

collected, and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including through the use of automated data collection techniques and other forms of information.

Proposed Project: Study of the Public Understanding of and Attitudes toward Science and Technology—New—A telephone survey of approximately 2,000 adults aged 18 and over. The proposed survey continues a series of national surveys of public understanding of and attitudes toward science and technology that began in 1972 and is used in the preparation of a chapter in the Science and Engineering Indicators reports by the National Science Board, as mandated by Section 4(j)(1) of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended. The Science and Engineering Indicators report and the chapter on public understanding and attitudes are widely used by planners and program development staff in federal and state agencies, universities, research centers, and similar institutions and by journalists and other individuals seeking to communicate with the public concerning science and technology.

The average burden per respondent is estimated to be 22 minutes, producing a total burden of 733 hours for the complete study.

Send comments to Herman Fleming, Division of Contracts Policy and Oversight, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, VA 22230. Written comments should be received by February 17, 1997.

Dated: December 17, 1996.

Herman G. Fleming,  
Reports Clearance Officer.

[FR Doc. 96-32318 Filed 12-19-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555-01-M

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

### Documents Containing Reporting or Recordkeeping Requirements: Notice of Pending Submittal to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for Review

**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 Action of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35).

### Information Pertaining to the Requirement To Be Submitted

1. *The title of the information collection:* Application/Permit for Use of the Two White Flint (TWFN) Auditorium.

2. *Current OMB approval number:* No. 3150-0181.

3. *How often the collection is required:* Each time public use of the auditorium is requested.

4. *Who is required or asked to report:* Member of the public requesting use of the NRC Auditorium.

5. *The number of annual respondents:* 48.

6. *The number of hours needed annually to complete the requirement or request:* 12.

7. *Abstract:* In accordance with the Public Buildings Act of 1959, an agreement was reached between the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (MPPC), the General Services Administration (GSA) and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the auditorium will be made available for public use. Public users who wish to use the auditorium will be required to complete NRC Form 590. Application/Permit for Use of Two White Flint North (TWFN) Auditorium. The information is needed to allow for administrative review, security review, approval of the requester, to facilitate scheduling, and to make a determination that there are no anticipated problems with the requester prior to utilization of the facility.

A copy of the draft supporting statement may be reviewed 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 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 may be directed to the NRC Clearance Officer, Brenda Jo. Shelton, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, T-6 F33, Washington, DC, 20555-0001, or by telephone at (301) 415-7233, or by Internet electronic mail at BJS1@NRC.GOV.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 16th day of December 1996.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Gerald F. Cranford,  
Designated Senior Official for Information Resources Management.

[FR Doc. 96-32344 Filed 12-19-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

### Agency Information Collection Activities: Proposed Collection; Comment Request

**AGENCY:** U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice of pending NRC action to submit an information collection request to Office of Management & Budget (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:* 10 CFR Part 60—Disposal of High-Level Radioactive Wastes in Geologic Repositories.

2. *Current OMB approval number:* 3150-0127.

3. *How often the collection is required:* The information need only be submitted one time.

4. *Who is required or asked to report:* States or Indian Tribes, or their representatives, requesting consultation with the NRC staff regarding review of a potential high-level waste geologic repository site, or wishing to participate in a license application review for a potential geologic repository.

5. *The number of annual respondents:* 2.

6. *The number of hours needed annually to complete the requirement or request:* An average of 40 hours per response for consultation requests, 80 hours per response for license application review participation proposals, and one hour per response for statements of representative authority. The total burden for all responses is estimated to be 242 hours.

7. **Abstract:** 10 CFR Part 60 requires State and Indian Tribes to submit certain information to the NRC if they request consultation with the NRC staff concerning the review of a potential repository site, or wish to participate in a license application review for a potential repository. Representatives of States Indian Tribes must submit a statement of their authority to act in such a representative capacity. The information submitted by the States and Indian Tribes is used by the Director of the Office of Nuclear Material Safety and safeguards as a basis for decisions about the commitment of NRC staff resources to the consultation and participation efforts.

Submit, by (insert date 60 days after publication in the Federal Register, 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 modern on the Public Document Room Bulletin Board (NRC's Advance 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 16th day of December, 1996.

For the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Gerald F. Cranford,

*Designated Senior Official for Information Resources Management.*

[FR Doc. 96-32347 Filed 12-19-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

#### [Docket No. 50-219]

#### **GPU Nuclear Corporation Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station Issuance of Director's Decision Under 10 CFR 2.206**

Notice is hereby given that by letters dated May 11 and June 14, 1996, Mr. deCamp, on behalf of Oyster Creek Nuclear Watch (Petitioner), requested NRC, pursuant to 10 CFR 2.206, to investigate and correct a highly inaccurate public statement in the "Neighborhood Update" (the licensee's news magazine) and apparently false public testimony given by GPU management at a local zoning board hearing and to take appropriate disciplinary action in the matter. Specifically, Petitioner's concerns relate to (1) the statement that GPU and the Commission agree that a license amendment request that involves the movement of spent fuel from the Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station spent fuel pool to the storage facility while the plant is at power "is not a safety issue but a procedural one" and (2) whether there is some special factor at Oyster Creek that would indeed justify Mr. Barton's sworn statement that it is unsafe to operate the Oyster Creek reactor without full core offload capacity. If no special situation is found that prevents Oyster Creek from operating without full offload capacity, Petitioner requests that the Commission take appropriate disciplinary action against GPU Nuclear management for making a false statement under oath.

As a basis for the request regarding the first concern that the statement in the "Neighborhood Update" is untrue, Petitioner referenced the following excerpts from NRC Bulletin 96-02 (NRCB 96-02) of April 11, 1996:

The NRC staff audited both the initial and updated 10 CFR 50.59 evaluations performed by the licensee [GPU Nuclear] and determined that the proposed cask movement activities represent an unreviewed safety question that should be submitted to the NRC for review and approval pursuant to the requirements of 10 CFR 50.59 and 50.90. \* \* \* Accordingly, as defined in 10 CFR 50.59(c), if an activity is found to

involve an unreviewed safety question, an application for a license amendment must be filed with the Commission pursuant to 10 CFR 50.90.

As a basis for the Petitioner's other concerns, the Petitioner sets forth the relevant excerpts from Mr. Barton's testimony of March 7, 1994, and states that "the NRC ruled in February 1985 in 10 CFR Part 53 that reactors may safely be run without full core offload capacity."

Notice is hereby given that by a Director's Decision (DD 96-22) dated December 11, 1996, the Acting Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, has denied the Petitions. The staff concluded that the issues raised by the Petitioner are without merit and that there is no basis to take disciplinary action against GPU, as explained in the "Director's Decision Pursuant to 10 CFR 2.206" (DD 96-22), the complete text of which follows this notice and is available for inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room at 2120 L Street, NW, Washington DC, and at the local public document room located at Ocean County Library, Reference Department, 101 Washington Street, Tom's River, NJ.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 11th day of December 1996.

For The Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Frank J. Miraglia,  
*Acting Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

#### Director's Decision Under 10 CFR 2.206 I. Introduction

By letters dated May 11 and June 14, 1996, Mr. William deCamp, Jr., requested on behalf of Oyster Creek Nuclear Watch (the Petitioner) that the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC or Commission) take action to investigate statements made by GPU Nuclear Corporation (GPU) in the April 1996 publication "Neighborhood Update" (the licensee's news magazine) and during sworn testimony on March 7, 1996, before the Lacey Township Zoning Board of Adjustment (the Zoning Board). The Petitioner asserts that the statements are false. The Petitioner further requests that NRC take appropriate disciplinary action against GPU management. The Petitioner's requests are being treated as Petitions pursuant to Section 2.206 of Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR 2.206).

The specific statements of concerns are (1) the statement in the "Neighborhood Update" that GPU and the Commission agree that a license amendment request that involves the movement of spent fuel from the Oyster