withdraw from its arrangement with the DB QPAM, with the exception of reasonable restrictions, appropriately disclosed in advance, that are specifically designed to ensure equitable treatment of all investors in a pooled fund in the event such withdrawal or termination may have adverse consequences for all other investors, provided that such restrictions are applied consistently and in like manner to all such investors; and (5) not to impose any fees, penalties, or charges for such termination or withdrawal with the exception of reasonable fees, appropriately disclosed in advance, that are specifically designed to prevent generally recognized abusive investment practices or specifically designed to ensure equitable treatment of all investors in a pooled fund in the event such withdrawal or termination may have adverse consequences for all other investors, provided that such fees are applied consistently and in like manner to all such investors. Within two (2) months of the date of publication of this notice of exemption in the Federal Register, each DB QPAM will provide a notice of its obligations under this Section I(g) to each ERISA-covered plan or IRA for which a DB QPAM provides asset management or other discretionary fiduciary services; (h) Each DB QPAM will maintain records necessary to demonstrate that the conditions of this exemption have been met, for six (6) years following the date of any transaction for which such DB QPAM relies upon the relief in the exemption; and (i) The DB QPAMs comply with each condition of PTE 84–14, as amended, with the sole exception of the violation of Section I(g) that is attributable to the Conviction; (j) The DB QPAMs will not employ any of the individuals that engaged in the spot/futures-linked market manipulation activities that led to the Conviction; (k) The DB QPAMs will provide a notice of the proposed exemption and this notice of temporary exemption, along with a separate summary describing the facts that led to the Conviction as well as a statement that Deutsche Bank has made a separate exemption request, in Application No. D–11856, in connection with the potential conviction of DB Group Services UK Limited for one count of wire fraud in connection with DB Group Services UK Limited’s role in manipulating LIBOR, which has been submitted to the Department, and a prominently displayed statement that the Conviction results in a failure to meet a condition in PTE 84–14 to each sponsor of an ERISA-covered plan and each beneficial owner of an IRA invested in an investment fund managed by a DB QPAM, or the sponsor of an investment fund in any case where a DB QPAM acts only as a sub-advisor to the investment fund; (l) Deutsche Bank disgorged all of its profits generated by the spot/futures-linked market manipulation activities of DSK personnel that led to the Conviction; (m) Deutsche Bank imposes internal procedures, controls, and protocols on DSK designed to reduce the likelihood of any recurrence of the conduct that is the subject of the Conviction, to the extent permitted by local law; (n) DSK has not, and will not, provide fiduciary or QPAM services to ERISA-covered plans or IRAs, and will not otherwise exercise discretionary control over plan assets; (o) No DB QPAM is a subsidiary of DSK, and DSK is not a subsidiary of any DB QPAM; (p) The criminal conduct of DSK that is the subject of the Conviction did not directly or indirectly involve the assets of any plan subject to Part 4 of Title I of ERISA or section 4975 of the Code; and (q) A DB QPAM will not fail to meet the terms of this exemption solely because a different DB QPAM fails to satisfy the conditions for relief under this exemption described in Sections II(d), (e), (f), (g), (h), (i), and (k).

Section II: Definitions (a) The term “Conviction” means the judgment of conviction against DSK to be entered on or about September 3, 2015, in Seoul Central District Court, South Korea, relating to charges filed against DSK under Articles 176, 443, and 448 of South Korea’s Financial Investment Services and Capital Markets Act for spot/futures-linked market price manipulation; (b) The term “DB QPAM” means a “qualified professional asset manager” (as defined in section VI(a) of PTE 84–14) that relies on the relief provided by PTE 84–14 and with respect to which DSK is a current or future “affiliate” (as defined in section VI(d) of PTE 84–14); and (c) The term “DSK” means Deutsche Securities Korea Co., a South Korean “affiliate” of Deutsche Bank (as defined in section VI(c) of PTE 84–14).

3 In general terms, a QPAM is an independent fiduciary that is a bank, savings and loan association, insurance company, or investment adviser that meets certain equity or net worth requirements and other licensure requirements and that has acknowledged in a written management agreement that it is a fiduciary with respect to each plan that has retained the QPAM.
I. Background

Job Corps is the country’s largest residential training program for at-risk youth ages 16 through 24. It addresses multiple barriers to employment faced by at-risk youth throughout the United States. Through a network of 124 campuses nationwide, Job Corps offers a comprehensive array of career development services to prepare students for successful careers. Job Corps employs a holistic career development training approach which integrates the teaching of academic, career technical, employability skills and social competencies through a combination of classroom, practical, and work-based learning experiences to prepare students for stable, long-term, and high-paying jobs. In addition, Job Corps commits resources to provide job placement and career transition services to all graduates and students who have stayed with the program for more than 60 days, and to conduct placement follow-ups at 6 month and 12 months after initial placement.

II. Review Focus

The Department is particularly interested in comments which:

- Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for an agency to properly perform its functions, including whether the information will have practical utility;
- Evaluate the agency’s accuracy in estimating 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 information collection on those who are to respond—including that obtained through 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

This submission requests comments on three primary and two secondary data collection instruments that collect follow-up data about individuals who are no longer actively participating in Job Corps. These youths either graduated from Job Corps or stayed in the program at least 60 days but left before completing graduation requirements (former enrollees). These data collection activities are conducted with the following groups of recent Job Corps participants:

- Former enrollees who were placed in a job or school program; this group will be contacted 90 days after separation.
- Graduates who were placed in a job or school program; this group will be contacted 90 days after initial placement.
- Graduates who were placed in a job or school program; this group will be contacted 6 months after initial placement.
- Graduates who were placed in a job or school program; this group will be contacted 12 months after initial placement.

The data collection instrument for graduates 90 to 120 days after their initial placement is called Interim Checkpoint for Eligibility (ICFE). Administration of the ICFE facilitates the key data collection at 6 and 12 months. In addition, two brief questionnaires (one for employers and one for schools or training institutions) are used to collect re-verification data about initial placement for the subset of placed graduates and former enrollees who cannot be contacted directly.

To maximize the comparability of the data collected from the different subgroups of students, the ICFE, the 90-day follow-up for former enrollees, and the 6-month and 12-month follow-up sections of the data collection instruments use modules with identical sets of questions on the same topics. The questions are designed to obtain:

- Data to re-verify the initial job or school placements of placed graduates and former enrollees (only in the instruments administered at 90 days and the ICFE)
- Information about employment experiences in the previous week
- Information about educational experiences in the previous week
- Summary information about the work, school, and job search activities of those who were neither working nor in school the previous week
- Information about satisfaction with the services provided by Job Corps

Type of Review: extension without changes.

Title: Placement Verification and Follow-up of Job Corps Participants.

OMB Number: 1205–0426.

Affected Public: Individuals or households and private sector: Businesses and not-for-profit profit institutions.

Total Annual Burden Cost for Respondents: $0.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data collection activity</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Total responses</th>
<th>Average time per response (hours)</th>
<th>Burden hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Placed Former Enrollees at 90 days</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placed graduates at 90-120 days</td>
<td>13,800</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13,800</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>3,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placed Graduates at Six Months</td>
<td>15,500</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15,500</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>3,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placed Graduates at 12 Months</td>
<td>13,200</td>
<td></td>
<td>13,200</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>2,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer/Institution Re-verification</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5,045</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48,300</td>
<td></td>
<td>48,345</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,240</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 52–043; NRC–2010–0215]


AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Request for comment.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is requesting comment on a draft Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between the NRC, New Jersey Historic Preservation Office (NJ HPO), Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), National Park Service (NPS), and PSEG Power, LLC, and PSEG Nuclear, LLC (PSEG). The purpose of the draft MOA is to resolve adverse effects to historic properties identified during consultation for a proposed early site permit (ESP).

DATES: Submit comments by October 5, 2015. Comments received after this date will be considered if it is practical to do so, but the NRC is able to assure consideration only for comments received on or before this date.

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

- Federal Rulemaking Web site: Go to http://www.regulations.gov and search for Docket ID NRC–2010–0215. 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.
- For additional direction on obtaining information and submitting comments, see “Obtaining information and Submitting Comments” in the SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION section of this document.


SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Obtaining Information and Submitting Comments

A. Obtaining Information

Please refer to Docket ID NRC–2010–0215 when contacting the NRC about the availability of information for this action. You may obtain publicly-available information related to this action by any of the following methods:

- 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. The draft MOA is available in ADAMS under Accession ML15239B244.
- 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.

B. Submitting Comments

Please include Docket ID NRC–2010–0215 in your comment submission. The NRC cautions you not to include identifying or contact information that you do not want to be publicly disclosed in your comment submission. The NRC will post all comment submissions at http://www.regulations.gov as well as enter the comment submissions into ADAMS.

If you are requesting or aggregating comments from other persons for submission to the NRC, then you should inform these persons not to include identifying or contact information that they do not want to be publicly disclosed in their comment submission. Your request should state that the NRC does not routinely edit comment submissions to remove such information before making the comment submissions available to the public or entering the comment into ADAMS.

II. Discussion

On May 25, 2010, PSEG submitted the ESP application via letter pursuant to Part 52 of Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations (10 CFR part 52) that allows an applicant to obtain an ESP without specifying the design of the reactor(s) that it may separately apply to build and operate at the site. The ESP application and review process makes it possible to evaluate and resolve safety and environmental issues related to siting the ESP before the applicant makes a large commitment of resources. Granting an ESP would result in no adverse effects to historic properties; the ESP review includes an analysis of potential adverse effects from construction and operation of a postulated plant to support a site suitability determination. Pursuant to 36 CFR 800.8, the NRC is using its National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process for developing the ESP environmental impact statement (EIS) to facilitate consultation pursuant to Section 106 of the NHPA (54 U.S.C. 306108). The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) participated in the development of the ESP EIS as a cooperating agency, pursuant to NEPA, but is consulting separately under Section 106 of the NHPA for the activities that it regulates.

On August 22, 2014, the NRC requested comment (79 FR 49820) on its draft EIS analyzing: (1) The impacts of constructing and operating a postulated nuclear plant at the proposed ESP site that is the subject of this review, and (2) impacts associated with a USACE permit action on a Department of the...