of it is not. Museum learning is often ''object-centered'' and activity centered,'' but visitors also perceive and remember the other facets of a museum experience including the rich social, physical and personal contexts.

Museum learning provides opportunities for active learning and provides for multiple points of entry into the learning experience. Because a museum visit may offer varied experiences, including the potential for discovery learning and for self-directed and self-paced inquiry, museums may provide learning experiences for a variety of learners with differing characteristics, needs expectations and learning styles.

Although museum learning experiences include formal, nonformal. and informal modes, they often differ from or transcend the typical offerings of formal, sequential instruction tied to specified goals with clearly identified populations which are found in other educational organizations.

AVAILABLE FUNDS: An award(s) is expected to be no greater than $1,000,000 and may be less, depending on the availability of funds and the quality of proposals. The supporting funding agencies reserve the right to make one, multiple or no awards as a result of this request for proposals. The coordinating agency, the Institute of Museum Services, reserves the right to negotiate with the applicant to ensure that the goals of this request for proposals are met.

APPLICATION FORMS: Applicants may obtain application packets for Research in Learning in Museums, Request for Proposals, by contacting the Institute of Museum Services, 1100 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Room 609, Washington, DC 20506, (202) 606–8539, TDD Line—(202) 606–8636, or e-mail at imsinfo@ims.fed.us.

APPLICABLE REGULATIONS: In addition to statutes and regulations referenced in the Statement of Assurances, these Office of Management and Budget Circulars may apply to the management of project activities by the cooperative team(s), depending on the organizational structure of the official applicant(s): A–21 Cost Principles for Educational Institutions; A–87 Cost Principles for State and Local Governments; A–102 Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants and Cooperative Agreements to State and Local Governments; A–110 Uniform Administrative Requirement for Grants and Other Agreements to Non-Profit Organizations; A–122 Cost Principles for Non-Profit Organizations; A–128 Audits of Institutions of Higher Education and Other Non-Profit Institutions; A–133 Audits of State and Local Governments.

(Catalogue of Federal Domestic Assistance No. 45.301, Institute of Museum Services)

Dated: May 1, 1996.

Diane B. Frankel,

Director.

[FR Doc. 96–11261 Filed 5–6–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7036–01–M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Agency Information Collection Activities: Submission for OMB Review: Comment Request

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

ACTION: Notice of the OMB review of information collection and solicitation of public comment.

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

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

2. The title of the information collection: 10 CFR 81, Standard Specifications for Granting of Patent Licenses.

3. The form number if applicable:

4. How often the collection is required: Application for licenses are submitted once. Other reports are submitted annually or as other events require.

5. Who will be required or asked to report: Applicants for and holders of NRC licenses to NRC inventions.

6. An estimated number of annual respondents: 0.

7. The estimated number of annual respondents: 0.

8. An estimate of the total number of hours needed annually to complete the requirement or request: 35 hours; however, no applications are anticipated during the next three years.

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

10. Abstract: 10 CFR Part 81 establishes the standard specifications for the issuance of licenses to rights in inventions covered by patents or patent applications invested in the United States, as represented by or in the custody of the Commission and other patents in which the Commission has legal rights.

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. Members of the public who are in the Washington, DC, area can access the submittal 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 should be directed to the OMB reviewer by June 6, 1996. Peter Francis, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs (3150–0121), 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 Jo. Shelton, (301) 415–7233.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland this 1st day of May 1996.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Gerald F. Cranford,

Designated Senior Official for Information Resources Management.

[FR Doc. 96–11294 Filed 5–6–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

Jefferson Proving Ground (U.S. Army), Indiana

[Docket No. 040–08838]

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Finding of no significant impact associated with amendment to Materials License SUB–1435 for Release of Area South of Firing Line for Unrestricted Use, U.S. Army Jefferson Proving Ground, Madison, IN.

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission is considering issuing an amendment to Material License No. SUB–1435, to release, for unrestricted use, that portion of the U.S. Army

Jefferson Proving Ground (JPG), Madison, IN, located south of the firing line, in response to a license amendment application dated September 29, 1995.

Summary of Environmental Assessment

Background

The U.S. Army (the licensee) holds NRC Material License No. SUB–1435 to use, store, and test depleted uranium (DU) munitions at the JPG, Madison, Indiana. In accordance with the Defense Authorization Amendments and Base Realignment and Closure Act of 1988 (Public Law 100–526), the licensee was required to close the JPG base on September 30, 1995.

The JPG site has been divided into two parts, separated along a line (firing line) connecting Gate 19 (west) with Gate 1A (east). The two areas have been designated ''the area north of the firing line'' and ''the area south of the firing line.''

The area north of the firing line contains the DU impact area and consists of approximately 12,000,000 m^2 (3,000 acres) located in the south-central portion of the site. The area located south of the firing line contains buildings and facilities that were used for storage of DU material and is the area that the licensee has requested be released for unrestricted use.

Identification of the Proposed Action

In a letter dated September 29, 1995, the licensee referenced previous briefings and correspondence as the bases for undertaking the following proposed actions: (1) Transferring the license (SUB–1435) to Headquarters, U.S. Army Test and Evaluation Command (TECOM), until license termination and defining the DU impact area north of the firing line as the area that would be covered by the license (SUB–1435) transferred to TECOM; and (2) informing NRC of the completion of the decommissioning of the area south of the firing line and the proposed release of the area for unrestricted use.

The Need for the Proposed Action

In accordance with the requirements of the Defense Authorization Amendment and Realignment Act of 1988 (Public Law 100–526), the licensee was required to close the JPG site on September 30, 1995. Upon base closure the JPG Army Command which managed the licensed material at the site was eliminated. On elimination of the JPG Army Command, responsibility for the licensed material at the JPG site was effectively transferred from the JPG Command (subordinate command) to TECOM.

The portion of the JPG site located south of the firing line has been remediated to levels in compliance with the current NRC decommissioning criteria for unrestricted release. The licensee submitted a Final Survey Report (FSR) to NRC by letter dated March 8, 1995. The staff reviewed the licensee's FSR and conducted a Confirmatory Radiological Survey (CRS) on June 6–8, 1995. Based on the FSR and CRS data, the staff concluded that the area south of the firing line meets NRC criteria for unrestricted release and can be removed from License SUB–1435.

Environmental Impact of the Proposed Action

The actual oversight of the licensee's licensed activities at JPG was effectively transferred from the JPG Army Command to TECOM, on closure of the JPG facility. The overall effects of base closure, on the JPG license oversight, were the elimination of a lower level of management and the transfer of responsibility to a higher level of management within the same organization. The practical impact of the transfer is a change in the radiation protection officers and their locations.

The staff, based on its review of the licensee's organization, has determined that it is acceptable for the licensee to transfer licensing responsibility for the area north of the firing line to what amounts to a higher level of management within the same organization. The reassignment of the JPG licensing responsibility to this higher level of management (TECOM) will not have an adverse impact on the environment nor on the health and safety of the public.

The licensee's submittals indicate that the residual contamination levels comply with NRC's criteria for unrestricted release established in ''The Action Plan to Ensure Timely Decommissioning of Site Decommissioning Management Plan Sites'' (57 FR 13391) of April 16, 1992. A confirmatory radiological survey conducted by NRC provided the staff with confidence in the accuracy and reliability of the licensee's final survey results. To alleviate concerns regarding potential inadvertent intrusion, from the area south of the firing line, into the DU impact area north of the firing line, the licensee has recently completed installation of a fence that will separate the area south of the firing line from the area north of the firing line. The NRC finds that because these criteria have been met and the fence has been installed, there is no significant impact on the environment and the area south of the firing line can be released for unrestricted use.

Alternatives to the Proposed Action

Alternatives to the proposed actions include:

(a) Transferring the License to another Army Command;

(b) Postponing release of the area south of the firing line until final disposition of the area north of the firing line is determined; and

(c) Taking no action.

The JPG Army Command is a subordinate command to TECOM. The technical capabilities of TECOM exceed those of the JPG Command. The Army had the option of selecting other commands with equivalent or greater capability upon elimination of the JPG Command upon base closure. The licensee's decision to transfer the license responsibility to a higher level Command (TECOM) with greater technical capability is acceptable.

Postponing release of the area south of the firing line is not consistent with the timeliness requirements of 10 CFR 40.42(g)(1) or the licensing provisions of § 40.42(j). Therefore, timely release of the remediated JPG portion south of the firing line is consistent with NRC regulations. In addition, postponing its release would hinder the licensee's plans to use the land and facilities for other useful purposes.

The ''no action alternative'' is unacceptable for the same reasons as postponed release.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

NRC has consulted with the Indiana State Department of Health, Division of Indoor and Radiological Health concerning this environmental assessment. This agency has concurred with the NRC's assessment that the area south of the firing line at JPG can be released for unrestricted use.

Finding of No Significant Impact

Based on the environmental assessment, the Commission concludes that the issuance of the license amendment will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment. Accordingly, the Commission has determined not to prepare an environmental impact statement for the proposed action.

The environmental assessment and the documents related to this proposed action are available for public inspection and copying at NRC's Public Document Room, 2120 L Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20555.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland this day of April, 1996.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Robert A. Nelson,

Acting Chief, Low-Level Waste and Decommissioning Projects Branch, Division of Waste Management, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.

[FR Doc. 96–11293 Filed 5–6–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

Environmental Assessment Finding of No Significant Impact Related to Amendment to Materials License No. SUB–908 BP Chemicals, Inc., Lima, OH

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission is considering issuing an amendment to Materials License No. SUB–908, held by BP Chemicals, Inc. (BPC), to authorize the remediation, decommissioning and construction of the mixed waste pond closure project at its facility in Lima, Ohio.

On November 19, 1991, NRC published a notice of Consideration of Amendment to BPC's License and Opportunity for Hearing (56 FR 58406). There was no response to that notice.

Environmental Assessment Summary

Proposed Action

The proposed action is as proposed by the licensee in a second revised application dated February 7, 1994, which supplemented the initial application dated August 15, 1991, and the first revision dated February 28, 1992. In this action, BPC is proposing to use onsite disposal, under 10 CFR Part 20.2002, at its facility in Lima, Ohio, to dispose of the mixed waste with concentrations up to the Option 2 limit in NRC's 1981 Branch Technical Position (1981 BTP) on ''Disposal or Onsite Storage of Thorium or Uranium Wastes from Past Operations'' (46 FR 52061). Materials to be disposed of are currently located in surface impoundments, hereinafter called ponds, that contain sludges contaminated with mixed wastes. The disposal will be in up to three lined closure cells designed and constructed according to the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) criteria.

Need for Proposed Action:

The proposed action is necessary to remediate the existing depleted uranium contamination and to decommission the ponds containing the radioactive wastes. Onsite disposal is proposed to accomplish the objectives of the remediation and decommissioning. Based on the advantages and disadvantages of the five other alternatives investigated, BPC concluded that the 10 CFR Part 20.2002 disposal option is the preferred choice.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action:

The NRC staff reviewed the levels of contamination, the proposed remediation and decommissioning methods, BPC's preferred disposal option, and the radiological and environmental controls that will be used during the remediation and decommissioning. These controls include the as low as is reasonably achievable (ALARA) program, worker dosimetry, a bioassay program for workers, air monitoring, routine surveys, and routine monitoring of both airborne and liquid effluent releases to meet 10 CFR Part 20 radiation protection requirements. Worker and public doses will be limited so that exposures will not exceed 10 CFR Part 20 requirements.

BPC proposed to remediate the contaminated sludge ponds in accordance with ''Guidelines for Decontamination of Facilities and Equipment Prior to Release for Unrestricted Use or Termination of Licenses for Byproduct, Source, and Special Nuclear Materials,'' dated August 1987. BPC also proposed to dispose of the depleted uranium-contaminated mixed wastes in the RCRA-designed onsite closure cells, in accordance with the 1981 BTP. Based on uranium solubility testing of the mixed wastes, the maximum depleted uranium concentration that is acceptable for disposal in the closure cells is 11.1 Bq/gm (300 pCi/gm) total depleted uranium.

The staff also analyzed the radiological impacts to the public from the disposal of depleted uranium-contaminated sludges and soils in the proposed on-site closure cells. Radiological impacts on members of the public could result from inhalation and ingestion of releases of radioactivity in air and in water during the remediation operations, and direct exposure to radiation from radioactive materials at the site during remediation operations. The public will also be exposed to radiation as a result of the on-site disposals in the closure cells. Decommissioning workers will receive doses primarily by ingestion, inhalation and direct exposure during the remediation activities. In addition to impacts from routine operations, the potential radiological consequences of accidents were considered.

The BPC provided an estimate of the dose to the public from airborne effluents to be generated during the remediation activities associated with the pond closure project. During normal operations, the licensee expects airborne concentrations to be minimal, because the sludges and soils will be handled in a wet state. NRC staff agrees with this assessment.

Liquids discharged to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) permitted deep well injection system will have concentrations less than the EPA proposed drinking water limits for uranium, and will result in doses less than 0.057 mSv/yr (5.7 mrem/yr) to individuals hypothetically, consuming this water.

The BPC performed dose assessments for two of the three closure cells using RESRAD computer code, Version 5.05. The RESRAD computer code estimates radiation dose impacts assuming a resident-farmer scenario, where an individual would live in a residence on the site, grow food, and consume all drinking water from a water well. The NRC staff verified BPC's analyses and obtained similar results to BPC's. These dose assessments include the worst-case scenarios, with the proposed cover over the closure cells assumed to have been removed. The predicted doses are less than NRC's limit of 1 mSv/yr (100 mrem/yr) for radiation doses to the public in 10 CFR Part 20. NRC staff considers that, if a third closure cell is constructed, the dose assessment results of the two closure cells will envelope the dose impacts of the third closure cell.

During the remediation of the waste from the ponds and placement of the waste into the closure cells, workers will receive doses from direct exposure and from the inhalation of airborne depleted uranium. The maximum estimated direct exposure is for workers standing on the contaminated soil from the ponds. The estimated exposure is 4.0E–05 mSv/hr (4.0E–03 mrem/hr). Assuming a 2000-hour work year, the maximally exposed worker would receive an annual dose of 0.08 mSv/yr (8 mrem/yr). The resulting dose is a small fraction of the 50 mSv/yr (5000 mrem/yr) limit for workers (routine occupational exposure) in 10 CFR Part 20.

Based on the above evaluations, radiation exposures, of persons living or traveling near the site, caused by onsite operations, will be well within limits contained in NRC's regulations and will be small in comparison to natural background radiation. The licensee has a radiation protection program that will maintain radiation exposures and effluent releases within the limits of 10 CFR Part 20, and will maintain exposures ALARA.

BPC and the NRC staff also evaluated the radiological impacts from potential accidents. The predicted maximum