complete information as part of the regular application process.

3. Procedure To Be Followed for Reconsideration

(a) Explanation by Director. Within 30 days following written notification from the Endowment of its decision on any application, the applicant may request an explanation for a declined application from the appropriate Director. This initial request may be by telephone, in person or in writing. The Director will explain within 30 days following the applicant's request the basis for declination which may include a summary of the discipline review, advisory panel comments, applicable on-site evaluation reports, the names of all discipline reviewers, panel and staff members, and other information not otherwise exempt from disclosure requested by the applicant. If the Director cannot provide such explanation within 30 days, the applicant will receive a written explanation of the need for more time and an estimate of when the results can be expected.

The Director may designate another Endowment official to provide the explanation for the declination to the applicant. The term ''Director'' as used here applies to such designees.

(b) Request for Reconsideration. If the Director's explanation appears to the applicant to indicate the presence of one or more of the ''Grounds for Reconsideration'' listed in paragraph 2(b) above, the applicant may submit to the Deputy Chairperson for Grants and Partnership (hereafter referred to as ''the Deputy'') a written Request for Reconsideration. This written request must reference the particular ground(s) for reconsideration and specify the facts supporting his or her claim, with enough particularity to enable the Deputy to determine whether the claim is meritorious. A request of this nature will be considered only if (a) the Request for Reconsideration is based on one or more of the grounds listed in paragraph 2(b); (b) the applicant has obtained an explanation from the appropriate Director, (c) the applicant has specified with sufficient particularity the facts supporting his or her claim; and (d) the Request for Reconsideration is received by the Deputy within 30 days after the date of the Director's explanation.

(c) Action by the Deputy.

(i) The Deputy will review the applicant's Request for Reconsideration, records of the discipline review and panel discussions, the applicant's application file, and any other relevant materials to determine if the recommendations were influenced by one or more of the grounds listed in paragraph 2(b). In conducting this review, the Deputy may request additional information from the applicant, obtain advice from an advisory panel, or conduct additional investigation or review. However, no revisions or additions to the grant application materials will be accepted in connection with the Request for Reconsideration except to the extent that additional materials are necessary to substantiate the applicant's claim that one or more of the grounds listed in paragraph 2(b) exists.

(ii) The Deputy may conduct the reconsideration personally or may designate another Endowment official who had no part in the initial evaluation to do so. The term ''the Deputy'', as used here, applies to such designees.

(iii) The Deputy will provide written notification of the results of the reconsideration within 45 days following receipt of the Request for Reconsideration. If the Deputy cannot provide such notice within 45 days, the applicant will receive a written explanation of the need for more time and an estimate of when the results can be expected.

(d) Resolution of Requests for Reconsideration. Reconsideration is not an adversarial process and a formal hearing is not provided. The Endowment cannot assure applicants that reconsideration will result in the award of a grant even if error is established in connection with the initial evaluation. The Deputy shall make one of the following four determinations. The determinations of the Deputy shall be in writing and shall be final.

(i) If the Deputy determines that none of the grounds listed in paragraph 2(b) existed, the declination will be affirmed.

(ii) If the Deputy determines that one or more of the grounds listed in paragraph 2(b) existed, but the recommendation of the advisory panel was not affected materially, the declination will be affirmed.

(iii) If the Deputy determines that one or more of the grounds listed in 2(b) existed, and he or she can determine, based on the materials reviewed, that but for the infirmity in the review process, the application would have been recommended, the application will be considered by the National Council on the Arts at its next regularly scheduled meeting. The Chairperson of the Endowment then will decide whether to approve applications recommended by the Council.

(iv) If the Deputy determines that one or more of the grounds listed in paragraph 2(b) occurred, but he or she cannot determine whether, but for the infirmity, the advisory panel would have recommended that application, the application will be reviewed by a panel. If the panel recommends the application for support, the National Council on the Arts will review it at the next regularly scheduled meeting. The Chairperson of the Endowment then will decide whether to approve applications recommended by the Council.

4. Reporting Requirements

The Deputy will maintain a record of Requests for Reconsideration in accordance with the Endowment's Records Disposition schedule. The record will include the date of receipt, the name of the applicant, including name of organization or institution where applicable, the application number, the determinations of the Deputy, and once the Deputy's review is complete, the date on which each applicant was notified of the results of the reconsideration, and what those results were.

Dated: September 23, 1996.

Karen Christensen,

General Counsel, National Endowment for the Arts.

[FR Doc. 96–25075 Filed 9–30–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7536–01–M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Agency Information Collection Activities: Proposed Collection; Comment Request

AGENCY: U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC).

ACTION: Notice of pending NRC action to submit an information collection request to OMB and solicitation of public comment.

SUMMARY: The NRC is preparing a submittal to OMB for review of continued approval of information collections under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35).

Information pertaining to the requirement to be submitted:

1. The title of the information collection: Billing Instructions for NRC Cost Type Contracts.
2. Current OMB approval number: (3150–0109).
3. How often the collection is required: Monthly.
4. Who is required or asked to report: NRC Contractors.
5. The number of annual respondents: 106.

6. The number of hours needed annually to complete the requirement or request: 2000 hours (Billing Instructions 1384 hours + 616 License Fee Recovery Cost Summary).

7. Abstract: The NRC Division of Contracts in administering its contracts provides Billing Instructions for its contractors to follow in preparation of invoices. These instructions stipulate the level of detail in which supporting cost data must be submitted for NRC review. The review of this information ensures that all payments made by NRC for valid and reasonable costs are in accordance with the contract terms and conditions. Submit, by December 2, 1996, comments that address the following questions:

1. Is the proposed collection of information necessary for the NRC to properly perform its functions? Does the information have practical utility?

2. Is the burden estimate accurate?

3. Is there a way to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected?

4. How can the burden of the information collection be minimized, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology?

A copy of the draft supporting statement may be viewed free of charge at the NRC Public Document Room, 2120 L Street NW., (lower level), Washington, DC. Members of the public who are in the Washington, DC, area can access this document via modem on the Public Document Room Bulletin Board (NRC's Advanced Copy Document Library), NRC subsystem at FedWorld, 703–321–3339. Members of the public who are located outside of the Washington, DC, area can dial FedWorld, 1–800–303–9672, or use the FedWorld Internet address: fedworld.gov (Telnet). The document will be available on the bulletin board for 30 days after the signature date of this notice. If assistance is needed in accessing the document, please contact the FedWorld help desk at 703–487–4608. Additional assistance in locating the document is available from the NRC Public Document Room, nationally at 1–800–397–4209, or within the Washington, DC, area at 202–634–3273.

Comments and questions about the information collection requirements may be directed to the NRC Clearance Officer, Brenda Jo. Shelton, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, T–6 F33, Washington, DC, 20555–0001, by telephone at (301) 415–7233, or by Internet electronic mail at BJS1@NRC.GOV.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 23rd day of September, 1996.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Gerald F. Cranford,

Designated Senior Official for Information Resources Management.

[FR Doc. 96–25067 Filed 9–30–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

[Docket Nos. 50–266 and 50–301]

Wisconsin Electric Power Company; Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating License, Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity for a Hearing

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an amendment to Facility Operating License Nos. DPR–24 and DPR–27 issued to Wisconsin Electric Power Company (the licensee), for operation of the Point Beach Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2, located in Manitowoc County, Wisconsin.

The proposed amendments would change Technical Specification requirements related to the low temperature overpressure protection (LTOP) system. Specifically, the reactor coolant system (RCS) temperature below which LTOP is required to be enabled and one high pressure safety injection pump is required to be rendered inoperable would be changed from 275 °F to 355 °F. Also, a specification would be added stating that only one reactor coolant pump shall be operated when the RCS temperature is less than or equal to 125 °F. Finally, editorial changes would be made to rename the ''Overpressure Mitigating System'' as the ''Low Temperature Overpressure Protection System.''

Before issuance of the proposed license amendment, the Commission will have made findings required by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act) and the Commission's regulations.

The Commission has made a proposed determination that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration. Under the Commission's regulations in 10 CFR 50.92, this means that operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; or (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

I. The proposed changes will explicitly define the temperature at which LTOP is required to be enabled in accordance with NRC guidance, increase the safety margin of the LTOP system by raising the temperature at which one high pressure safety injection pump is required to be rendered inoperable, and ensure that required safety margins are maintained by imposing a restriction on the operation of multiple reactor coolant pumps at low temperatures. The consequences or probability of a previously evaluated accident will, therefore, not significantly be increased.

II. The underlying purpose of the LTOP system is to prevent the pressure of the reactor vessel from exceeding the allowable limits as defined by ASME Code Section XI, Appendix G at any given reactor coolant system temperature. Since this purpose remains unchanged, a new or different kind of accident cannot be created.

III. The proposed changes implement administrative controls that are more restrictive than those required by the present Technical Specifications in order to ensure that the margins of safety previously evaluated for the LTOP system are maintained. It has been determined that the proposed changes will provide acceptable margins as specified in Appendix G of the ASME Code Section XI. Therefore, these changes do not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

The Commission is seeking public comments on this proposed determination. Any comments received within 30 days after the date of publication of this notice will be considered in making any final determination.

Normally, the Commission will not issue the amendment until the expiration of the 30-day notice period. However, should circumstances change during the notice period such that failure to act in a timely way would result, for example, in preventing startup of the facility, the Commission may issue the license amendment before the expiration of the 30-day notice period, provided that its final determination is that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration. The final determination will consider all public and State comments received. Should the Commission take this action, it will publish in the Federal Register a notice of issuance and provide for opportunity for a hearing after issuance. The Commission expects that the need to take this action will occur very infrequently.