

collected; and (4) 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, e.g., permitting electronic submissions of responses.

Agency: National Endowment for the Humanities.

Title of Proposal: Generic Clearance Authority for the National Endowment for the Humanities.

OMB Number: 3136-0134.

Frequency of Collection: On occasion.

Affected Public: Applicants to NEH grant programs, reviewers of NEH grant applications, and NEH grantees.

Total Respondents: 6,978.

Average Time per Response: varied according to type of information collection.

Estimated Total Burden Hours: 68,375 hours.

Total Annualized capital/startup costs: 0.

Total annual costs (operating/maintaining systems or purchasing services): 0.

Description: This submission requests approval from OMB for a three year extension of NEH's currently approved generic clearance authority for all NEH information collections other than one-time evaluations, questionnaires and surveys. Generic clearance authority would include approval of forms and instructions for application to NEH grant programs, reporting forms for NEH grantees, panelists and reviewers and for program evaluation purposes.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Susan G. Daisey, Director, Office of Grant Management, National Endowment for the Humanities, 1100 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Room 311, Washington, DC 20506, or by email to: sdaisey@neh.gov. Telephone: 202-606-8494.

Carole Watson,

Deputy Chairman, National Endowment for the Humanities.

[FR Doc. 2012-10196 Filed 4-27-12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7536-01-P

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Proposal Review Panel for Materials Research; Notice of Meeting

In accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92-463 as amended), the National Science Foundation announces the following meeting:

Name: Site visit review of the Materials Research Science and Engineering Center

(MRSEC) at the University of Nebraska Lincoln by the Division of Materials Research (DMR) #1203.

Dates & Times: May 21, 2012; 7:15 a.m.–8:30 p.m., May 22, 2012; 7:15 a.m.–3:00 p.m.

Place: University of Nebraska Lincoln, Lincoln, NE.

Type of Meeting: Part open.

Contact Person for More Information: Dr. Sean L. Jones, Program Director, Materials Research Science and Engineering Centers Program, Division of Materials Research, Room 1065, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, VA 22230, Telephone (703) 292-2986.

Purpose of Meeting: To provide advice and recommendations concerning further support of the MRSEC at the University of Nebraska.

Agenda

Monday, May 21, 2012

7:15 a.m.–4:30 p.m. Open—Review of the MRSEC

5 p.m.–6:45 p.m. Closed—Executive Session

6:45 p.m.–8:30 p.m. Open—Dinner

Tuesday, May 22, 2012

7:15 a.m.–9:50 a.m. Closed—Executive Session

9:50 a.m.–3 p.m. Closed—Executive Session, Draft and Review Report

Reason for Closing: The work being reviewed may include information of a proprietary or confidential nature, including technical information; financial data, such as salaries and personal information concerning individuals associated with the MRSEC. These matters are exempt under 5 U.S.C. 552b(c), (4) and (6) of the Government in the Sunshine Act.

Dated: April 24, 2012.

Susanne Bolton,

Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 2012-10273 Filed 4-27-12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. NRC-2012-0081]

Agency Information Collection Activities: Proposed Collection; Comment Request

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Notice of pending NRC action to submit an information collection request to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) and solicitation of public comment.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) invites public comment about our intention to request the OMB's approval for renewal of an existing information collection that is summarized below. We are required to publish this notice in the **Federal Register** under the provisions of the

Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35).

Information pertaining to the requirement to be submitted:

1. *The title of the information collection:* Request for Information Pursuant to Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR) 50.54(f), Regarding Recommendations 2.1, 2.3 and 9.3, of the Near-Term Task Force Review of Insights from the Fukushima Dai-ichi Event.

2. *Current OMB approval number:* 3150-0211.

3. *How often the collection is required:* Once.

4. *Who is required or asked to report:* 104 power reactor licensees, 2 reactors in the process of resuming licensing, and 2 Combined License applicants (with 2 units each).

5. *The number of annual respondents:* 110.

6. *The number of hours needed annually to complete the requirement or request:* 369,960 hours.

7. *Abstract:* Following events at the Fukushima Dai-ichi nuclear power plant resulting from the March 11, 2011, earthquake and subsequent tsunami, and in response to requirements contained in Section 402 of the Consolidated Appropriations Act (Pub. L. 112-074), the NRC sought an expedited clearance from OMB to allow the collection of information from power reactor licensees pursuant to 10 CFR 50.54(f). OMB approved this clearance, which will expire on September 30, 2012. The NRC is currently preparing to resubmit the collection to OMB under normal clearance processes. The information requested includes seismic and flooding hazard reevaluations to determine if further regulatory action is necessary, walkdowns to confirm compliance with the current licensing basis and provide input to the hazard reevaluations, and analysis of the Emergency Preparedness capability with respect to staffing and communication ability during a prolonged multiunit event.

Submit, by June 29, 2012, comments that address the following questions:

1. Is the proposed collection of information necessary for the NRC to properly perform its functions? Does the information have practical utility?

2. Is the burden estimate accurate?

3. Is there a way to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected?

4. How can the burden of the information collection be minimized, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology?