

Forms 5500-EZ for electronic filing using modem, magnetic tape, floppy diskette, or CD-ROM; and, (3) software developers (a company, trade, business, or other person that creates, programs, or otherwise modifies computer software) applying for codes required to develop EFAST-compliant computer software for electronically preparing and filing the Form 5500 and/or Form 5500-EZ. Applicants provide some or all of the following information depending on applicant type: name and title of applicant, mailing address, Employer Identification Number (EIN), telephone number, facsimile number and e-mail address (optional), contact person if different than applicant, and a signed agreement concerning the terms and conditions of the electronic filing program. Applicants receive, depending on applicant type, some or all of the following codes: electronic signature; filer identification number; personal identification number; encryption key; electronic filing identification number; password; and software developer ID. Applicants use these codes, as applicable, in connection with electronic filing, electronic transmission, or the development of EFAST software for the Form 5500 and 5500-EZ.

The information provided by the applicants on EFAST-1, combined with the codes supplied to the applicants by the program, allow EFAST to verify a filer, transmitter, or software developer's standing as a qualified participant in the EFAST electronic filing program for the Form 5500 and 5500-EZ. EFAST-1 information also establishes a means of contact between the EFAST program and filers, transmitters, and software developers for information exchange.

Type of Review: Extension of a currently approved collection.

Agency: Department of Labor, Pension and Welfare Benefits Administration.

Title: Application for EFAST Electronic Signature and Codes for EFAST Transmitters and Software Developers.

Agency Form: EFAST-1.

OMB Number: 1210-0117.

Frequency: On occasion.

Affected Public: Individuals or households; business or other for-profit; Not-for-profit institutions.

Total Respondents: 10,800.

Total Responses: 10,800.

Estimated Total Burden Hours: 3,600.

Estimated Total Burden Cost: \$4,100.

II. Desired Focus of Comments

The Department is particularly interested in comments that:

- Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agencies, including whether the information will have practical utility;
- Evaluate the accuracy of the agencies' estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;
- Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected;
- 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 submission of responses.

III. Current Actions

The Pension and Welfare Benefits Administration is requesting an extension of the currently approved ICR pertaining to the Application for EFAST Electronic Signature and Codes for EFAST Transmitters and Software Developers (Form EFAST-1). The Department is not proposing or implementing changes to the existing ICR at this time.

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

Dated: December 11, 2001.

Gerald B. Lindrew,

Deputy Director, Office of Policy and Research, Pension and Welfare Benefits Administration.

[FR Doc. 01-30891 Filed 12-13-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-29-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 of 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 3 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 on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

DATES: Written comments should be received by February 12, 2002, to be assured of consideration. Comments received after that date would 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 Blvd., Rm. 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: The Evaluation of NSF's Louis Stokes Alliance for Minority Participation (LSAMP) Program.

OMB Control No.: 3145-NEW.

Expiration Date of Approval: Not applicable.

1. Abstract

This document has been prepared to support the clearance of data collection instruments to be used in the evaluation of the Louis Stokes Alliance of Minority Participation (LSAMP) Program. The goal of this program is to increase the number of interested, academically qualified minority students receiving baccalaureate degrees in science, technology, engineering and math (STEM), continuing to graduate school to attain a STEM graduate degree, and entering the STEM workforce. The program makes awards to alliances, which are composed of institutional

partnerships (e.g., with two- and four-year higher education institutions, business, research labs, and local, state, and federal agencies). LSAMP projects fund students, offer a range of student support services, and undertake systemic reform of undergraduate education in STEM (particularly curricular improvement and faculty professional development). This mixed-methods study will gather data through telephone interviews with project staff, a survey questionnaire of program graduates, and in person interviews with faculty, staff, and students at three selected case study sites. The process evaluation component of this study will identify strategies that accelerate or inhibit the attainment of project goals, strategies employed to promote linkages among Alliance partners, and the manner in which the LSAMP model has evolved since its inception. The impact evaluation component of this study will examine program impact on institutions of higher education in promoting diversity in STEM, and participant career outcomes.

2. Expected Respondents

The expected respondents are project directors and/or managers of all 27 projects; LSAMP graduates who received program funding and who earned STEM baccalaureate degrees between 1992 and 1997; ad, faculty, staff, and student participants at the three selected case study sites.

3. Burden on the Public

The total elements for this collection are 308 burden hours for a maximum of 795 participants annually, assuming a 90–100% response rate. The average annual reporting burden is under 1 hour per respondent. The burden on the public is negligible because the study is limited to project participants that have received funding from the LSAMP Program.

Dated: December 10, 2001.

Suzanne H. Plimpton,

NSF Reports Clearance Officer.

[FR Doc. 01–30893 Filed 12–13–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555–01–M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Enforcement Program and Alternative Dispute Resolution Request for Comments

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Request for comments.

SUMMARY: The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is announcing its intent to evaluate the use of Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) in the NRC's enforcement program, which is governed by the NUREG–1600, "General Statement of Policy and Procedure for NRC Enforcement Actions" (Enforcement Policy). The NRC is undertaking this evaluation because ADR techniques have proven to be efficient and effective in resolving a wide range of disputes government-wide. The Commission is seeking public comment in the form of answers to questions presented in the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section of this notice.

DATES: The comment period expires January 28, 2002.

ADDRESSES: Submit written responses to the questions presented in the Supplementary Information section of this notice to Michael Lesar, Chief, Rules and Directives Branch, Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration, Mail Stop T–6 D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001. Hand deliver comments to: 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland, between 7:30 a.m. and 4:15 p.m. on Federal workdays. Copies of comments received may be examined at the NRC Public Document Room, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, MD 20852. Comments may also be sent electronically to Mr. Lesar, E-mail mtl@nrc.gov.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Terrence Reis, Office of Enforcement, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001 (301) 415–3281, E-mail txr@nrc.gov, or Francis X. Cameron, NRC ADR Specialist, Office of the General Counsel, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington DC 20555–0001, (301) 415–1642, E-mail fxc@nrc.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: "ADR" is a term that refers to a number of voluntary processes, such as mediation and facilitated dialogues, that can be used to assist parties in resolving disputes and potential conflicts. The Administrative Dispute Resolution Act of 1996 (ADR Act) encourages the use of ADR by Federal agencies, and defines ADR as "any procedure that is used to resolve issues in controversy, including but not limited to, conciliation, facilitation, mediation, fact finding, minitrials, arbitration, and use of an ombudsman, or any combination thereof" (5 U.S.C. 571(3)). These techniques involve the use of a neutral third party, either from within the agency or from outside the agency, and

are typically voluntary processes in terms of the decision to participate, the type of process used, and the content of the final agreement. Federal agency experience with ADR has demonstrated that the use of these techniques can result in more efficient resolution of issues, more effective outcomes, and improved relationships between the agency and the other party.

The NRC has a general ADR policy (57 FR 36678; August 14, 1992) that supports and encourages the use of ADR in NRC activities. In addition, the NRC has used ADR effectively in a variety of circumstances, including rulemaking and policy development, and EEO disputes. Section 2.203 of the Commission's regulations provides for the use of "settlement and compromise" in proceedings dealing with enforcement issues. In addition, § 2.337 of the Commission's proposed revisions to the NRC hearing process provides for ADR in NRC proceedings (see, 66 FR 19610, 19645; April 16, 2001). In at least one instance, an NRC enforcement case has been resolved through the use of a "settlement judge" from the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel pursuant to 10 CFR 2.203 of the Commission's regulations, but there has been no systematic evaluation of the need for ADR in the enforcement process. The NRC's participation in a 1998 interagency initiative to encourage the use of ADR by Federal agencies, and the NRC's receipt of a request to use ADR in a recent enforcement case, have prompted the agency to consider whether a new, specific ADR policy would be beneficial in the enforcement area.

Use of ADR by the NRC and other Federal Agencies. In order to encourage Federal agencies to take advantage of the benefits of ADR, Congress enacted the ADR Act. The Act requires each agency to do the following:

1. Adopt a policy that addresses the use of ADR;
2. Designate a senior official to be the dispute resolution specialist for the agency;
3. Provide ADR training on a regular basis; and
4. Review each standard agency agreement for contracts, grants, and other assistance with an eye towards encouraging the use of ADR.

As noted above, "ADR" is a term that describes a set of processes which assist parties in resolving their disputes quickly and efficiently. Mediation, early neutral evaluation, facilitated dialogues, and arbitration are examples of these ADR processes. Central to each ADR process is the use of an objective third party or neutral, for example, a