that the Foundation is able to reach fair and knowledgeable judgments. These scientists and educators come from colleges and universities, nonprofit research and education organizations, industry, and other Government agencies.

In making its decisions on proposals the counsel of these merit reviewers has proven invaluable to the Foundation both in the identification of meritorious projects and in providing sound basis for project restructuring.

Review of proposals may involve large panel sessions, small groups, or use of a mail-review system. Proposals are reviewed carefully by scientists or engineers who are expert in the particular field represented by the proposal. About one-fourth are reviewed by mail reviewers alone. Another one-fourth are reviewed exclusively by panels of reviewers who gather, usually in Washington, to discuss their advice as well as to deliver it. The remaining one-half are reviewed first by mail reviewers expert in the particular field, then by panels, usually of persons with more diverse expertise, who help the NSF decide among proposals from multiple fields or sub-fields.

Use of the Information

The information collected is used to support grant programs of the Foundation.

The information collected on the proposal evaluation forms is used by the Foundation to determine the following criteria when awarding or declining proposals submitted to the agency: (1) Research performance competence; (2) Intrinsic merit of the research; (3) Utility or relevance of the research; and (4) Effect of the research on the infrastructure of science and engineering.

The information collected on reviewer background questionnaires is used by managers to maintain an automated data base of reviewers for the many disciplines represented by the proposals submitted to the Foundation. Information collected on gender, race, ethnicity is used in meeting NSF needs for data to permit response to congressional and other queries into equity issues. These data are also used in the design, implementation, and monitoring of NSF efforts to increase the participation of various groups in science, engineering, and education.

Confidentiality

Verbatim but anonymous copies of reviews are sent to the principal investigators/project directors. Subject to this NSF policy and applicable laws, including the Freedom of Information Act, reviewers' comments will be given maximum protection from disclosure.

While listings of panelists' names are released, the names of individual reviewers, associated with individual proposals, are not released to anyone.

Because the Foundation is committed to monitoring and identifying any real or apparent inequities based on gender, race, ethnicity, or disability of the proposed principal investigator(s)/project director(s) or the co-principal investigator(s)/co-project director(s), the Foundation also collects race, ethnicity, disability, and gender. This information is also protected by the Privacy Act.

Burden on the Public

The Foundation estimates that anywhere from one hour to twenty hours may be required to review a proposal. It is estimated that approximately five hours are required to review an average proposal. Each proposal receives an average of seven reviews.

Send comments to Herman Fleming, Clearance Officer, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 485, Arlington, VA 22230. Written comments should be received by October 4, 1996.

Dated: August 8, 1996.

Herman G. Fleming,

Reports Clearance Officer.

[FR Doc. 96–20735 Filed 8–13–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555–01–M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50–440]

The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company, et al.; Notice of Withdrawal of Application for Amendment to Facility Operating License

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has granted the request of The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company (the licensee) to withdraw its November 2, 1995, application for proposed amendment to Facility Operating License No. NPF–58 for the Perry Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 1, located in Lake County, Ohio.

The proposed amendment would have revised the technical specifications pertaining to the energization of 120 volt AC buses EV–1–A and EV–1–B from either their normal inverter power supply or from their alternate power supply.

The Commission had previously issued a Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment published in the Federal Register on December 6, 1995 (60 FR 62497). However, by letter dated July 23, 1996, the licensee withdrew the proposed change.

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendment dated November 2, 1995, and the licensee's letter dated July 23, 1996, which withdrew the application for license amendment. The above documents are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, and at the local public document room located at the Perry Public Library, 3753 Main Street, Perry, Ohio.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 7th day of August 1996.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Jon B. Hopkins,

Sr. Project Manager, Project Directorate III–3, Division of Reactor Projects—III/IV, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 96–20680 Filed 8–13–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

[Docket No. 50–440]

The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company, et al.; Notice of Withdrawal of Application for Amendment to Facility Operating License

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has granted the request of The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company (the licensee) to withdraw its December 21, 1994, application for proposed amendment to Facility Operating License No. NPF–58 for the Perry Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 1, located in Lake County, Ohio.

The proposed amendment would have revised the technical specifications pertaining to the Traversing In-Core Probe System to allow the use of substitute data generated from the process computer, normalized with available operating measurements, to replace data from inoperable local power range monitor (LPRM) strings for up to 10 LPRM strings.

The Commission had previously issued a Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment published in the Federal Register on February 1, 1995 (60 FR 6310). However, by letter dated July 23, 1996, the licensee withdrew the proposed change.

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendment dated December 21, 1994, and the licensee's letter dated July 23, 1996, which withdrew the application for license amendment. The above documents are available for public

inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, and at the local public document room located at the Perry Public Library, 3753 Main Street, Perry, Ohio.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 7th day of August 1996.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission

Jon B. Hopkins,

Sr. Project Manager, Project Directorate III–3, Division of Reactor Projects—III/IV, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 96–20681 Filed 8–13–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

[Docket No. 50–346]

Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

In the Matter of: Toledo Edison Company; Centerior Service Company; and The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company; Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station, Unit No. 1.

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an exemption from certain requirements of its regulations to Facility Operating License No. NPF–3, issued to the Toledo Edison Company, Centerior Service Company and The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company (the licensees), for operation of the Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station (DBNPS), located in Ottawa County, Ohio.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensees' application dated June 28, 1996, for an exemption from certain requirements of 10 CFR 73.55, ''Requirements for Physical Protection of Licensed Activities in Nuclear Power Reactors Against Radiological Sabotage.'' The requested exemption would allow the implementation of a hand geometry biometric system of site access control in conjunction with photograph identification badges and would allow the badges to be taken off site.

The Need for the Proposed Action

Pursuant to 10 CFR 73.55(a), the licensee is required to establish and maintain an onsite physical protection system and security organization.

In 10 CFR 73.55(d), ''Access Requirements,'' it specifies in part that ''The licensee shall control all points of personnel and vehicle access into a protected area.'' In 10 CFR 73.55(d)(5), it specifies in part that ''A numbered picture badge identification system shall be used for all individuals who are authorized access to protected areas without escort.'' It further indicates that an individual not employed by the licensee (e.g., contractors) may be authorized access to protected areas without an escort provided the individual ''receives a picture badge upon entrance into the protected area which must be returned upon exit from the protected area.''

Currently, unescorted access for both employee and contractor personnel into the DBNPS is controlled through the use of picture badges. Positive identification of personnel who are authorized and request access into the protected area is established by security personnel making a visual comparison of the individual requesting access and that individual's picture badge. The picture badges are issued, stored, and retrieved at the entrance/exit location to the protected area. In accordance with 10 CFR 73.55(d)(5), contractor personnel are not allowed to take their picture badges off site. In addition, in accordance with the plant's physical security plan, the licensees' employees are also not allowed to take their picture badges off site. The licensees propose to implement an alternative unescorted access control system which would eliminate the need to issue and retrieve picture badges at the entrance/exit location to the protected area. The proposal would also allow contractors who have unescorted access to keep their picture badges in their possession when departing the DBNPS site. In addition, the site security plans will be revised to allow implementation of the hand geometry system and to allow employees and contractors with unescorted access to keep their picture badges in their possession when leaving the DBNPS site.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed action. In addition to their picture badges, all individuals with authorized unescorted access will have the physical characteristics of their hand (hand geometry) registered with their picture badge number in a computerized access control system. Therefore, all authorized individuals must have not only their picture badges to gain access into the protected area, but must also have their hand geometry confirmed.

All other access processes, including search function capability and access revocation, will remain the same. A security officer responsible for access control will continue to be positioned within a bullet-resistant structure. The proposed system is only for individuals with authorized unescorted access and will not be used for individuals requiring escorts.

The underlying purpose for requiring that individuals not employed by the licensees must receive and return their picture badges at the entrance/exit is to provide reasonable assurance that the access badges could not be compromised or stolen with a resulting risk that an unauthorized individual could potentially enter the protected area. Although the proposed exemption will allow individuals to take their picture badges off site, the proposed measures require that not only the picture badge be provided for access to the protected area, but also that verification of the hand geometry registered with the badge be performed as discussed above. Thus, the proposed system provides an identity verification process that is equivalent to the existing process.

Accordingly, the Commission concludes that the proposed exemption to allow individuals not employed by the licensees to take their picture badges off site will not result in an increase in the risk that an unauthorized individual could potentially enter the protected area. Consequently, the Commission concludes that granting the exemption will not increase the probability or consequences of accidents, will make no changes in the types of any effluents that may be released offsite, and will not significantly increase the allowable individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

With regard to potential nonradiological impacts, the proposed action does involve features located entirely within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20. It does not affect nonradiological plant effluents and has no other environmental impact. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant nonradiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

Alternatives to the Proposed Action

Since the Commission has concluded there is no measurable environmental impact associated with the proposed action, any alternatives with equal or greater environmental impact need not be evaluated. As an alternative to the proposed action, the staff considered denial of the proposed action. Denial of the application would result in no change in current environmental impacts. The environmental impacts of