

APPENDIX

[11 TAA petitions instituted between 6/6/11 and 6/10/11]

TA-W	Subject firm (petitioners)	Location	Date of institution	Date of petition
80217	Intelicoat Technologies, LLC (Workers)	Portland, OR	06/06/11	06/03/11
80218	Unimin Corporation (Union)	Hamilton, WA	06/06/11	06/03/11
80219	Beacon Medical Services (Workers)	Aurora, CO	06/07/11	05/16/11
80220	Pelican Importing and Exporting (State/One-Stop)	Houston, TX	06/07/11	06/06/11
80221	International Netherlands Group, ING (State/One-Stop)	Windsor, CT	06/07/11	06/06/11
80222	Saint-Gobain Abrasives (Union)	Watervliet, NY	06/07/11	06/06/11
80223	RockTenn (Company)	Milwaukee, WI	06/08/11	05/27/11
80224	Grays Harbor Paper L.L.C. (Union)	Hoquiam, WA	06/08/11	06/07/11
80225	Finisar Corporation (Workers)	Horsham, PA	06/09/11	06/08/11
80226	Camco Cedar (State/One-Stop)	Tacoma, WA	06/09/11	06/07/11
80227	Bos Automotive Products, Inc (Company)	Morristown, TN	06/10/11	06/09/11

[FR Doc. 2011-15845 Filed 6-23-11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-FN-P

**NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION**

**Agency Information Collection Activities: Comment Request**

**AGENCY:** National Science Foundation.  
**ACTION:** Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request.

**SUMMARY:** Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Public Law 104-13 (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*), and as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, the National Science Foundation (NSF) is inviting the general public and other Federal agencies to comment on this proposed continuing information collection. This is the second notice for public comment; the first was published in the **Federal Register** at 76 FR 21073 and no substantial comments were received. NSF is forwarding the proposed submission to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for clearance simultaneously with the publication of this second notice. The full submission may be found at: <http://www.reginfo.gov/public/do/PRAMain>.

**DATES:** Comments regarding these information collections are best assured of having their full effect if received by OMB within 30 days of publication in the **Federal Register**.

**ADDRESSES:** Written comments regarding (a) Whether the collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of NSF, including whether the information will have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of NSF's estimate of burden including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility and clarity of the information to be collected; or (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 should be addressed to: Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs of OMB, Attention: Desk Officer for National Science Foundation, 725-17th Street, NW., Room 10235, Washington, DC 20503, and to Suzanne H. Plimpton, Reports Clearance Officer, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 295, Arlington, Virginia 22230 or send e-mail to [splimpto@nsf.gov](mailto:splimpto@nsf.gov). Copies of the submission may be obtained by calling (703) 292-7556.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Suzanne H. Plimpton, NSF Reports Clearance Officer at (703) 292-7556 or send e-mail to [splimpto@nsf.gov](mailto:splimpto@nsf.gov).

An agency may not conduct or sponsor a collection of information unless the collection of information displays a currently valid OMB control number and the agency informs potential persons who are to respond to the collection of information that such persons are not required to respond to the collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

*Title of Collection:* National Science Foundation Science Honorary Awards.  
*OMB Control No.:* 3145-0035.

*Abstract:* The National Science Foundation (NSF) administers several honorary awards, among them the President's National Medal of Science, the Alan T. Waterman Award, the National Science Board (NSB) Vannevar Bush Award, the NSB Public Service Award, and the Presidential Awards for Excellence in Science, Mathematics and Engineering Mentoring (PAEMEM) program.

In 2003, to comply with E-government requirements, the nomination processes were converted to electronic submission through the National Science Foundation's (NSF) FastLane system. Individuals can now prepare nominations and references through <http://www.fastlane.nsf.gov/honowards/>. First-time users must register on the Fastlane Web site using the link found in the upper right-hand corner above the "Log In" box before accessing any of the honorary award categories.

*Use of the Information:* The Foundation has the following honorary award programs:

- *President's National Medal of Science.* Statutory authority for the President's National Medal of Science is contained in 42 U.S.C. 1881 (Pub. L. 86-209), which established the award and stated that "(t)he President shall \* \* \* award the Medal on the recommendations received from the National Academy of Sciences or on the basis of such other information and evidence as \* \* \* appropriate."

Subsequently, Executive Order 10961 specified procedures for the Award by establishing a National Medal of Science Committee which would "receive recommendations made by any other nationally representative scientific or engineering organization." On the basis of these recommendations, the Committee was directed to select its candidates and to forward its recommendations to the President.

In 1962, to comply with these directives, the Committee initiated a solicitation form letter to invite these nominations. In 1979, the Committee initiated a nomination form as an attachment to the solicitation letter. A slightly modified version of the nomination form was used in 1980.

The Committee established the following guidelines for selection of candidates:

1. Principal criterion: The total impact of an individual's work on the current state of physical, biological, mathematical, engineering or social and behavioral sciences.

2. Achievements of an unusually significant nature in relation to the potential effects on the development of scientific thought.

3. Unusually distinguished service in the general advancement of science and engineering, especially when accompanied by substantial contributions to the content of science. Recognition by peers within the scientific community.

4. Contributions to innovation and industry.

5. Influence on education through publications, teaching activities, outreach, mentoring, etc.

6. Must be a U.S. citizen or permanent resident who has applied for citizenship.

In 2003, the Committee changed the active period of eligibility to three years, including the year of nomination. After that time, candidates must be renominated with a new nomination package for them to be considered by the Committee.

Narratives are now restricted to two pages of text, as stipulated in the guidelines at <http://www.fastlane.nsf.gov/honawards/nms>.

• *Alan T. Waterman Award.* Congress established the Alan T. Waterman Award in August 1975 (42 U.S.C. 1881a (Pub. L. 94–86) and authorized NSF to “establish the Alan T. Waterman Award for research or advanced study in any of the sciences or engineering” to mark the 25th anniversary of the National Science Foundation and to honor its first Director. The annual award recognizes an outstanding young researcher in any field of science or engineering supported by NSF. In addition to a medal, the awardee receives a grant of \$500,000 over a three-year period for scientific research or advanced study in the mathematical, physical, medical, biological, engineering, social, or other sciences at the institution of the recipient's choice.

The Alan T. Waterman Award Committee was established by NSF to comply with the directive contained in Public Law 94–86. The Committee solicits nominations from members of the National Academy of Sciences, National Academy of Engineering, scientific and technical organizations, and any other source, public or private, as appropriate.

In 1976, the Committee initiated a form letter to solicit these nominations. In 1980, a nomination form was used which standardized the nomination

procedures, allowed for more effective Committee review, and permitted better staff work in a short period of time. On the basis of its review, the Committee forwards its recommendation to the Director, NSF, and the National Science Board (NSB).

Candidates must be U.S. citizens or permanent residents and must be 35 years of age or younger or not more than seven years beyond receipt of the Ph.D. degree by December 31 of the year in which they are nominated. Candidates should have demonstrated exceptional individual achievements in scientific or engineering research of sufficient quality to place them at the forefront of their peers. Criteria include originality, innovation, and significant impact on the field.

• *Vannevar Bush Award.* The NSB established the Vannevar Bush Award in 1980 to honor Dr. Bush's unique contributions to public service. The award recognizes an individual who, through public service activities in science and technology, has made an outstanding “contribution toward the welfare of mankind and the Nation.”

The NSB *ad hoc* Vannevar Bush Award Committee annually solicits nominations from selected scientific engineering and educational societies. Candidates must be a senior stateperson who is an American citizen and meets two or more of the following criteria:

1. Distinguished himself/herself through public service activities in science and technology.
2. Pioneered the exploration, charting, and settlement of new frontiers in science, technology, education, and public service.
3. Demonstrated leadership and creativity that have inspired others to distinguished careers in science and technology.
4. Contributed to the welfare of the Nation and mankind through activities in science and technology.
5. Demonstrated leadership and creativity that have helped mold the history of advancements in the Nation's science, technology, and education.

Nominations must include a narrative description about the nominee, a curriculum vitae (without publications), and a brief citation summarizing the nominee's scientific or technological contributions to our national welfare in promotion of the progress of science. Nominations must also include two reference letters, submitted separate from the nomination through <http://www.fastlane.nsf.gov/honawards/>.

Nominations remain active for three years, including the year of nomination. After that time, candidates must be renominated with a new nomination for

them to be considered by the selection committee.

• *NSB Public Service Award.* The NSB Public Service Award Committee was established in November 1996. This annual award recognizes people and organizations that have increased the public understanding of science or engineering. The award is given to an individual and to a group (company, corporation, or organization), but not to members of the U.S. Government.

Eligibility includes any individual or group (company, corporation, or organization) that has increased the public understanding of science or engineering. Members of the U.S. Government are not eligible for consideration.

Candidates for the individual and group (company, corporation, or organization) award must have made contributions to public service in areas other than research, and should meet one or more of the following criteria:

1. Increased the public's understanding of the processes of science and engineering through scientific discovery, innovation and its communication to the public.
2. Encouraged others to help raise the public understanding of science and technology.
3. Promoted the engagement of scientists and engineers in public outreach and scientific literacy.
4. Contributed to the development of broad science and engineering policy and its support.
5. Influenced and encouraged the next generation of scientist and engineers.
6. Achieved broad recognition outside the nominee's area of specialization.
7. Fostered awareness of science and technology among broad segments of the population.

Nominations must include a summary of the candidate's activities as they relate to the selection criteria; the nominator's name, address and telephone number; the name, address, and telephone number of the nominee; and the candidate's vita, if appropriate (no more than three pages).

The selection committee recommends the most outstanding candidate(s) for each category to the NSB, which approves the awardees.

Nominations remain active for a period of three years, including the year of nomination. After that time, candidates must be renominated with a new nomination for them to be considered by the selection committee.

• *Presidential Awards for Excellence in Science, Mathematics and Engineering Mentoring (PAESMEM) program.*

In 1996, the White House, through the National Science and Technology Council (NSTC) and the Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP), established the Presidential Awards for Excellence in Science, Mathematics and Engineering Mentoring (PAESMEM) program. The program, administered on behalf of the White House by the National Science Foundation, seeks to identify outstanding mentoring efforts or programs designed to enhance the participation of groups (women, minorities and persons with disabilities) underrepresented in science, mathematics and engineering. The awardees will serve as exemplars to their colleagues and will be leaders in the national effort to more fully develop the Nation's human resources in science, mathematics and engineering.

An honorarium in the amount of \$10,000 will accompany the award along with a commemorative Presidential certificate. The award will be made to: (1) An individual who has demonstrated outstanding and sustained mentoring and effective guidance to a significant number of students at the K-12, undergraduate, or graduate education level or (2) to an organization that, through its programming, has enabled a substantial number of students underrepresented in science, mathematics and engineering to successfully pursue and complete the relevant degree programs. It is anticipated that each award will be used to continue the recognized activity. The nominees must have served in such a mentoring role for at least five years.

**Estimate of Burden:** These are annual award programs with application deadlines varying according to the program. Public burden also may vary according to program; however, across all the programs, it is estimated that each submission will average 19 hours per respondent. If the nominator is thoroughly familiar with the scientific background of the nominee, time spent to complete the nomination may be considerably reduced.

**Respondents:** Individuals, businesses or other for-profit organizations, universities, non-profit institutions, and Federal and State governments.

**Estimated Number of Responses per Award:** 207 responses, broken down as follows: For the President's National Medal of Science, 55; for the Alan T. Waterman Award, 60; for the Vannevar Bush Award, 12; for the Public Service Award, 20; and for the PAESMEM, 60.

**Estimated Total Annual Burden on Respondents:** 3,980 hours, broken down by 1,100 hours for the President's National Medal of Science (20 hours per 55 respondents); 1,200 hours for the

Alan T. Waterman Award (20 hours per 60 respondents); 180 hours for the Vannevar Bush Award (15 hours per 12 respondents); 300 hours for the Public Service Award (15 hours per 20 respondents); and 1,200 hours for the PAESMEM (20 hours per 60 respondents).

**Frequency of Responses:** Annually.

**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; or (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.

Dated: June 20, 2011.

**Suzanne H. Plimpton,**

*Reports Clearance Officer, National Science Foundation.*

[FR Doc. 2011-15785 Filed 6-23-11; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7555-01-P**

## **NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

**[NRC-2008-0391]**

### **Notice of Availability of Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for the Lost Creek In-Situ Recovery (ISR) Project in Sweetwater County, WY; Supplement to the Generic Environmental Impact Statement for In-Situ Leach Uranium Milling Facilities**

**AGENCY:** Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice of availability.

**SUMMARY:** Notice is hereby given that the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is issuing a final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) to the Generic Environmental Impact Statement for *In-Situ Leach Uranium Milling Facilities* (GEIS), (NUREG-1910, Supplement 3) for the Lost Creek *In-Situ Recovery Project* in Sweetwater County, Wyoming. By letter dated October 30, 2007, Lost Creek ISR, LLC (LCI), a wholly-owned subsidiary of UR-Energy

USA, Inc. submitted an application to the NRC for a new source and byproduct material license for the Lost Creek ISR Project, which LCI proposed to be located in the Great Divide Basin in Sweetwater County, Wyoming. LCI is proposing to recover uranium from the Lost Creek ISR Project site using the *in-situ leach* (also known as the *in-situ recovery* [ISR]) process. In this final SEIS, the NRC staff assessed the environmental impacts from the construction, operation, aquifer restoration, and decommissioning of the proposed Lost Creek ISR Project.

In addition to the proposed action, the NRC staff assessed two alternatives in the final SEIS: An alternative that would result in dry yellowcake production at the proposed Lost Creek ISR Project and the No-Action Alternative. In addition, the NRC staff evaluated alternative wastewater disposal options to the proposed action of disposing of liquid effluent via Class I disposal wells. Under the No-Action alternative, NRC would deny LCI's request to construct, operate, conduct aquifer restoration, and decommission an ISR facility at Lost Creek. Alternatives that were considered, but were eliminated from detailed analysis, included conventional mining and milling or heap leach processing. However, given the substantial environmental impact from implementing these alternatives, they were not further considered. The NRC staff also evaluated alternate lixivants. For reasons discussed in the SEIS, this alternative was also eliminated from detailed analysis.

As discussed in Section 2.4 of the final SEIS, unless safety issues mandate otherwise, the NRC staff's recommendation to the Commission related to the environmental aspects of the proposed action is that the source and byproduct material license be issued as requested. This recommendation is based upon: (1) The license application, including the environmental and technical report submitted by LCI and the applicant's supplemental letters and responses to the NRC staff's requests for additional information; (2) consultation with Federal, State, Tribal, and local agencies; (3) the NRC staff's independent review; (4) the NRC staff's consideration of comments received on the draft SEIS; and (5) the assessments summarized in this SEIS.

The final SEIS for the Lost Creek ISR Project may be accessed on the Internet at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/doc-collections/nuregs/staff/sr1910/s3/>. Additionally, the NRC maintains an Agencywide Documents and Management System (ADAMS), which