

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