

COMET and CCT are being revised to reduce the burden of information collection on grantees, increase the quality of the data, and facilitate the monitoring and tracking of grantee progress.

In addition to the information collected from the COMET and CCT system, the new evaluation will include a case study component to document coalition practices. This element of the evaluation will involve interviews with coalition leaders and surveys of coalition partners from a number of agencies. Each year, nine DFC grantees will be evaluated and the information from the case studies will be shared with other grantees.

Type of Information Collection: Web-based data collection, surveys and interviews of DFC and Sober Truth on Preventing Underage Drinking (STOP) Act grantees.

Title: Drug Free Communities Support Program National Evaluation.

Frequency: Semi-annually by DFC and Stop Act Program Directors via COMET, and annually for DFC Program Directors and selected coalition members via the CCT. Interviews and electronic surveys of Program Directors and electronic surveys of selected coalition members will be accomplished one time.

Affected Public: DFC and STOP Act grantees.

Estimated Burden: ONDCP expects that the time required to complete each semi-annual report via COMET will be approximately five hours, and each CCT report will take approximately one hour to complete. Face to face interviews will take 1.5–2 hours and surveys will take approximately .25 hours each to complete. The estimated total amount of time required by all respondents over one year, including Program Directors and grantees to complete COMET, CCT, surveys, and interviews, is 9,680 hours.

Goals: ONDCP intends to use the data of the DFC National Evaluation to assess the DFC Program's effectiveness in preventing and reducing youth substance use. Two primary objectives of the evaluation are to: (1) Support an effective grant monitoring mechanism that provides the Federal government with the expertise, system, functions, and products to collect, analyze, and report data collectively, and (2) regularly monitor and measure data in order to demonstrate the progress of the DFC program and its grantees.

Comment Request: ONDCP especially invites comments on: (1) Whether the proposed data are proper for the functions of the agency; (2) whether the information will have practical utility; (3) the accuracy of ONDCP's estimate of

the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions; (4) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and, (5) ways to ease the burden on proposed respondents, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology. Comments will be accepted for sixty days.

Dated: April 26, 2011.

Daniel R. Petersen,

Deputy General Counsel.

[FR Doc. 2011–10481 Filed 4–29–11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3180–02–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50–413 and 50–414; NRC–2011–0100; Docket Nos. 50–369 and 50–370; Docket Nos. 50–269, 50–270, and 50–287]

Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC; Catawba Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2; McGuire Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2; Oconee Nuclear Station, Units 1, 2, and 3; Notice of Withdrawal of Application for Amendment to Facility Operating License

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC, the Commission) has granted the request by Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC (the licensee), to withdraw its April 26, 2010, application for proposed amendments to Renewed Facility Operating Licenses NPF–35 and NPF–52 for the Catawba Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2, located in York County, South Carolina; Renewed Facility Operating Licenses NPF–9 and NPF–17, for the McGuire Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2, located in Mecklenburg County, North Carolina; and Renewed Facility Operating Licenses DPR–38, DPR–47, and DPR–55 for the Oconee Nuclear Station, Units 1, 2, and 3 located in Oconee County, South Carolina.

The proposed amendment would have revised the Technical Specifications (TSs) and Licenses by making organizational changes.

The Commission has previously issued a Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment published in the **Federal Register** on September 7, 2010 (75 FR 54392). However, the licensee has chosen not to pursue the proposed change.

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendment dated April 26, 2010 (Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS) Accession No. ML101250042), and the

NRC staff's letters dated April 18, 2011 (ADAMS Accession No. ML11094A029), and April 26, 2011 (ADAMS Accession No. ML11109A079). 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. Publicly available records will be accessible electronically from the ADAMS Public Electronic Reading Room on the Internet at the NRC Web site, <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 e-mail to pdr.resource@nrc.gov.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 26th day of April 2011.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

John Stang,

Senior Project Manager, Plant Licensing Branch II–1, Division of Operating Reactor Licensing, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 2011–10558 Filed 4–29–11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[NRC–2011–0097]

Draft Regulatory Guide: Issuance, Availability

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Notice of Issuance and Availability of Draft Regulatory Guide, DG–1264, “Thermal Overload Protection for Electric Motors On Motor-Operated Valves.”

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Darrell Murdock, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001, telephone: 301–251–7629 or e-mail Darrell.Murdock@nrc.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Introduction

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is issuing for public comment a draft guide in the agency's “Regulatory Guide” series. This series was developed to describe and make available to the public such information as methods that are acceptable to the NRC staff for implementing specific parts of the NRC's regulations, techniques that the staff uses in evaluating specific problems or