“contain an assessment of the completeness and reliability of the performance data included in it [that] * * * describes any material inadequacies in the completeness and reliability of the data.” (OMB Circular A–11, Section 230.2 (f)). The Department emphasizes the importance of complete and accurate information for program monitoring and improving program performance.

The UI DV program employs a refined and automated approach to review 322 elements reported on 13 benefits reports and one tax report. The Department uses many of these elements for key performance measures as well as for workload items.

The validation process assesses the validity (accuracy) of the counts of transactions or measurements of status as follows. In the validation process, guided by a detailed handbook, the state first constructs extract files containing all pertinent individual transactions for the desired report period to be validated. These transactions are grouped into 15 benefits and five tax populations. Each transaction record contains the necessary characteristics or dimensions that enable it to be summed into an independent recount of what the state has already reported. The Department provides state agencies with software that edits the extract file (to identify and remove duplicate transactions and improperly built records, for example), then aggregates the transactions to produce an independent recount or “validation count” of the reported figure. The reported count is considered valid by this “quantity” validation test if it is within ±2% of the validation count (±1% for a GPRA-related element).

The software also draws samples of most transaction types from the extract files. Guided by a state-specific handbook, the validators review these sample records against documentation in the state’s management information system to determine whether the transactions in the extract file are supported by system documentation. This qualitative check determines whether the validation count can be trusted as accurate. The benefits extract files are considered to pass this “quality” review if random samples indicate that no more than 5% of the records contain errors; tax files are subjected to different but related tests. A reported count is considered valid only if it differs from a reconstructed (valuated) count by no more than the appropriate criterion of ±2% or ±1%, and that validation count comes from an extract file that has satisfied all quality tests.

For Federal fiscal years 2011 and beyond, all states will be required to conduct a complete validation every three years. In three cases the three-year rule does not apply, and a revalidation must occur within one year: (1) Groups of reported counts that are summed for purposes of making a Pass/Fail determination and do not pass validation by being within ±2% of the reconstructed counts or the extract file does not pass all quality tests; (2) the validation applies to the two benefits populations and one tax population used for GPRA measures; and (3) reports are produced by new reporting software. Every year states must also certify that Module 3 of the Benefits and Tax handbooks are up to date.

In January 2012 through UIPL 08–12 the Department issued changes that added 100 cells to the ETA 227 report: most of these cells will be validated through the UI DV program. The ETA 227 report is now validated through three of the 15 benefit populations. Accommodating the new report cells requires: (1) Adding a sixteenth benefit population; (2) making one-time changes to the three populations that validate the old 227 report; and (3) adding 13 items (called Steps or Substeps) to Module 3 of the Benefits and Tax handbook, which relates State definitions and data system locations for Federal reporting requirements. These changes will impose both one-time and continuing burdens on state validators.

II. Review Focus

The Department is particularly interested in comments which:

- Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility;
- Evaluate the accuracy of the agency’s 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; and
- 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 submissions of responses.

III. Current Actions

Type of Review: Extension with revisions.

Title: Unemployment Insurance Data Validation Benefits and Tax.

OMB Number: 1205–0431.

Affected Public: State Workforce Agencies.

Form(s): ET Handbook 361.

Total Annual Respondents: 53.

Annual Frequency: At least five validation items per state (two benefits populations and one tax population) plus reviewing and certifying that Benefits and Tax Module items are up to date.

Total Annual Estimated Responses: 265 (53 states × 5 populations).

Average Time per Response: 573 Hours.

Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours: 30,369 Hours.

Dated: Signed on this 5th day of July 2012.

Jane Oates,
Assistant Secretary for Employment and Training, Labor.
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understood, and the impact of collection requirements on respondents can be properly assessed.

A copy of the proposed information collection request can be obtained by contacting the individual listed below in the **ADDRESSES** section of this notice.

**DATES:** Comments must be submitted to the office listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section below on or before August 13, 2012.

OMB is particularly interested in comments that help the agency to:
- Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility;
- Evaluate the accuracy of the agency's 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; and
- 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.

**ADDRESSES:** Kim A. Miller, Management Analyst, Institute of Museum and Library Services, 1800 M Street NW., 9th Floor, Washington, DC 20036. Telephone: 202–653–4762; Fax: 202–653–4600; or email: kmiller@imls.gov; or by teletype (TTY/TDD) for persons with hearing difficulty at 202–653–4614.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Institute of Museum and Library Services is the primary source of federal support for the Nation’s 123,000 libraries and 17,500 museums. The mission of IMLS is to inspire libraries and museums to advance innovation, lifelong learning, and cultural and civic engagement. We provide leadership through research, policy development, and grant making. IMLS provides a variety of grant programs to assist the Nation’s museums and libraries in improving their operations and enhancing their services to the public. (20 U.S.C. 9101 et seq.).

Current Actions: This notice proposes general clearance of the agency’s guideline application and report forms. The 60-day notice for the “Notice of Continuance for General Clearance for Guideline Application and Reporting Forms” was published in the **Federal Register** on May 10, 2012 (FR vol. 77, No. 91, pgs. 27486). No comments were received.


Title: IMLS Guidelines, Applications and Reporting Forms.

**OMB Number:** 3137–0029, 3137–0071.

**Agency Number:** 3137.

**Frequency:** Annually, Semi-annually.

**Affected Public:** State Library Administrative Agencies, museums, libraries, institutions of higher education, library and museum professional associations, and museum and library professionals, Indian tribes (including Alaska native villages, regional corporations, or village corporations), and organizations that primarily serve and represent Native Hawaiians.

**Number of Respondents:** 7,961.

**Estimated Time per Respondent:** .08–90 hours.

**Total Burden:** 70,092.

**Total Annualized Capital/Startup Costs:** $0.

**Total Annual Costs:** $1,921,209.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Comments should be sent to Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Attn.: OMB Desk Officer for Education, Office of Management and Budget, Room 10235, Washington, DC 20503, (202) 395–7316.

Dated: July 10, 2012.

Kim A. Miller,
Management Analyst, Office of Policy, Planning, Research, and Communication.
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BILLING CODE 7035–01–P

---

**NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

[Docket No. 50–425; NRC–2012–0169]

Southern Nuclear Operating Company, Inc.; Notice of Withdrawal of Application for Amendment to Facility Operating License

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has granted the request of Southern Nuclear Operating Company, Inc. (the licensee) to withdraw its December 19, 2011, application for proposed amendment to Facility Operating License No. NPF–81 for the Vogtle Electric Generating Plant, Unit 2, located in Burke County, Georgia.

The proposed amendment would have revised the Technical Specifications related to the Engineered Safety Features Room Cooler and Safety-Related Chiller System, Allowed Completion Time for Condition A.

The Commission had previously issued a Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment published in the **Federal Register** on February 7, 2012 (77 FR 6149). However, by letter dated June 19, 2012, the licensee withdrew the proposed change.

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendment dated December 19, 2011, and the licensee’s letter dated June 19, 2012, which withdrew the application for license amendment. Documents may be examined, and/or copied for a fee, at the NRC’s Public Document Room (PDR), located at One White Flint North, Public File Area O1 F21, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland 20852. Publicly available documents created or received at the NRC are accessible electronically through the Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS) in the NRC Library at http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html. Persons who do not have access to ADAMS or who encounter problems in accessing the documents located in ADAMS should contact the NRC PDR Reference staff by telephone at 1–800–397–4209, or 301–415–4737 or by email to pdr.resource@nrc.gov.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 5th day of July 2012.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Patrick G. Boyle,
Project Manager, Plant Licensing Branch II–1, Division of Operating Reactor Licensing, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.
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BILLING CODE 7550–01–P

---

**NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

[Docket Nos. 50–247 and 50–286; NRC–2012–0168]

Entergy Nuclear Indian Point Unit 2, LLC, Entergy Nuclear Indian Point Unit 3, LLC, Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc., Indian Point Nuclear Generating Units 2 and 3; Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is considering issuance of an amendment and changes to the Technical Specifications (TSs) for Facility Operating License Nos. DPR–26 and DPR–64, issued to Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc. (Entergy or the licensee) for operation of the Indian Point Nuclear Generating Units 2 and 3 (IP2 and IP3) located in Westchester County, New York, in accordance with Title 10 of the **Code of Federal**