NIGC and sources including tribes, Office of Personnel Management, or by contractors; persons interviewed as part of a background investigation; Federal, state, foreign, tribal, and local law enforcement and regulatory agencies; Commission staff and members; credit bureaus.

EXEMPTIONS CLAIMED FOR THE SYSTEM:

Under 5 U.S.C. 552a(k)(2) the Commission is claiming exemptions from certain provisions of the Act for portions of its records. The exemptions and the reasons for them are described in the regulations.

Dated: March 10, 2004.

Philip N. Hogen,

Chairman, National Indian Gaming Commission.

[FR Doc. 04–5796 Filed 3–12–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7565–01–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, Pub. L. 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 68 FR 75652 and no 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.

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 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 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.* 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.*

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 unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Title of Collection: Evaluation of the Research Experiences for Teacher (RET) Program.

OMB Number: 3145–NEW.

Type of Request: Intent to seek approval to carry out a new information collection for one year.

Abstract: Proposed Project: The Directorate for Engineering (ENG) initiated the Research Experiences for Teachers (RET) Supplements activity in FY 2001 to be add-ons to active award funded by ENG programs. The intent was to build on the popular NSF-wide Research Experiences for Undergraduates (REU) Supplements activity by providing opportunities for K–12 teachers to conduct hands-on experiences in the laboratories/facilities of ENG-funded researchers interested in participating in RET. Typically the supplements supported one or two teachers. The assumption was that the teachers could also benefit from involvement in research and direct exposure to the scientific method and transfer what they learned into classroom activities. Since then, ENG has funded RET Site awards, which are similar to REU Sites in that NSF awards fund groups of teachers to work with faculty members at the same institution and to engage in group activities related to the research. In 2003, community college faculty became eligible as participants in RET awards.

This study of RET will include participants in RET Supplement and Site awards from 2001–2003 funded by the Division of Engineering Education and Centers, the Division of Bioengineering and Environmental Systems, and the Division of Design, Manufacture, and Industrial Innovation. The study will examine whether the scale and programmatic characteristics of the larger group awards, such as those funded as RET Sites, bring about different outcomes and impacts on the teachers and their subsequent instructional and professional activities, compared with those resulting from involvement in the typical small-scale RET Supplement. NSF wishes to know how RET experiences have affected participating teachers' subsequent teaching techniques and content modifications made as a result of teachers' RET activities. In addition, outcomes and impacts beyond the teachers' own classrooms from the research experiences, *e.g.,* follow-up knowledge transfer activities, any formal partnerships formed between the awardee and the teachers' school system/district, or community college, etc. should also be examined. The collection will be done on the World Wide Web.

Estimate of Burden: Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 30 minutes per response.

Respondent: Individuals.

Estimated Number of Responses per Form: 596.

Estimated Total Annual Burden on Respondents: 298 hours—596 respondents at 30 minutes per response.

Frequency of Responses: One time.

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; and (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: March 9, 2004.

Suzanne Plimpton,

Reports Clearance Officer, National Science Foundation.

[FR Doc. 04–5751 Filed 3–12–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555–01–M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 71–6703]

General Atomics Model No. Rg–1 Package; Issuance of Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact Regarding a Proposed Exemption

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC or Commission) is considering issuance of an exemption, pursuant to 10 CFR 71.8, from certain requirements of 10 CFR 71.38 ''Renewal of a certificate of compliance or quality assurance program approval'' to General Atomics Company. The exemption would permit renewal of Certificate of Compliance No. 6703 for the Model No. RG–1 radioactive material transportation package even though General Atomics Company, the certificate holder, did not request renewal at least 30 days before the expiration of the Certificate of Compliance. Therefore, as required by 10 CFR 51.21, the NRC is issuing this Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact.

Environmental Assessment (EA)

Identification of the Proposed Action: Requirements for renewal of a certificate of compliance are specified in 10 CFR 71.38. Specifically, 10 CFR 71.38(b) states:

> In any case in which a person, not less than 30 days before the expiration of an existing Certificate of Compliance or Quality Assurance Program Approval issued pursuant to the part, has filed an application in proper form for renewal of either of those approvals, the existing Certificate of Compliance or Quality Assurance Program Approval for which the renewal application was filed shall not be deemed to have expired until final action on the application for renewal has been taken by the Commission.

Certificate of Compliance No. 6703, Revision No. 5, expired on May 31, 1990. General Atomics Company requested renewal on May 29, 1990. Although the renewal application was dated before the certificate expiration date, it was not at least 30 days before expiration. The certificate was deemed to have expired on May 31, 1990, and NRC terminated use of the package by letter dated June 13, 1990, stating that the termination was due to the late filing of the application.

General Atomics Company by application dated February 26, 2004, has again requested renewal of Certificate of Compliance No. 6703. Although this renewal application from General Atomics Company is not timely, as defined in 71.38(b), NRC proposes to renew Certificate of Compliance No. 6703 for approximately an 18-month period to authorize use of the package for the limited shipments identified in the renewal application.

The Model No. RG–1 package is a radioisotope thermoelectric generator (RTG). It is approximately cylindrical, is 18 inches high, and has a base diameter of 14 inches. The package incorporates a fixed radioactive source within a main housing that is closed by a bolted closure flange. The radioactive source is a maximum 8,300 curies of strontium-90 titanate doubly encapsulated in a Type 304L stainless steel liner and Hastelloy C capsule. The thermoelectric module, that converts the radioactive heat source into low voltage electrical power, and uranium and tungsten shields are also fixed within the main housing. The package has an electrical connector, top end lifting lugs, and a bottom flange used for package tie-down. The device is designed to be transported and operated as an integral unit. It is designed for marine use at sea depths which may result in external pressures up to 10,000 psi. The package weighs approximately 800 pounds.

The Need for the Proposed Action: The proposed exemption would allow renewal of Certificate of Compliance No. 6703 for the Model No. RG–1 package for a limited period of time (approximately 18 months) for the purpose of authorizing the shipment of two packages from the General Atomics Company site in San Diego, California, to the Los Alamos National Laboratory in Los Alamos, New Mexico, for storage and final disposition.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action: Continued use of certain Type B packages previously-approved by the NRC (including the Model No. RG–1 package) is authorized under general license by the provisions in 71.13(a). Section 71.13 includes several restrictions with respect to continued use of these packages, including limited fabrication of new units (71.13(a)(1)) and limited modifications to the package that can be authorized (71.13(c)). Renewal of Certificate of Compliance No. 6703 would allow continued use of this package, subject to the conditions specified in 71.13, the general license provisions of 71.12, and the Certificate of Compliance.

The Certificate of Compliance will be renewed for approximately an 18-month term that will expire on September 30, 2005. The following condition will be included in the renewed certificate:

> This certificate authorizes a one-time shipment from General Atomics Company site in San Diego, California, to the Los Alamos National Laboratory in Los Alamos, New Mexico, for two packages (Serial Nos. –001 and –002).

The potential environmental impact of transporting radioactive material pursuant to 10 CFR part 71 was initially presented in the ''Final Environmental Statement on the Transportation of Radioactive Material by Air and Other Modes,'' for the proposed rule to amend 10 CFR part 71 (40 FR 23768(1977)). The environmental statement was published in 1977 as NUREG–0170, Volumes 1 and 2. A categorical exclusion for transportation package approvals is given in 10 CFR 51.22(c)(13).

NUREG–0170 included an evaluation of environmental impacts from three parts: The radiological impact from normal, incident-free transport, the risk of radiological effects from accidents involving vehicles carrying radioactive materials, and all non-radiological impacts. The principal unavoidable environmental effect was found to be the population exposure resulting from normal transport of radioactive materials. The much smaller risk from accidents that have the potential for releasing radioactive material from packages will always be present, but such accidents have a very small probability of occurrence. The calculated, unavoidable non-radiological impact resulting from transport amounts to about two injuries and one fatality every five years, from transportation accidents from all radioactive material transport. Other non-radiological impacts such as the use of vehicle fuel and other resources were found to be insignificant. The assessment included impacts due to shipments such as the RG–1 package, that is, shipment of sealed, industrial sources within accident-resistant packages.

The RG–1 package design was originally approved by NRC on November 28, 1972. The Certificate of Compliance was subsequently renewed on January 23, 1975; February 6, 1980; and May 30, 1985. Although the renewal application in 1990 was filed late, there is no indication that the renewal request would have been denied if the application had been