and accurate information possible to policymakers in Congress and throughout government and academia, NSF/SRS conducts many surveys to obtain the data for these purposes. The Generic Clearance will be used to ensure that the highest quality data is obtained from these surveys. State-of-the-art methodology will be used to develop, evaluate, and test questionnaires and survey concepts as well as to improve survey methodology. This may include field or pilot tests of questions for future large-scale surveys, as needed.

Expected Respondents: The respondents will be from industry, academia, nonprofit organizations, members of the public, and state, local, and federal governments. Respondents will be either individuals or institutions, depending upon the survey under investigation. Qualitative procedures will generally be conducted in person or over the phone, but quantitative procedures may be conducted using mail, web, e-mail, or phone modes, depending on the topic under investigation. Up to 19,150 respondents will be contacted across the survey improvement projects. No respondent will be contacted more than twice in one year under this generic clearance. Every effort will be made to use technology to limit the burden on respondents from small entities.

Both qualitative and quantitative methods will be used to improve NSF's current data collection instruments and processes and to reduce respondent burden, as well as to develop new surveys. Qualitative methods include, but are not limited to, expert review; exploratory, cognitive, and usability interviews; focus groups; and respondent debriefings. Cognitive and usability interviews may include the use of scenarios, paraphrasing, card sorts, vignette classifications, and rating tasks. Quantitative methods include, but are not limited to, telephone surveys, behavior coding, split panel tests, and field tests.

Information being collected is not considered sensitive. In general, assurances of data confidentiality will not be provided to respondents in the pretests. Instead, respondents have the option of requesting that any and all data they provide be kept confidential.

Use of the Information: The purpose of these studies is to use the latest and most appropriate methodology to improve NSF surveys. The data will be used internally to improve NSF surveys. Methodological findings may be presented externally in technical papers at conferences, published in the proceedings of conferences, or in journals. Improved NSF surveys will help policy makers in decisions on research and development fundings, graduate education, scientific and technical workforce, regulations, and reporting guidelines, as well as contributing to reduced survey costs.

Burden on the Public: NSF estimates that a total reporting and recordkeeping burden of 14,950 hours will result from activities to improve its surveys. The calculation is:

TABLE 1.—ANTICIPATED SURVEYS TO UNDERTAKE IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS, ALONG WITH THE NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS AND BURDEN HOURS PER SURVEY FOR THREE YEAR PERIOD

Survey name	Number of respondents[1]	Hours
Graduate Student Survey	[2] 5,000	3,000
SESTAT Surveys	10,000	5,000
Postdoc Project	800	1,600
New and Redesigned R&D Surveys:		
Academic R&D	600	1,200
Government R&D	50	100
Nonprofit R&D	200	100
Industry R&D	500	2,000
Survey of Scientific & Engineering Facilities	300	150
Public Understanding of S&E Surveys	200	50
Survey of Earned Doctorates	300	550
Additional surveys not specified	1,200	1,200
Total	19,150	14,950

[1] Number of respondents listed for any individual survey may represent several methodological improvement projects.
[2] This number refers to the science, engineering, and health-related departments within the academic institutions of the United States (not the academic institutions themselves).

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, 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.

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

Dated: August 25, 2006.

Suzanne Plimpton,

Reports Clearance Officer, National Science Foundation.

[FR Doc. 06–7238 Filed 8–29–06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555–01–M

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Notice of Permit Applications Received Under the Antarctic Conservation Act of 1978 (Pub. L. 95–541)

AGENCY: National Science Foundation.

ACTION: Notice of Permit Applications Received under the Antarctic

Conservation Act of 1978, Public Law 95–541.

SUMMARY: The National Science Foundation (NSF) is required to publish notice of permit applications received to conduct activities regulated under the Antarctic Conservation Act of 1978. NSF has published regulations under the Antarctic Conservation Act at Title 45 Part 670 of the Code of Federal Regulations. This is the required notice of permit applications received.

DATES: Interested parties are invited to submit written data, comments, or views with respect to this permit application by September 29, 2006. This application may be inspected by interested parties at the Permit Office, address below.

ADDRESSES: Comments should be addressed to Permit Office, Room 755, Office of Polar Programs, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, Virginia 22230.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dr. Polly A. Penhale at the above address or (703) 292–7405.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The National Science Foundation, as directed by the Antarctic Conservation Act of 1978 (Public Law 95–541), as amended by the Antarctic Science, Tourism and Conservation Act of 1996, has developed regulations for the establishment of a permit system for various activities in Antarctica and designation of certain animals and certain geographic areas requiring special protection. The regulations establish such a permit system to designate Antarctic Specially Protected Areas.

The applications received are as follows:

1. *Applicant:* Permit Application No. 2007–001, Olav T. Oftedal, Department of Conservation Biology, Smithsonian Institution, National Zoological Park, 3001 Connecticut Ave., NW., Washington, DC 20008.

Activity for Which Permit is Requested

Take, and import into the U.S.A. The applicant plans to capture and collect samples from up to 120 Weddell seal mother-pup pairs and up to 180 lactating mother-juvenile pairs. The samples will help determine the importance of food intake to lactating Weddell seals and their young during the lactation period. They will measure: (a) Energy expenditure of lactating females, (b) the amount and composition of milk consumed by nursing pups, (c) growth of pups, and (d) onset and prevalence of feeding in mothers and pups, and (e) amount of energy that lactating females derive from food intake.

Location

McMurdo Sound vicinity.

Dates

September 1, 2006 to February 1, 2009.

2. *Applicant:* Permit Application No. 2007–004, Gretchen E. Hofmann, Department of Ecology, Evolution and Marine Biology, University of California, Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara, CA 93106–9610.

Activity for Which Permit Is Requested

Introduce non-indigenous species into Antarctica. The applicant proposes to bring up to 10 black cod (*Notothenia angustata*) for use in experiments in Crary Lab at McMurdo Station. The fish from temperate waters will be exposed to the subzero conditions of Antarctic coastal waters. The responses of the New Zealand fish will be assessed using genomics techniques, and these results will be compared to the Antarctic species. The New Zealand fish are thought to have initially evolved in the Antarctic and then migrated to more temperate water. These experiments will more carefully test this supposition. The New Zealand fish will not be released into Antarctic waters.

Location

The Crary Science and Engineering Center, McMurdo Station, Antarctica.

Dates

October 1, 2006 to December 31, 2006.

3. *Applicant:* Permit Application No. 2007–006, Paul J. Ponganis, Center for Marine Biotechnology/Biomedicine, Scripps Institution of Oceanography, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA 92093–0204.

Activity for Which Permit Is Requested

Take and Enter Antarctic Specially Protected Area. The applicant proposes to capture up to 80 adult Emperors, up to 20 Emperor chicks, and 10 adult Adelie penguins. Blood and muscle tissue samples will be collected and depth recorders will be attached. The samples collected will help to understand how Emperors dive so long and avoid complications such as shallow water black out and accumulation of metabolic byproducts such as lactate. In addition, the applicant will conduct censuses of the Emperor colonies at Cape Crozier (ASPA #124), Beaufort Island (ASPA #105), Cape Washington, Franklin Island and Coulman Island. The applicant also proposes to salvage up to 10 Emperor carcasses each year for anatomical studies.

Location

McMurdo Sound sea ice, Cape Washington, Franklin Island, Coulman Island, Cape Crozier (ASPA #124), and Beaufort Island (ASPA #105).

Dates

September 1, 2006 to January 31, 2009.

4. *Applicant:* Permit Application No. 2007–007, Markus Horning, Hatfield Marine Science Center, 2030 SE Marine Science Drive, Newport, OR 97365.

Activity for Which Permit Is Requested

Take and Import into the United States. The applicant proposes to capture up to 48 Weddell seals to be weighed, blood and muscle tissue samples taken and VHF transmitters attached. The samples collected will be returned to the U.S. for analysis to determine the small-scale, immediate and obvious effects of aging on the diving capacity and exercise capability of adult Weddell seals.

Location

McMurdo Sound sea ice.

Dates

October 1, 2006 to January 31, 2008.

5. *Applicant:* Permit Application No. 2007–008, Walker O. Smith, Virginia Institute of Marine Science, P.O. Box 1346, 1208 Greate Road, Gloucester Point, VA 23062.

Activity for Which Permit Is Requested

Introduce non-indigenous species into Antarctica. The application proposed to bring 2 flasks each of phytoplankton (*Phaeocystis Antarctica, Pseudo-nitzschia sp.* and *Fragilariopsis cylindus*) for use in experiments during a cruise on the R/V Nathaniel B. Palmer. These cultures are originally from Antarctica and have not been genetically modified. The applicant will study the physiological response of these native species to controlled environmental factors with onboard incubation. It is necessary to use these samples because the occurrence of these species in unpredictable in the Ross Sea and there is limited time on the cruise to perform the experiments.

Location

Ross Sea.

Dates

October 20, 2006 to December 25, 2006.

6. *Applicant:* Permit Application No. 207–011, Mark Buckley, Senior Manager

Multimedia, Raytheon Polar Service Company, 7400 S. Tucson Way, Centennial, CO 80112.

Activity for Which Permit Is Requested

Enter Antarctic Specially Protected Areas. The RPSC Multimedia team is often tasked with taking video and still footage of scientific activities and general scenery. Request for such coverage is expected to increase during the International Polar Year. The applicant requests to enter the Antarctic Specially Protected Areas in the McMurdo Sound/Ross Sea region when tasked to film scientific activities occurring at any of the sites. Access to the sites will be limited to due to operational and scientific constraints.

Location

Sabrina Island (ASPA 104), Beaufort Island (ASPA 105), Cape Hallett (ASPA 106). Cape Bird (ASPA 116), Mt. Melbourne (ASPA 118), Cape Royds (ASPA 121), Arrival Heights (ASPA 122), Barwick Valley (ASPA 123), Cape Crozier (ASPA 124), Tramway Ridge (ASPA 130), Canada Glacier (ASPA 131), Northwest White Island (ASPA 137), Linneaus Terrace (ASPA 138), Botany Bay (ASPA 154), Cape Evans (ASPA 155), Lewis Bay (ASPA 156), Backdoor Bay (ASPA 157), Hut Point (ASPA 158), Cape Adare (ASPA 150), Terra Nova Bay (ASPA 161).

Dates

October 1, 2006 to February 14, 2009.

Nadene G. Kennedy,

Permit Officer, Office of Polar Programs.

[FR Doc. 06–7256 Filed 8–29–06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555–01–M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50–413, 50–414, 50–369 and 50–370]

Duke Power Company Llc, et al., Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating License, Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity for a Hearing

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an amendment to Facility Operating License Nos. NPF–35, NPF–52, NPF–9 and NPF–11, issued to Duke Power Company, LLC, et al., for operation of the Catawba Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2, located in York County, South Carolina, and McGuire Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2, located in Mecklenburg County, North Carolina.

The proposed amendments would revise technical specification (TS) 3.4.15, ''RCS [Reactor Coolant System] Leakage Detection Instrumentation''. The proposed changes address the incore instrument room sump level instrumentation and containment atmosphere radioactivity monitors and their compliance with Regulatory Guide 1.45.

Before issuance of the proposed license amendment, the Commission will have made findings required by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), and the Commission's regulations.

The Commission has made a proposed determination that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration. Under the Commission's regulations in Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations (10 CFR), Part 50, Section 50.92, this means that operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; or (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below. This analysis is from the May 4, 2006, submittal and supercedes the analysis from the licensee's July 27, 2005, submittal:

1. Would implementation of the changes proposed in this LAR involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated?

No. The changes contained in this LAR (license amendment request) have been evaluated and determined to not increase the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated. The proposed changes do not make any hardware changes and do not alter the configuration of any plant structure, system, or component. The proposed LAR: (1) Removes the containment atmosphere gaseous radioactivity monitor as an option for meeting the operability requirements of TS 3.4.15 and replaces it with the containment atmosphere particulate radioactivity monitor, (2) clarifies the applicability of the TS to the containment atmosphere particulate radioactivity monitor, (3) adds the incore instrument sump and its level instrumentation to the McGuire and Catawba licensing basis contained in the TS, the Bases, and the Updated Final Safety Analysis Reports, and (4) makes other low risk changes to TS 3.4.15. None of the containment Reactor Coolant System (RCS) leakage detection instrumentation systems are initiators of any accident; therefore, the probability of occurrence of an accident is not increased. The McGuire and Catawba licensing bases will continue to require diverse means of detecting reactor coolant system (RCS) leakage, thus ensuring that leakage due to cracks would continue to be identified prior to breakage and the plant would be shutdown accordingly. Therefore the consequences of an accident are not increased.

2. Would implementation of the changes proposed in this LAR create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated?

No. The changes proposed in this LAR do not involve the use or installation of any equipment that is less conservative than that already installed and in use. No new or different system interactions are created and no new processes are introduced. The proposed changes will not introduce any new failure mechanisms, malfunctions, or accident initiators not already considered in the design and licensing basis. The proposed changes do not affect any structure, system, or component associated with an accident initiator. Based on these considerations, the proposed changes do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

3. Would implementation of the changes proposed in this LAR involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety?

No. The changes proposed in this LAR do not make any alteration to any RCS leakage detection components. The proposed changes only remove the containment atmosphere gaseous radioactivity monitors as an option for meeting the operability requirements for TS 3.4.15 and replace it with the more responsive containment atmosphere particulate radioactivity monitor. Since the level of radioactivity in the McGuire and Catawba reactor coolant has become much lower than what was assumed in the original licensing bases, the gaseous channel can no longer detect a small RCS leak consistent with the plants' leak-before-break (LBB) analyses. A conservative addition is being made to TS 3.4.15 in order to include controls for the incore instrument sump level instrumentation. The changes contained in the LAR are not risk significant since the RCS leakage detection instrumentation is not credited in the McGuire and Catawba probabilistic risk assessments. The proposed amendment continues to require diverse means of leakage detection equipment with the capability to promptly detect RCS leakage well within the margin of the LBB analyses. Based on this evaluation, the proposed changes do not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

The Commission is seeking public comments on this proposed determination. Any comments received within 30 days after the date of