

procedures and systems that comply with the standards and requirements of the federal government for administering federal awards for research and education (including lack of material weaknesses in internal control structures as confirmed by applicable audit requirements and substantial compliance with federal policies and regulations pertaining to grant administration, such as timely technical, invention and financial reporting).

2. Agreement to actively participate in the FDP, including regular attendance, at institutional expense, of FDP committee and task force meetings, and participation in new or ongoing FDP demonstrations and pilots. Failure to attend two or more consecutive regularly-scheduled FDP committee meetings will be grounds for termination of membership.

3. Commitment to continued efforts to reengineer and streamline internal processes while enhancing the stewardship of federal support and to provide a report to the FDP membership at least every two years on these efforts.

4. Execution of a memorandum of agreement confirming the above, and setting forth certain additional understandings and requirements (copy of draft agreement will be furnished on request and may also be accessed electronically via the NSF Home Page on the World-Wide Web). Federal agencies currently participating in the FDP have agreed that agency grants and cooperative agreements to FDP member institutions and organizations (excluding affiliate members) will be governed by the "FDP Terms and Conditions" (unless otherwise required). During Phase III they are expected to use the FDP as the primary focus for tests and demonstrations of reengineered processes and systems for the support of research and education. Additional federal agencies may be admitted to the FDP upon agreement to these conditions.

#### What To Submit

Proposing organizations must submit ten (10) copies of a brief proposal (not to exceed 5 pages). The proposal must be signed by a senior official authorized to commit the organization in such matters (in the case of educational institutions Provost level or higher). It must cover the following:

1. Description of existing and planned efforts by the proposing institution/organization to reengineer and improve the effectiveness of systems for administration of federal support.

2. Description of possible Phase III demonstration and pilot projects

including significance of the administrative problem or burden to be addressed, suggested methods/approaches, ways to assess the impact on productivity, and expected benefits.

3. Identification of primary institutional/organizational representatives including their background and qualifications. One of the outcomes of Phase II is a recognition of the need for greater participation in FDP activities by principal investigators and project directors of Federally supported research and education activities. Therefore proposing organizations should identify both administrative and principal investigator/project director representatives and indicate their commitment to participate in FDP activities. (It is expected that each FDP Phase III member organization will designate two representatives).

4. Indication of the proposing organization's top management commitment to reengineer administrative processes and systems, and willingness and commitment to fully participate in FDP activities.

This section also should include a brief summary of the organization's characteristics: type of institution/organization, size, Federal R&D/education funding for fiscal years 1994 and 1995, by year and funding agency, etc.

#### Selection Criteria

1. Evaluation and assessment of existing reengineering activities of the organization in the area of administrative processes and systems and organizational commitment to same.

2. Significance of proposed demonstrations and pilot projects and the extent to which suggested methods and approaches clearly show potential to achieve the results sought.

3. Commitment of individuals proposed as lead organizational representatives and their experience and leadership in improving administration of federal support.

4. Evidence of organizational and top management commitment to full participation in Phase III. In addition to the above, equally weighted criteria, consideration will be given to achieving an appropriate representation of organizations, including organization type, size, extent of federal support, geographic location, etc.

#### Evaluation of Proposals and Selection Process

Evaluation of proposals will be carried out by the Standing FDP Committee on Membership, which is

comprised of federal agency officials, representatives of current FDP member institutions, and GUIRR representatives. The Membership Committee will make the final selection in consultation with the Executive Committee of the FDP.

#### Proposal Submission and Deadlines

Ten copies of the organization's proposal must be received by C.O.B. March 20, 1996 at the Government—University—Industry Research Roundtable, National Academy of Sciences, National Academy of Engineering, Institute of Medicine, 2101 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20410. Attention: FDP

#### Selection and Schedule

Evaluation and selection of organizations will be completed about May 1, 1996. Project organization and execution of Phase III agreements will be completed about June 15, 1996.

Dated: February 2, 1996.

Robert B. Hardy,

*Director, Division of Contracts, Policy and Oversight.*

[FR Doc. 96-2642 Filed 2-7-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555-01-M

---

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

### Documents Containing Reporting or Recordkeeping Requirements: Office of Management and Budget Review

**AGENCY:** Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice of the OMB review of information collection and solicitation of public comment. The NRC hereby informs potential respondents that an agency may not conduct or sponsor, and that a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number.

**SUMMARY:** The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) has recently submitted to OMB for review the following proposal for collection of information under the provision of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35).

1. Type of submission, new, revision, or extension: Revision.

2. The title of the information collection: 10 CFR Part 20, Proposed Rule, Reporting Requirements for Unauthorized Use of Licensed Radioactive Material.

3. The form number if applicable: Not applicable.

4. How often is the collection required: As the events occur.

5. Who will be required or asked to report: All NRC licensees.

6. An estimate of the number of responses: 19,800.

7. The estimated number of annual respondents: 20 per year.

8. An estimate of the number of hours needed annually to complete the requirement or request: 400 hours for the 20 licensees that may be affected by this proposed rule or 20 hours per licensee.

9. An indication of whether Section 3507(d), Pub. L. 104-13 applies: Not applicable.

10. Abstract: The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is proposing to require reporting of events that cause, or have the potential to cause, an exposure of individuals whether or not the exposure exceeds the regulatory limits. This proposed rule would add a new requirement for licensees to notify the NRC Operations Center within 24 hours after finding any event of intentional or allegedly intentional deviation of licensed radioactive material from its intended or authorized use. In addition, the proposed rule would add a new requirement for licensees to notify the NRC when they are unable, within 48 hours of discovery of the event, to rule out that the use was intentional.

Submit by April 8, 1996, comments that address the following question:

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 submittal may be viewed free of charge at the NRC Public Document Room, 2120 L Street, NW (lower level), Washington, DC 20555-0001. 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 Advances 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. Comments

and questions should be directed to the OMB reviewer by March 11, 1996: Troy Hillier, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, (3150-0014), NEOB-10202, Office of Management and Budget, Washington, DC 20503.

Comments can also be submitted by telephone at (202) 395-3084.

The NRC Clearance Officer is Brenda J. Shelton, (301) 415-7233.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 30th day of January, 1996.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.  
Gerald F. Cranford,

*Designated Senior Official for Information Resources Management.*

[FR Doc. 96-2700 Filed 2-7-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

#### [Docket Nos. 50-498 AND 50-499]

#### **Houston Lighting and Power Company, City Public Service Board of San Antonio, Central Power and Light Company, City of Austin, Texas; Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendments to Facility Operating Licenses, 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. NPF-76 and NPF-80, issued to Houston Lighting & Power Company, et. al., (the licensee) for operation of the South Texas Project, located in Matagorda County, Texas. The original application dated May 1, 1995, was previously published in the Federal Register on June 6, 1995 (60 FR 29876). That application was supplemented by letters dated June 22, August 28, November 22, December 19, 1995, January 4, January 8 (two letters), and January 23, 1996.

The proposed amendment would provide a special test exception that would allow an extension of the standby diesel generator (SDG) allowed outage time for a cumulative 21 days on each SDG once per fuel cycle, and it would also allow an extension of the essential cooling water (ECW) loop allowed outage time for a cumulative 7 days on each ECW loop once per fuel cycle. These extended allowed outage times will be used to perform required inspections and maintenance on the SDGs and the ECW system during power operation.

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:

1. The proposed change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The Standby Diesel Generators are not accident initiators, therefore the increase in Allowed Outage Times for this system does not increase the probability of an accident previously evaluated. The three train design of the South Texas Project ensures that even during the seven days the Essential Cooling Water loop is inoperable there are still two complete trains available to mitigate the consequences of any accident. If the Essential Cooling Water loop is not inoperable during the 21 days the Standby Diesel Generator is inoperable, the Standby Diesel Generator's Engineered Safety Features bus and equipment in the train will be operable. This ensures that all three redundant safety trains of the South Texas Project design are operable. In addition the Emergency Transformer will be available to supply the Engineered Safety Features bus normally supplied by the inoperable Standby Diesel Generator. These actions will ensure that the changes do not involve a significant increase in the consequences of previously evaluated accidents.

2. The proposed change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

The proposed changes affect only the magnitude of the Standby Diesel Generator and Essential Cooling Water Allowed Outage Times once per fuel cycle as identified by the marked-up Technical Specification. As indicated above, the proposed change does not involve the alteration of any equipment nor does it allow modes of operation beyond those currently allowed. Therefore, implementation of these proposed changes does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

3. The proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The proposed changes result in no significant increase in core damage or large early release frequencies.

Three sets of PSA [probabilistic safety assessment] results have been presented to the NRC for the South Texas Project. One submitted in 1989 from the initial Level 1