers' firm of articles/services that are like or directly competitive with those produced/supplied by the workers' firm.

III. The third criterion requires that the shift/acquisition must have contributed importantly to the workers' separation or threat of separation. See section 222(a)(2)(B)(ii) of the Act, 19 U.S.C. 2272(a)(2)(B)(ii).

As amended by the Trade and Globalization Adjustment Assistance Act of 2009, section 222 of the Act (19 U.S.C. 2272) covers foreign contracting scenarios, where a company closes a domestic operation and contracts with a company in a foreign country for the goods or services that had been produced in the United States.

During the remand investigation, the Department obtained information from the subject firm, solicited input from the two sets of Plaintiffs, and addressed all of the Plaintiffs' allegations.

Based on the information collected during the remand investigation, the Department determined that the subject worker group was impacted by a shift in

production of articles like or directly competitive with the locomotives, locomotive kits, and propulsion and specialty parts produced at the subject facility.

The Department's findings on remand revealed that the subject firm engages in practices that entail the transfer of work to foreign countries under "localization" agreements in which the subject firm penetrates into foreign markets under joint ventures with entities in the foreign country. Further, although the subject firm asserts that the articles manufactured at the facilities abroad are not identical in nature to the articles manufactured at the subject facility, upon close examination of data collected on remand, the Department has determined that the articles manufactured abroad are like or directly competitive with those produced by the subject worker group. The regulations implementing the Act, at 29 CFR 90.2, provide that "like or directly competitive articles" include those which are substantially identical in inherent or intrinsic characteristics, as well as those which are substantially equivalent for commercial purposes.

After a painstaking review on remand, the Department has determined that a significant number or proportion of the workers in the appropriate subdivision of the subject firm was separated. Further, the Department has determined that a shift in production abroad of articles like or directly competitive with the articles produced by the subject worker group contributed importantly to worker group separations. Therefore, the Department has determined that the group eligibility requirements under section 222(a)(2)(B) of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, have been met.

Conclusion

After careful review of the facts during the remand investigation, I determine that the workers' firm has shifted to foreign countries the production of articles like or directly competitive with those produced by the subject firm or appropriate subdivision, and such shift of production contributed importantly to worker group separations at the subject facility. In accordance with section 223 of the Act, 19 U.S.C. 2273, I make the following certification:

All workers of General Electric Company, Transportation Division, including on-site leased workers from Adecco Technical, Erie, Pennsylvania, who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after June 10, 2008, through two years from the date of certification, and all workers in the group threatened with total or partial separation from employment on the date of certification through two years from the date

of certification, are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Chapter 2 of Title II of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 23rd day of July 2010.

Del Min Amy Chen,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 2010-19390 Filed 8-5-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-FN-P

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Sunshine Act Meetings

TIME AND DATES:

All meetings are held at 2:30 p.m.

Tuesday, August 3;

Thursday, August 12;

Wednesday, August 18;

Wednesday, August 25;

Thursday, August 26;

Friday, August 27, 2010.

PLACE: Board Agenda Room, No. 11820, 1099 14th St., NW., Washington, DC 20570.

STATUS: Closed.

MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED: Pursuant to § 102.139(a) of the Board's Rules and Regulations, the Board or a panel thereof will consider "the issuance of a subpoena, the Board's participation in a civil action or proceeding or an arbitration, or the initiation, conduct, or disposition * * * of particular representation or unfair labor practice proceedings under section 8, 9, or 10 of the [National Labor Relations] Act, or any court proceedings collateral or ancillary thereto." See also 5 U.S.C. 552b(c)(10).

CONTACT PERSON FOR MORE INFORMATION: Lester A. Heltzer, Executive Secretary, (202) 273-1067.

Dated: August 4, 2010.

Lester A. Heltzer,

Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2010-19538 Filed 8-4-10; 11:15 am]

BILLING CODE 7545-01-P

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Agency Information Collection Activities: Proposed Collection, Comment Request

AGENCY: National Science Foundation.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The National Science Foundation (NSF) is announcing plans to request clearance for this collection. In accordance with the requirement of Section 3506(c)(2)(A) 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 OMB clearance of this collection for no longer than three years.

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

DATES: Written comments should be received by October 5, 2010, to be assured of consideration. Comments received after that date will be considered to the extent practicable.

ADDRESSES: Written comments regarding the information collection and requests for copies of the proposed information collection request should be addressed to Suzanne Plimpton, Reports Clearance Officer, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Room 295, Arlington, VA 22230, or by e-mail to splimpto@nsf.gov.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Suzanne Plimpton on (703) 292-7556 or send e-mail to 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.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Title of Collection: Implementation Evaluation of the ADVANCE Program.

OMB Control No.: 3145-0209.

Expiration Date of Approval: October 31, 2012.

Abstract: The ADVANCE Program was established by the National Science Foundation in 2001 to address the underrepresentation and inadequate advancement of women on STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics) faculties at postsecondary institutions. The evaluation being conducted by the Urban Institute focuses on the implementation of ADVANCE projects at institutions throughout the nation. The three major funding components—institutional transformation, leadership, and partnership awards—as well as all

cohorts funded that completed their funding cycles will be included. The study will rely on a thorough review of project documents, telephone interviews with all grantees, and detailed case studies at selected sites. The goal of the evaluation will be to identify models of implementation and, depending on outcomes by model, conduct case studies at selected institutions to understand how ADVANCE models operate and may be effective in differing settings.

Respondents: Faculty and staff at institutions of higher education awarded an ADVANCE grant from NSF.

Estimated Number of Annual Respondents: 151 (total).

1. *Site visit interviews.* Conduct interviews in 6 sites selected for case studies. Interview project staff, administrators and faculty. Burden calculated as follows: Approximately 8 interviews in each site + interview recipients of leadership awards at case study sites (if any).

Total respondents: 48 estimated interviewees + 7 leadership and PAID award recipients = 55

2. *Site visit focus groups with faculty:* 2 per site; 6 sites; 6–8 faculty in each; total = 96

Burden on the Public: 149 hours (maximum). Calculated as follows:

1. *Site visit interviews:* 48 interviews of 1 hour duration = 48 hours and 7 interviews of 45 minutes duration = 5.25 hours (53)

2. *Focus groups:* 96 participants of 1 hour duration = 96 hours

Dated: August 3, 2010.

Suzanne H. Plimpton,

Reports Clearance Officer, National Science Foundation.

[FR Doc. 2010-19458 Filed 8-5-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[NRC-2009-0522; Docket No. 50-284; License No. R-110]

Idaho State University; Notice of Issuance of Director's Decision

Notice is hereby given that the Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, has issued a Director's Decision with regard to a petition dated June 26, 2009 (Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS) Accession No. ML092440721), filed by Dr. Kevan Crawford, hereinafter referred to as the "petitioner." Additionally, the petitioner requested further enforcement action against the licensee, during a

transcribed conference call which addressed the Petition Review Board (PRB) on September 1, 2009 (ADAMS Accession No. ML09244072), supplementing the June 26, 2009, petition.

Action Requested

The petitioner requested that the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) take the following enforcement actions:

(1) The reactor operating license should be suspended immediately. All continuing violations, including items that Dr. Crawford alleged were unresolved from the Notice of Violation (NOV) 93-1 as well as 20 violations that Dr. Crawford alleged to be concealed must be reconciled with the regulatory requirements immediately. The alleged violations correspond to regulatory, criminal, and ethical misconduct which Dr. Crawford contends had impacted public health and safety and the environment of Pocatello, Idaho.

(2) The licensee should be fined for all damages related to the violations and cover-up of violations.

(3) The licensee should be required to carry a 50-year \$50,000,000 bond to cover latent radiation injuries instead of covering these injuries with unreliable State budget allocations for contingency funds.

(4) During the fall semester of 1993, Dr. Crawford alleges that students utilizing the reactor lab facilities were handling irradiated samples without permission. Furthermore he alleges that the samples were handled without anti-contamination clothing and no radiological surveys were conducted, although he states neither of which was required. Dr. Crawford contends said students proceeded to the local hospital to visit friends in the neonatal unit. Upon this basis, Dr. Crawford requests every potential exposure and contamination victim be identified through facility records, located, and informed of the potential risk to them and their families. The Medical Center in Pocatello, Idaho, should also be informed so that they may do the same. Those who were exposed should be informed of the entire range of expected symptoms and of their right to seek compensation from the licensee.

(5) The following should warrant immediate revocation of the operating license due to the inability of the licensee to account for, with documentation, controlled byproduct nuclear materials that were:

- a. Released in clandestine, undocumented shipments before August 4, 1993;
- b. Possessed by individuals not licensed to control the materials, and