

## II. Method of Collection

NASA utilizes paper and electronic methods to collect information from collection respondents.

## III. Data

*Title:* NASA FAR Supplement, Part 1827, Patents, Data, & Copyrights.

*OMB Number:* 2700-0052.

*Type of review:* Revision of a currently approved collection.

*Affected Public:* Business or other for-profit; Not-for-profit institutions; Federal government; State, local, or tribal government.

*Estimated Number of Respondents:* 2351.

*Estimated Time Per Response:* Ranges from 1/2 hour to 8 hours per response.

*Estimated Total Annual Burden*

*Hours:* 8,603.

*Estimated Total Annual Cost:* \$0.

## IV. Request for Comments

Comments are invited on: (1) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of NASA, including whether the information collected has practical utility; (2) the accuracy of NASA's estimate of the burden (including hours and cost) of the proposed collection of information; (3) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (4) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including automated collection techniques or the use of other forms of information technology.

Dated: January 31, 2005.

**Patricia L. Dunnington,**

*Chief Information Officer.*

[FR Doc. 05-2302 Filed 2-4-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7510-13-P

---

## NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

### Agency Information Collection Activities: Comment Request

**AGENCY:** National Science Foundation.

**ACTION:** Submission for OMB review; comment request.

**SUMMARY:** The National Science Foundation (NSF) has submitted the following information collection requirement to OMB for review and clearance under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Pub. L. 104-13. This is the second notice for public comment; the first was published in the **Federal Register** at 69 FR 62726, and no comments were received. NSF is forwarding the proposed renewal submission to the Office of Management

and Budget (OMB) for clearance simultaneously with the publication of this second notice. Comments regarding (a) whether the collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of burden including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility and clarity of the information to be collected; (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology should be addressed to: Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs of OMB, Attention: Desk Officer for National Science Foundation, 725 17th Street, NW., Room 10235, Washington, DC 20503, and to Suzanne H. Plimpton, Reports Clearance Officer, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 295, Arlington, Virginia 22230 or send e-mail to [splimpto@nsf.gov](mailto:splimpto@nsf.gov). Comments regarding these information collections are best assured of having their full effect if received within 30 days of this notification. Copies of the submission(s) may be obtained by calling 703-292-7556.

NSF may not conduct or sponsor a collection of information unless the collection of information displays a currently valid OMB control number and the agency informs potential persons who are to respond to the collection of information that such persons are not required to respond to the collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

*Title of Collection:* NSF Proposal Review Process.

*OMB Control No.:* 3145-0060.

#### Proposed Project Proposal Evaluation Process

The National Science Foundation (NSF) is an independent Federal agency created by the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1861-75). The Act states the purpose of the NSF is "to promote the progress of science; [and] to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare" by supporting research and education in all fields of science and engineering."

From those first days, NSF has had a unique place in the Federal Government: It is responsible for the overall health of science and

engineering across all disciplines. In contrast, other Federal agencies support research focused on specific missions such as health or defense. The Foundation also is committed to ensuring the nation's supply of scientists, engineers, and science and engineering educators.

The Foundation fulfills this responsibility by initiating and supporting merit-selected research and education projects in all the scientific and engineering disciplines. It does this through grants and cooperative agreements to more than 2,000 colleges, universities, K-12 school systems, businesses, informal science organizations and other research institutions throughout the U.S. The Foundation accounts for about one-fourth of Federal support to academic institutions for basic research.

The Foundation relies heavily on the advice and assistance of external advisory committees, ad-hoc proposal reviewers, and to other experts to ensure 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 in the identification of meritorious projects.

Review of proposals may involve large panel sessions, small groups, use of individuals, ad hoc "mail reviews" by three or more reviewers, or some combination of these peer review methods. Proposals are reviewed carefully by scientists or engineers who are expert in the particular field represented by the proposal. About 50% are reviewed exclusively by panels of reviewers who gather, usually in Arlington, VA, to discuss their advice as well as to deliver it. About 35% 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. Finally, about 15% are reviewed exclusively by mail.

#### Use of the Information

The information collected on the proposal evaluation forms is used by the Foundation in applying the following criteria when awarding or declining proposals submitted to the Agency: (1) What is the intellectual merit of the proposed activity? (2) What are the broader impacts of the proposed activity?

The information collected on reviewer background questionnaire (NSF 428A) is used by managers to maintain an automated database of reviewers for the many disciplines represented by the proposals submitted to the Foundation. Information collected on gender, race, and ethnicity is used in meeting NSF needs for data to permit response to Congressional and other queries into equity issues. These data also are used in the design, implementation, and monitoring of NSF efforts to increase the participation of various groups in science, engineering, and education.

### Confidentiality

When a decision has been made (whether an award or a declination), verbatim copies of reviews, excluding the identities of the reviewers, and summaries of review panel deliberations, if any, are provided to the PI. A proposer also may request and obtain any other releasable material in NSF's file on his or her proposal. Everything in the file except information that directly identifies either reviewers or other pending or declined proposals is usually releasable to the proposer.

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

The Foundation collects information regarding race, ethnicity, disability, and gender, as noted above. The FOIA and the Privacy Act protect this information from public disclosure.

### 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 6.3 reviews, with a minimum requirement of three reviews.

Dated: February 2, 2005.

**Suzanne H. Plimpton,**

*Reports Clearance Officer, National Science Foundation.*

[FR Doc. 05-2301 Filed 2-4-05; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7555-01-M**

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50-266 and 50-301]

### Nuclear Management Company; Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendments 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 Nuclear Management Company (the licensee) for operation of the Point Beach Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2, located in Two Rivers, Wisconsin.

The proposed amendment would revise the Point Beach Nuclear Plant (PBNP), Units 1 and 2, Updated Final Safety Analysis Report to reflect the Commission staff's approval of the WCAP-14439-P, Revision 2 analysis entitled, "Technical Justification for Eliminating Large Primary Loop Pipe Rupture as the Structural Design Basis for the Point Beach Nuclear Plant Units 1 and 2 for the Power Uprate and License Renewal Program."

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 Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations (10 CFR), Section 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. Operation of PBNP in accordance with the proposed amendments does not result in a significant increase in the probability or consequences of any accident previously evaluated.

The proposed change revises the analysis supporting the PBNP dynamic effects design basis for primary loop piping. The proposed change does not adversely affect accident initiators or precursors nor alter the design

assumptions, conditions, or the manner in which the plant is operated and maintained. The proposed change does not alter or prevent the ability of structures, systems, and components from performing their intended function to mitigate the consequences of an initiating event within the assumed acceptance limits. The proposed change does not affect the source term, containment isolation, or radiological release assumptions used in evaluating the radiological consequences of an accident previously evaluated. Further, the proposed change does not increase the types or amounts of radioactive effluent that may be released offsite, nor significantly increase individual or cumulative occupational/public radiation exposures. The proposed change is consistent with safety analysis assumptions and resultant consequences. Therefore, it is concluded that this change does not significantly increase the probability of occurrence of an accident previously evaluated.

2. Operation of PBNP in accordance with the proposed amendments does not result in a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

The proposed change revises the analysis supporting the PBNP dynamic effects design basis for primary loop piping. The changes do not impose any new or different requirements or eliminate any existing requirements. The changes do not alter assumptions made in the safety analysis. The proposed changes are consistent with the safety analysis assumptions and current plant operating practice. Therefore, the proposed change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

3. Operation of PBNP in accordance with the proposed amendments does not result in a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The proposed change revises the analysis supporting the PBNP dynamic effects design basis for primary loop piping. All the recommended margins regarding leak-before-break conditions (margin on leak rate, margin on flaw size, and margin on loads) are satisfied for the primary loop piping. The proposed change does not alter the manner in which safety limits, limiting safety system settings or limiting conditions for operation are determined. The setpoints at which protective actions are initiated are not altered by the proposed changes. Sufficient equipment remains available to actuate upon demand for the purpose of mitigating an analyzed event.

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.