# 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 section. 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 19, 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 the Preparing Future Faculty (PFF) Program.

*OMB Control No.:* 3145–0183. *Expiration Date of Approval:* May 31, 2002. *Abstract:* This document has been prepared to support the clearance of data collection instruments to be used in the evaluation of the Preparing Future Faculty (PFF) Program, funded since 1993 by The PEW Charitable Trust, the National Science Foundation, and an anonymous donor. PFF is designed to change the culture of graduate education in order to produce faculty for colleges and universities who are fully prepared for teaching and service responsibilities as well as the research role.

Data will be collected using Webbased surveys and conducting institutional site visits for six selected case studies. Titles of the survey instruments and interview protocol for the PFF Evaluation are as follows:

• PFF Partner Faculty Survey

PFF Graduate Faculty Survey
PFF Participant Survey (Graduate

Students)

• PFF Site Visit Protocol (for case studies)

NSF will use this collection to evaluate the impact and effectiveness of the Preparing Future Faculty Program on graduate education and the development of future professors.

*Expected Respondents:* The expected respondents are project directors, deans, and graduate student participants at PFF grantee institutions as well as faculty associated directly with the PFF program at both graduate institutions and partner institutions.

Burden on the Public: The remaining elements for this collection represent 734 burden hours for a maximum of 3840 participants over two years, assuming an 80–100% response rate. The burden on the public is negligible; the study is limited to project participants that have directly received funding from or otherwise have benefited from participation in the PFF program.

Dated: December 14, 2001.

# Suzanne H. Plimpton,

NSF Reports Clearance Officer. [FR Doc. 01–31283 Filed 12–19–01; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 7555–01–M

### 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 19, 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 the Preparing Future Faculty (PFF) Program.

OMB Control No.: 3145–0183. Expiration Date of Approval: May 31, 2002.

*Abstract:* This document has been prepared to support the clearance of data collection instruments to be used in the evaluation of the Preparing Future Faculty (PFF) Program, funded since 1993 by The PEW Charitable Trust, the National Science Foundation, and an anonymous donor. PFF is designed to change the culture of graduate education in order to produce faculty for colleges and universities who are fully prepared for teaching and service responsibilities as well as the research role.

Data will be collected using Webbased surveys and conducting institutional site visits for six selected case studies. Titles of the survey instruments and interview protocol for the PFF Evaluation are as follows:

- PFF Partner Faculty Survey.
- PFF Graduate Faculty Survey.

• PFF Participant Survey (Graduate Students)

• PFF Site Visit Protocol (for case studies).

NSF will use this collection to evaluate the impact and effectiveness of the Preparing Future Faculty Program on graduate education and the development of future professors.

*Expected Respondents:* The expected respondents are project directors, deans, and graduate student participants at PFF grantee institutions as well as faculty associated directly with the PFF program at both graduate institutions and partner institutions.

Burden on the Public: The remaining elements for this collection represent 734 burden hours for a maximum of 3840 participants over two years, assuming an 80–100% response rate. The burden on the public is neligible; the study is limited to project participants that have directly received funding from or otherwise have benefited from participation in the PFF program.

Dated: December 14, 2001.

### Suzanne H. Plimpton,

NSF Reports Clearance Officer. [FR Doc. 01–31284 Filed 12–19–01; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 7555–01–M

### NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-219]

### Amergen Energy Company, LLC; 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 No. DPR– 16 issued to AmerGen Energy Company, LLC (the licensee) for operation of the Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station located in Ocean County, New Jersey.

The proposed license amendment request is to revise Technical Specification (TS) 3.5.A.5.b to change the number of allowed inoperable suppression chamber to drywell vacuum breakers from two to five. This change decreases the required number of operable vacuum breakers for opening from twelve to nine.

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 10 CFR 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:

1. Operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The proposed change reduces the number of vacuum breakers required to be operable from twelve to nine, allows continued operation for 72 hours with one required vacuum breaker inoperable, and allows a vacuum breaker to remain operable with one position alarm circuit inoperable. The proposed change does not increase the probability of an accident. The number of vacuum breakers required to be operable is not assumed to be an accident initator of any analyzed event.

[...] The change does not allow continuous operation with only eight vacuum breakers operable. Therefore, the consequences of an accident are not increased. This change does not alter assumptions relative to the mitigation of an accident or transient event. The position alarm circuits only provide indication of valve position prior to an event and do not perform any accident mitigation functions. Additional surveillance of an operable vacuum breaker with an inoperable position alarm circuit will provide adequate assurance of vacuum breaker status and operability of the remaining redundant position alarm circuit.

Therefore, this change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. Operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

The proposed change reduces the number of vacuum breakers required to be operable from twelve to nine, allows continued

operation for 72 hours with one required vacuum breaker inoperable, and allows a vacuum breaker to remain operable with one position alarm circuit inoperable. This change will not physically alter the plant since [because] no new or different type of equipment will be installed. The change in analytical methods used to establish the proposed Technical Specification limits for normal plant operation preserves the current safety analysis assumptions and acceptable criteria. The proposed 72 hour allowed outage time for a required operable vacuum breaker is consistent with NRC Standard Technical Specifications, NUREG-1433, and is considered acceptable due to the low probability of an event in which the remaining vacuum breaker capability would not be adequate assuming a single failure to open. Additional surveillance of an operable vacuum breaker with an inoperable position alarm circuit will provide adequate assurance of vacuum breaker status and operability of the remaining redundant position alarm circuit.

Therefore, this change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

3. Operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

This proposed change reduces the number of vacuum breakers required to be operable from twelve to nine, allows continued operation for 72 hours with one required vacuum breaker inoperable, and allows a vacuum breaker to remain operable with one position alarm circuit inoperable. Reducing the number of required vacuum breakers from twelve to nine is consistent with the analysis that shows eight vacuum breakers are sufficient to maintain containment differential pressures and downcomer water column height below acceptable limits. Therefore, the margin of safety is not affected. The safety analysis assumptions and acceptance criteria are maintained. In addition, with one required vacuum breaker inoperable for 72 hours, the margin of safety is not significantly reduced considering the remaining vacuum breakers are still available and sufficient to mitigate an event, and the low probability of an accident occurring during this time period requiring vacuum breaker operation. Additional surveillance of an operable vacuum breaker with an inoperable position alarm circuit will provide adequate assurance of vacuum breaker status and operability of the remaining redundant position alarm circuit.

Therefore, the proposed change does 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