

average person may not have; arguments can also be made that training is ineffective in periods of high unemployment because there are no jobs in the areas in which customers are trained. However, a study of the impacts of training in Europe finds that the magnitude of the impacts is higher in periods of high unemployment (Lechner and Wunsch, 2006, IZA discussion paper number 2355). The Department believes that the public workforce investment system must prove its worth under all economic conditions, including during times of economic challenges and high unemployment, since Federal funding for these programs is not—currently—predicated on the country's or area's employment situation.

Comment: Two comments mentioned the additional work the study will require of local staff. One commenter suggested that participating sites should receive monetary compensation for participating in the study.

Response: We recognize that the study requires additional work of local staff in the selected LWIAs and, therefore, participating LWIAs are receiving compensation for extra costs incurred due to the study. In addition, evaluation staff will work with staff in the selected LWIAs to minimize the effect that study procedures may have on each area's ongoing procedures.

Comment: One commenter suggested that there should be adjustments for performance measures for participating sites.

Response: The restricted service groups are so small that the evaluation is unlikely to affect performance measures for participating sites.

The Department appreciates the comments received in response to the request for public comment. All the comments gave useful information and provided suggestions which we had already incorporated into the study's design. The responses provided above outline the specific aspects of the evaluation methodology that address each comment.

Conclusion: Accordingly, the Department has determined that it is in the public interest to use a random assignment methodology for the study since this methodology will provide the most reliable estimates of the net impacts of WIA intensive services and training.

Signed: at Washington, DC, this 25th day of January 2012.

Jane Oates,

Assistant Secretary for Employment and Training.

[FR Doc. 2012-2521 Filed 2-3-12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-FN-P

NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS ADMINISTRATION

Agency Information Collection Activities: Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

AGENCY: National Archives and Records Administration (NARA).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: NARA is giving public notice that the agency has submitted to OMB for approval the information collection described in this notice. The public is invited to comment on the proposed information collection pursuant to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.

DATES: Written comments must be submitted to OMB at the address below on or before March 7, 2012 to be assured of consideration.

ADDRESSES: Send comments to Mr. Nicholas A. Fraser, Desk Officer for NARA, Office of Management and Budget, New Executive Office Building, Washington, DC 20503; Fax: (202) 395-5167; or electronically mailed to Nicholas_A_Fraser@omb.eop.gov.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Requests for additional information or copies of the proposed information collection and supporting statement should be directed to Tamee Fechhelm at telephone number (301) 837-1694 or fax number (301) 713-7409.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Pursuant to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104-13), NARA invites the general public and other Federal agencies to comment on proposed information collections. NARA published a notice of proposed collection for this information collection on November 23, 2011 (76 FR 72449). No comments were received. NARA has submitted the described information collection to OMB for approval.

In response to this notice, comments and suggestions should address one or more of the following points: (a) Whether the proposed information collection is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of NARA; (b) the accuracy of NARA's estimate of the burden of the proposed information collection; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d)

ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including the use of information technology; and (e) whether small businesses are affected by this collection. In this notice, NARA is soliciting comments concerning the following information collection:

Title: Use of NARA Official Seals.

OMB number: 3095-0052.

Agency form number: N/A.

Type of review: Regular.

Affected public: Business or other for-profit, Not-for-profit institutions, Federal government.

Estimated number of respondents: 10.

Estimated time per response: 20 minutes.

Frequency of response: On occasion.

Estimated total annual burden hours: 3 hours.

Abstract: The authority for this information collection is contained in 36 CFR 1200.8. NARA's three official seals are the National Archives and Records Administration seal; the National Archives seal; and the National Archives Trust Fund Board seal. The official seals are used to authenticate various copies of official records in our custody and for other official NARA business. Occasionally, when criteria are met, we will permit the public and other Federal agencies to use our official seals. A written request must be submitted to use the official seals, which we approve or deny using specific criteria.

Dated: January 26, 2012

Michael L. Wash,

Executive for Information Services/CIO.

[FR Doc. 2012-2342 Filed 2-3-12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7515-01-P

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Proposal Review Panel for Chemistry; 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: Centers for Chemical Innovation (CCI) Cyber Review Reverse Site Visit 2012 Site Visit (1191).

Date and Time: Thursday, February 9, 2012 (8:30 a.m.–6 p.m.); Friday, February 10, 2012 (8:30 a.m.–5 p.m.).

Place: ACCESS Grid Facility, Arlington, VA.

Type of Meeting: Partially-Open.

Contact Person: Katharine Covert, Program Director, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Blvd., Arlington, VA, (703) 292-4950.

Purpose of Meeting: To provide advice and recommendations concerning center

proposals submitted to NSF for financial support.

Agenda:

Thursday, February 9, 2012

8:30 a.m.–9:15 a.m. Closed—Executive Session.
9:30 a.m.–11:45 a.m. Open—Center for Quantum Information and Computation for Chemistry Presentations.
11:45 a.m.–1 p.m. Closed—Executive Session, review and drafting report.
1:15 p.m.–3:30 p.m. Open—Center for Aerosol Impacts on Climate and Environment Presentation.
3:30 p.m.–6 p.m. Closed—Executive Session, review and drafting report.

Friday, February 10, 2012

8:30 a.m.–9 a.m. Closed—Executive Session.
9 a.m.–11:15 a.m. Open—Center for Nanostructured Electronic Materials Presentation.
11:30 p.m.–5 p.m. Closed—To prepare and finalize the site visit report.

Reason for Late Notice: The late notice is due to administrative complications and the necessity to proceed with the review of proposals.

Reason for Closing: The meeting is closed to the public because the Site Visitors will be reviewing proposal actions that will include privileged intellectual property and personal information concerning individuals associated with the proposals. These matters that are exempt under 5 U.S.C. 552b(c)(4) and (6) of the Government Sunshine Act.

Dated: January 31, 2012.

Susanne Bolton,

Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 2012–2495 Filed 2–3–12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[NRC–2012–0028; Docket Nos.: 50–333; 50–313; 50–368; 50–416; 50–247; 50–286; 50–255; 50–293; 50–458; 50–271; 50–382; License Nos.: DPR–59; DPR–51; NFP–6; NFP–29; DPR–26; DPR–64; DPR–20; DPR–35; DPR–47; DPR–28; NFP–38; EA–10–090; EA–10–248; EA–11–160]

In the Matter of Entergy Nuclear Operations Inc; Confirmatory Order Modifying License (Effective Immediately)

I

Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc. (Entergy or licensee) is the holder of Operating License Nos. DPR–59, DPR–51, NFP–6, NFP–29, DPR–26, DPR–64, DPR–20, DPR–35, NFP–47, DPR–28, and NFP–38, issued by the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC or the Commission) pursuant to *Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR) part 50. The licenses authorize operation of the James A. FitzPatrick

Nuclear Power Plant, Arkansas Nuclear One Units 1 & 2, Grand Gulf Nuclear Station Unit 1, Indian Point Nuclear Generating Units 2 & 3, Palisades Nuclear Plant, Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station, River Bend Station, Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station and Waterford Steam Electric Station Unit 3 (collectively, the Facilities), in accordance with conditions specified therein. The Facilities are located in the vicinity of the following cities: Oswego, New York; Russellville, Arkansas; Vicksburg, Mississippi; New York City, New York; South Haven, Michigan; Boston, Massachusetts; Baton Rouge, Louisiana; Brattleboro, Vermont; and New Orleans, Louisiana; respectively.

This Confirmatory Order is the result of an agreement reached during an ADR mediation session conducted on November 9, 2011, in the NRC Region I office in King of Prussia, Pennsylvania.

II

On July 1, 2009, February 5, 2010, and April 8, 2010, the NRC Office of Investigations (OI) initiated separate investigations (OI Case Nos. 1–2009–041, 1–2010–019, and 1–2010–031, respectively) at Entergy's James A. FitzPatrick Nuclear Power Plant facility (FitzPatrick). Based on the evidence developed during these investigations, the NRC concluded that FitzPatrick radiation protection technicians (RPTs), on occasions between 2006 and 2009, failed to: (1) Test required individuals for respirator fit in accordance with the requirements specified in 10 CFR Section 20.1703 and site procedures;

(2) maintain accurate documentation of completed respirator fit tests in accordance with the requirements of 10 CFR 50.9; (3) perform and/or accurately document in accordance with site procedures required by Technical Specifications (TS) and 10 CFR 50.9, independent verification of Drywell Continuous Atmospheric Monitoring System valve positions after the valves were manipulated; (4) document a personal contamination event in accordance with site procedures required by TS; (5) perform a contamination survey in accordance with site procedures required by TS, prior to removing an item from the radiologically controlled area; and (6) perform daily radiological surveys in accordance with 10 CFR 20.1501(a).

In a letter dated September 8, 2011, the NRC provided Entergy the results of the investigations, informed Entergy that escalated enforcement action was being considered for apparent violations identified during the investigations, and offered Entergy the opportunity to

attend a predecisional enforcement conference or to participate in ADR.

III

In response to the September 8, 2011 NRC letter, Entergy requested ADR. Consequently, on November 9, 2011, the NRC and Entergy met in an ADR session mediated by a professional mediator, arranged through Cornell University's Institute on Conflict Resolution. ADR is a process in which a neutral mediator with no decision-making authority assists the parties in reaching an agreement on resolving any differences regarding the dispute. During that ADR mediation session, an agreement in principle was reached. This Confirmatory Order is the result of that agreement, the elements of which consisted of the following:

1. The NRC and Entergy agree on the facts as set forth in the NRC's September 8, 2011, letter to Entergy, the violations described therein, and willfulness of some of the violations, including deliberate actions by one of the RPTs.

2. The NRC agrees that Entergy, upon receiving the information from the NRC regarding these issues, immediately conducted a comprehensive investigation into the issues. Entergy also ensured affected staff were properly re-tested for respirator fit and determined there were no previous radiological uptakes for the time period in question.

3. In addition, the NRC acknowledges that, prior to the ADR session, Entergy took a number of corrective actions in response to the violations identified at the FitzPatrick site, so as to preclude the occurrence of similar violations in the future. These actions included:

A. Completed Corrective Actions affecting the FitzPatrick site:

a. Actions to address Individual Accountability:

i. Reviewed and adjudicated the unescorted access authorization with individuals involved in the respirator fit test issue and subsequent radiation protection (RP) performance issues.

ii. Completed disciplinary reviews/actions against the individuals involved with the conduct of or the receipt of a respirator qualification without performance of a quantitative fit test and subsequent RP performance issues.

iii. Conducted a series of station and small group meetings between Entergy senior management and staff to reinforce station expectations with regard to raising issues via available station processes and procedure compliance.

b. Actions to improve RP Procedures/Processes, and adherence to standards: