information is most needed. Alternatively, small samples can be selected to statistically represent at least some aspect of the survey population.

5. *Split Panel Tests.* A technique for controlled experimental testing of alternatives. Thus, they allow one to choose from among competing questions, questionnaires, definitions, error messages, surveys, or survey improvement methodologies with greater confidence than other methods alone. Split panel tests conducted during the actual fielding of the survey are superior in that they support both internal validity (controlled comparisons of variables under investigation) and external validity (represent the population under study). Nearly any of the previously mentioned survey improvement methods can be strengthened when teamed with this method.

6. *Behavior Coding.* A quantitative technique in which a standard set of codes is systematically applied to respondent/interviewer interactions in interviewer-administered surveys or respondent/questionnaire interactions in self-administered surveys. Though this technique can quantifiably identify problems with the wording of questions, it does not necessarily illuminate the underlying causes.

Use of the Information: The information obtained from these efforts will be used to develop new NSF surveys and improve current ones. These surveys will generally be used to monitor outputs and outcomes of NSF funding over time (particularly data that is not being collected in annual and final reports), and manage and improve programs. Data collected through survey questionnaires can be used in program evaluation studies and can be matched to administrative data to understand NSF's portfolio of investments. Specifically, the information from the survey questionnaire improvement projects will be used to reduce respondent burden and to improve the quality of the data collected in these surveys. These objectives are met when respondents are presented with plain, coherent, and unambiguous questionnaires asking for data compatible with respondents' memory and/or current reporting and recordkeeping practices. The purpose of the survey improvement projects will be to ensure that NSF surveys are continuously attempting to meet these standards of excellence.

Improved NSF surveys will help policy makers make decisions on R&D funding, STEM education, scientific and technical workforce, innovation, as well as contribute to increased agency efficiency and reduced survey costs. In addition, methodological findings have broader implications for survey research and may be presented in technical papers at conferences or published in the proceedings of conferences or in journals.

Estimate of Burden

NSF estimates that a total reporting burden of 171,000 hours over the three years of the requested generic clearance is possible from working to evaluate/improve existing surveys and to develop new ones. This includes both the burden placed on respondents participating in each activity as well as burden imposed on potential respondents during screening activities. Table 1 provides a list of potential improvement projects for which generic clearance activities might be conducted, along with estimates of the number of respondents and burden hours that might be involved in each.

TABLE 1—POTENTIAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS

Improvement project type	Number of respondents [2]	Hours
Cognitive Testing	5,000	15,000
Focus Groups	5,000	10,000
Card Sorting	5,000	5,000
Interviews	5,000	5,000
Panelist Survey	7,000	12,000
Past Awardee Survey	9,000	14,000
Usability Testing	5,000	10,000
Additional surveys not specified	35,000	100,000
Total	76,000	171,000

Respondents

The respondents are PIs, program coordinators, or participants in NSF-funded activities.

Estimates of Annualized Cost to Respondents for the Hour Burdens

The cost to respondents generated by the list of potential projects is estimated to be $7,212,780 over the three years of the clearance. No one year's cost would exceed $7,212,780. In other words, if all work were done in one year, costs in that one year would be $7,212,780 and the costs in each of the other 2 years would be zero. As in previous requests for generic clearance authority, the total cost was estimated by summing all the hours that might be used on all projects over the three years (171,000) wage amount is the May 2011 national cross-industry estimate of the mean hourly wage for a financial analyst, or Job Category 13–2051, by the Bureau of Statistics. *http://www.bls.gov/oes/#data.* The total hours are based on similar NSF projects over the past few years.

There are no capital, startup, operation or maintenance costs to the respondents. The costs generated by future data collections will be described in the clearance request for each specific data collection. NSF does not anticipate any capital, startup, operation, or maintenance costs for future surveys.

[2] Number of respondents listed for any individual survey may represent several methodological improvement projects.

Dated: June 29, 2015.

Suzanne H. Plimpton,

Reports Clearance Officer, National Science Foundation.

[FR Doc. 2015–16369 Filed 7–1–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[NRC–2012–0220]

Standard Review Plan for Fuel Cycle Facilities License Applications

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: NUREG; issuance.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is issuing NUREG–1520, Revision 2, ''Standard Review Plan for Fuel Cycle Facilities License Applications,'' dated June 2015.

ADDRESSES: Please refer to Docket ID NRC–2012–0220 when contacting the NRC about the availability of information regarding this document. You may obtain publicly-available information related to this document using any of the following methods:

- Federal Rulemaking Web site: Go to *http://www.regulations.gov* and search for Docket ID NRC–2012–0220. Address questions about NRC dockets to Carol Gallagher; telephone: 301–415–3463; email: *Carol.Gallagher@nrc.gov.* For technical questions, contact the individual listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section of this document.
- NRC's Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS): You may obtain publicly available documents online in the ADAMS Public Documents collection at *http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html.* To begin the search, select ''*ADAMS Public Documents''* and then select ''*Begin Web-based ADAMS Search.''* For problems with ADAMS, please contact the NRC's Public Document Room (PDR) reference staff at 1–800–397–4209, 301–415–4737, or by email to *pdr.resource@nrc.gov.* NUREG–1520, Revision 2, ''Standard Review Plan for Fuel Cycle Facilities License Applications,'' is available in ADAMS under accession number ML15176A258.
- NRC's PDR: You may examine and purchase copies of public documents at the NRC's PDR, Room O1–F21, One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland 20852.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Soly I. Soto, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington DC 20555–0001; telephone: 301–415–7528; email: *Soly.Soto@nrc.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Discussion

Licenses to possess and use special nuclear material (SNM) are governed by Part 70 of Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR). The revised Standard Review Plan (SRP) now being made available provides NRC staff guidance for reviewing and evaluating the safety, health, security, and environmental protection aspects of applications for licenses to possess and use SNM at fuel cycle facilities.

The SRP has been revised to ensure consistency among the chapters, improve clarity of the text, reduce redundancies, and assure that statutory, regulatory, and guidance document references are accurate and up to date. Additionally, the SRP was revised to clarify the existing SRP discussion in several technical areas such as nuclear criticality safety and management measures, as summarized below. Chapter 5, ''Nuclear Criticality Safety,'' contains an expanded discussion of the double contingency principle and double contingency protection, including a description of what constitutes a loss of double contingency. Chapter 11, ''Management Measures,'' includes a discussion of graded management measures and the selection of items relied on for safety that relates to the application of graded management measures. Additionally, the SRP contains two new chapters, Chapter 12, ''Material Control and Accounting,'' which includes guidance associated with 10 CFR part 74 requirements; and Chapter 13, ''Physical Protection,'' which includes guidance associated with 10 CFR part 73 requirements. These new chapters were added to address the requirements in 10 CFR paragraphs 70.22(b), (g), (h), (j), and (k). The title of the SRP was revised from ''Standard Review Plan for the Review of a License Application for a Fuel Cycle Facility'' to ''Standard Review Plan for License Applications for Fuel Cycle Facilities.''

On June 5, 2014 (79 FR 32579), the NRC announced the availability of draft NUREG–1520, Revision 2, and requested comments on it. The comment period originally closed on September 3, 2014. In a second notice, dated August 6, 2014 (79 FR 45849), the NRC extended the comment period to November 3, 2014. A public meeting with the industry was held on September 23, 2014, to discuss the proposed changes to the SRP. A comment resolution table listing all comments and the NRC staff's responses was made publicly available in ADAMS on March 23, 2015 (ML15065A286). Suggestions to improve the SRP were considered by the NRC staff in the preparation of the final NUREG report. After further consideration, the NRC staff revised the title of NUREG–1520, Revision 2, for final issuance. This change was performed after publication of the comments resolution. The title was revised from ''Standard Review Plan for License Applications for Fuel Cycle Facilities'' to ''Standard Review Plan for Fuel Cycle Facilities License Applications.''

The final version of NUREG–1520, Revision 2, is now available for use by applicants, licensees, NRC license reviewers, and other NRC staff. Revision 2 supersedes the last official revision published on May 2010.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 26th day of June, 2015.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Marissa G. Bailey,

Director, Division of Fuel Cycle Safety, Safeguards, and Environmental Review Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.

[FR Doc. 2015–16363 Filed 7–1–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[NRC–2015–0161]

Comprehensive Vibration Assessment Program for Reactor Internals During Preoperational and Startup Testing

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Draft regulatory guide; request for comment.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is issuing for public comment draft regulatory guide (DG), DG–1323, ''Comprehensive Vibration Assessment Program for Reactor Internals During Preoperational and Startup Testing.'' This guide describes methods and procedures that the staff of the NRC considers acceptable when a developing a comprehensive vibration assessment program (CVAP) for power reactor internals during preoperational and startup testing.

DATES: Submit comments by August 31, 2015. Comments received after this date will be considered if it is practical to do so, but the NRC is able to ensure consideration only for comments received on or before this date. Although a time limit is given, comments and suggestions in connection with items for inclusion in guides currently being developed or improvements in all published guides are encouraged at any time.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments by any of the following methods (unless this document describes a different method for submitting comments on a specified subject):

- Federal Rulemaking Web site: Go to *http://www.regulations.gov* and search for Docket ID NRC–2015–0161. Address questions about NRC dockets to Carol Gallagher; telephone: 301–415–3463; email: *Carol.Gallagher@nrc.gov.* For technical questions, contact the individual(s) listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section of this document.
- *Mail comments to:* Cindy Bladey, Office of Administration, Mail Stop: